Introduction

This presentation explores the connections between anti-agreement, (intransitive) subject extraction, and atelic aspect in the closely related Kampan Arawak languages of Peru.
The inspiration for a discussion of these phenomena comes from the work of Harold Shaver

El verbo estativo intransitivo debe llevar un sufijo estativo en la posición de los sufijos de aspecto. Este sufijo aparece solamente en verbos intransitivos que no llevan un prefijo pronominal y los convierte en verbos estativos, no perfectivos; deben llevar un sujeto libre.

Los sufijos estativos son:

-atsi/-ach estativo no futuro (La forma -ach aparece antes del sufijo reflexivo -a.)

-ënguitsi/-ënguicha estativo futuro

Figure 2: Shaver (1996:60) on Nomatsigenga

Shaver (ibid.) goes on to describe that stative verbs of this sort appear in:

1. subject content interrogatives (‘en preguntas para identificar al sujeto y en las respuestas correspondientes’)

2. intransitive subject relative clauses (‘en las oraciones relativas intransitivas’)

3. subject focus (‘para enfatizar el sujeto en vez de la acción’)

The use of the term ‘stative’ – as a sort of atelic aspect – appears to originate in an aspectual alternation between “perfect” (-ak) and “progressive” described by David Payne for the Apurucayali dialect of related Ashéninka (Figure 3)

• The Apurucayali progressive -aˇc closely resembles the Nomatsigenga non-future stative

For the Perené dialect of Ashéninka, Mihas (2015:218-219) describes two allomorphs of the progressive -atz [ats] ~ -aty

(1) PERENÉ ASHÉNKKA

a. Aparojatzini no-jatatz sharakamashiki.

arpajatzini no- ja -atz -i sharakamashi =ki

Once 1s- go -EP -PROG -REAL:ACT highlands =LOC

Once I was going to the Andean highlands.

b. Okisatya irori.

1 Ashéninka dialects include: Perené, Pichis, Ucayali, Apurucayali, and Pajonal. Matsigenka dialects include: Lower Urubamba, Upper Urubamba, and Manú.

2 Translation (mine): ‘The stative intransitive verb should take a stative suffix in place of the aspect suffixes. This suffix appears only in intransitive verbs that do not take a pronominal prefix and transforms them into stative verbs, not perfective ones; they should take a free subject.’

3 Contrast, for example, Shaver (1975), who uses the term ‘present’ to describe this morpheme, still in use for the Apurímac dialect of related Asháninka in Kindberg (1980:464).
Figure 3: Payne (1981:31) on Apurucayali Ashéninka

(41) hiyaatanaki he has gone (departing) (CANOE 11)

iNkantaNakiri he will have said to him (departing) (CANOE 20)

owaka we have eaten (CONVERSATION 60)

The PROGRESSIVE suffix -ač indicates an action in progress or, if in the future, viewed as being in progress. The examples below illustrate the suffix:

(42) hotitača he is/was getting in

howačiina it will be eating me

ighikačaana he is cutting me

Similarly, Nomatsigenga exhibits a progressive suffix -ats [ats] ~ -ach exactly identical to its “non-future stative” (cf. Figure 2), and closely resembling Perené Ashéninka

(2) Ibaségatsi.

Nomatsigenga

i-  baseg -ats -i

3M.S- hit -PROG -REAL:ACT

‘He kept hitting (himself).’ (Lawrence 2013:102)

However, Perené Ashéninka exhibits two suffixes that more closely resemble the Nomatsigenga ones in Figure 2

1 = first; 2 = second; 3 = third; AA = anti-agreement; ABL = ablative; ACT = active; ALL = allative; ANT = anterior; ANTIP = antipassive; AP = alienable possession; APPL = applicative; CL = classifier; CNGR = congruent; CNTR = contrastive; COP = copula; DEM = demonstrative; DIST = distal; DSTR = distributive; DUR = durative; EP = epenthetic; F = feminine; FE = feminine ego; FOC = focus; HAB = habitual; INFER = inferential; INTR = intransitive; IRR = irrealis; LOC = locative; M = masculine; MAL = malefactive; MED = medial; MID = middle; NEG = negative; O = object; P = possessive; PFV = perfective; PRO = pronominal; PROG = progressive; REAL = realis; REC = recipient; REG = regressive; REL = relativizer; SC = scene change; SE = subject extraction; STAT = stative; S = subject.

Here and elsewhere I alter some of Mihas’ segmentations and glosses for ease of comparison with other examples. The reader is referred to the original.

Here and elsewhere I alter some of Lawrence’s segmentations and glosses for ease of comparison with other examples. The reader is referred to the original.
• -ats [atsʰ] ~ -ach ‘stative imperfective’

• -aiNts ~ -aiNich ‘stative perfective’

While the progressive suffixes in Apurucayali and Peréné Ashéninka appear to have an atelic interpretation, it is not obvious that there is anything stative about the stative suffixes (3)

(3) ... kamitaincharinta, pokanaki irirori.

In Nomatsigenga there is no formal distinction between the progressive and one of the two stative suffixes (compare Figure 2 and (2))

• In Peréné Ashéninka there is a slight distinction, -atz ~ -aty ‘progressive’ and -ats ~ -ach ‘stative’

However, in both Nomatsigenga and Peréné Ashéninka it is only the -ats-like form that occurs as progressive and stative

• The longer form found as the second of the stative suffixes (cf. Mihas’ stative perfective above) in neither language occurs in the progressive paradigm

Only Nomatsigenga, Ashéninka, and Caquinte exhibit an -ats-like atelic aspect marker

In contrast, every Kampan language exhibits a pair of suffixes cognate with the Nomatsigenga and Ashéninka stative suffixes (Table 1)

Table 1: Kampan Intransitive Subject Extraction Suffixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nomatsigenga</td>
<td>-ats ~ -ach</td>
<td>-iijits ~ -iijich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caquinte</td>
<td>-atsi</td>
<td>-ankitsi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashéninka</td>
<td>-ats ~ -ach</td>
<td>-ai(N)ts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matsigenka</td>
<td>-ats ~ -ach</td>
<td>-ankits ~ -ankich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanti</td>
<td>-atsi</td>
<td>-ankichcha</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I argue that the Ashéninka facts have hampered the analysis of the suffixes that Shaver (and many others) describe(s)

• There are a pair of intransitive subject extraction suffixes in every Kampan language

• Some Kampan languages exhibit an additional suffix expressing an atelic aspect

I illustrate these claims with data from Caquinte – which behaves differently than Ashéninka – before returning to comparative facts and sketching a brief diachronic account
1.1 Person

Person in Caquinte, as in all Kampan languages, is marked with verbal affixes

Table 2: Caquinte Verbal Person-Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A, $S_A$</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>$S_P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$n(o)$-</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>$a$, $\emptyset$-</td>
<td>-ahi</td>
<td>-ahi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$p(i)$-</td>
<td>-$N_{pi}$</td>
<td>-$N_{pi}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>$i$, $y$, $ir(i)$-</td>
<td>-$ri$</td>
<td>-$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>$\alpha$, $\emptyset$-</td>
<td>-$ro$</td>
<td>-$\emptyset$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitive subjects (A) are marked with a verbal prefix, objects (P) with a suffix.

(4) “Nometohakeri tanpishinari.”

\[ \text{no- metoh -a -k -i -ri tanpishinari} \]

1S- kill -EP -PFV -REAL:ACT -3M.O tapir

“I killed the tapir.” (kas82)

Intransitive subjects (S) are marked with either prefixes or suffixes, constituting a fluid system not dependent on lexical aspect (O’Hagan 2015)

(5) Caquinte

a. ... “Aato noshiga, ametanakena.”

\[ \text{aato no- shig -a ame -t -an -a -k -a -na} \]


... “I won’t run away, I’m accustomed to things.”

b. “Chapinkinpani tee nametenpahi.”

\[ \text{chapi\text{\char13}ki =Npani tee no- ame -t -e -Npa -hi} \]

recently =CNTR NEG:REAL 1S- accustom -EP -IRR -MID -NEG:REAL

“Recently I wasn’t accustomed to things.” (ttk818-819)

1.2 Reality Status

Reality status distinguishes notionally realized and unrealized eventualities (Michael 2014)

- REALIS: past or present temporal reference

\(^{7}\)The distribution of object agreement follows a differential pattern sensitive to familiar definiteness.

\(^{8}\)Caquinte data derives from my own fieldwork; citations include a three-letter code corresponding to a text title, followed by a line number.
IRREALIS: future temporal reference, negation, counterfactual, imperative

‘RS is a binary inflectional category in all the Kampan languages’ (ibid:279)

- The form of reality status suffixes is nearly identical across Kampan languages.

In all Kampan languages there are two pairs of reality status suffixes

- In Caquinte reality status is morphologically fusional with voice (active vs. middle)
- In other languages these pairs have come to differentiate fairly lexicalized verb classes

In Caquinte, degree of morphological fusion varies based on reality status value (Table 3)

- Realis suffixes differ in whether they expone active or middle voice
- There is one invariant irrealis suffix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Caquinte Reality Status Suffixes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REALIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRREALIS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In irrealis, middle voice is exponed via a separate suffix -Npa, separated from the reality status suffix by a single morphological slot that hosts the recipient applicative -nV.

(6) “Pohokitsitenenpari!”

\[
\text{Caquinte} \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{pi} - \text{ohok} - \text{itsi} - \text{t} - \text{e} - \text{nV} - \text{Npa} - \text{ri} \\
\text{2s- give} - \text{APPL:MAL} - \text{EP} - \text{IRR} - \text{APPL:REC} - \text{MID} - \text{3M.O}
\end{array}
\]

“Give it to him!”

2 Subject Extraction

Sorts of subject extraction described below include wh-questions, relative clauses, and focus constructions

\footnote{\textit{See Table 5 in Michael (2014:279).}}

\footnote{The vowel of this suffix is a copy of the vowel of the preceding syllable.}
2.1 Transitive Subject Extraction

In terms of verbal morphology, the extraction of the subject of a transitive verb in Caquinte suppresses subject agreement (7)

(7) “Avirokea anaakena.”

Caquinte

aviro =kea anaq -a -k -i -na
2.PRO =SC defeat -EP -PFV -REAL:ACT -1O

“You defeated me.” (kch2.79)

This is a straightforward instance of ‘anti-agreement’, or the lack of agreement when an agreement controller is extracted (see Baier (2016) and references therein)

When subject agreement is absent, irrealis must be multiply exponed with the abovedescribed suffixes and -ne

(8) “Imaika aviro aaherine.”

Caquinte

imaika aviro ag -ah -e -ri -ne
now 2.PRO live.with -REG -IRR -3M.O -IRR:AA

“Now you will go back to live with him.” (sis101)

2.2 Intransitive Subject Extraction

In addition to the absence of subject agreement, Caquinte exhibits two verbal suffixes that are obligatory when the subject of an intransitive verb is extracted: -atsi and -ankitsi

• There is an apparent aspectual distinction between the two, but this is the subject of future research (A and B are arbitrary abbreviations)

• These suffixes replace reality status suffixes, collapsing the realis-irrealis and the active-middle distinctions
  – Irrealis is similarly exposed via -ne (see (11))
  – Middle voice is not exponed at all, even when it would be without extraction

When either -atsi or -ankitsi is present, subject agreement is absent

(9) Caquinte

a. “Taa tanpishitatsi?”

Caquinte

taa tanpishi -t -atsi
WH be.strong -EP -INTR.SE:A
... “Who is strong?” (kev48)

This suffix is cognate to the Perené Ashéninka irrealis relativizer -ni (Mihas 2015:541-546). It is not a relativizer in Caquinte, evidenced by the fact that it co-occurs with the relativizer =ka.
b. “Inani, taakea chookatankitsi ontaniki antakeronta?”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Inani} & \quad \text{taa} \quad \text{=ke} \quad \text{chooka} \quad -t \quad \text{-ankitsi} \quad \text{o-} \quad \text{Nta} \quad \text{-niki} \quad \text{anTakeronta} \\
\text{mother} \quad \text{WH} & \quad \text{=SC} \quad \text{reside} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-INTR.SE:B} \quad \text{3F-} \quad \text{DEM:DIST} \quad \text{-LOC} \quad \text{other.side:DIST}
\end{align*}
\]

“Mother, who lives over there on the other side?” (ama137)

(10) **CAQUINTE**

**RELATIVE CLAUSE**

a. Aritari ikota metohantatsika.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ar} & \quad \text{=tari} \quad \text{i-} \quad \text{ko} \quad -t \quad \text{-a} \quad \text{metoh} \quad \text{-aN} \quad -t \quad \text{-atsi} \quad \text{=ka} \\
\text{so} & \quad \text{=CNGR} \quad \text{3M.S-} \quad \text{COP} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-REAL:MID} \quad \text{kill} \quad \text{-ANTIP} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-INTR.SE:A} \quad \text{=REL}
\end{align*}
\]

That is what warriors are like. (shm120)

b. ... “Iriketi voankitsi inpahitakenpa Taavanti.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iriketi} & \quad \text{=ka} \quad \text{vog} \quad \text{-ankitsi} \quad \text{i-} \quad \text{N-} \quad \text{pahi} \quad -t \quad \text{-ak} \quad -c \quad \text{Npa} \\
\text{3M.FIRST} & \quad \text{=REL} \quad \text{be.born} \quad \text{-INTR.SE:B} \quad \text{-3M.S-} \quad \text{IRR: name} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad \text{-MID}
\end{align*}
\]

Taavanti

Taavanti

... “The one that was born first will be named Taavanti.” (kat165)

(11) **CAQUINTE**

**FOCUS**

a. ... “Avirosa peagetatsi.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aviro} & \quad \text{=} \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{peg} \quad -a \quad \text{-ge} \quad -t \quad \text{-atsi} \\
\text{2.PRO} & \quad \text{=} \quad \text{INFER} \quad \text{transform} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-DSTR} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-INTR.SE:A}
\end{align*}
\]

... “You transform into things.” (imo41)

b. “Avirokea imaika shekatankitsine isavihi.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aviro} & \quad \text{=} \quad \text{kea} \quad \text{imaika} \quad \text{sheka} \quad -t \quad \text{-ankitsi} \quad \text{-ne} \quad \text{isavihi} \\
\text{2.PRO} & \quad \text{=} \quad \text{SC} \quad \text{now} \quad \text{eat} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-INTR.SE:B} \quad \text{-IRR:AA} \quad \text{below}
\end{align*}
\]

“You now are going to eat down below.” (hag121)

3 **“Stativity”**

Habitual aspect in Caquinte is expressed via -atsi, which exhibits the same morphological properties as the marker of intransitive subject extraction

- Differently, however, habitual -atsi requires suffixal subject agreement
- Recall that the exponent of third person in this paradigm is -Ø (see Table 2)

An -atsi-marked verb may be a main clause verb (12) or a complement ((13) & (14))

(12) “Aviatinpa chokotitanatsinpi paamaripokiki.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{aviati} & \quad \text{n} \quad \text{pa} \quad \text{2.PRO} \quad \text{sit} \quad \text{-EP} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-HAB} \quad \text{-2S} \quad \text{fire} \quad \text{-CL:hearth} \quad \text{=LOC}
\end{align*}
\]

“You’re always sitting at the fire.” (hag10)
Arikea ichookatake oraniki Taataki peakaanatsi ishikiripite... Caquinte

And so Taataki lived there making his arrows... (ttk610)

Onehapohirokea ovatyageo nohatanatsi aintochapaki. Caquinte

Then when she arrived she saw her daughter-in-law masticating manioc. (has55)

Crucially, -ankitsi has no function outside of intransitive subject extraction

4 Other Kampan Languages

4.1 Matsigenka

Matsigenka has no cognate to Caquinte habitual -atsi

The active-middle distinction is maintained in realis intransitive subject extraction

-ats co-occurs with -i, -ach with -a
-ankits co-occurs with -i, -ankich with -a

Like Caquinte, irrealis is not exponed in the usual way, but by -ne

Matsigenka data is drawn from Vargas Pereira et al. (2013); citations include a three-letter code corresponding to a text title, followed by a line number.
“You will run back away.” (ivo14)

(16) Matsigenka
   a. ... maika virotya atanksine...
      
      maika viro =tya a -t -ankits -i -ne
      now  2.PRO =also go -EP -INTR.SE:B -REAL:ACT -IRR:AA
      “... now you too will go...” (ips5)
   b. “Koki, naketyo sekatankichane…”
      
      koki naketyo seka -t -ankich -a -ne
      “Uncle, I’m going to eat first...” (oim16)

4.2 Nanti

Nanti exhibits a construction superficially similar to the Caquinte habitual [17]

(17) Nokamosotake ige, biikanatsi hanta.

NANTI

no- kamoso -t -ak -i  ige obiik -an -atsi -Ø hanta
1S- visit -EP -PFV -REAL:ACT brother.ME drink -ABL -HAF13 -3S there

I visited my brother, he was drinking there. (Michael 2008:405)

However, Michael analyzes -atsi (his -ts14) and -ankicha as relativizers of intransitive verbs that carry imperfective and perfective values, respectively [18]

(18) NANTI
   a. Inpo pokahigatsi ikamanti...
      
      inpo pok -a -hig -atsi i- kamaNT -i
      then come -EP -PL -REL:PFV 3M.S- tell -REAL:ACT
      Then whoever it was that came told (us)... (Michael 2008:407)
   b. “... hara pogabisahiri kogankicha inpasehabagetake.”
      
      hara pi-ogi-abis -ah -i -ri kog -ankicha i- n-
      NEG:IRR 2S-CAUS pass -REG -REAL:ACT -3M.O want -REL:PFV 3M.S-IRR-
      paseha -bage -t -ak -e
      visit -DUR -EP -PFV -IRR
      “... don’t permit those who want to visit for a long time to pass by again.”
      (Michael 2008:405)

Yet other examples appear to be subject extraction under focus [19]

(19) Hose iryo shigapahatsi, ikanti: “Kobake!”

13Here (and elsewhere) I alter some of Michael’s segmentation and glossing for ease of comparison. The original translation is: ‘I visited my brother, who was drinking there.’ See below.
14That is, he analyzes the a as epenthetic.
José, who was running towards us, said: “Watch out!”

5 Diachrony

The phylogeny of Kampan languages is not well understood

![Figure 4: Kampan Classification (Michael 2011)](image)

Synchronically there are two constructions in Nomatsigenga, Ashéninka, and Caquinte

1. A suffix expressing a sort of atelic aspect

2. A pair of suffixes obligatory under intransitive subject extraction, which (likely) cumulatively expone aspect as well

The nature of the atelic aspect construction varies among the languages

- In Caquinte, -atsi occurs only with intransitive verbs (and suffixal subject agreement)
- In Nomatsigenga and Ashéninka, this suffix occurs with verbs of either transitivity

Given the distribution of the atelic aspect construction in the tree in Figure 4, it is probable that it was present in Proto-Kampan (and lost in the ancestor Matsigenka and Nanti)

The languages also vary in the degree of fusion of the extraction suffixes (see Table 1)

- Given that voice is distinguished under extraction in Nomatsigenga, Matsigenka, and Ashéninka, it is probable that it was similarly distinguished in Proto-Kampan (and collapsed in different ways in Nanti and Caquinte)

15 Potential translation under focus analysis: ‘José, he was running towards us, and said: “Watch out!”’
It is striking that Caquinte, with its reduced voice distinctions under extraction, also has a reduced voice distinction in its atelic aspect construction (i.e., only -atsi)

- This suggests that the two suffixes are etymologically related

In Caquinte, an intransitive verb with a third-person subject in the habitual construction looks superficially similar to one in the extraction construction

- There is no overt marking of subject (cf. -Ø 3s)
- Reality status and voice are neutralized in the same way

(20) **Caquinte**

a. Apaopaeka _oanahatsi_.
   
   _apaopae_ =kea og -an -ah -atsi
   
   Some =SC go -ABL -REG -INTR.SE:A
   
   Only some got away back. (ttk484)

b. ... _teekeate iragamahenpahi, shiakotanatsi_.
   
   _tee_ =kea =te _iri- agamah -e _Npa -hi_ shiako
   
   NEG:REAL =SC =xxx 3M.S.IRR- pay.attention -IRR -MID -NEG:REAL weed
   
   -t -an -atsi -Ø
   
   -EP -ABL -HAB -3S
   
   ... but he wasn’t paying attention, he was weeding. (has13)

I suggest that proto-Kampan exhibited two intransitive subject relativizers, one with an imperfective value and another with a perfective value, much like Nanti.\(^{16}\)

- The subject extraction construction is an old cleft (20a)
- The atelic aspect construction is an old apposition (20b)

In most languages the relativizers were reinterpreted, at least in part, as markers of extraction, becoming combinable with relativizers grammaticalized from other elements (10)

- These new relativizers probably first relativized the arguments of transitive verbs, later combining with intransitive verbs
- This later combination appears to have occurred to a limited degree in Nanti (18)

The atelic aspect construction had at least two grammaticalization trajectories

- In Nomatsigenga and Ashéninka it came to combine with prefixal subject agreement
- In Caquinte it came to combine with suffixal subject agreement

No telic aspect construction developed from the other intransitive subject relativizer

Exponence of voice and reality status developed differently in various languages (Table 1)

\(^{16}\)That extraction suffixes might be tied to relativization historically is hinted at by Lawrence (2013:101-102).
6 Conclusion

The Kampanist literature has long noted two constructions

1. One is synchronically tied to intransitive subject extraction (with two suffixes), i.e., the “stative”

2. Another is synchronically tied to atelic aspect (one suffix), i.e., the “progressive”

Linguists have attempted to incorporate a notion of stativity into the description of the former, even when none appears to be present

These constructions are arguably related, but they should be distinguished for the purposes of description

More fieldwork is needed on these languages to better understand:

• *wh*-questions
• relative clauses
• focus
• clefts
• temporal aspect

This will allow for the closer diachronic study of relativization, clefts, aspect, and their interactions
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