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1 Introduction

• I investigate three frustrative constructions in Caquinte (Swift 1988; Castillo Ramírez 2017)
  – Kampa Arawak (Mihas 2017) language of southeastern Peru

• Definition: “a grammatical marker that expresses the non-realization of some expected outcome implied by the proposition expressed in the marked clause” (Overall 2017:479)
  1. is a grammatical morpheme (“An adverb with a meaning ‘in vain’ may have a similar semantic effect”)
  2. expresses an unrealized expectation (“is part of the epistemic domain, as it relates to speaker’s knowledge and expectations. There is, however, a tendency for it to take on aspectual and evaluative functions”)
  3. is a clause-level category (“typically marked on the predicate, and has clausal scope”)
  4. implies two propositions (“marked in a clause expressing proposition \( p \) that implies proposition \( q \) as an outcome \([\ldots]\); and the use of frustrative expresses the non-realization of \( q \), that is, it negates \( q \)"

(1) a. ...“Anianishi, aato ateronkio asheka.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{anianishi} & \quad \text{aato} & \quad a- & \quad \text{teronk} & \quad i \quad -ro \quad a- & \quad \text{sheka} \\
\text{brother-in-law.MP} & \quad \text{NEG:IRR} & \quad \text{1INCL.S} & \quad \text{finish} & \quad -R:ACT & \quad -3F.O \quad \text{1INCL.P} & \quad \text{food} \\
\end{align*}
\]

...“Brother-in-law, we won’t finish our food.”

*I am grateful to Antonina Salazar Torres, Joy Salazar Torres, Emilia Sergio Salazar, and Miguel Sergio Salazar, speakers of Caquinte who have taught me their language. Other residents of Kitep´ ampani welcomed me into their community from the first visit, and this project would not be possible without their kindness and generosity. Financial support for this research comes from an Oswalt Endangered Languages Grant (University of California, Berkeley) and the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (SOAS, London). In the analysis of Caquinte grammar, I have benefited from conversations with Kenneth Baclawski, Nico Baier, Christine Beier, Antonio Castillo Ramírez, Emily Clem, Virginia Dawson, Stephanie Farmer, Lev Michael, Line Mikkelsen, Kelsey Neely, Amalia Skilton, and Kenneth Swift, as well as from audiences at the Conference on the Indigenous Languages of Latin America (Austin), the Group in American Indian Languages (Berkeley), the Symposium on Amazonian Languages (Berkeley), and the Seminario Internacional de Lenguas Amerindias (Lima). I use the orthography approved by the Peruvian Ministry of Education in 2013, with the exception of the name of the language, following the desires of my collaborators. Relevant orthographic conventions are: \(<\text{b}> = [β]; \ <\text{ch}> = [tʃ]; \ <\text{j}> = [h]; \ <\text{n}> = \text{placeless nasal}; \ <\text{r}> = [r]; \ <\text{sh}> = [ʃ]; \ <\text{y}> = [j].\)
b. “Ashekabekemparo, mana arasokanake intati.”

\[\text{sheka -be -k -e -Npa -ro mana a- arasok -an} \]
\[1\text{INCL.S- eat -FRUST -PFV -IRR -MID -3F.O ALT 1\ INCL.S- be.full(.food) -ABL} \]
\[\text{-k -e intati} \]
\[\text{-PFV -IRR only} \]

“We’ll eat it, but we’ll just get full.”

- Related grammatical categories:
  - Incompletive: “necessarily requires an action to be incomplete, while saying nothing about the expected outcome. Frustrative, by contrast, most typically applies to a completed action and does refer to an expected outcome.”
  - Concessive: “frustrative implies two propositions, but does not require both to be expressed overtly as clauses [as do concessives]”
  - Antiresultative (citing Plungian 2001):
    1. “The end point was not achieved – the process was interrupted earlier [...]”
    2. Passage from the end point to the resulting state did not occur – the process was completed, but the new state did not arise;
    3. The resulting state arose, but it proved to be unstable and it ceased to occur (for example, it was nullified by some factor external to the situation.”

- Extended functions:
  - Evaluative: “The sense of unfulfilled intention or desire, however, seems in most examples to be epiphenomenal. [...] Unambiguous examples of evaluative frustrative indicate that the action or state described by the marked verb is unsatisfying or annoying for the speaker, in the absence of any sense of unrealized expectation”
  - Incompletive: “indicate[s] an action or event that was begun but not completed”
  - Action narrowly averted (ANA): “marks an action that was on the verge of happening”
  - Discontinuous past: “The unrealized expectation is that the past situation would continue uninterrupted into the present.”
  - Counterfactual conditionals: “a tendency for frustrative to be used in counterfactual conditional constructions”
  - Narrative effects: “a narrative structuring device”

- These extended functions are all attested in Caquinte frustrative constructions, distributed across the morphemes -be and =me

---

1 Epenthetic segments /t/ and /a/, which repair vowel and consonant hiatus, respectively, are not represented in the segmentation. Abbreviations: A = applicative; abl = ablativc; act = active; all = allative; alt = alternative; am = associated motion; aug = augmentative; ce = counter-expectational; cf = counterfactual; cl = classifier; cngr = congruent; cop = copula; d = demonstrative; dir = directional; distr = distributive; dur = durative; epst = epistemic; f = feminine; foc = focus; frust = frustrative; ideo = ideophone; incl = inclusive; incngr = incongruent; instr = instrumental; irr = irrealis; loc = locative; m = masculine; mal = malefactive; me = male ego; med = medial; mid = middle; neg = negation; o = object; p = possessor; pfv = perfective; persp = perspctival; pl = plural; poss = possessive; pro = pro-form; r = realis; reg = regressive; rel = relativizer; s = subject; top = topic.
• However, I argue, following Carol and Salanova (2017), that the category of frustrative is inherently aspectual, and not epistemic, in nature.

• Telic eventualities can be schematized as consisting of three periods:
  – planning
  – development
  – result state

• Two points, initiation and culmination, intervene between first and second, and second and third periods, respectively.

• Atelic eventualities can be schematized as consisting of two periods, those preceding and following initiation.

• Grammatical morphemes may differ in where along a temporal trajectory they express that an eventuality has been ‘interrupted’.

• A single grammatical morpheme may express different points of interruption depending on the lexical aspectual properties of a stem.

• Consequently, in Caquinte, no one frustrative construction conforms to Overall’s definition regarding outcomes (cf. result state).

• I propose that it is analytically more straightforward to describe possible points of interruption expressed by particular grammatical morphemes:
  – Caquinte -be expresses that the period following culmination for telic predicates and following initiation for atelic predicates is interrupted.
  – Caquinte =me expresses that the period preceding culmination for telic predicates and preceding initiation for atelic predicates is interrupted.

1.1 Sociolinguistic and Project Background

• Caquinte is spoken by some 300-400 individuals in the headwaters of the Mipaya (Cusco) and Pogeni (Junín) rivers in the tropical Andean foothills of southeastern Peru.

• Caquintes first entered into contact with non-indigenous outsiders in three main periods – c1959, 1969, and 1976 –, with the arrival of members of the Summer Institute of Linguistics.

• Traditionally, Caquintes were in tense relations with neighboring Asháninkas and Yines.

• Confined to the Pogeni headwaters probably from the mid-19th century, Caquintes migrated into the Mipaya headwaters in the mid-1950s.
  – These Caquintes began intermarrying with Matsigenkas (Arawak), and those remaining on the Pogeni began intermarrying with Asháninkas.
Very few living Caquintes have no Matsigenka or Asháninka ancestor, resulting in intense social pressures on Caquinte speakers and linguistic pressures on Caquinte grammar.

- Since 2006 the Spanish oil and natural gas company Repsol has been operative in Caquinte territory, leading to some good but many bad social consequences.

- I conduct fieldwork in Kitepánpani, a community of ~100 individuals (~35 adults).

- Data for this presentation comes from a corpus of more than 8,000 lines of segmented, glossed, and translated text organized in FieldWorks Language Explorer (FLEx).

### 1.2 Relevant Grammatical Details

- Caquinte is a polysynthetic, strongly headmarking, mainly agglutinative language.

- Basic word order is VSO and a sentence need not exhibit overt DP arguments.

- Verbal categories include:
  - Obligatory: person (specifically subject agreement) and reality status ([Michael 2014](#)).
  - Non-obligatory: causatives, applicatives, reciprocals, pluractionals, plurals, directionals, markers of associated motion, aspect, and “adverbial” categories (e.g., `-aman ‘early in the morning’`).

- Perfective aspect is expressed via `-a/k`, while imperfective marking is null.

- Person is expressed on the verb via prefixes and suffixes (Table 1[1](#)).
  - Intransitive verbs exhibit two paradigms of subject agreement ([O’Hagan 2015](#)).
  - Object agreement and suffixal intransitive subject agreement paradigms are similar.

#### Table 1: Verbal Person Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A, S</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>n(o)-</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>aji</td>
<td>aji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>p(i)-</td>
<td>-npi</td>
<td>-npi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>i-, ir(i)-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>(o)-</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>-ro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2 Frustrative `-be`

- Caquinte `-be` expresses that the period following culmination for telic predicates and following initiation for atelic predicates is interrupted.
  - Verbal suffix that requires middle voice and may occur with either realis or irrealis.

- Using perfective `-k`, it is shown with telic eventualities `atsomi ‘breastfeed’`, `kitsaa ‘put on (clothes)’`, `shig ‘run’`, and `tintsig ‘pull taught and release (arrow)’` in (2)-(4).
(2) Atsomibekarike a tee irantsomiteji.

Ø- atsomi  -be  -k  -a  -ri  =kea  tee  iri-  N- atsomi
3F.S- breastfeed -FRUST -PFV -R:MID -3M.O =KEA NEG:R 3M.S.IRR- IRR- breastfeed
- e  -ji
-IRR -NEG:R

She breastfed him but he would not breastfeed.

(3) Ikitsaabetakaro ojokapojari ityabaatoki.

i- kitsaa  -be  -ak  -a  -ro  Ø- ajok  -poj
3M.S- put.on.(clothes) -FRUST -PFV -R:MID -3F.O 3F.S- make.contact.with -ALL
-a  -ri  i- tyabaato =ki
-R:MID -3M.O 3M.P- shin =LOC

He put it on but it [only] reached his shins [and was thus too short].

(4) Arikea ishiashibetanakari itintsashimajabetakari tsein tserok, mana okentakeri satarek...

ari  =kea  i- shig-ashi  -be  -an  -k  -a  -ri  i-
PRO  =KEA 3M.S- run -A:PURP -FRUST -ABL -PFV -R:MID -3M.O 3M.S-
tin sig  -ashi  -maja  -be  -ak  -a  -ri  tsein
pull.(bow.string) -A:PURP -truly -FRUST -PFV -R:MID -3M.O IDEO:arrow.release
 tserok  mana  o- ken  -ak  -i  -ri  satarek
IDEO:pass.by ALT 3M.F- pierce -PFV -R:ACT -3M.O IDEO:pass.through

Then he ran toward him and pulled his bow taughtly aimed at him and released tsein tserok, but it passed through him satarek...

• It is exemplified with (atelic) stative verbs anij ‘be alive’, and chooka ‘exist’ in (5) & (6)

(5) “...pinkempogijitsitakemparoriji anijabegitageti.”

pi- N- kenpogij  -itsi  -ak  -e  -Npa  -ro  =riji  Ø- anij  -be
2S- IRR- look.after -A:MAL -PFV -IRR -MID -3F.O =DEON 3F.S- be.alive -FRUST
-gi  -a  =geti
-prolonged -R:MID =when

“...you should have looked after her when she was alive [but now she’s dead].”

(6) Irirakea tai ari ichookabegitani.

iri- ra  =kea  tai  ari  i- chooka  -be  -gi  -a  =ni
3M.P- D:MED =KEA moon PRO 3M.S- exist -FRUST -prolonged -R:MID =AUG

The moon remained [there] for a long time [but ultimately left].

• A dynamic atelic verb shig ‘run’ is shown in (7)

²Compare its telic counterpart in [4].
He ran, but stopped [not reaching where he needed to go].

- With the verb keje ‘be like’, -be uniquely expresses a sort of attenuation, i.e., that a referent is only somewhat similar to another

- Comparisons between two referents, one of which more closely resembles some third referent than the other, involve alternations in the presence of -be on the verb

- Such comparisons can also be achieved with the use of the verbal suffix -maja ‘truly’

- Frustrative -be may occur with future temporal reference, and is also attested under negation, although aspect is suppressed under negation
“...this is why I didn’t want to go [but we’ve gone anyway].”

- The frustrative may serve as a sort of foreshadowing device in narrative (12a,b)

(12)  a. Arikea okenkejanakero ikamantetakaroko omankigare inkajaranki.
    ari =kea o- keNkej -an -k -i -ro i- kaman -be
    PRO =KEA 3F.S- think.about -ABL -PFV -R:ACT -3F.O 3M.S- tell -FRUST
    -ak -a -ro =ka o- maNkigare inKajaranki
    -PFV -R:MID -3F.O =REL 3F.P- spouse previously
    Then she thought about what her husband had told her previously.

b. Arikea iraitsibeta jiii jiii oshinkiro santomaritsa.
    ari =kea Ø- irag -itsi -be -a jiii jiii o- shiNki -ro
    PRO =KEA 3F.S- cry -A:MAL -FRUST -R:MID jiii jiii 3F.P- intoxicate -NOMZ
    santomaritsa
    ayahuasca
    Then she cried jiii jiii from the ayahuasca’s hallucinogenic properties.

c. Oshianakea sotsiki ojokapinitageti kajarashiteki.
    o- shig -an -k -a =kea sotsiki Ø- ojok -pini -a
    3F.S- run -ABL -PFV -R:MID =KEA outside 3F.S- deposit -regularly -R:MID
    =geti kajarashiteki
    =where garbage
    And she ran outside to where she deposited the garbage.

d. Arikea ogibotapojaka aakeri amonkoshitekitanakeri kojoshiteki.
    ari =kea Ø- ogibo -apoj -k -a Ø- ag -k -i
    PRO =KEA 3F.S- place.face-down -ABL -PFV -R:MID 3F.S- grab -PFV -R:ACT
    -ri Ø- amonKo -shiTeki -an -k -i -ri
    -3M.O 3F.S- fill.mouth.with -Ni:reduced.mass -ABL -PFV -R:ACT -3M.O
    kojoshiteki
    grub.sp.
    Then she lay face-down, grabbed the kojoshiteki grubs, and filled her mouth with them.

3 Frustrative =me

- Caquinte =me expresses that the period preceding culmination for telic predicates and
preceding initiation for atelic predicates is interrupted
  - Clausal second-position clitic with no effect on voice and that requires irrealis
- Using -k, it is shown with telic eventualities ag ‘grab’ and montej ‘wade across’ in (13) & (14)

(13) ...iraabakerime tee irageriji.
    iri- ag -ab -k -e -ri =me tee iri- ag -e -ri
    3M.S.IRR- grab -DIR -PFV -IRR -3M.O =FRUST NEG:R 3M.S.IRR- grab -IRR -3M.O
    -ji
    -NEG:R
...he almost grabbed him but [in the end] he didn’t grab him.

(14) Inejapojana koanontajatakena, nomontejanakeme intatikero.

He saw me searching for a river crossing, I had almost waded across to the other side.

• It is shown with the dynamic atelic eventuality pig ‘return’ in (15).

(15) “[…] arikampa yomposaka, ari impigeme.”

He wanted to hug her [but was not permitted to].

• It occurs on verbal complements (16), indicating (with perfective -k) that the eventuality did not culminate

(16) ...inuke irabiñarikikerome.

My son almost died.

• It occurs frequently – but not obligatorily – on verbs following pajini/pajeni ‘almost’ (17), which are obligatorily irrealis

(17) Pajeni irimetojeme nochaajanikirite.

My son almost died.

• It may double (18), and, in the present corpus, if it occurs on pajini it also occurs on the verb

(18) ...pajinime irogataakopojempame.

...they almost came ashore.

• It expresses counterfactuality, in which case it frequently occurs on all words that are not verbal arguments (19).
“Nonkokempameke a nometojakemegeti, aatome pamenapojajaname.”

“Had I died, you would not see me again, having arrived [here].”

• It also expresses deontic modality (20)

(20) ...“Aatome nokamantime.”

“I shouldn’t have said anything.”

4 Frustrative ji ‘believe falsely’

• The verb ji ‘believe falsely’ may take nominal or verbal complements, as in (21) & (22)

(21) “Nojikeriji irio, irigentimpa emooki.”

“I thought it was that, but it’s emooki grub.”

(22) “Nojikeji pitsakero.”

“I thought you were familiar with it.”

• When subjects are coreferential between matrix and complement verb, a frustrative interpretation similar to that of =me obtains, as in (23)-(25)

– One difference between these two constructions appears to be the degree of intentionality of the syntactic subject, resulting in felicitous translations with English try

(23) Ojikeji onteronkero tee onteronkeroji.

She thought she would finish it but she did not finish it.

(24) Ojikeji onkamarankajero aatoniji ometoji, mana otomoakiti intati.
She tried to vomit again so she wouldn’t die, but she only retched slightly.

He had started to turn around but at that moment he transformed into a turkey vulture...

5 Combining Frustratives

- It is common for -be to occur in a clause that precedes a clause in which =me occurs

He wanted to own them despite him, but he was unable to own them...

Then he stood up and tried to run away [but was unable to, having started].

- It is useful to examine the meanings of sentences that permute -be and =me in minimal ways
- The verb iro ‘be about to’ selects for a verbal complement [28]

...ari itineokitanaji irotapojajitari osabinkagitetanaje.

Then he stood up and tried to run away [but was unable to, having started].
...then he went back to sleep because the sun was about to come up [and later did].

- In the present corpus, if *iro* takes -be, its complement takes =me (29)

(29) Irobetanaka interonkakerome...

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iro} & \quad \text{-be} \quad -an \quad -k \quad -a \quad -\emptyset \quad i- \quad N- \quad \text{teron}\text{k} \quad -k \quad -e \quad -ro \\
\text{be.about.to} & \quad \text{-FRUST} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-R: MID} \quad -3S \quad 3M.S- \quad \text{IRR- finish} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad -3F.O \\
\text{=me} & \\
\text{=FRUST}
\end{align*}
\]

He was about to finish it [but did not]...

- A synonymous verb *iroshi* ‘be about to’ exhibits the same properties, as in (30) & (31)

(30) “Iroshitapoji inkoraketapoje.”

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iroshi} & \quad \text{-apoj} \quad -i \quad -\emptyset \quad i- \quad N- \quad \text{korake} \quad \text{-apoj} \quad -e \\
\text{be.about.to} & \quad \text{-ALL} \quad \text{-R: ACT} \quad -3S \quad 3M.S- \quad \text{IRR- come} \quad \text{-ALL} \quad \text{-IRR}
\end{align*}
\]

“He's about to come [back, and will].”

(31) Iroshibetanaja impianajeme.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iroshi} & \quad \text{-be} \quad -an \quad -aj \quad -a \quad -\emptyset \quad i- \quad N- \quad \text{pig} \quad -an \quad -aj \quad -e \quad =\text{me} \\
\text{be.about.to} & \quad \text{-FRUST} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-REG} \quad \text{-R: MID} \quad -3S \quad 3M.S- \quad \text{IRR- return} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-REG} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad =\text{FRUST}
\end{align*}
\]

He was about to return [but did not].

6 Conclusion

- Depending on whether a predicate is telic, -be and =me result in different interpretations
  - Telic: -be targets the post-culmination and =me targets the pre-culmination period
  - Atelic: -be targets the post-initiation and =me the pre-initiation period

- Alternation between frustratives yields subtle but important differences in meaning, which can be seen being reworked in texts (32)

(32) Arikea yoanake irishiteme, ishibetapoja metototo taaja kiisho.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ari} & \quad =\text{kea} \quad i- \quad og -an \quad -k \quad -i \quad i\text{-ri-} \quad \text{shi} \quad -e \quad =\text{me} \quad i- \quad \text{shi} \\
\text{PRO} & \quad =\text{kea} \quad 3M.S- \quad \text{go} \quad \text{-ABL} \quad \text{-PFV} \quad \text{-R: ACT} \quad 3M.S.IRR- \quad \text{shit} \quad \text{-IRR} \quad =\text{FRUST} \quad 3M.S- \quad \text{shit} \\
\text{-be} & \quad \text{-apoj} \quad -a \quad \text{metototo} \quad \text{taaja} \quad \text{kiisho} \\
\text{-FRUST} & \quad \text{-ALL} \quad \text{-R: MID IDEO: grunt} \quad \text{IDEO: FRUST} \quad \text{IDEO: hard}
\end{align*}
\]

Then he went to shit [but did not begin], he was shitting, grunting metototo, but then stopped taaja kiisho.

- Thus =me with a telic verb and -be with an atelic verb target the same temporal period
They differ in whether interruption occurs before a culmination or simply ceases

• Caquinte frustratives may carry an evaluative component (33), but this is clearly an implication based on the interruption of eventualities

(33) "Nokamantabekempi: ‘Kepishibaeke.’"

no- kamaN -be -k -i -Npi kepishi -bae -k -i -Ø
1S- tell -FRUST -PFV -R:ACT -2O be.bitter -DUR -PFV -R:ACT -3S

“I told you [but you didn’t listen]: ‘It’s very bitter.’”

• Caquinte -be with atelic predicates resembles the incompletives that Overall distinguishes

  – That frustratives “most typically apply to a completed action” may have more to do with descriptive coverage than something inherent to frustratives

• Caquinte distinguishes frustratives based on whether they interrupt an eventuality following (-be) or preceding (=me) the rightmost point along a temporal trajectory

  – That is, the culmination of telics and the initiation of atelics, respectively

• Overall’s incomplete, action narrowly averted (ANA), discontinuous past, and frustrative are all subsumed within this framework

  – ANA is shown to require further specification as to whether the relevant point is the initiation or culmination (cf. “on the verge of happening”)

• Further research is required to better understand:

  – The interpretations of frustratives with predicates whose initiation and culmination are collapsed (i.e., achievements)

  – What exactly is encoded in the result states of different predicates, and thus what the general meanings of those predicates are (e.g., kitsaa ‘put on (clothes)’)

  – The interaction of frustratives with other verbal morphology that appears to require its own aspectual interpretations (e.g., directionals)

  – The differences among simple =me constructions, and those including pajini ‘almost’ and iro(shi) ‘be about to’

• To the extent that expectations as to outcomes of eventualities can be reanalyzed in terms of predictable result states given fine-grained understandings of the meanings of verbal roots, a picture emerges in which frustratives are more aspectual than epistemic in nature

• The result is a more inclusive definition of frustratives based on where along the temporal trajectory of an eventuality interruption occurs
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