Reality status in Kampan languages and its partial loss in Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka[1]

Toni Pedrós
Universiteit Leiden, The Netherlands
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7062-5987

ABSTRACT: Abstract: The Kampan languages have the grammatical feature called *reality status*, which consists of obligatory verbal affixes that express a binary opposition between realized and unrealized events. Although the validity of this grammatical category has been questioned for its lack of consistency cross-linguistically, the pan--Kampan system has been presented as an example of a canonical reality status opposition. This article examines and compares the almost identical reality status systems of all Kampan languages, and then, based on dedicated fieldwork, goes on to describe the change that Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka has undergone. This change consists in the loss of the reality status system in most I-class verbs (the largest by far of the two verb classes typical of Kampan languages) and makes Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka divergent in this aspect from the other Kampan languages. This loss shows a grammatical change taking place and therefore poses some questions about the evolution of such a grammatical feature, which are analyzed in the conclusions.
KEYWORDS: Ashéninka; Kampan languages; Reality status; Morphological change; Arawakan languages.

RESUMEN: Las lenguas campa tienen la característica gramatical llamada *estado de realidad*, que consiste en afijos verbales obligatorios que expresan una oposición binaria entre acciones realizadas e irrealizadas. Aunque la validez de esta categoría gramatical ha sido cuestionada debido a su falta de consistencia en las lenguas del mundo, el sistema pancampa ha sido presentado como ejemplo canónico de la oposición de estado de realidad. Este artículo examina y compara los casi idénticos sistemas de estado de realidad de todas las lenguas campa, y, a continuación, basándose en trabajo de campo específico, describe el cambio que el ashéninka Ucayali-Pajonal ha experimentado, que consiste en la pérdida del sistema de estado de realidad en la mayoría de los verbos de clase I (la más numerosa con diferencia de las dos clases típicas de las lenguas campa) y hace al ashéninka Ucayali--Pajonal divergente de las otras lenguas campa en este aspecto. Esta pérdida muestra un cambio gramatical en marcha y por tanto plantea algunas cuestiones sobre la evolución de una característica gramatical de este tipo, las cuales se analizan en las conclusiones.
PALABRAS CLAVE: Ashéninka; Lenguas campa; Estado de realidad; Cambio morfológico; Lenguas arawak.

---

1. The Kampan languages and the reality status

The Kampan languages are a subgroup of the Arawakan family that is spoken in the eastern foothills of the central Peruvian Andes and the adjoining Amazonian rainforest until Brazil, where there are a few speakers. The Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2018), calls this group *Pre-Andine*, a term that was used by Payne (1981) and Wise (1986) to refer to it plus other Arawakan languages spoken in the same area, such as Yine and Yanesha. These languages are very similar to each other, and they are: Nomatsigenga, Matsigenka,[2] Caquinte and Nanti, plus the Ashé-Ashá dialect chain, which is divided in seven languages in the Ethnologue (Simons & Fennig 2018) and the Glottolog (Hammarström et al. 2018). However, my proposal, developed in detail in Pedrós (2018: 24-26), is that the Ashé-Ashá complex can be divided in two or three languages according to the principle of mutual intelligibility. In order to ease understanding by readers, I will use the Ethnologue's and Glottolog's division, which does not imply that I accept the existence of seven different Ashé-Ashá languages, rather that I consider Ashé-Ashá varieties as dialects of a dialect chain. All these languages have been researched to a greater or lesser degree, with the exception of the variety called *South Ucayali* by the Ethnologue and the Glottolog, for which I have found no prior publication. Probably, this is partly due to the fact that this variety only appears in the Ethnologue in its fifteenth edition (Gordon 2005), but did not appear in the fourteenth (Grimes 2000). However, this variety is the one on which I have been carrying out fieldwork, so that I have my own data for it, which were gathered mainly in the small town of Atalaya with speakers from the neighboring Ucayali area in October and November 2015 and October 2016 and 2017 in a total of nine weeks gathering data for a grammar sketch.

The linguistic literature shows that the Kampan languages have the grammatical category called *reality status* in the form of an obligatory mark on the verb that indicates a binary distinction between realis and irrealis. The actual existence of this category cross-linguistically has been challenged by some authors, which has caused a debate on its validity as a grammatical category (Michael 2014: 255-259). Most of the criticism is based on the heterogeneity among different reality status systems and the fact that these systems do not approach "the expected prototype, in which a binary distinction between «realized» and «unrealized» states of affairs is obligatorily marked" (Michael 2014: 252). Nonetheless, Michael (2014) argues that Nanti can be used as the canonical example of a reality status system that fits our notional expectations of such a system. Michael (2014) describes the reality status system in Nanti, pointing out at the same time that all Kampan languages have a reality status system practically identical to the one in Nanti (Michael 2014: 278-279).

In this article, I will compare the reality status system of the different Kampan languages and will show that this system has been partially lost in UP (Ucayali-Pajonal)

---

[2] Nomatsigenga and Matsigenka appear in some sources as *Nomatsiguenga*, and *Machiguenga* or *Matsiguenga* (e.g. in the Glottolog). The names used here are those accepted by the speaker community and approved by the Peruvian government (see Base de Datos de Pueblos Indígenas u Originarios at bdpi.cultura.gob.pe/pueblos-indigenas#main-content).

Ashéninka,[3] which distinguishes this language not only from the rest of the Ashé-Ashá complex, but also from the rest of the Kampan languages. This partially fulfilled loss is an example of how a grammatical feature is being lost and thus of a language change in progress.

In section 2, I will compare the reality status systems of the different Kampan languages as described by different authors, while in section 3 I will do the same with the Ucayali variety based on my own fieldwork and with the Pajonal variety based on Heitzman's (1991) texts. In section 4, I try to value the importance of the change undergone by UP Ashéninka as a token of the partial loss of a grammatical feature.

2. Reality status in the Kampan languages (except Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka)

In this section, the reality status system in the Kampan languages will be examined according to the existing descriptions. Since all reality status systems are very similar, instead of examining each language separately, I will compare the main features of the pan-Kampan reality status system and those that have a relation with the development occurring in UP Ashéninka. I will do this in two steps: first, the non-Ashé-Ashá languages, and second, the Ashé-Ashá languages. In section 3.1, I will show my findings in UP Ashéninka and will compare its reality status system with those of the other Kampan languages. In the non-Ashé-Ashá languages, I will follow a geographical order, starting with the language furthest from UP Ashéninka (Nanti). For the Ashé-Ashá languages, I will follow the order of the dialect continuum proposed in Pedrós (2018: 18): from the variety linguistically furthest from UP Ashéninka (Tambo-Ene) to the linguistically closest (Yuruá).

First of all, it is important to note that verbs in all Kampan languages have been classified in two classes according to their reality status suffixes: older works have called these classes *reflexive* and *non-reflexive* (Payne 1981; Payne 1983; García 1997; Swift 2008 [1988]; Snell 2011, the last one based on fieldwork carried out in the 1980s), while more recent works call them *I-class* and *A-class* (Michael 2008; Lawrence 2013, Michael 2014; Mihas 2015*a*; Mihas 2015*b*) based on the realis suffix (usually -*i* and -*a* respectively). The label *reflexive* corresponds to *A-class*, and *non-reflexive*, to *I-class*. The reason why more recent works changed the name is that a high number of A-class verbs do not have a reflexive meaning, but all reflexive verbs have A-class suffixes. Some verbs can bear both inflections depending on whether they are transitive or reflexive (e.g. *cut something* or *cut yourself*). More recently, Baier & O'Hagan (to appear) have used the terms *active* and *middle voice* for Caquinte, which correspond to I and A-class, respectively. The I-class is by far more numerous. In the same way, some older grammars call realis and irrealis morphemes *non-future* and *future*, respectively. In this article, I will follow the more recent label in both cases (A/I-class and realis/irrealis).

---

[3] The name *Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka* used here encompasses the languages that the Ethnologue (Simons & Fennig 2018) calls *South Ucayali Ashéninka* (ISO 639-3 cpy) and *Pajonal Ashéninka* (ISO 639-3 cjo). All the speakers from the Ucayali river with whom I talked told me that they have no intelligibility problems with people from the Gran Pajonal plateau and that the difference is restricted to a few words.

2.1. Non-Ashé-Ashá languages

The Kampan languages outside the Ashé-Ashá complex are Nanti, Matsigenka, Caquinte and Nomatsigenga. Nanti and Nomatsigenga descriptions (Michael 2008, 2014, and Lawrence 2013, respectively) are more recent. Matsigenka and Caquinte descriptions (Snell 2011 and Swift 2008 [1988], respectively) are older and both are publications of the Peruvian division of the Summer Institute of Linguistics –Snell's dictionary and grammar sketch (2011) is based on much earlier fieldwork (the author says that she arrived the first time in Matsigenka territory in 1952).

2.1.1. Function of the reality status systems

Nanti's reality status is the most thoroughly described due to Michael's article (2014) devoted to this grammatical feature. Michael (2014: 251-252) describes Nanti's reality status system as a verbal mark that expresses a binary opposition between realized and unrealized situations, which can be considered the standard description for this grammatical feature. Nanti's realis marking expresses non-future, positive polarity and actuality; whereas irrealis marking expresses future, negative polarity, hypotheticality (conditional, counterfactual), imperative, obligation, need and prospectiveness (Michael 2014: 252). This distribution of grammatical features between realis and irrealis fits Michael's distinction between realized and unrealized situations.

Snell (2011: 837) uses for Matsigenka the terms *real* and *irreal* in Spanish for realis and irrealis, and defines them by saying that realis expresses "una acción que ya se ha realizado o que está realizándose"[4] or "una acción que no va a realizarse en el futuro",[5] while irrealis indicates "una acción que no se ha realizado en el pasado y tampoco está realizándose en el presente"[6] or "una acción que va a realizarse en el futuro".[7] Snell (2011: 838) also says that irrealis is used with imperatives. Snell (2011:837) uses the terms *no-reflexivo* and *reflexivo* to refer to I-class and A-class verbs, respectively.

Swift (2008: 55) describes the Caquinte reality status system under the name of *tiempo* 'tense' and as an opposition between *futuro/irreal* 'future/irrealis' and *no-futuro/real* 'non-future/realis', although he uses the terminology *futuro/no-futuro*. In this way, he treats the reality status affixes as a tense category with a future/non-future opposition and does not explain why he also calls them *real* and *irreal*. Actually, Swift (2008) does not talk about the use of irrealis with negative polarity and the imperative, but at least an example can be found for both (p. 56 with negative, p. 29 with imperative). Swift (2008: 55) says that this is the only obligatory suffix in finite verbs. I-verbs and A-verbs are called *non-reflexive* and *reflexive*, respectively (Swift 2008: 57).

Lawrence (2013) uses the more recent terminology *realis* and *irrealis*, and *I-class* and *A-class* verbs. She (p. 105) says that "irrealis markers are used for imperative formations, reference to future time, negated verbs and some complement clauses".

---

[4] 'An action that has already happened or is happening.'
[5] 'An action that is not going to happen in the future.'
[6] 'An action that has not happened in the past and is not happening in the present.'
[7] 'An action that is going to happen in the future.'

With this overview, we can see that irrealis is used in negative, future and imperative clauses in the four languages. Other uses are described by Michael for Nanti (see above), but the less detailed descriptions existing for the other languages and the lack of space oblige to concentrate this study only in these clause types. In any case, negative, future and imperative clauses clearly refer to actions that have not been realized.

2.1.2. Reality status affixes

This section shows the forms of the reality status affixes, which are ordered in an identical table for each language so as to ease the comparison, and provides examples of their use. The examples illustrate the realis (*a* examples) and irrealis use in future (*b* examples) and imperative (*c* examples). The use of these affixes in negative clauses will be studied in section 2.1.3.

Nanti's reality status affixes are shown in Table 1. The irrealis prefix *ri-* is used following third person masculine proclitics, while N- occurs in the other cases, but only before a voiceless stop or affricate (Michael 2014: 262). Examples of their use are given in (1).[8]

[9]**Table 1**: Reality status affixes in Nanti. Adapted from Michael (2014: 261).

	Realis	Irrealis
I-class	*-i* (realized as *-i, -e, -a*)	N-[10], *ri-/r-*, *-e*
A-class	*-a*	N-, *ri-/r-*, *-empa*

---

[8] I will use the same abbreviations for all languages so as to ease the comparison, but will not change the grammatical terms used by the authors (e.g. the different denominations realis-irrealis and non-future-future will be respected). The abbreviation list is as follows: &, epenthetic phoneme; 1/2/3, 1st/2nd/3rd person; A, A-class verb; ABL, ablative; ADD, additive; AG, agent; ALL, allative; ANI, animate; ANT, anterior; APPL, applicative; BEN, benefactive; CAUS, causative; CF, counterfactual; CHA, characteristic; CLF, classifier; COND, conditional; DIR, directional; DIRR, double irrealis; DIST, distal; DETR, detransitivizer; F, feminine; FOC, focus; FRS, fossilized reality status; FUT, future; I, I-class verb; INCL, inclusive; INS, instrumental; IPFV, imperfective; IRR, irrealis; ITER, iterative; LOC, locative; M, masculine; NEG, negation; M, masculine; NFUT, non-future; NM, non-masculine; NMLZ, nominalizer; NREFL, non-reflexive; O, object; PL, plural; POSS, possessive; PP, positive polarity; PFV, perfective aspect; PROSP, prospective; PROG, progressive; PST, past; REC, recipient; REA, realis; REFL, reflexive; REG, regressive; REL, relative; RSN, reason; S, subject; SG, singular; TEMP, temporal; TERM, terminative; TH, theme. Abbreviations not included in glosses: Ashé-Ashá, Ashéninka-Asháninka; UP, Ucayali-Pajonal; RS, reality status.

[9] Throughout the whole article, I will use the same orthography in all languages in order to ease the comparison, which is based on the orthography used traditionally for Kampan languages. Characters differing from those of the IPA are: <ch>=/tʃ⁽ᵗʰ⁾/, <g>=/g/, /ɣ/ or /ɰ/, <ĩ>=/ɨ/, <ñ>=/ɲ/, <r>=/ɾ/, <sh>=/ʃ/, <ty>=/c/ or /tʲ/, and <v>=/β/; in Ashé-Ashá varieties with an opposition in aspiration in /ts/ (all except Tambo-Ene), <tz>=/ts/ and <ts>=/tsʰ/; in the other languages, which do not have this opposition, <ts>=/ts/. A double vowel (aa) represents a long vowel. When the source indicates the stress (the least cases), an acute accent (á) represents primary stress, and a grave accent (à), secondary stress. A paroxytone with only one stress bears no accent. A circumflex (â) indicates a high tone in Nomatsigenga.

[10] N- represents in Michael (2014) and other Kampan literature an unspecified nasal consonant that occurs before a stop or an affricate taking its point of articulation. Therefore, N- can be realized as [m], [n], [ɲ] or [ŋ] –or even Ø in Nanti.

Nanti

(1a)   Opoki maika.
        o=pok–Ø–i   maika
        3NM.S=come–IPFV–REA.I   now
        'She is coming now.' (Michael 2014:254)

(1b)   Ompoke kamani.
        o=N–pok–Ø–e   kamani
        3NM.S=IRR–come–IPFV–IRR.I   tomorrow
        'She will come tomorrow.' (Michael 2014:254)

(1c)   Tinkasetero.
        N–otink–a–se–t–e=ro
        IRR–mash–&–CLF:MASS–&–IRR.I=3NM.O
        'Mash it.' (Michael 2014:263)

In Matsigenka, similarly to Nanti, the prefixes *ri-/r-* occur with third person masculine proclitics: *ri-* before verb stems starting with *m-*, *n-*, *s-* and *sh-*; and *r-* before stems starting with a vowel. The nasal irrealis prefix occurs before voiceless stops or affricates, as in Nanti. Some speakers from the Lower Urubamba use both irrealis prefixes together (Snell 2011: 837).

Table 2: Reality status affixes in Matsigenka. Adapted from Snell (2011: 837).

	Realis	Irrealis
I-class	*-i*	*n-, ri-, r-, -e*
A-class	*-a*	*n-, ri-, r-, -empa*

Snell (2011) does not gloss her Matsigenka examples, but only translates them. However, the simplicity of some one-verb sentences and the information provided by Snell's dictionary (2011) enables me to gloss some short sentences myself.

Matsigenka

(2a)   Iati.
        i–a–t–i
        3M.S–go–&–REA
        'He went.' (Snell 2011: 838; glosses mine)

(2b)   Iriate.
        i–ri–a–t–e
        3M.S–IRR–go–&–IRR
        'He will go.' (Snell 2011: 838; glosses mine)

(2c)   Kemisante.
         kemisant–e
         shut.up–IRR
         'Shut up!.' (Snell 2011: 837; glosses mine)

According to Swift (2008: 57), in Caquinte the unspecified nasal irrealis prefix occurs "después de vocal y antes de consonante no continua"[11] (a non-fricative consonant, i.e. a stop or an affricate), which is the same environment as in Nanti and Matsigenka. Caquinte affixes (table 3) are practically identical to those already presented for Nanti and Matsigenka in tables 1 and 2, respectively. Although Swift (2008) does not show an irrealis prefix *r-/ri-* following third person masculine prefixes, as in Nanti and Matsigenka, Baier & O'Hagan (to appear) says that this prefix exists in Caquinte and considers it the irrealis form of the third person masculine prefix (*iri-*), rather than two different prefixes. However, for a better comparison with the other languages, I represent *r-/ri-* in table 3 as a separate prefix. The A-class irrealis suffix *-e-mpa* is described by Swift (2008) as two suffixes: *-e* is the irrealis suffix and *-mpa* the A-class suffix, as exemplified in (3d).

Table 3: Reality status affixes in Caquinte. Adapted from Swift (2008:57-58) and Baier & O'Hagan (to appear).

	Realis	Irrealis
I-class	*-i*	*N-, ri-/r-, -e*
A-class	*-a*	*N-, ri-/r-, -e-mpa*

Swift calls realis and irrealis affixes *non-future* and *future*, respectively, and, consequently, the affixes are glossed as such, even in the imperative sentence (3c). (3d) shows how Swift (2008: 57) analyzes the A-class verb irrealis suffix *-e-mpa* as two different suffixes.

Caquinte

(3a)   i–kaNt–i
         3M–decir–NFUT
         'Él dijo.' [12, 13] (Swift 2008:56)

(3b)   i–N–kaNt-e
         3M–FUT–decir–FUT
         'Él dirá.'[14] (Swift 2008:56)

---

[11] 'After a vowel and before a non-continuous consonant'

[12] In examples taken from sources written in Spanish, I will reproduce the original in the main text and the English translation in a footnote. I have decided to do it this way rather than the other way round because, in an article about a South American language, I presume that most readers will be able to read such short sentences in Spanish. For those that do not understand Spanish, the footnotes serve as clarification. In this way, I assume that I spare most readers the hassle of having to look for the original in a footnote so as to check if my own translation is accurate.

[13] 'He said.'

[14] 'He will say.'

(3c)   pi–N–p–e–na–ro
         2–FUT–dar–FUT–1–3F
         'Dámela a mí.'[15] (Swift 2008:29)

(3d)   i–N–tsi–aNt–ak–e–ne–mpa–ri–ka
         3M–FUT–quemar–INS–PFV–FUT–3–REFL–3M–REL
         'Eso que él quemará para él.'[16] (Swift 2008: 57)

The Nomatsigenga affixes are the same as in Caquinte except the A-class irrealis suffix (-*ima* in Nomatsigenga and -*e(-)mpa* in the three other languages). As in the other languages, the nasal unspecified prefix occurs before voiceless stops (Lawrence 2013: 121-122), but nothing is said about its occurrence before affricates. However, the clusters *Np* and *Nk* are realized as [m] and [ŋg], respectively (Lawrence 2013: 122). The prefix *r-* "is used with third-person masculine subjects when the verb stem begins with a vowel" (Lawrence 2013:122).

Table 4: Reality status affixes in Nomatsigenga. Adapted from Lawrence (2013: 104,122)

	Realis	Irrealis
I-class	-*i*	N-, *r*-, -*e*
A-class	-*a*	N-, *r*-, -*ima*

Examples (4) show sentences in Nomatsigenga with realis marking used for past and irrealis for future and imperative.

Nomatsigenga

(4a)   Nitsongiro.
         na=itsong–i=ro
         1s=finish–REA.I=3NM.O
         'I finished it.' (Lawrence 2013: 104)

(4b)   Nitsongero.
         na=N–itsong–e=ro
         1s=IRR–finish–IRR.I=3NM.O
         'I will finish it.' (Lawrence 2013: 104-105)

(4c)   Pomenaro!
         pi=N–p–e=na–ro
         2SG=IRR–give–IRR.I=1SG.O–3NM.O
         'Give it to me!' (Lawrence 2013:105)

---

[15] 'Give it to me.'
[16] 'What he will burn for him.'

We can see that the reality status affixes are practically identical in the four languages. The only differences are *-ima* in Nomatsigenga versus *-empa* in the other three, with the particularity that it is described as two different affixes in Caquinte. We can also see that the irrealis prefix *ri-/r-* is used with third person masculine subjects in the four languages, and that the irrealis unspecified nasal prefix is used before voiceless stops or affricates, except in Nomatsigenga, where it occurs only before voiceless stops, according to Lawrence's description (2013: 121-122).

2.1.3. Negation and double irrealis

A negative clause expresses an action that has not been realized; thus, these clauses are marked with irrealis in Kampan languages. However, there are cases in which two irrealis categories are present in a clause, as for example in the negative future or the negative imperative clause, where the negation and the future or imperative categories both trigger irrealis affixes. In this kind of clauses, the Kampan languages present what Lawrence (2013: 107) and Michael (2014: 271-274) call *doubly* or *double irrealis construction*. This construction consists of a special irrealis negation particle and a verb marked with realis suffixes. Examples of negative clauses with realis (*a* examples) and irrealis (*b* examples) negation particles are provided in the following for each language.

Nanti

(5a)   Tera ompoke chapi.
        te=ra   o=N–pok-e   chapi
        NEG=TEMP   3NM.S=IRR–come–IRR.I   yesterday
        'She did not come yesterday.' (Michael 2014: 254)

(5b)   Hara ihati.
        ha=ra   i=ha–t–i
        NEG.IRR=TEMP   3M.S=go–&–DIRR.I
        'He will not go.' (Michael 2014: 272)

Matsigenka

(6a)   Tera iriate.
        tera   i=ri–at–e
        NEG.REA   3M.S=IRR–go–IRR
        'He didn't go.' (Snell 2011: 838; glosses mine)

(6b)   Gara iati.
        gara   i=at–i
        NEG.IRR   3M.S=go–REA
        'He won't go.' (Snell 2011: 838; glosses mine)

Caquinte

(7a)   tee   i–N–kaNt–e–hi
            NEG.NFUT   3M–FUT–decir–FUT–NEG
            'Él no dijo.'[17] (Swift 2008: 56)

(7b)   aato   i–kaNt–i
            NEG.FUT   3M–decir–NFUT
            'Él no dirá.'[18] (Swift 2008: 56)

Nomatsigenga

(8a)   Naroêgi teni nongogaîgïiri.
            naro–hegi   te=ni   na=N–oôg–e–ri
            1SG–PL   NEG.REA=IPFV.ANI   1SG.S=IRR–want–IRR.I–3M.O
            'We didn't want to see them.' (Lawrence 2013: 134)

(8b)   Kero pitsorogi.
            kero   pi=tsorog–i
            NEG.IRR   2S=scared–REA.I
            'Don't get scared.' (Lawrence 2013:106)

As the examples (5) to (8) show, the four languages use the same strategy to build negative clauses: the negation of a verb with an irrealis grammatical feature (future or imperative in the examples) is formed with the irrealis negative particle plus realis suffixes on the verb, while the rest of the negative clauses are formed with the realis negative particle plus irrealis affixes on the verb. In other words, a negative clause is marked irrealis –as is logical because the action has not been realized–, but a clause bearing an irrealis feature (e.g. future, imperative) has a different irrealis negation particle, which makes the use of irrealis affixes redundant and thus realis affixes are used. Table 5 shows the different realis and irrealis negation particles.

Table 5: Realis and irrealis negative particles in Kampan non-Ashé-Ashá languages.

	Nanti	Matsigenka	Caquinte	Nomatsigenga
Realis	*te(=ra)*[19]	*tera*	*tee*	*te(=ni)*
Irrealis	*ha(=ra)*	*gara*	*aato*	*kero*

2.1.4. Neutralization of reality status affixes

The four Kampan non-Ashé-Ashá languages neutralize the opposition between reality status affixes after the perfective aspect suffix *-ak* in that the I-class realis suffix *-i* is

---

[17] 'He didn't say.'
[18] 'He won't say.'
[19] Although the Nanti examples in this secion are with *tera* and *hara*, Michael (2014) shows other examples with *tetya* (p. 268), *harika* (p. 275), *hame* (p. 276) and *hani* (p. 277).

realized /e/, thus being equal to the irrealis suffix -*e*. In Caquinte, the same process occurs after the progressive suffix -*k*, while, after the stative suffix -*ats* and the temporal stative suffix -*ankits*, the neutralization occurs with the irrealis suffix -*e* being realized as /i/ (Swift 2008: 57, 60). In Nomatsigenga there is a complex set of allomorphy rules that neutralizes the opposition realis-irrealis in different environments, which is summed up below.

In all the mentioned cases, if the irrealis nasal prefix is present, the difference between a realis and an irrealis verb is maintained, but, if there is no nasal prefix due to the phonological environment, there is a complete neutralization of the opposition and the realis and irrealis forms of a verb are identical. Examples (9) to (11) show the neutralization of the suffix. All irrealis verbs in the examples are marked with the nasal prefix. Unfortunately, the reference works do not show examples with a total neutralization.

Nanti

(9a) Ipokake.
       i=pok–ak–i
       3M.S=come–PFV–REA.I
       'He came.' (Michael 2014: 265)

(9b) Impokake.
       i=N–pok–ak–e
       3M.S=IRR–come–PFV–IRR.I
       'He will come.' (Michael 2014: 265)

Matsigenka

(10a) Ipokake apa chapi.
       i=pok–ak–e   apa   chapi
       M.S=come–PFV–REA   father   yesterday
       'My father came yesterday.' (Snell 2011: 837; glosses mine)

(10b) Nompokake kamani.
       no=m–pok–ak–e   kamani
       1S=IRR–come–PFV–IRR   tomorrow
       'I'll come tomorrow.' (Snell 2011: 837; glosses mine)

Caquinte

(11a) i–chaki–t–ak–e–ro
       3M–rozar–&–PFV–NFUT–3F
       'Él lo rozó/lo ha rozado.'[20] (Swift 2008: 59)

(11b) i–N–chaki–t–ak–e–ro
       3M–FUT–rozar–&–PFV–FUT–3F
       'Él lo rozará.'[21] (Swift 2008: 59)

---

[20] 'He (has) cleared it.'
[21] 'He will clear it.'

The Nomatsigenga case is special because the realis-irrealis opposition can be neutralized in several phonological environments in I-class verbs. Lawrence (2013:108) shows a table with the different realizations of realis -*i* and irrealis -*e*, and both suffixes are identical in the following phonological environments (the realization of the suffix in both realis and irrealis is given between brackets): /p_/ (-*ïi*), /m_#/ (-*ïi*), /t_#/ (-*e* ~ -*ïi*), /n_/ (-*ïi*) and /k_/ (-*e*). Obviously, with the neutralization in /k_/, the suffixes are always realized as -*e* and thus neutralized after the perfective suffix -*k*, as in the three other languages.

Therefore, we can see that the realis-irrealis opposition can be inexistent in some cases. Michael (2014: 265) says about Nanti that, in these cases, "the speaker must depend on adverbial elements or context to determine reality status".

2.2. Ashé-Ashá languages

In this section, the same features that were studied in the previous section will be treated for the Ashé-Ashá languages, so that the subsections are also the same. The difference is that varieties instead of languages will be studied, given that the question of how many Ashé-Ashá languages there are is not totally settled. The Ucayali and Pajonal varieties will be discussed in section 3, although they also pertain to the Ashé-Ashá complex.

The sources for the Ashé-Ashá languages are scarcer than for the non-Ashé-Ashá. The only recent grammar is Mihas (2015*a*) on the Alto Perené variety, and there is an older grammar on Apurucayali (Payne 1981). Minor works in which some information can be found are Mihas (2015*b*)[22] and the pedagogical guide of the indigenous university Nopoki (Zumaeta 2012) on Tambo-Ene, Payne (1983) on Pichis, García (1993, 1997)[23] on Yuruá and Heitzman (1991) on Pajonal.

The varieties treated in this section are Tambo-Ene, Alto Perené, Pichis, Apurucayali and Yuruá, and they will be studied in this order, which is the order of the dialect chain proposed in Pedrós (2018: 18) (Ucayali-Pajonal is at one extreme of the chain following Yuruá).

2.2.1. Function of the reality status systems

For Tambo-Ene, Mihas (2015*b*: 13-14) says that "the scope of the irrealis suffixes -*e* and -*ea* covers the entire notional range of what is defined as irrealis (unrealized) events", and lists the following grammatical categories as belonging to the realm of irrealis: future, imperative, intentional/desiderative/optative, negated realis clauses, prospective events,

---

[22] Mihas (2015b) calls this variety *Satipo Asháninka* after the Satipo province, although traditionally it has been called just *Asháninka* and its core area is the Satipo province, which is crossed by the rivers Tambo and Ene. The people in Atalaya call it either *Asháninka* or *Tambo-Ene*. Given that all varieties except Pajonal are named after rivers (Pajonal is a tableau with no important river), I will call it *Tambo-Ene* throughout this article in order to give it a treatment equal to the other varieties.

[23] García (1993) is a Master thesis, and García (1997) is a monography in which the contents of the thesis are better arranged, but both are practically identical. Since both works are not easy to find, I will make references to both, so that a reader that has only one can look for the reference.

habitual events that took place in the past, counterfactual clauses, possible condition clauses, purpose clauses, want-complements and converbial clauses.

For Alto Perené, Mihas (2015*a*: 258-259) says exactly the same as for Tambo-Ene: "The scope of the irrealis morphemes *-e* and *-ia* covers the entire notional range of what is defined as irrealis (unrealized) events", and lists under this category future, commands, wishes, averted events, possible conditions, purposive constructions and complement clauses with the verb *-kov-* 'want.' She adds (p. 260) that "converbial clauses which provide background information and habitual events are also inflected for irrealis". As categories marked with realis, Mihas (2015*a*: 258) mentions "completed events, which took place in the past, or events that are still in progress at the moment of speaking".

Regarding Pichis, Payne (1983: 101) describes the opposition between reality status affixes as *future* and *non-future*, and does not mention other grammatical categories in which these affixes are used.

In the same fashion, for Apurucayali, Payne (1981: 31) labels the opposition as belonging to the category of tense and as a binary distinction between *future* and *non-future*.

The only available source for Yuruá is García's Master thesis (1993), improved in a monography (García 1997). These works describe the reality status system citing Payne, Payne & Sánchez's (1982)[24] Apurucayali grammar. Therefore, there is no sense in repeating the same as for Apurucayali.

We can see that the only comprehensive descriptions of the function of the reality status are the more modern in Mihas (2015*a*, 2015*b*), while Payne's older works (1983, 1981) treat the distinction as one between future and non-future without giving further explanations.

2.2.2. Reality status affixes

Ashé-Ashá reality status affixes are practically identical in each variety. I-class verbs have the suffixes realis *-i* and irrealis *-e*, with the exception of Apurucayali, in which both suffixes are *-i* (see below for explanation). A-class verbs have the realis *-a* and irrealis *-ia* suffixes, except for Tambo-Ene, whose irrealis A-class suffix is *-ea* (Payne 1981, 1983; Mihas 2015*a*, 2015*b*). García (1993: 54, 1997: 37) cites Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982) to show the reality status suffixes, so we cannot know well what is happening in Yuruá, although García (1993: 54, 1997: 37) says that the contrast between /e/ and /i/ is starting to disappear in Yuruá.

Although the I-class suffixes are identical in Apurucayali, they contrast after /t/ or the progressive aspect suffix *-ach*, where both /t/ and /ʧ/ change to /ts/ (Payne 1981: 121-127) when realis is marked. An example of this contrast is *nomisitzi* (realis, 'I dreamed') versus *nomisiti* (irrealis, 'I will dream') (Payne 1981: 122).

The nasal irrealis prefix is mentioned in Payne (1983: 104) (Pichis) and Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982: 46) (Apurucayali), in both glossed as *future*. In Apurucayali, Payne,

---

[24] Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982) is a revision in Spanish of Payne (1981), but both are practically identical. According to the language in which this article is written, I use Payne (1981) except in some cases in which Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982) have passages that do not appear in Payne (1981).

Payne & Sánchez (1982: 46) say that the prefix always occurs before a *non-continuous* consonant (this must be understood as *non-fricative*, i.e. a stop or affricate), while the necessary environment for this prefix is not explicitly mentioned for Pichis in Payne (1983). Mihas does not mention explicitly the nasal irrealis prefix neither for Tambo-Ene (2015*b*) nor for Alto Perené (2015*a*), but the prefix appears in many examples in both of her works (e.g. (12b) and (12c) below). The nasal prefix is also described by Zumaeta (2012: 58) for Tambo-Ene. In Yuruá, García (1993, 1997) does not mention the nasal prefix, but the glossed texts at the end of her thesis show several occurrences of the prefix where it is expected (1993: 88-99, 1997: 64-72).

In Pichis, Payne (1983: 105) glosses the prefix *r-* as *future*, which we have already seen in section 2.1.2 for the non-Ashé-Ashá languages, and says that it occurs with third person masculine subject prefixes before verbal stems starting with a vowel.

Therefore, we can see that the RS suffix paradigm in the Ashé-Ashá languages except Ucayali-Pajonal is practically identical with only slight variations, and that all varieties have the nasal irrealis prefix, while Pichis also has the irrealis suffix *r-* described in section 2.1.2 for the non-Ashé-Ashá languages.

Some examples illustrating the use of the affixes described in this section are given below. As in section 2.1.2 for non-Ashé-Ashá languages, I will try to show an example with realis marking (*a* examples), one with irrealis marking expressing future (*b* examples) and one imperative with irrealis marking (*c* examples).

Tambo-Ene

(12a) peerani   y–atsik–ant–i–ni   maniti
       long.ago   3m.s–bite–cha–rea–dist.pst   jaguar
       'Long ago, jaguars would bite (people).' (Mihas 2015*b*: 6)

(12b) i–n–koniha~koniha–t–e   aisati
       3m.s–irr–appear~iter–&–irr[25]   also
       'He will appear again and again (in the deep forest).' Said about a demonic miniature person who kills by breaking a person's bones. (Mihas 2015*b*: 12)

(12c) pi–m–p–ah–e–na–ro
       2ag–irr–give–term–irr–1sg.rec–3nm.th
       'Give it back to me.' (Mihas 2015*b*: 9)

Alto Perené

(13a) n–a–ak–i   kaniri
       1sg.s–take–pfv–rea   manioc
       'I obtained manioc roots.' (Mihas 2015*a*: 194)

(13b) no–sai–t–aty–e–ro   niha
       1sg.a–pour–&–prosp–irr–3m.o   water
       'I will empty out the water.' (Mihas 2015*a*: 259)

---

[25] Although Mihas does not give iter in this example (she glosses redupl), she explains that the reduplication has an iterative meaning.

(13c)   p–amin–e   mapi
        2s–look–IRR   stone
        'Look for a stone.' (Mihas 2015*a*: 259)

Pichis

(14a)   n–ir–i
        1–beber–NFUT
        'Yo bebía'[26]. (Payne 1983: 101)

(14b)   n–ir–e
        1–beber–FUT
        'Beberé'[27] (Payne 1983: 101)

As said in section 2.2.1, Payne (1983) only describes the binary opposition as one between future and non-future and does not give any example of an imperative sentence.

For Yuruá, there is some inconsistency in the glosses of the RS affixes called *future* and *non-future* in García's (1993, 1997) collection of texts: in some examples, the translations do not fit the tense indicated by the glosses, *-e* or *-i* are glossed indistinctively as future or non-future, or a verb is glossed future in the nasal prefix but non-future in the suffix (the latter in García 1993: 89, 1997: 65). Therefore, I will not give examples of Yuruá so as to avoid confusion. The interested reader can examine García's texts (1993: 83-133, 1997: 61-97).

2.2.3. Negation and double irrealis

Negation in Ashé-Ashá languages functions in the same fashion as described in section 2.1.3 for the other Kampan languages: a negation of a verb that triggers irrealis marking is formed with the irrealis negation particle plus realis suffixes; a negation of a verb that triggers realis marking is formed with the realis negation particle plus irrealis affixes. Some examples are provided in the following.

Tambo-Ene

(15a)   te   o–n–ko–ye–ni–hi   a–ye   o–hime
        NEG.REA 3NM.S–IRR–want–IRR–DIST.PST–NEG 3NM.S.take–IRR 3NM.POSS-husband
        'Long ago she didn't want to take a husband.' (Mihas 2015*b*: 5)

---

[26] 'I was drinking.' This is the translation of the Spanish *yo bebía*, but I think that *niri* could also be translated as 'I drank', 'I have drunk' or 'I drink.' In absence of another aspectual or temporal information, any translation that expresses that the action of drinking has been realized should be right according to our knowledge of the RS functions in close varieties.

[27] 'I'll drink.'

(15b) eiro   o–ta–it–i–ri=me   o–tomi,   ari
       NEG.IRR   3NM.AG–burn–ANT–REA–3M.O=CF   3NM.POSS–SO   PP
       ov–ame–t–an–ak–e–ro=me   irori
       3NM.AG.CAUS–be.accustomed–&–DIR–PFV–IRR–3NM.O=CF   3NM.FOC.ADD
       'Hadn't she burned her son, it is the case that she (the mother) would have taught
       her, too (the murderer the art of weaving).' (Mihas 2015*b*: 13)

Alto Perené

(16a) te   i–m–pok–i
       NEG.REA   3M.S–IRR–come–IRR
       'He didn't come.' (Mihas 2015*a*: 518)

(16b) airo   pi–shiri–t–a–ro   pi–ha–t–e
       NEG.IRR   2AG–think–&–REA–3NM.O   2S–go–&–IRR
       katonko,   airo   p–avish–i
       upstream.area   NEG.IRR   2S–pass–REA
       'Don't think about going upstream, you won't pass.' (Mihas 2015*a*: 520)

     Regarding Pichis, there is no mention of its negative clause in Payne (1983), nor
is there for Apurucayali in Payne (1981) or Payne, Payne & Sánchez (1982). However,
in Payne's (1981) texts, some examples of both negation forms can be found, which are
shown in (17). Note that (17b) uses an irrealis negation because it is a purpose clause.

Apurucayali

(17a) Apa ti isaiki ipankoki.
       apa   ti   ir–saik–i   ir–panko–ki
       father   no   3M–be–NFUT   3M–house–LOC
       'My father is not in his house.' (Payne 1981: 177, 185, 198, 220)[28]

(17b) ..., iiro   akimainkatantari.
       Iiro   a–kim–aiNka–aNt–a–ri
       no   1PL.INCL–feel–olfactory–RSN–REFL.NFUT–REL
       '.., so that we wouldn't smell him.' (Payne 1981: 180, 190, 206, 224)[28]

     Also for Yuruá there is no mention of the negative clause in García (1993, 1997),
and valid examples that illustrate the contrast between the realis and the irrealis negation
cannot be found in her texts.
     The realis and irrealis negative particles in Ashé-Ashá languages different from UP
Ashéninka are almost identical, as shown in table 6.

---

[28] Payne's (1981) glosses are not one line below the other, but every level is in different pages, so that the
phonetic representations of all texts are together, then the words separated by morphemes in all texts together,
and so on.

Table 6: Realis and irrealis negative particles in Ashé-Ashá languages except UP Ashéninka (words for Pichis are from Payne & Payne (1983:130, 156) and for Yuruá, from García (1997: 74, 81))

	Tambo-Ene	Alto Perené	Pichis	Apurucayali	Yuruá
Realis	*te*	*te*	*te*	*ti*	*te*
Irrealis	*eiro*	*airo*	*eero*	*iiro*	*eero*

2.2.4. Neutralization of reality status affixes

The five Ashé-Ashá varieties studied in section 2.2 neutralize the opposition realis-irrealis in different cases, that is why they are described individually in the following lines.

In Tambo-Ene, the neutralization is shown in Mihas' (2015*b*: 3) table of suffixes: the usual I-class realis suffix -*i* becomes -*e* after -*ak* or -*ah*, which causes both realis and irrealis suffixes to have the same form (-*e*). In these cases, a verb has the same form in realis and irrealis when the irrealis nasal prefix is not present, and the realis-irrealis opposition is neutralized. This neutralization is shown in (18), where the realis and irrealis suffixes are identical (-*e*).

Tambo-Ene

(18a) i–kam–ak–e   nosari
       3M.S–die–PFV–REA   1SG.POSS.grandfather
       'My grandfather died.' (Mihas 2015*b*: 8-9)

(18b) pi–m–p–ah–e–na–ro
       2AG–IRR–give–TER–IRR–1SG.REC–3NM.TH
       'Give it back to me.' (Mihas 2015*b*: 9)

In Alto Perené, Mihas (2015*a*: 258) says that I-class verbs are marked with -*e* for realis instead of the usual -*i* after the perfective or terminative aspect suffixes -*ak* and -*ah*, respectively. This is the same neutralization as described above for Tambo-Ene, although for Tambo-Ene the description refers to all occurrences of -*ak* and -*ah*, not only to perfective and terminative suffixes. Mihas (2015*a*: 258) describes two more types of neutralization with stative verbs and first person plural suffixes, but, in these cases, what happens is that the RS suffixes are absent, so that we could speak here of an exception to the rule of the obligatory RS marking rather than of neutralization of affixes. Examples of the I-class realis suffix realized as -*e* cannot be found in Mihas (2015*a*) for Alto Perené in the sections devoted to the perfective and terminative aspects (section 8.1.1, pp. 214-216) and reality status (section 8.5, pp. 258-260).

In Pichis, Payne (1983:108) says that the opposition realis-irrealis is neutralized in I-class verbs after one of the two terminative aspects: the perfective -*ak* and the regressive -*ag* (/aɲ/). After -*ak*, the neutralization is realized as -*e*; after -*ag*, as -*i*. In (19), the realis and the irrealis suffix have both the same form (-*e*). In this case, the difference is marked through the nasal prefix in (19b).

Pichis

(19a)   i–chek–ak–e
         3–cortar–PFV–NREFL
         'Él cortó.'[29] (Payne 1983: 108)

(19b)   i–N–chek–ak–e
         3–FUT–cortar–PFV–NREFL
         'Él cortará.'[30] (Payne 1983: 108)

In Apurucayali, an overall neutralization comes from the lack of the vowel /e/, so that all I-class RS suffixes are -*i*. However, as explained in section 2.2.2, /t/ and the progressive aspect suffix -*ach* change to /ʦ/ before a realis suffix, which marks the opposition in this environment (Payne 1981: 121-127). This feature has a clear diachronic origin in that */ti/ evolved to /ʦi/ and then /e/ and /i/ merged, so that the former */ti/ and */te/ evolved to /ʦi/ and /ti/, respectively. Therefore, the neutralization is general due to the merging of /e/ and /i/, and the exception would rather be the non-neutralization in the phonological environments described above.

A similar process as the one described for Apurucayali in the preceding paragraph seems to be starting in Yuruá. García (1993: 54, 1997: 37) says that there is an incipient loss of the contrast /e/-/i/ in Yuruá, so that the tendency should be the same as in Apurucayali.

We can see that the neutralization after the perfective suffix -*ak*, described in section 2.1.4 for the non-Ashé-Ashá languages, is also present in Tambo-Ene, Alto Perené and Pichis, and in all of them there is an additional neutralization after the terminative/regressive aspect suffix -*ah/-ag*. In Apurucayali, the neutralization is general due to the merging of /i/ and /e/, a process that seems to be starting in Yuruá as well. These features are summed up in table 7. Obviously, there is no neutralization if the irrealis nasal prefix is present due to the phonological environment.

Table 7: Summary of cases of RS neutralization in Ashé-Ashá languages (except UP Ashéninka)

Variety	Yuruá	Apurucayali	Pichis	Alto Perené	Tambo-Ene
Cases of neutralization	Incipient loss of contrast /e/-/i/	Lack of contrast /e/-/i/. RS opposition in I-verbs present only in contrast /ʦi/-/ti/.	PFV -*ake* REG -*agi*	PFV -*ake* TER -*ahe*	-*ake* -*ahe*

2.3. Summary of reality status features

We have seen that the reality status systems of all the studied Kampan languages show similar features. All of them express a binary distinction between verbs that express

---

[29] 'He cut.'
[30] 'He will cut.'

what has become real (realis) against what has not become real (irrealis). Therefore, realis marking appears with past and present tense affirmative clauses, while imperative, future and negative clauses are marked with irrealis. More recent and detailed works (Michael 2008, 2014; Mihas 2015*a*, 2015*b*) also list a series of clause types that are marked with irrealis and fit the definition of a non-realized action (expression of desire, conditional, etc.). Furthermore, all languages have a realis and an irrealis negative particle, which are used in the same fashion, and all languages present the so called *double irrealis construction*, which consists of the irrealis negative particle plus realis suffixes on the verb.

We have seen that all languages have two verb classes that were called *reflexive* and *non-reflexive* in older works, which are equivalent to the more recent *A-class* and *I-class*, respectively. The RS suffixes of the I-class are identical in all languages, with the exception of Apurucayali due to the loss of the contrast between /e/ and /i/, which might also be progressing in Yuruá. These suffixes are realis *-i* and irrealis *-e*. The A-class realis suffix is also identical in all languages (*-a*), while its irrealis counterpart shows some variation. Also all languages have an irrealis nasal prefix that occurs in similar phonological environments (mainly before voiceless stops and affricates). There are different cases in which the distinction realis-irrealis is neutralized, but all languages share the neutralization of the realis and irrealis suffixes after the perfective aspect suffix *-ak*.

The similarity of the Kampan languages can be easily observed, and the great similarity of their RS systems only fits their general similarity and offers no doubt that the present RS systems come from a former RS system in proto-Kampan with the features that are summed up in this section. In the next section, I will describe the changes that Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka has undergone in its reality status system.

3. Reality status in Ucayali-Pajonal Ashéninka

When I started researching the Ashéninka reality status with Ucayali speakers, I expected to find features similar to those described in section 2. However, to my great surprise, I discovered that its reality status system has undergone a profound change that makes it different from the rest of the Kampan languages. The differences are that there is no distinction between the I-class RS suffixes, the irrealis nasal prefix has disappeared and the negative clause is marked realis on A-class verbs. However, in I-class verbs, when the RS suffix (always *-i*) occurs after *t*, the difference between realis and irrealis is preserved in that this *t* becomes *tz* in realis situations, yielding thus an opposition realis-irrealis expressed with *tzi-ti*, respectively. In these cases, the negative clause is marked realis, as in A-class verbs. This remnant of the realis-irrealis opposition is the same as explained for Apurucayali in section 2.2 and represents the realization of the tendency indicated by García (1993: 54, 1997: 37) for Yuruá (see section 2.2.4). The same as in Apurucayali, if we take into account the opposition *te-ti* in other Kampan languages, we can easily infer that the same opposition existed in Ucayali-Pajonal and a shift /ti/ > /ʦi/ and /te/ > /ti/ brought about the present opposition. The lack of contrast between realis and irrealis suffixes implies that I-class verbs, when *t* does not precede the RS suffix, in absence of different suffixes and an irrealis prefix, have totally lost the reality status system. Therefore, the

RS system only exists with I-class verbs with *t* preceding the RS suffix and with A-class verbs. In both cases, a verb in a negative clause is marked realis, differently from the other Kampan languages. UP Ashéninka keeps the two realis and irrealis negative particles and uses them in the same way as the other Kampan languages. Another peculiar development is that the former irrealis suffix *-e/-eya* has fossilized after the progressive suffix *-aty* and has given birth to a future suffix *-atyee/-atyeya* (the latter only in A-class verbs).

The study of the Pajonal texts in Heitzman (1991) (the only published Pajonal texts, to my knowledge) yields the same features as in Ucayali. This accords with the account of my informants from the Ucayali in that they told me that the only difference between Ucayali and Pajonal is in *wh*-words,[31] which implies that both varieties are practically identical. Details and examples are given in the following lines.

3.1. Ucayali

As said above, the Ucayali I-class verbs only keep RS marking when *t* occurs before the RS suffix, while, in all other cases, they have totally lost any RS marking and thus reality status as a grammatical feature, except for the negative clause, where the different negative particles mark the difference. There is no doubt of the loss of the irrealis nasal prefix, given that it has never appeared in any elicitation, story or conversation. Regarding the RS suffix, it tends to be realized most times as [ɪ], although it can also be realized as [i], [ɨ], [e] or [ɛ]. This sound variation could suggest that two different phonemes might be present. However, the work with different speakers and elicitations in which I proposed the speaker a change of [i] to [e] and vice versa showed me that they do not perceive any difference with this variation. My impression is that this suffix is a fossilized reality status marker that has become a sort of dummy vowel, and that it can be represented phonologically as /i/, taking into account that it has a broad range of realizations. This means that unstressed /i/ can be realized as [e], but unstressed /e/ can only be realized as [e]. The best example is the above mentioned future suffix *-atyee*, which no speaker admits to be realized as *[acii]. Some examples of this fossilized reality status suffix, which I have glossed FRS (fossilized reality status), are in (20). These examples show the disappearance of the opposition realis-irrealis through identical suffixes and the absence of the nasal prefix, which would be expected to be present with a verbal root like *-pok-*, starting with a voiceless stop. However, the distinction has been preserved in the different negation particles (20d, e, f).

---

[31] It may seem strange that two dialects differ only in *wh*-words and not in other words, but, when one gets to know UP Ashéninka *wh*-words, the explanation is straightforward: the same *wh*-word can have different meanings and different *wh*-words can express the same meaning. Therefore, it is normal that speakers of even different native communities can tend to use one or the other *wh*-word for the same meaning.

Ucayali

(20a) Nopoki.
    no–pok–i
    1s–come–FRS
    'I'm coming.'

(20b) Nopoki oháiteki
    no–pok–i   oháiteki
    1s–come–FRS   tomorrow
    'I'll come tomorrow.'

(20c) Pipoki!
    pi–pok–i
    2s–come–FRS
    'Come!'

(20d) Eero pipoki!
    eero   pi–pok–i
    NEG.IRR 2s–come–FRS
    'Don't come!'

(20e) Tee nopoki.
    tee   no–pok–i
    NEG.REA 1s–come–FRS
    'I'm not coming.'

(20f) Eero nopoki.
    eero   no–pok–i
    NEG.IRR 1s–come–FRS
    'I won't come.'

As explained above, when *t* occurs before the RS suffix, the RS opposition is present. Examples of this occurrence are given in (21). I have glossed -*zi/-i* as RS suffix, but it must be taken into account that -*tzi* represents /ʦɨ/ (usually realized as [ʦɨ]), so that the separation of -*t* and -*zi* in the glosses, both part of the same affricate phoneme, means that the affrication of *t* is marking the suffix as realis. Since this affrication occurs both with the epenthetic *t* and verbal roots finishing in *t* (e.g. -*kant*- 'say'), there is no better way to gloss the fact that an affrication marks the difference, although it may seem strange to separate a digraph that represents only one phoneme. The examples (21) show realis -*tzi* and irrealis -*ti* occurring where they are expected according to the descriptions given for other Kampan languages in section 2, with the exception of the negative sentence (21b), where the RS marking differs from the rest of the Kampan languages.

Ucayali

(21a) Nonátziro.
    no–na–t–zi–ro
    1s–carry–&–REA–3F.O
    'I carry it.'

(21b) Tee nonátziro.
    tee   no–na–t–zi–ro
    NEG   1s–carry–&–REA–3F.O
    'I don't carry it.'

(21c) Nonátiro inkámani.
    no–na–t–i–ro   inkámani
    1s–carry–&–IRR–3F.O tomorrow
    'I'll carry it tomorrow.'

(21d) Eero nonátziro inkámani.
    eero   no–na–t–zi–ro   inkámani
    NEG.IRR 1s–carry–&–REA–3F.O tomorrow
    'I won't carry it tomorrow.'

(21e) Pinátiro!
　　　pi–na–t–i–ro
　　　2s–carry–&–IRR–3F.O
　　　'Carry it!'

(21f) Eero pinátziro!
　　　eero　　　pi–na–t–zi–ro
　　　NEG.IRR　2s–carry–&–REA–3F.O
　　　'Don't carry it!'

Besides negative, future and imperative examples, also examples with a desiderative sentence (21g) and conditional sentences (21h, i) are given.

(21g)　Nokói nohámpitimi
　　　no–koy–i　　　no–hampi–t–i–mi
　　　1s–want–FRS　1s–ask–&–IRR–2O
　　　'I want to ask you.'

(21h)　Arírika nonátiro, osheki oténanka.
　　　ari=rika　　　no–na–t–i–ro　　　osheki　　　o–tena–nka
　　　FUT=COND　　1s–carry–IRR–3F.O　much　　　3F.S–be.heavy–NMLZ
　　　'If I carry it, it will be very heavy.'

(21i)　Éerorìka nonátziro, eero oténakana.
　　　eero=rika　　　no–na–t–zi–ro　　　eero　　　o–tena–ak–a–na
　　　NEG.IRR=COND　1s–carry–&–REA–3F.O　NEG.IRR　3F.S–be.heavy–PFV–REA–1O
　　　'If I don't carry it, it won't be heavy for me.'

As said above, the RS opposition has been preserved in A-class verbs. As can be seen in the examples (22), reality status is marked with two different suffixes: realis *-a* and irrealis *-ya* (*-ya* actually triggers a palatalization from /t/ to /c/ in these examples). The root of the verb in (22) starts with *sh* (except (22g)), so that a nasal prefix would also not be present in other Kampan languages. However, the roots *-chek-* 'cut', *-kitha-* 'dress' and *-kew-* 'wash' show no trace of a nasal prefix when marked with A-class suffixes either (when they have a reflexive meaning).

Ucayali

(22a)　Nòshirónta.
　　　no–shiront–a
　　　1s–laugh–REA
　　　'I'm laughing.'

(22b)　Nòshiróntya.
　　　no–shiront–ya
　　　1s–laugh–IRR
　　　'I'm going to laugh.'

(22c)　Pìshiróntya!
　　　pi–shiront–ya
　　　2s–laugh–IRR
　　　'Laugh!'

(22d)　Eero pìshirónta!
　　　eero　　　pi–shiront–a
　　　NEG.IRR　2s–laugh–REA
　　　'Don't laugh!'

(22e) Tee noshironta.
      tee   no–shiront–a
      NEG.REA   1s–laugh–REA
      'I'm not laughing.'

(22f) Eero noshironta.
      eero   no–shiront–a
      NEG.IRR   1s–laugh–REA
      'I won't laugh.'

(22g) Nokówaki nowéthatyàwo
      no–kow–ak–i   no–wetha–t–ya–ro
      1s–want–PFV–FRS   1s–greet–&–IRR–3F.O
      'I want to greet her.'

Examples (21) and (22) also show a particular feature of UP Ashéninka different from the rest of Kampan languages: the verbs in the negative clauses (21b) and (22e) are not marked irrealis, but realis. The case of (21b) shows that this innovation occurred before the innovations /ti/>/ʦi/ and /te/>/ti/; otherwise, the negative clause would present -*ti* (from old irrealis *-te) in the verb.

Some verbs can show the RS opposition through a difference in the suffix class, so that A-class marking indicates realis and I-class marking, irrealis, as is shown in (23).

Ucayali

(23a) Ipiya.
      i–piy–a
      3M.S–come.back–REA
      'He is coming back.'

(23b) Tee ipiya.
      tee   i–piy–a
      NEG.REA   3M.S–come.back–REA
      'He is not coming back.'

(23c) Ipiyi inkámani.
      i–piy–i   inkámani
      3M.S–come.back–IRR   tomorrow
      'He'll come back tomorrow.'

(23d) Pipiyi!
      pi–piy–i
      2s–come.back–IRR
      'Come back!'

(23e) Eero pipiya!
      eero   pi–piy–a
      NEG.IRR   2s–come.back–REA
      'Don't come back!'

(23f) Nokoyi nopiyi.
      no–koy–i   no–piy–i
      1s–want–FRS   1s–come.back–IRR
      'I want to come back.'

Another development of UP Ashéninka is the future suffix -*atyee/-atyeya* (the latter only in A-class verbs), which is shown in (24).

---

[32] This sentence and the one in example (22b) were given by a speaker as two translation options for Spanish *voy a reír* 'I'm going to laugh/I will laugh'.

Ucayali

(24a) Nòmanatyéero.
no–man–atyee–ro
1sg.s–hide–fut–3f.o
'I will hide it.'

(24b) Nòshirontatyéya.[32]
no–shiront–atyeya
1s–laugh–fut
'I will laugh.'

Verbs with the future suffix do not bear any (fossilized) reality status suffix, which is obligatory in all verbs. This shows that the future suffix *-atyee/-atyeya* most probably originated from the progressive aspect suffix *-aty* plus the irrealis suffix *-e/-eya* (the latter used only in A-class verbs). I have said above that unstressed /i/ can be realized as [e]. This was checked by asking speakers if it would be possible to pronounce a word with [i] or [e], and they replied that there was no difference, but no speaker has approved changing *-atyee* ([aceː]) by *-atyii ([aciː]). This confirms that the phoneme in this suffix is /e/ and its realization is much more restricted than that of /i/.

The features described in this section show that Ucayali Ashéninka has undergone changes in its reality status system that no other Kampan variety has. In the next section, I examine if these changes hold in its sister variety spoken in the Gran Pajonal.

3.2. Pajonal

The literature on the Pajonal variety is very scarce. The only reference with glossed texts, to my knowledge, is Heitzman (1991). She glosses the reality status suffixes as *future* and *non-future*, and consistently glosses *-i* as non-future (realis) and *-e* as future (irrealis) in I-class verbs, and *-a* as non-future reflexive and *-ya* as future reflexive in A-class verbs. The only inconsistencies always appear with *-a-e* (reg-nfut), as in (25), where the realis (non-future) suffix should be *-i*.

Pajonal

(25) no–heek–ap–a–e   no–heek–ap–a–e   no–heek–ap–a–e
      1–vivir–all–reg–nfut   1–vivir–all–reg–nfut   1–vivir–all–reg–nfut
      'Al volver, seguí viviendo aquí.'[33] (Heitzman 1991: 130)

The most interesting feature in Heitzman's texts is that the nasal prefix is absolutely missing, the same as in Ucayali. Clear examples where one would expect it to appear are given in (26).

Pajonal

(26a) … roohatzi   no–pok–ant–eya
       entonces   1–venir–detr–fut[34]
       '… entonces vendré.'[35] (Heitzman 1991:122)

---

[33] 'Coming back, I followed living here.'

[34] Here I have to say that I totally disagree with the gloss detr (detransitivizer). The suffix *-ant* in my field data and in other works expresses, among other meanings, the consequence of a cause, which fits this example, since this is the last sentence of a longer text and is the outcome of what has been previously said. Moreover, the verb *to come* is clearly intransitive, so there is nothing to detransitivize here.

[35] '…then I'll come.'

(26b)   no–kant–e–eya   shok shok shok yow–a–a–na   Tzinkañari–ki
        1–hacer–REG–FUT ir   ir   ir   salir–REG–NFUT.REFL–1S Tzinkañari
        'Lo cruzaré y luego paso a paso, paso a paso, saldré (del monte) en
        Tzincañari.'[36] (Heitzman 1991: 131)

(26c)   i–konte–t–apa–ak–ya   paashini   pey–ak–a–Ø…,
        3M–aparecer–&–ALL–PFV–FUT.REFL   otro   desaparecer–PFV–NFUT.REFL–3S
        'Cuando otra (luna) aparezca y desaparezca…,'[37] (Heitzman 1991: 122)

Examples (26) express a future action with a verbal root starting with a voiceless stop. Therefore, if Pajonal had an irrealis nasal prefix similar to the other Kampan languages, this prefix would occur in these examples.

The opposition between realis -*tzi* and irrealis -*ti*, described in section 3.1 for Ucayali, is also present in Heitzman's (1991) Pajonal texts, yet irrealis is transcribed -*te* instead of -*ti*. The examples (27) show this feature. The verb -*iyaa*- 'go' in (27a) is marked irrealis (*future* in Heitzman's terminology) with -*e* and the epenthetic consonant *t*, while, in (27b), the same verb is marked realis with -*i* and the epenthetic consonant *tz*.

Pajonal

(27a) Aririka   n–iyaa–t–e   Tyooni–ki, no–piy–a–e   intsipaete.
       cuando   1–ir–&–FUT Tyooni–LOC 1–volver–REG–FUT   rápidamente
       'Cuando vaya a Tyooni, volveré rápidamente.'[38] (Heitzman 1991: 117)

(27b) No–kant–a   n–iyaa–tz–i   n–anonk–an–ak–a.
       1–hacer–NFUT 1–ir–&–NFUT   1–cruzar.cerro–ABL–PFV–NFUT
       'Yo empecé a cruzar las montañas.'[39] (Heitzman 1991: 117)

The same distinction *t-tz* as described for Ucayali exists here, but the typical Kampan opposition *e-i* is also represented. Payne (1983: 102) shows for Pichis the same opposition as in Heitzman's texts: *tzi-te*. However, I prefer to be cautious about Heitzman's interpretation of the RS suffix, given that, as I said in section 3.1, the realization of /i/ in Ucayali is very broad, which could also be the case in Pajonal, and Heitzman might have been influenced by her expectation of irrealis *e* and realis *i*.

In any case, what Heitzman's (1991) examples clearly reveal is the loss of the irrealis nasal prefix, which puts Pajonal together with Ucayali, and this is further evidence to group Pajonal with Ucayali besides phonological reasons (the innovation /s/>/h/ described in Pedrós (2018: 11)). Heitzman's texts do not reveal if a verb in a negative sentence is marked realis, as in Ucayali, or irrealis, as in the other Kampan languages.

---

[36] 'I'll cross it and then, step by step, step by step, I'll get out (of the forest) at Tzincañari.'

[37] 'When another (moon) appears and disappears…,'

[38] 'When I go to Tyooni, I'll come back quickly.'

[39] 'I started to cross the mountains.'

4. Conclusions

The most important contribution of this article intends to be to show that a Kampan language has partially lost the reality status system; one of the most characteristic features of the Kampan languages, given that this loss was unknown in the previous literature. However, this discovery can raise some questions about, among other topics, language change and reality status. In this section, I briefly comment on which these questions might be.

The development of reality status markers in UP Ashéninka shows a grammatical change in progress. The binary RS opposition is present in all Kampan languages except in this one, in which the RS system has been lost in roughly half of all verbs. This is a token of language change and raises the question of how and why a RS system as the Kampan one appears and disappears in a language.

Michael (2014: 255-259) presents a good account of what he calls "the reality status debate". In this debate, some authors (Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994; Bybee 1998; De Haan 2012) argue that reality status cannot be considered a valid cross-linguistic category, while others (Givón 1994; Mithun 1995) argue the opposite. The arguments against RS are based on the study of languages for whose description the *realis-irrealis* terminology has been used, and these arguments are mainly that the described RS systems are too heterogeneous so as to form a cross-linguistic category and none of them represents what we would expect in a binary system that would differentiate real/actualized from unreal/non-actualized events. The arguments in favor of the validity of RS as a cross-linguistic category are basically that a grammatical feature should not be expected to be identical in all languages so as to be considered valid cross-linguistically. Michael's (2014) new idea is to propose Nanti's RS system, and with it the pan-Kampan RS system, as a canonical prototype of RS, given that this RS system shows the features that the detractors of RS as a valid grammatical category find that should be expected in a binary RS opposition. Indeed, as Michael (2014) argues, the Kampan RS systems exhibit an obligatory binary opposition between realized and unrealized events, as we have seen in the previous sections. Although already Swift (2008: 55) defined the Caquinte RS system as a tense opposition between *futuro/irreal* and *no-futuro/real*, he uses throughout his grammar the terms *futuro/no-futuro*, while *irreal/real* are only mentioned once, in the introduction to the category. Payne (2001) uses the terminology *realis/irrealis* in his glosses in a book chapter devoted to causatives. However, the first work on a Kampan language that uses the *realis/irrealis* terminology and describes it is Michael (2008). This is probably the reason why the participants in the reality status debate did not mention any Kampan language: all the works of the debate are older than Michael (2008) except De Haan (2012), where again no Kampan language is mentioned, despite also Mihas (2010) had already been published with the *realis/irrealis* terminology. In this way, the Kampan RS system seems to refute partly the arguments against RS as a cross-linguistic grammatical category –I say *partly* because many more languages would be needed in order to totally refute them.

If, instead of the pan-Kampan RS system, one examined only the UP Ashéninka system, the arguments held against RS would continue having a good basis: the RS opposition is not present in roughly half of all verbs, so a canonical example of RS system would still be missing. What may be enlightening from the pan-Kampan system together

with the UP Ashéninka evolution is that this example shows us how a perfect RS system evolves, and this might be a good explanation on why it is so difficult to find a good representative of our expected prototypical RS system: since language is continuously changing, it must be very difficult that the different evolution paths of a language come together to create a perfect RS system as the pan-Kampan one, and when this happens, this system will not hold forever, but language evolution will change it and maybe make it disappear totally or partially, as is the case in UP Ashéninka. In fact, the neutralizations described in sections 2.1.4 and 2.2.4 show that every Kampan language has lost the RS opposition in a few environments.

Palmer (2001: 160) says: "…there are few, if any, languages where there is a simple binary contrast of realis and irrealis. This is hardly surprising, for such a binary contrast would allow for a great deal of ambiguity". Palmer probably did not know the existence of the Kampan RS system, but his statement about the ambiguity of a simple binary RS contrast might be an explanation for the change undergone by UP Ashéninka. That is, the disappearance of RS marking in roughly half of all verbs poses the question of how useful this system is in a language, and the development of the UP Ashéninka future suffix (see section 3.1) shows a token of how RS can be partially replaced with other grammatical categories.

Palmer (2001:185-187) discusses the difference between irrealis and subjunctive, and says that each term belongs to a different tradition (*subjunctive* and *indicative* have been used for classical and modern European languages). However, he says that the functions of subjunctive and irrealis differ in main clauses, but that notional features associated with irrealis are also often associated with subjunctive in subordinate clauses. Indeed, in Spanish, future is expressed with subjunctive in subordinate clauses (e.g. *cuando vuelvas…* 'when you come back…') and imperative is also expressed with subjunctive only in the negative clause (e.g. *no vuelvas* 'don't come back'). In a way, the Spanish subjunctive-indicative system could qualify for an imperfect RS system as one of those to which the detractors of RS refer when they note the lack of a canonical RS system according to our notional expectations. With this, I want to highlight the fact that languages seem to tend to establish a binary opposition between real/actualized and unreal/non-actualized events, and the ways this is performed are very different and are in constant evolution, the result of which is the picture that we have today of the different reality status or subjunctive-indicative systems. This constant evolution should make it difficult to find an example of a perfect or canonical binary opposition between realis and irrealis. The pan-Kampan RS system seems to be the most ideal candidate for this canonical binary system, and UP Ashéninka shows us that such a system is not going to hold forever and thus why it is difficult for it to exist in a specific point in time as nowadays.

The difference between UP Ashéninka and the other Kampan languages in RS may show a direction in future typological research: it might be the case that the study of RS or indicative-subjunctive oppositions in closely related groups of languages might show that these oppositions have changed in some languages. If some of these cases might be identified in different groups of related languages, the comparison might yield interesting results about the evolution paths of grammatical oppositions between real/actualized and unreal/non-actualized events.

REFERENCES

Base de datos de pueblos indígenas u originarios. Ministerio de Cultura del Perú. Retrieved from bdpi.cultura.gob. pe. Accessed in 12/2018.

Baier, Nico & Zachary, O'Hagan (To appear). Morphological reflexes of subject extraction in Caquinte. *Proceedings of WSCLA* 23 (2018). Ottawa: University of Ottawa.

Bybee, Joan (1998). "Irrealis" as a grammatical category. *Anthropological Linguistics* 40(2): 257-271.

Bybee, Joan; Perkins, Revere; Pagliuca, William (1994). *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

De Haan, Ferdinand (2012). Irrealis: fact or fiction? *Language Sciences* 34(2): 107-130.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.06.016

García Salazar, Gabriela Victoria (1993). *Ashéninca-Ucayali: morfología y fonología* (Master thesis). Florionópolis: Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.

García Salazar, Gabriela Victoria (1997). Generalidades de la morfología y la fonología del ashéninca del Ucayali. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Etnolingüísticos* 9: 1-101.

Givón, T. (1994). Irrealis and the subjunctive. *Studies in Language* 18(2): 265-337.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1075/sl.18.2.02giv

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.) (2005). *Ethnologue: languages of the world. Fifteenth edition*. Dallas: SIL International. Retrieved from archive.ethnologue.com/15. Accessed in 04/2017.

Grimes, Barbara F. (ed.) (2000). *Ethnologue: languages of the world. Fourteenth edition*. Dallas SIL International. Retrieved from archive.ethnologue.com/14. Accessed in 04/2017.'

Hammarström, Harald; Forkel, Robert; Haspelmath, Martin (2018). *Glottolog 3.3*. Jena: Max-Planck-Institut für Menschheitsgeschichte. Retrieved from glottolog.org. Accessed 10/2018.

Heitzman, Allene (1991). Tiempo y lugar en la narrativa del ashéninca pajonalino. *Revista Latinoamericana de Estudios Etnolingüísticos* 6: 113-132.

Lawrence, Aimee Lynn (2013). *Inflectional verbal morphology in Nomatsigenga* (Master thesis). Austin: University of Texas at Austin.

Michael, Lev (2008). *Nanti evidential practice: Language, knowledge, and social action in an Amazonian society* (doctoral dissertation). Austin: University of Texas at Austin.

Michael, Lev (2014). The Nanti reality status system: implications for the typological validity of the realis/irrealis contrast. *Linguistic Typology* 18(2): 251-288.
doi: https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2014-0011

Mihas, Elena (2010). *Essentials of Ashéninka Perené grammar* (doctoral dissertation). Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

Mihas, Elena (2015*a*). *A grammar of Alto Perené (Arawak)* (Mouton Grammar Library 69). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Mihas, Elena (2015*b*). Non-spatial setting in Satipo Ashaninka (Arawak). Talk given at the Round Table Meeting, LCRC (Language and Culture Research Centre, James Cook University), September 2.

Mithun, Marianne (1995). The relativity of irreality. In Joan Bybee; Suzanne Fleischman (eds.). *Modality in grammar and discourse*, pp. 367-388. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Palmer, Frank R. (2001). *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Payne, David L. (1981). *The phonology and morphology of Axininca Campa* (SIL Publications in Linguistics 66). Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas at Arlington.

Payne, David L. (1983). Notas morfológicas y morfofonémicas sobre el ashéninca del Pichis. In David L. Payne; Marlene Ballena Dávila (eds.). *Estudios lingüísticos de textos ashéninca (campa-arawak preandino)* (Serie Lingüística Peruana 21), pp. 101-112. Peru: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Payne, David L. (2001). Causatives in Asheninka: The case for a sociative source. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.). *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation* (Typological Studies in Language, vol 48), pp. 485-505. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Payne, David L. & Judith K. Payne (1983). Análisis de un texto ashéninca: la inundación de la tierra. In David L. Payne; Marlene Ballena Dávila (eds.). *Estudios lingüísticos de textos ashéninca (campa-arawak preandino)* (Serie Lingüística Peruana 21), pp.113-164. Peru: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Payne, David L.; Payne, Judith K.; Sánchez Santos, Jorge (1982). *Morfología, fonología y fonética del ashéninca del Apurucayali* (2nd edition). Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Pedrós, Toni (2018). Ashéninka y asháninka: ¿de cuántas lenguas hablamos? *Cadernos de Etnolingüística* vol. 6(1): 1-30.

Simons, Gary F., & Charles D. Fennig (eds.) (2018). *Ethnologue: languages of the world, twenty-first edition*. Dallas: SIL International. Retrieved from www.ethnologue.com. Accessed in 03/2018.

Snell, Betty A. (2011). *Diccionario matsigenka – castellano, con índice castellano, notas enciclopédicas y apuntes gramaticales*. Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Swift, Kenneth E. (2008) [1988]. *Morfología del caquinte*, translated from English by Elena Townsend Díez-Canseco and Marlene Ballena Dávila (2nd edition) (Serie Lingüística Peruana nº 25). Lima: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Wise, Mary Ruth. 1986. Grammatical characteristics of Pre-Andine Arawakan languages of Peru. In Desmond Derbyshire; Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds.). *Handbook of Amazonian languages*, vol. 1, pp. 567-642. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Zumaeta Rojas, Esaú (2012). *Guía teórica. Idioma asháninka*. Lima: Universidad Católica Sedes Sapientiae.