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1. Introduction

In this paper, I will present data to illustrate that aspect contrasts in Inuktitut are expressed in two different ways.

Aspect contrasts may be indicated by simply adding aspectual morphemes based on the meaning of those morphemes. These morphemes are available for both transitive and intransitive constructions. I will show that some aspectual suffixes are used in the antipassive construction to enable imperfective viewpoint aspect readings for achievement verbs.

I will also show that antipassive constructions are imperfective constructions paralleling patterns found in other ergative languages (Polinsky 2008). The proposal accounts for the fact that the seemingly accidental homophony between the most common antipassive marker -si and the inceptive marker -si across most Eskimo languages (Fortescue 1996) is in fact due to the fact that the inceptive reading is required for achievement verbs to be interpreted as imperfective.

1 I would like to dedicate this paper to the late Saille Michael whose spirit will always stay with me and my future work.
2 Following a similar proposal in Bittner (1987) for Kalaallisut.
The traditional view of antipassive markers as meaningless detransitivisers that alternate between null and overt markers has not been able to consistently explain why the antipassive marker is by default -si across the Eskimo languages, why the overt antipassive markers are supposed to have accidental aspectual homophones and why antipassives are crosslinguistically interpreted as imperfective or atelic in ergative languages. Taking into account the meaning of the antipassive marker and the antipassive construction can provide a consistent explanation for their distribution in Inuktitut.3

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 gives an overview of the aspect literature and the terminology that I am adopting. Section 3 shows the behaviour and distribution of the different aspectual morphemes. Section 4 formalises viewpoint aspect and illustrates the use of aspectual morphemes in antipassives and changes in aspectual interpretation. It also tests the proposal that the antipassive has imperfective viewpoint aspect. Section 5 closes the paper outlining the crosslinguistic application of this proposal.

The data is from the Baffin Island dialects of Inuktitut Mittimatalik (MI) spoken in Pond Inlet, Iglulik (IG), spoken in Iglulik, and South Baffin (SB) from the Iqaluit area. My thanks for their patience and their enthusiastic willingness to answer my endless questions go to Ida Awa (MI), Saila Michael (SB), and Sandra Uvilluk (IG).

2. What is Aspect?

2.1. Lexical Aspect

In broadest terms, lexical aspect is a part of verbal semantics that denotes how an event is related to points in time or time intervals. Events are distinguished often according to progress, changes of state or an inherent endpoint to the event, implying a result or change of state at the end of the event. In contrast, non-dynamic events or states denote no such progress.4 Traditionally, verbs or predicates are tested for endpoints by using an adverbial modifier in an hour/for an hour. If they are compatible with in

---

3 This paper is a condensed summary of parts of Spreng (2012).
4 I will exclude a discussion of states from this paper (see Spreng 2012: chapter 3.3.2).
an hour or something equivalent, they have an endpoint. If they are compatible with for an hour, they do not. Endpoints are also often associated with telicity, where events with endpoints are considered telic, while events without are atelic.

(1)a. John recovered in an hour / ?for an hour. → telic
b. John swam ?in an hour / for an hour → atelic (Filip 2012: 722)

Aspect is also thought of in terms of durativity or stages (Rothstein 2004), mainly based on Vendler (1957) that distinguishes between events that can be defined in terms of time intervals while non-durative events that cannot. It means that there is no progress between two time points because the verbs denote states (2c) or instantaneous, i.e. punctual events (2d).

(2)a. John built a house in ten days. → +stages, +telic
b. John swam for ten hours. → +stages, –telic
c. John loved Peter. → –stages, –telic
d. John had recovered by 5 pm. → –stages, +telic

These aspect types are also called situations (Rothstein 2004, 2008) and in combining the sense of endpoint and progress in predicates are generally categorized as four classes.

(3) States: [–telic, –stages]
Activities: [–telic, +stages]
Achievements: [+telic, –stages]
Accomplishments: [+telic, +stages] (Rothstein 2004: 12)

Accomplishments and achievements are generally thought of as telic and many approaches group them together. However, there is a significant difference between accomplishments and achievements. Achievements are instantaneous, which means that their event time is a point in time. Therefore, there is no endpoint, only that one point in time at which they are true. On the other hand, the endpoint at which accomplishments are true is the point in time that is often specified by an adverbial modifier such as in ten days (2a), or possibly a quantised direct object or delimiter such as the finished house (2a) (Filip 2000, Tenny 1994).5 Here, I follow Piñón (1997) who argues that achievements are different from accomplishments in that they are duration-less, they have no progression or

5 See Smollett (2005) for arguments that not all quantised objects act as delimiters.
interval. This view accounts for various properties of achievements that cannot be explained if they are taken as very short accomplishments (Verkuyl 1972). The property I will focus on here is that achievements tend to have unexpected interpretations in the progressive if we assume that they entail completion because of their telicity. Progressives with achievements do not entail the completion or even partial completion of the event. Accomplishments allow for the partial completion entailment (4a), activities allow only for the complete entailment (4b) and achievements do not entail any completion (4c).

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4a) I was eating an apple.  → does not entail: I ate an apple.  → entails: I partially ate an apple.</td>
<td>b. I was running.   → entails: I ran.  → entails: I ran partially.</td>
<td>c. I was leaving the house.  → does not entail: I left the house.  → does not entail: I partially left the house.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interpretation of achievements in progressives has been discussed at length in the literature (Higginbotham 2004, Dowty 1977, Rothstein 2004, Pinon 1997). A second feature that distinguishes achievements from durative verbs is that the latter are compatible with interpretations that overlap with speech time in present progressives. Achievements on the other hand tend to be interpreted as what Higginbotham calls “futurate progressives” (Higginbotham 2004: 332). Adding a future adverbial such as tomorrow enables this reading for any verb (6a) but it is the only possible reading for achievements if an iterative reading (5c) is not available as in (5a). In contrast to durative verbs, they are not compatible with an adverbial such as at the moment unless their progressive form enables a semelfactive or iterative reading which is possible in (5c). Without any adverbial, they are uttered right before or at the very beginning of the event that is referred to (5b) and never late during the event as shown in the incompatibility with the adverbial at the moment (5a, d). This way, they indicate a viewpoint that is inceptive, while durative verbs are interpreted as speech time overlapping with the event time, allowing easy compatibility with at the moment (6b, c).6

---

6 Martin (2011) argues that in principle, any achievement can be coerced into a durative reading. I argue that the so-called durative reading is one of viewpoint, not durativity, also arguing against Clarke (2009) that proposes a similar idea.
(5)a. *I am leaving at the moment.  
b. I am leaving.  \[inceptive\]  
c. I am shooting dear at the moment.  \[iterative\]  
d. *I am reaching the conclusion at the moment.  

(6)a. I am eating an apple tomorrow.  \[inceptive\]  
b. I am eating an apple at the moment.  \[progressive\]  
c. I am swimming at the moment.  \[progressive\]  

For Inuktitut, I will show that inceptive and the iterative readings of achievement verbs are made available by inceptive and iterative markers. I will further show that this is obligatory with antipassive constructions, supporting the view that the antipassive construction has an imperfective or progressive reading. The lexical aspect types in Inuktitut are exemplified in (7). Note the difference in default readings in the intransitive versions of achievements (7c) and accomplishments (7d).

(7)a. state:  
\textit{quviasuktq}  \[MI\]  
quviasuk-tuq  
\textit{happy-PART.3SG}  
‘He is happy.’

b. activity:  
\textit{pisuktq}  
pisuk-tuq  
\textit{walk-PART.3SG}  
‘He is walking.’

c. achievement:  
\textit{kapijara} \textit{suraktuq}  
kapi-jara  
\textit{stab-PART.1SG/3SG} \textit{break-PART.3SG}  
‘I stabbed him/it/her.’ ‘It broke.’

d. accomplishment:  
\textit{angutiup niqi nirijaa niri\textit{ingga} niqimik}  
anguti-up niqi nirijaa  
\textit{man-ERG meat(ABS) eat-PART.3SG/3SG} \textit{eat-PART.1SG meat-mik}  
‘The man ate the meat.’ ‘I am eating meat.’

2.2. Viewpoint Aspect

Viewpoint aspect is often called grammatical aspect in the Indo European tradition. Its name stems from the fact that many Indo-European languages tend to overtly encode this type of aspect within the inflectional system of

\[Rothstein (2004) describes one of the readings of achievements in progressives as ‘slow-motion’ reading, which simulate a slow-motion point of view. These readings behave more like activities in progressives (Rothstein 2004: 57) in that they allow for partial entailments in English (see section 4.3).\]
subject agreement as part of the T(ense)A(spect)M(odality) system such as in English or German (Guéron 2008). The basic semantic distinction is between imperfective and perfective where imperfective includes progressive and continuous readings (Comrie 1976). As Smith (1991) points out, grammatical aspect is best described as viewpoints that “[…] function like the lens of a camera, making objects visible to the receiver. Situations are the objects on which viewpoint lenses are trained.” (Smith 1991: 61).

Formally, grammatical or rather viewpoint aspect will here be defined as a relation between E(vent) time and (R)eference time in the sense of Reichenbach (1947) and in an adaptation by Borik & Reinhart (2004). Reference time functions as the viewpoint or the lens we point at a situation, event time is the time frame/point that an event takes (Guéron 2008). Perfective viewpoint treats the event time as viewed from the outside (Comrie 1976) and is formally defined as $E \subseteq R$. Imperfective in contrast is a viewpoint from the inside of the event time, formally defined as $R \subseteq E$.

(8)a. $E \subseteq R$: Perfective

![Diagram of perfective viewpoint]

b. $R \subseteq E$: Imperfective

![Diagram of imperfective viewpoint]

If the event time is instantaneous as it is for achievements, logically, it cannot be viewed from the inside. Therefore, if the viewpoint is imperfective, it will be interpreted in a way that simulates duration. In English, and as I will show also in Inuktitut, they are interpreted as inceptive *I am leaving* or iterative/semelfactive *I am shooting dear*. I will argue that in Inuktitut, the aspectual markers inceptive *-si* and iterative/semelfactive *-saq* are required for transitive achievement verbs in antipassive constructions in order to enable imperfective readings for those verbs. This is not something particular to Inuktitut; many other languages may add affixes or particles to create phrasal verbs that change the viewpoint interpretation of a verb such as in German or
Russian (Basilico 2008). Crosslinguistically, changing case and agreement is also a common means to express viewpoint contrasts. Imperfectivity can be found for demoted objects and reduced transitivity in ergative languages (Coon 2013) and in nominative-accusative languages such as in Finnish (Kiparsky 2005, Hopper & Thompson 1980) or German (Krause 2002). I will show that Inuktitut follows that same pattern by combining case/agreement changes with aspectual suffixes to enable imperfective readings of achievement verbs in the antipassive.

3. Aspectual suffixes in Inuktitut

Aspectual modification generally refers to the concepts of (1) iteration, repetition, (2) inception, (3) progression, and (4) habituality, Inuktitut has suffixes that denote all of these concepts.

3.1. -qattaq: habitual, regular, often (1), (4)

This suffix is used to convey regularity, frequency, habituality (9, 10, 11). When using it in a habitual sense, it implies repetition (10, 11). It is used in main clauses to establish a concurrent temporal relation between the event in the main clause and the event in the embedded clause (11). It can be used with transitive (9, 10a, 11) constructions and intransitive constructions (10b). When used in a simple clause, it indicates a sense of frequency or repetition both for transitive (10a) and intransitive (10b) constructions where there is no difference in interpretation between intransitive and transitive constructions. It is obligatory when combined with -jaraanga ‘each time, whenever, habitual, regular action’ (Harper 1979: 22) in a subordinate clause (11).

(9)a. #tuqgulaavigiqattaqtautausalaangangmaanga8
    #tuqgulaa-vigiq-qaattaaq-Ø-tara tusaa-langa-ngmaanga
    yell-to-HABIT-PRES-PART.1SG/3SG hear-langa-CAUS.3SG/1SG
    ‘I speak loud so that he can hear me.’

b. tuqgulaaavigiqattatatautausarniangmaanga
    tuqgulaa-vigiq-qaattaaq-Ø-tara tusaa-ar-nia-ngmaanga
    yell-to-HABIT-PRES-PART.1SG/3SG hear-niaq-CAUS.3SG/1SG
    ‘I speak loud so that he can hear me.’ (Hayashi 2010: 95)9

8 First line added here.
9 All examples cited from Hayashi (2005, 2010) are from SB.
3.2. -saq: repeatedly, iterative, always (1), (4)

When used in an ergative construction, -saq is used for repeated actions that imply habituality (12a). When used in antipassive constructions, it indicates iterativity (12b, 13) combined with a sense of being unsuccessful or less forceful.

(12)a. *nanuq kapisaqtara*

\[ \text{naruq} \quad \text{kapi-saq-tara} \]

polar bear(ABS) stab-ITER-PART.1SG/3SG

‘I always stab the polar bear.’ (‘I never use a gun, said by someone showing off’)

b. *kapisaqtunga nanurmit*

\[ \text{kapi-saq-tunga} \quad \text{nanurq-mit} \]

stab-ITER-PART.1SG polar bear-mik.12

‘I’m stabbing a polar bear.’ (‘poking, repeated stabbing’)

(13) *Piita qukirsaqtuq nanurnit*

\[ \text{Piita} \quad \text{qukiq-saq-tuq} \quad \text{nanuq-nik} \]

Piita(ABS) shoot-ITER-PART.3SG polar bear-mik.PL

‘Peter is shooting at the polar bears.’ (‘he keeps shooting, it seems he might be missing’)

In Harper (1979: 68), the translation for the suffix is given as “working at something to achieve a desired state, usually through prolonged action”. Furthermore, it has a phonological alternant -sai in North Baffin for

---

10 Glosses are added in the examples from Harper (1979). Translations are taken directly from the source.
11 The data from Harper (1979) are from North Baffin, although the specific dialect is not noted for each entry.
12 I gloss this case as -mik due to this case’s various names in the literature such as modalis (Kleinschmidt 1851), accusative (Bok-Bennema 1991), comitative (Jensen & Johns 1989), instrumental (Fortescue 1984). See a detailed discussion on the nature of this case in Spreng (2012: chapter 4).
intransitive uses (14b). In South Baffin, the morpheme is identical in transitive and intransitive constructions (12).

The translations given in Harper (1979) for the alternation between -saq for transitives and -sai for intransitives indicate a similar contrast as in South Baffin between a habitual interpretation with -saq in the transitive construction which implies a result state (clean) (14a) and an incomplete interpretation with -sai in the intransitive construction which does not imply a result state (14b).

(14)a. qiiliqsaqpaa  
  qiiliq-saq-paa  
  clean-ITER-IND.3SG/3SG  
  ‘He cleans (polishes) it.’

b. qiiliqsaivuq  
  qiiliq-sai-vuq  
  clean-ITER-IND.3SG  
  ‘He polishes (unspecified object).’  
  (Harper 1979: 68)

As the examples in (12) and (14) show, there is a slight difference in aspectual interpretation depending on whether -saq is used in intransitive or transitive constructions while retaining the meaning of repetition of the suffix.

3.3. -si, -liq: readiness, commencement of action or motion, becoming (2), (3)

When the suffixes -si and -liq are used in transitive or regular intransitive constructions, both -si (15) and -liq (16) cause the deletion of a preceding consonant and indicate inceptive aspect.

(15)a. arnaup anautaq surasilvaa  
  arna-up anautaq sura(κ)-si-vaa  
  woman-ERG stick(ABS) break-INCPT-IND.3SG/3SG  
  ‘The woman starts to break the stick.’

b. arnaup anautaq suraliqpa  
  arna-up anautaq sura(κ)-liq-paa  
  woman-ERG stick(ABS) break-INCPT-IND.3SG/3SG  
  ‘The woman starts to break the stick.’
(16)a. *anautaq surasijuq
    anautaq sura(\text{k})-\text{si}-juq
    stick(ABS) break-INCPT-PART.3SG
    ‘The stick is about to break.’

b. *anautaq suraliqtuq
    anautaq sura(\text{k})-\text{liq}-tuq
    stick(ABS) break-INCPT-PART.3SG
    ‘The stick is about to break.’

The suffix -\text{si} is the most common so-called antipassive marker or detransitiviser used across the Eskimo languages (Nagai 2006, Spreng 2012, Bittner 1987). When -\text{si} is used in an antipassive construction, the preceding consonant is not deleted.\textsuperscript{13}

(17) *arnaq suraksijuq (anautarmik)
    arnaq surak-\text{si}-juq (anautaq-mik)
    woman(ABS) break-AP-PART.3SG stick-mik
    ‘The woman is breaking (a stick) / something.’ (Spreng 2012: 21)

Despite having very similar meaning, -\text{liq} cannot be used in antipassive constructions by itself (18c). For verbs that require an antipassive marker in antipassive constructions, -\text{si} has to be present (18a, b). For those verbs, in order to render an overtly inceptive reading, -\text{si} may also be used twice as in (18d) although speakers prefer (18a).\textsuperscript{14}

(18)a. anguti kuniksiliqpuq arnamik
    anguti kunik-\text{si}-liq-puq arnaq-mik
    man(ABS) kiss-AP-PART.3SG woman-mik
    ‘The man starts to kiss a woman.’

b. *anguti kunikpuq arnamik
    anguti kunikpuq arnaq-mik
    man(ABS) kiss-IND.3SG woman-mik
    ‘The man is kissing a woman.’

c. *anguti kuniklirpuq arnamik
    anguti kunik-liq-puq arnaq-mik
    man(ABS) kiss-INCPT-IND.3SG woman-mik
    ‘The man starts to kiss a woman.’

\textsuperscript{13} A similar pattern of consonant deletion for -\text{si} can be found in Labrador Inuttut (Beaudoin-Lietz 1982: 75). There, they are treated as separate morphemes despite similar meaning and distribution. (See Spreng 2012, chapter 2 for discussion).

\textsuperscript{14} “It means the same but I would not say it that way” (Ida Awa, p.c., 2001).
With verbs that do not require an antipassive marker (19a), the inceptive meaning of -si and -liq is apparent in antipassive (19b, c), intransitive (19b, c) and ergative construction (19d, e).

(19)a. \textit{anguti niri\textbackslash nuq (niqimik)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{anguti} & niri\textbackslash nuq & (niqimik) \\
\textit{man(ABS)} & eat-IND.3SG & meat-mik \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{quote}
‘The man is eating (meat) / something.’
\end{quote}

b. \textit{anguti niri\textbackslash sisivuq (niqimik)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{anguti} & niri\textbackslash si\textbackslash vuq & (niqimik) \\
\textit{man(ABS)} & eat-IN\textbackslash CPT-PART.3SG & meat-mik \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{quote}
‘The man starts to eat (meat).’
\end{quote}

c. \textit{anguti niri\textbackslash liq\textbackslash puq (niqimik)}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{anguti} & niri\textbackslash liq\textbackslash puq & (niqimik) \\
\textit{man(ABS)} & eat-IN\textbackslash CPT-IND.3SG & meat-mik \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{quote}
‘The man starts to eat (meat).’
\end{quote}

d. \textit{angutiup niqi niri\textbackslash sisivaa}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{anguti-up} & niqi & niri\textbackslash si\textbackslash vaa \\
\textit{man-ERG} & meat(ABS) & eat-IN\textbackslash CPT-IND.3SG/3SG \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{quote}
‘The man starts to eat meat.’
\end{quote}

e. \textit{angutiup niqi niri\textbackslash liq\textbackslash paa}
\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textit{anguti-up} & niqi & niri\textbackslash liq\textbackslash paa \\
\textit{man-ERG} & meat(ABS) & eat-IN\textbackslash CPT-IND.3SG/3SG \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{quote}
‘The man starts to eat meat.’
\end{quote}

Note the significant difference in aspectual interpretation when the verbs with -si in the antipassive are used in regular intransitive constructions. The imperfective reading is retained for \textit{niri-} (20a), while \textit{surak-} (20b) is interpreted as perfective. The only time \textit{surak-} can be interpreted as imperfective is in the presence of -si in the antipassive construction (17), indicating that the imperfective reading is correlated to the inceptive suffix while that reading is readily available for \textit{niri-} without -si.

\footnote{15 Called null-type antipassives in Spreng (2012). In essence, there is no asceptual difference in (19a) with or without \textit{niqimik}.}
(20)a. nirijuq
   niri-juq
   eat-PART.3SG
   ‘He is eating.’

b. suraktuq\textsuperscript{16}
   surak-tuq
   break-PART.3SG
   ‘It broke. / It is broken.’

3.4. -a: prolongation of action (3)

This suffix seems to occur with both stative tusaq- and eventive kataq- verbs. When attached, it has a stative effect (21a), a prolonging effect (21b) and one that seems to remove the result state (21c), (22c). While the effects might be slightly different in different dialects, the prolonging effect is not consistent and seems to be partly dependent on the lexical aspect of the verb. These effects are not present without -a (22).

(21)a. aanniajuq
   aanni-a-juq
   hurt-PROL-PART.3SG
   ‘He is ill.’

c. tusaaajuq
   tusa(q)-a-juq
   hear-PROL-PART.3SG
   ‘He listens.’

(22)a. aaniqtunga
   aanniq-tunga
   hurt-PART.1SG
   ‘I am hurt.’

c. Piita tusaqtuq
   Piita tusaq-tuq
   Peter(ABS) hear-PART.3SG
   ‘Peter hears.’

The suffix -a adds an element of durativity or stativity to the predicate. In some sense, the implied results seem to be missing when it is present, recalling progressive readings. More research needs to be done in order to determine whether it could be an antipassive marker for some perception

\textsuperscript{16} Note that this is not actual past tense: suraktuq is not compatible with a past adverbial such as ippaksaq ‘yesterday’ (see Hayashi & Spreng 2005).

\textsuperscript{17} I added hyphenation and glosses.
or psych verbs such as *tusaq*-.

Based on the translation, the difference between using -a or not seems to be not only in prolonging but also in the result *tusaq*- ‘hear’ vs. *tusa-a*- ‘listen’.

### 3.5. Summary

The aspectual suffixes in Inuktitut are generally not restricted or obligatory to a particular construction. They work to modify events either by prolonging, repeating, or focusing on completion or beginnings. The two aspectual morphemes -si and -saq I have found to be obligatory in antipassive constructions (Spreng 2012) show some phonological differences when used in the antipassive compared to when used in other constructions. -si causes the deletion of preceding consonants in non-antipassives while -saq is -sai in intransitive constructions in North Baffin (Harper 1979).

### 4. Viewpoint aspect: Reference Time and Event Time

As noted in section 2.2, using a Reichenbachian framework, I am modifying proposals made in Borik (2002) and Borik & Reinhart (2004) to define viewpoint aspect for Inuktitut. In this framework, viewpoint aspect is equivalent to the relation between (R)eference Time and (E)vent Time. Tense is determined by the relation between R and (S)peech Time or utterance time. Other approaches generally agree on the relations but not always on the terminology (Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria 2004). In English, perfective aspect is built into the past tense morphology (Borik & Reinhart 2004) and thus must fulfill two conditions: E is a subset of R while S and R cannot overlap.

(23) English: Perfective aspect: $E \subseteq R \land S \cap R = \emptyset$  

(Borik & Reinhart 2004: 18)

In Inuktitut, S is not necessary for viewpoint aspect. Tense marking is only responsible for tense and has no correlation to aspect (Hayashi 2010). In English, the only possible translation of perfective viewpoint is simple past
whose interpretation is ambiguous between perfectivity and actual past. As shown in the translation in (24a), English simple past is compatible with a ‘just now’ interpretation and with a past adverbial (24b). On the other hand, the Inuktitut verb is only compatible with a ‘just now’ interpretation (24a) but not with a past adverbial (24b) unless overtly marked with a past tense suffix (24c). Thus, the default interpretation of an achievement verb such as tikit- ‘arrive’ (24a) is perfective viewpoint but not past tense.

(24)a. tikittuq
    tikit-Ø-tuq
    arrive-Ø-PART.3SG
    ‘He just arrived.’

b. *tikittuq ippaksaq
   *tikit-Ø-tuq  ippaksaq
   arrive-Ø-PART.3SG  yesterday
   ‘He arrived yesterday.’

c. tikilauqtuq ippaksaq
   tiki-lauq-tuq  ippaksaq
   arrive-PAST-PART.3SG  yesterday
   ‘He arrived yesterday.’ (Hayashi & Spreng 2005: 5)

With durative eventive verbs, however, the default interpretation is in fact present imperfective as shown in (20a) and (25).18

(25) arnaq miqsuqtuq (qarling-nit) [SB]
    arnaq  miqsuq-tuq  (qarling-nit)
    woman(ABS)  sew-AP-PART.3SG  pant-mik.DL
    ‘The woman is sewing (a pair of pants) / something.’

In formal terms, the two viewpoints can thus be rendered for Inuktitut as in (26) without the inclusion of speech time.

(26)a. E ⊆ R: Perfective
    b. R ⊆ E: Imperfective

In informal terms, R is our viewpoint. If it is outside of E and thus E is a subset of R, we get perfective viewpoint; a viewpoint from outside the Event time. R is thus an interval or point in time from which we view the event or E. The opposite imperfective viewpoint is achieved if R is a subset of E. In this case, E is thus viewed from a point or interval within the event time.

---

18 This does not apply to perception verbs like taku- ‘see’ or tusaq- ‘hear’. Their default reading is stative, not eventive.
The only relation for viewpoint is the relation between E and R. There is no temporal relation between them. Thus when outside, R can be before or after E. Tense comes only into play when R is put in relation to S as in English.

Since viewpoint is not “grammatical” in the sense as being part of INFL or Tense in Inuktitut, I argue that viewpoint is determined primarily by the verb’s lexical aspectual properties and only secondarily by the agreement system.

Consider the following contrast in (27) and (28). The inceptive AP marker -si changes the interpretation for the verbs in (28) to progressive, but the reverse is not necessary for the durative verbs in (27) (Hayashi 2010).

\begin{enumerate}
\item (27)a. \textit{pisuktuq} \[\text{pisuk-tuq}\]
\text{walk-PART.3SG} \text{‘He is walking.’}
\item (27)b. \textit{uqalimaqtunga} \[\text{uqalimaq-tunga}\]
\text{read-PART.3SG} \text{‘I’m reading (something).’}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item (28)a. \textit{suraktuq} \text{[MI]} \[\text{surak-tuq}\]
\text{break-PART.3SG} \text{‘It broke.’}
\item (28)b. \textit{tuqujuq} \[\text{tuqu-juq}\]
\text{die-PART.3SG} \text{‘It died. / It is dead.’}\textsuperscript{19}
\end{enumerate}

\textbf{4.1. Viewpoint and agreement}

As discussed above, durativity determines a default viewpoint reading that may be modified with aspectual suffixes. Inuktitut also has a way to change or determine viewpoint through agreement changes. As shown in (29b), (30b), ergative constructions are always interpreted as perfective even with verbs that are by default imperfective (30a). On the other hand,

\textsuperscript{19} Martin (2011) argues that viewpoint can be focused either on the result state or the event. This might account for the ambiguity of the translation in (28b): ‘it is dead’ focuses on the result state while ‘it died’ on the event that lead to that result.
antipassive constructions are always interpreted as imperfective (29a), (30a).

(29)a.  *Piita kapisijuq nanurmit*  
Piita  kapi-*si*-juq  nanur-mit  
Peter(ABS) stab-AP-PART.3SG polar bear-mik  
‘Peter is stabbing a polar bear.’

b.  *Piitaup nanuq kapijaa*  
Piita-up  nanuq  kapi-jaa  
Peter-ERG polar bear(ABS) stab-PART.3SG/3SG  
‘Peter stabbed the polar bear.’

(30)a.  *uqalimaqtuq*  
uqalimaq-tuq  
read-PART.3SG  
‘He is reading (something).’

b.  *uqalimaqtaa*  
uqalimaq-taa  
read-PART.3SG/3SG  
‘He read it (just now).’

If we compare the examples in (29) and (30), it is clear that the meanings of so-called antipassives for durative verbs are no different from regular intransitives. The presence of -si however clearly changes achievement verbs to progressives. The question now is, how and why the inceptive meaning of -si can enable the imperfective reading of the antipassive or whether it is is a different homophonous morpheme that occurs as meaningless intransitiviser as the traditional descriptions claim (Fortescue 1996).

4.2. The role of -si and -saq in imperfective interpretation

As we have seen in section 3.3, the meaning of -si is inceptive. According to Comrie (1976), inceptive is not a type of imperfective viewpoint. However, the examples in (31) should illustrate very clearly that imperfective readings are not just progressive or continuous.

When punctual verbs are used in the imperfective, they may be interpreted as inceptive (31a), iterative (31b), or prolonged (31c).

(31) ‘touch’

a.  He is touching the painting! (said watching someone about to touch a painting)  
Literally: He is about to touch it.  
*[inceptive]*
b. He is touching the painting.
   Literally: He keeps tapping the painting. [iterative]

c. He is touching the painting.
   Literally: He is stroking it. [prolonged]

While in English, these readings are available for any verb, in Inuktitut, these are the imperfective readings that become available for punctual verbs by virtue of adding the aspectual suffix. It has the effect of prolonging as in (32a), iteration (32c, 33a), or removing the result state (33a).

(32)a. aqtuqsijuq
   aqtuq-si-juq
   touch-AP-PART.3SG
   ‘He is stroking someone.’

b. aqtuqtanga
   aqtuq-tanga
   touch-PART.2SG/1SG
   ‘You touched me.’

c. aqtuqsaqtuq
   aqtuq-saq-tuq
   touch-ITER-PART.3SG
   ‘He is repeatedly touching someone.’ (‘like tapping with your finger’)

(33)a. kapisijuq
   kapi-si-juq
   stab-AP-PART.3SG
   ‘He is poking someone.’

b. kapijara
   kapi-jara
   stab-PART.1SG/3SG
   ‘I stabbed him.’

The question now arises if -si and -saq are not simply meaningless intransitivisers, then why would an aspectual morpheme be required in an antipassive construction with punctual verbs? I suggest that they are necessary to enable imperfective readings for verbs that are punctual and thus cannot have R ⊆ E by default.

One might argue that -si and -saq simply act as durative markers. In fact this has been proposed in Clarke (2009). While I agree that the aspectual suffix has the effect of enabling a viewpoint where R is a subset of E, this does not mean it is a durative morpheme. That would be akin to saying be+ing is a durative morpheme. Such an analysis disregards the
actual meaning of the various antipassive markers, especially for -saq which is not a durative suffix but an iterative suffix.

Furthermore, neither inceptive -si nor iterative -saq have a completely different meaning from their original meanings as inceptive or iterative markers. While -si, as the default marker seems to have a more general use similar to be+ing in English, it does not actually make the event durative. If that were the case, then we would get a progressive meaning or continuous meaning, which we get preferably with -saq, as shown in (34).20

(34)  Piita kuniksaqtuq
Piita kunik-saq-tuq
Peter(ABS) kiss-ITER-PART.3SG
‘Peter is kissing someone.’ (“English kissing: making out”)

From a diachronic point of view, it should be noted that the ergative construction is disappearing rapidly in the Eastern dialects of Inuktitut and can now be elicited only in restricted contexts (Hallman 2008, Johns 2006). Geographically speaking, the ergative is a much more marked construction in an Eastern dialect like Labrador Inuttut than in a Western variant like Iñupiaq (Johns 1999, 2001a, 2001b, 2006). With the disappearance of the ergative construction as the default transitive, the language is starting to lose the robust viewpoint contrast that is conveyed through the contrast with the antipassive construction. Recent data from South Baffin suggest some ambiguity in antipassive constructions between imperfective and perfective viewpoint. In -si-type antipassive constructions, the reading may be perfective since it cannot be cancelled, as shown in the translation (35a).21

(35)a. anguti qukiqsijuq tuktumit kisiani qukiqsilaunngituq [SB]
anguti qukiq-si-juq tuktu-mit kisiani qukiq-si-lauq-nngit-tuq
man(ABS) shoot-AP-PART.3SG caribou-mik but shoot-AP-PAST-NEG-PART.3SG
*‘The man just shot caribou but didn’t shoot any.’

b. ‘I was shooting caribou, but I was interrupted (so I didn’t shoot any).’

---

20 Also, we would expect the prolonging suffix -a to be necessary.
21 The Mittimatalik data presented here was elicited between 1999 and 2002 and the contrasts are a lot more robust than in the more recent data from South Baffin which was elicited between 2003 and 2014. Ambiguity like in (35) was never apparent in MI.
The imperfective reading is however salvaged with the use of -saq where the cancellation is possible, as shown in (36).

(36)  anguti qukirsaqtuq tuktumit  [SB]
     anguti qukiq-saq-tuq tuktu-mit
     man(ABS) shoot-ITER-PART.3SG caribou-mik
  kisiani qukirsilaunngittuq
  kisiani qukiq-si-lauq-ngit-tuq
  but shoot-AP-PAST-NEG-PART.3SG

‘The man is shooting caribou but hasn’t shot any.’

The more recent data from SB thus indicates that imperfective viewpoint may be achieved purely by inserting an appropriate morpheme, in this case -saq. However, when there is an ergative construction, only the perfective reading is available for that construction, which applies to any type of verb, as shown in (37).

(37)a. quqirtaa  [MI]
     quqiq-taa
     shoot-PART.3SG/3.SG
  *(S)he is shooting it.’

b. nirijara  [SB]
     niri-jara
     eat-PART.1SG/3SG
  ‘I ate it.’
  *‘I am eating it’

The fact that only the antipassive construction with -si type verbs and not the ergative construction may become ambiguous with respect to viewpoint aspect shows clearly that Inuktitut, although possibly on its way to becoming a language that encodes viewpoint contrasts purely with morphology, still encodes it in the agreement system to a degree. The recent data also still supports the idea that punctual verbs are by default interpreted as perfective since only these verbs now allow for a perfective reading of the intransitive antipassive construction.

The meaning of -si is more specific than simply extending that duration of the event. It may be iterative (38), prolonged (39), or inceptive (40).22

---

22 The fact that -si is cross-dialectally the most common AP marker indicates a certain underspecification in its meaning when used in this position; also supported by the fact that it is usually only translated as ‘start to’ when it is not in the antipassive construction.
(38)a. kapisijuq
   kapi-si-juq
   stab-AP-PART.3SG
   ‘He is poking someone.’

   b. kapijara
   kapi-jara
   stab-PART.1SG/3SG
   ‘I stabbed him.’

(39)a. aqtuqsiujuq
   aqtuq-si-juq
   touch-AP-PART.3SG
   ‘He is stroking someone.’

   b. aqtuqtanga
   aqtuq-tanga
   touch-PART.2SG/1SG
   ‘You touched me.’

(40)a. naalauti suraktuq
   naalauti surak-tuq
   radio(ABS) break-PART.3SG
   ‘The radio broke / is broken.’

   b. surusiq irmusimik suraksijuq
   surusiq irmusi-mik surak-si-juq
   child(ABS) cup-mik break-AP-PART.3SG
   ‘The child is breaking the cup.’

In Mittimatalik, South Baffin, and Iglulik, the iterative reading can also be achieved with the alternative antipassive morpheme -saq (41).

(41)a. anguti kuniksaqtuq ikaralimaamut
   anguti kunik-saq-tuq ikaralimaamut
   man(ABS) kiss-ITER-PART.3SG for.an.hour
   ‘The man is kissing someone for an hour.’ literally: kissing repeatedly (“little pecks”)

   b. aqtuqsaqtuq
   aqtuq-saq-tuq
   touch-ITER-PART.3SG
   ‘He is repeatedly touching someone.’ (“like tapping with your finger”)

   c. angut qukiqsaqtuq qimmirmit
   angut qukiq-saq-tuq qimmiq-mit
   man(ABS) shoot-ITER-PART.3SG dog-mik
   ‘The man is shooting a dog.’ (“he keeps pulling the trigger”)

If I am correct in that the antipassive construction is imperfective, it is not surprising that the antipassive morpheme is only necessary for punctual
verbs. Iterative -saq renders E as repeated interval, creating an E that has many intervals, thus creating a circumstance where R can be a subset of at least one of all the intervals of E. While aqtq- by default means a ‘quick touch’, aqtuq-si-juq may mean something like ‘a longer touch’, again, making the inclusion of R in E possible. If -si in the antipassive construction is only a meaningless intransitiviser that is a homophone of the aspectual inceptive -si, we cannot explain these meaning differences for achievement verbs.

4.3. Is the antipassive construction imperfective?

The above approach to viewpoint aspect makes certain predictions. If R is within E, then there cannot be an endpoint, i.e. no telic interpretation. Contrasts with respect to telicity, i.e. endpoints should thus only be shown with perfective viewpoint.

In English, this is illustrated in the following contrasts. In (42), when the verb is not in the progressive form, ‘drink’ can be interpreted with an endpoint if it has a delimiter such as a quantised definite object ‘the beer’ that delimits the event. In the progressive (43), the presence of ‘the beer’ is irrelevant. It is always interpreted as atelic. Furthermore, in (43c), it is only partially entailed that the beer was finished.23

(42)a. Peter drank the beer in 5 minutes/*for 5 minutes
b. Peter drank. *in 5 minutes/for 5 minutes

(43)a. Peter was drinking the beer *in 5 minutes/for 5 minutes
b. Peter was drinking *in 5 minutes/for 5 minutes
c. Peter was drinking the beer → does not entail Peter drank the beer.
   → partially entails that Peter drank the beer.

Another prediction is that with conjoined clauses, if one clause has an imperfective reading, they can be read as simultaneous. The only time conjoined clauses would always be interpreted as sequential would be if both clauses are perfective. Reinhart (2003) argues that telic events introduce a new R, while atelic events do not. They have their own R, so to speak. On the other hand, atelic events are true at more than one interval, thus they do not introduce a specific R. Reinhart argues that what is delimited in telic events is not E but R. Thus, because telic events may

23 Also see discussion in section 2.1.
only be true for one point, a new R is automatically introduced for any possible successive event. On the other hand, atelic events do not delimit R, thus any interval of R can be the R for more than one atelic event.

(44) Sequence (R-time movement) generalization:
   a) Given the current R-time R_i, for each new e_j, E_j \subseteq R_i (notated: [e_i, E_j]).
   b) An R-time R_i is current, until a new R_{i+1} is introduced.
   c) A telic event introduces a new R-time, R_{i+1}. (atelic events do not.)
   d) Temporal delimiters introduce a new R-time (Reinhart 2003: 8)

For imperfectives, since at least one R is always within E, the option of simultaneous readings of two events is available while it is not available for two perfective viewpoints.

(45) Simultaneous reading

(46) Sequential reading

4.3.1. Conjoined events in Inuktitut

Conjoining events in Inuktitut is different from English in that they are formed with conjunctive clauses. Conjunctions like *amalu* ‘and’ are disfavoured. Conjoined events are usually formed with the conjunctive mood *-tillu*, which, as Hayashi (2005) discusses, is best translated as ‘when’ for readings with two punctual events. Sequential vs. simultaneous readings are determined by the punctuality of the verb, tense marking and negation (Hayashi 2005, 2010). With two punctual verbs, if the matrix clause is marked with past tense, that tense scopes over the conjunctive clause and thus immediately follows the unmarked conjunctive clause (47).

(47)a. *miali and tillu jaan aniqqaujuq*  
   miali an OTillu jaan ani-qqau-juq  
   Mary leave-PRES-CNJ.3SG John leave-PAST-PART.3s  
   ‘When Mary left, John left.’

b. PAST [Mary leave PRES [John leave]]  
   (Hayashi 2005: 132)
On the other hand, when two durative events are conjoined in the past, they are interpreted as simultaneous, as shown in (48).

(48)a. *jaan niritillugu miali uqalimaalaauqtuq*

```
jaan nir-Ø-tillugu miali uqalimaa-laauq-tuq
John eat-PRES-CONJ.3SG Mary read-PAST-PART.3SG
```
‘When John was eating Mary was reading.’

b. **PAST** [Mary be reading **PRES** [John be reading]] (Hayashi 2005: 131)

The discussion in Hayashi (2005) thus gives us a way of testing whether the same applies to ergative and antipassive constructions. If the matrix clause is ergative or intransitive and punctual, it should precede the event in the conjunctive clause if that event is negated. Note that *-tillu* only occurs with intransitive agreement, which means that the embedded conjunctive clause can never be a transitive construction. Therefore, the event in the conjunctive clause, unless it is a canonical intransitive clause with a punctual verb, should always be simultaneous to the event in the matrix clause. This is indeed borne out, as shown in (49). Regardless of whether the conjunctive clause is in a *-si*-type antipassive construction or a null-type antipassive construction, the events are always simultaneous when the matrix clause is also in an antipassive construction.

(49)a. *-si*-type AP conjunctive AND *-si*-type AP matrix clause → [simultaneous]

```
qukiqsitillunga kuniksaqtui
qukiq-si-tillunga kunik-saq-tui
shoot-AP-CONJ.1SG kiss-ITER-3PL
‘While I am shooting, they are kissing.’
```

b. *-si*-type AP conjunctive AND null-type AP matrix clause → [simultaneous]

```
qukiqsaqtillunga tuktumit miqsuartuq garlingnit
qukiq-saq-tillunga tuku-mit miqsuq-tuq garling-nit
shoot-ITER-CONJ.1SG caribou-mik sew-PART.3SG pant-mik.DL
‘While I am shooting caribou, she is sewing pants.’
```

c. null-type AP conjunctive AND null-type AP matrix clause → [simultaneous]

```
miqsuqtillunga garlingnit tusaajuq naalautimit
miqsuq-tillunga garling-nit tusa-a-juq naalauti-mit
sew-CONJ.1SG pant-mik.DL hear-PROL-PART.3SG radio-mik
‘While I am sewing pants, he is listening to the radio.’
```

d. null-type AP conjunctive AND *-si*-type AP matrix clause → [simultaneous]

i. *miqsuartillunga garlingnit kuniksaqtui*

```
miqsuq-tillunga garling-nit kunik-saq-tui
sew-CONJ.1SG pant-mik.DL kiss-ITER-PART.3PL
‘While I am sewing pants, they are kissing.’
```
Thus, the conjunction does not allow sequential readings (50a) unless the conjunctive clause and the matrix clause are canonical intransitive constructions with a punctual verb. The only other way to get a sequential reading where the event in the matrix clause precedes the event in the conjunctive clause is with the help of tense marking, as discussed in Hayashi (2010). In order to determine whether the transitive constructions behaves like a punctual and therefore like a perfective, we further expect that conjoined events with a transitive construction in the matrix clause and a canonical intransitive punctual event in the conjunctive clause are interpreted as sequential. This prediction is also borne out since the ergative behaves like a punctual verb, as shown in (50).24

(50) punctual conjunctive AND ergative matrix → [sequential]

   a. tuquitillugu takujara
      tuqu-tillugu taku-jara
      die-CONJ.3SG see-PART.1SG/3SG
      ‘I saw that he had died.’
      E2 E1

   b. tikitillugu tuquutara
      tiki-tillugu tuqu-t-tara
      arrive-CONJ.3SG die-caus-PART.1SG/3SG
      ‘I killed him after (when) he arrived.’
      E2 E1

Extrapolating the results from Hayashi (2005) by taking punctual to be perfective and durative to be imperfective in canonical intransitive constructions, we can determine whether the antipassive and the transitive construction behave like the punctual and durative intransitives. As the data in (49) and (50) shows, the sequential reading is only possible with a punctual conjunctive clause and a transitive matrix clause, thus confirming that the transitive behaves like a punctual event and thus has perfective viewpoint. Using the antipassive construction in the conjunctive clause has shown that when punctual verbs are used in the antipassive in the

---

24 In the absence of any tense marking, the order of events is reversed compared to the tense marked (48).
conjunctive clause, they behave like a canonical durative intransitive, thus providing further evidence that the antipassive is an imperfective.

### 4.3.2. Progressive entailments

A final test to determine whether the antipassive is imperfective comes from progressive entailments. As briefly discussed in section 2, only atelic predicates hold the entailment as in (51a). Thus, under the endpoint-approach, we would expect accomplishment and achievement predicates to have the same entailment relations, as in (51b, c).

(51)a. Mary was driving a car **ENTAILS** Mary drove a car  
    b. Mary was building a house **DOES NOT ENTAIL** Mary built a house  
    c. Mary was shooting the bear **DOES NOT ENTAIL** Mary shot the bear

Thus, if all antipassives are imperfectives and thus atelic, they should show the entailment relations in (52).

(52)a. antipassive (no -si) **ENTAILS** transitive  
    He is pulling a sled He pulled the sled  
    b. antipassive (accomplishment with no -si) **DOES NOT ENTAIL** transitive  
    He’s building a house He built a house  
    c. antipassive (achievement with -si) **DOES NOT ENTAIL** transitive  
    He is breaking a window He broke the window

As shown in (53), this is indeed borne out. The examples show that the entailment correlations between antipassive and transitive mirror the ones between imperfective and perfective in English. The antipassive construction with durative atelic predicates in (53a, b) entail the transitive constructions. The durative verb *sana-* (53c) does not entail the transitive construction, thus behaving like a telic predicate and mirroring the relation between progressive telic predicates and their perfective counterparts in English. The punctual telic verb in (53d) also behaves like a telic verb in that it does not entail the ergative construction.

(53)a. *uniaqtunga qamutimit* **ENTAILS** *uniaqtara qamutit* [SB]  
    uniaq-tunga qamuti-mit He is pulling a sled  
    pull-PART.1SG sled-mik ‘I am pulling a sled.’  
    b. *uniaqtunga qamutimit* **DOES NOT ENTAIL** *uniaqtara qamutit*  
    uniaq-tara qamutit He built a house  
    pull-PART.1SG/3SG sled(ABS) ‘I just pulled a sled.’  
    c. *uniaqtunga qamutimit* **DOES NOT ENTAIL** *uniaqtara qamutit*  
    uniaq-tara qamutit He broke the window  
    pull-PART.1SG/3SG sled(ABS) ‘I just pulled a sled.’
Thus, we have further empirical support that the antipassive has imperfective viewpoint.

5. Conclusion

I have shown data from Baffin Island Inuktitut that supports the idea that antipassive constructions have imperfective viewpoint in Inuktitut. This proposal aligns Inuktitut with other ergative languages that express imperfective viewpoint in the antipassive (Polinsky 2008) and with other languages that employ detransitivising and changes in case and agreement to express aspect contrasts (Kratzer 2004, Barrie & Spreng 2009).

This proposal also explains why -si is the most common antipassive marker across the Eskimo languages. It enables imperfective readings for punctual achievement verbs. Some of the imperfective readings for imperfective achievements are expressed by -si and another iterative marker -saq. The crosslinguistically common readings for those verbs in imperfectives are inceptives, ‘becoming’, iteration, and filmstrip readings (Rothstein 2004). The proposal thus explains the general distribution of antipassive markers which has been to date considered somewhat “[…] difficult to predict.” (Fortescue 1996: 35).

The reason why that is so difficult is because the traditional view of these morphemes as meaningless detransitivisers assumes that all verbs that occur in transitive constructions are somehow basically transitive and transitive constructions are in some sense defaults. However, verbs like
niri- ‘eat’ or miqsuq- ‘sew’ occur as intransitives without any objects without any additional morphology. Assuming that they require some sort of null detransitivisers for so-called antipassives that have only optional objects appears to complicate the grammar unnecessarily while not sufficiently accounting for the actual distribution of the overt suffixes.

The traditional view that inceptive -si and a meaningless detransitivising antipassive -si are different morphemes fails to account for the fact that -si is only necessary for punctual verbs in antipassives and that the default aspectual meaning of verbs without it is considerably different compared to their occurrence with it in antipassive constructions. Traditional accounts also assume that there is a null detransitiviser for verbs that seem to occur without -si. One might say that it is only the null antipassive marker that has no meaning, but in that case, the support for proposing it disappears completely. If it does not detransitivise and it has no meaning, there is no reason to suspect it exists.

Transitive and antipassive constructions are aspectually different and taking into account the meaning that the aspectual markers contribute also accounts for a remarkably consistent distribution of those morphemes in the language family (Nagai 2006, Woodbury 1977, Beaudoin-Lietz 1982, Bittner 1987).

The semantic properties of the antipassive construction are based not only on morphology, but are the outcome of the change in case/agreement configurations. Such an agreement/case-based change to signal aspectual contrasts is not uncommon in languages and is not even confined to ergative languages. A reduction in transitivity is well-known to correlate with imperfective aspect (Hopper & Thompson 1980, Ura 2006, Spreng 2010) crosslinguistically and Inuktitut fits well into this general pattern.

Abbreviations

ABS=absolutive case; AP=antipassive; CAUS=causative; CONJ=conjunctive mood; DL=dual; ERG=ergative case; HABIT=habitual aspect; INCPT=inceptive aspect; IND=indicative mood; ITER=iterative aspect; mik=object case in the antipassive; PART=participial mood; PL=plural; PROL=prolonged aspect; SG=singular
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