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ATAYAL: INTRODUCTION

- Atayal < Atayalic < Austronesian
- Spoken in: central and northern Taiwan
- Major dialect groups:
  - Squliq
  - C’uli’
ATAYAL: INTRODUCTION

• Basic word order: VOS
  • pronominal clitics positioned after the first stressed word
  • topicalization with a special topic marker

• Verb is inflected for four voices (active, passive, locative and instrumental) and three moods (indicative, imperative and hortative; only indicative considered in current study)

• Some voices in indicative can also take TMA affixes (<\textit{in}> or \textit{p}-) or reduplication

• Most of TMA is encoded by auxiliaries or particles
**Presumed Atayal TMA System**

- [Egerod 1965]: markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No auxiliary</th>
<th>With auxiliary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>φ</td>
<td>wal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>p-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Presumed Atayal TMA system**

- [Egerod 1965]: *mqumah* ‘to labour’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No auxiliary</th>
<th>With auxiliary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect</td>
<td><em>m&lt;in&gt;qumah</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td><em>mqumah</em></td>
<td><em>wal mqumah</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>p-qumah</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESUMED ATAYAL TMA SYSTEM

• [Rau 1992]: markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>synthetic</th>
<th>analytic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
<td>wal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td>p-</td>
<td>musa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESUMED ATAYAL TMA SYSTEM

- [Rau 1992]: *mqumah* ‘to labour’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>synthetic</th>
<th>analytic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td><em>m&lt;in&gt;qumah</em></td>
<td><em>wal mqumah</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td><em>mqumah</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>p-qumah</em></td>
<td><em>musa mqumah</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Presumed Atayal TMA System**

- [Zeitoun & Huang 1997]: only synthetic forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Tense / Aspect</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Realis</td>
<td>Perfective/Past</td>
<td><em>&lt;in&gt;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
<td>φ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrealis</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td><em>p-</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE FACTATIVE IN ATAYAL

• The indicative form, unmarked for TMA (called neutral, present or imperfective in different papers mentioned above), is a factative in Atayal. It has no fixed temporal or aspectual reading. It can (and quite often does) encode a situation with past time reference:

(1) \textit{m-qumah}=\textit{sami} \quad \textit{tiqah} \quad \textit{shera}

AF-work=1PL.EXC little yesterday

‘Yesterday we worked a little’
CANDIDATES FOR THE PERFECT

• <in>-form:
  • labeled ‘perfect’ in [Egerod 1965];
  • seems to be restricted to past time reference;

• wa construction
  • labeled ‘past’ alongside <in>-form in [Rau 1992];
  • seems to be restricted to past time reference;
BACKGROUND

• Data collected in Pyanan tribe (Yilan county, Taiwan)
  • Pyanan variety < Squliq dialect group < Atayal
  • Speakers: aged over 40
  • Informants: aged 45-79
• Contact language: Mandarin
• Interfering languages:
  • Mandarin and Minnan Chinese
  • Skikun variety of Atayal
  • Seediq, Taroko
  • Japanese (previously)
BACKGROUND

Additional data collected in

• Skikun tribe (Yilan county, Taiwan)
  • Skikun dialect < C’ole’ dialect group < Atayal
  • Informants: aged 40-56

• Syanuh tribe (Yilan county, Taiwan)
  • Syanuh variety < Gogan dialect < Squliq dialect group < Atayal
  • Informants: aged 60-66
**Basic Experiment**

- [Dahl 1985] TMAQ-based experiment (checking the perfect candidates for some TMAQ contexts)
  - perfect contexts
  - perfective contexts
  - past tense contexts
- the possible meanings of the relevant forms for different aspectual classes of predicates were also checked
  - telic / atelic
  - stative / non-stative
ADDITIONAL DATA ANALYSIS

• Oral texts studied for the usage of the relevant forms
  • Texts recorded in Pyanan tribe in 2009-2010
• Any unexpected data was double-checked through additional elicitation
MAIN FINDINGS

• *wa* construction:
  • almost a perfect perfect
  • completive implication with telic predicates
  • inchoative usage with states

• *<in>*-form:
  • discontinuous past (see [Plungian & van der Auwera 2006])
  • experiential (or rather existential)
  • antiresultative
  • pluperfect

• another perfect relative: iamitive marker *la*
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Structure:
  • \textit{wa} (<\textit{wal} < \textit{wayal} ‘be gone’) + factative
    ➢ an unusual grammaticalization path for a perfect (see [Heine&Kuteva 2002]; a similar path is mentioned, however, as dubious in [Bybee et al. 1998] and [Maisak 2005])
  • \textit{wa} attracts pronominal clitics
  • \textit{wa} is not inflected for voice or tense-aspect, but it is also the feature of the source lexical item \textit{wayal}
  • incompatible with other auxiliaries (except for modals) and TMA affixation
  • incompatible with standard negation
  • encounters high co-occurrence with a phrasal particle \textit{la} (‘already’)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 53

(2) \textit{wa}=nia \textbf{ktal-an} \textit{qutux biru hon=ni} \textit{la} \\
PERF=3SG.GEN \textit{read-LF} \textit{one book book=DEM.PROX} \textit{IAM} \\
‘He \underline{has read} this book’ \ (Skikun)

(2’) \textit{wayal}=nia \textbf{kta-n} \textit{biru qani la} \\
PERF=3SG.GEN \textit{read-LF} \textit{book DEM.PROX IAM} \\
‘He \underline{has read} this book’ \ (Pyanan)
• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 54

(3) \textit{wa=nia} \textit{kta-n kwara biru=qa la}
P\text{ERF=3\textsc{sg}.\textsc{gen}} \text{ read-LF all book=DEM} \text{ IAM}

‘He has read all of this book’ \hfill (Pyanan)

(3’) \textit{wan=nia} \textit{kta-n kwara biru qani la}
P\text{ERF=3\textsc{sg}.\textsc{gen}} \text{ read-LF all book DEM.PROX} \text{ IAM}

‘He has read all of this book’ \hfill (Syanuh)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 56

(4) \textit{wan hoqin la}

\begin{tabular}{llllll}
PERF & AF.die & IAM \\
\end{tabular}

‘He \underline{has died}’ (Syanuh)

(4’) \textit{waya rema hlu-n utux la}

\begin{tabular}{llllllll}
PERF & earlier & follow-PF & spirit & IAM \\
\end{tabular}

‘He \underline{has passed away}’ (Skikun)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 42

(5) \( \text{wa}=\text{su} \quad \text{pstnaq} \quad \text{qsuyan}=\text{maku} \)
PERF=2SG AF.run.into elder.sibling=1SG.GEN

‘Have you met my brother?’ (Pyanan)

(5’) \( \text{wa}=\text{su} \quad \text{ktala}-\text{n} \quad \text{qsuyan}=\text{mu} \quad \text{mlikuy} \)
PERF=2SG AF.see elder.sibling=1SG.GEN male

‘Have you met my brother?’ (Skikun)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 64

(6)  \textit{wa}=su \quad m-ema \quad qva \quad la

\text{PERF}=2\text{SG} \quad \text{AF-wash} \quad \text{hand} \quad \text{IAM}

‘Have you washed your hands?’ (Skikun)

(6’) \textit{wayal}=su \quad m-ima \quad qba \quad l=ga

\text{PERF}=2\text{SG} \quad \text{AF-wash} \quad \text{hand} \quad \text{IAM}=Q

‘Have you washed your hands?’ (Pyanan)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 67

(7)  
soto   qasa   ga   wa   m-hoqil   l=ma
president   DEM.DIST   TOP   PERF   AF-die   IAM=REP

‘The president has died, they say’  (Pyanan)

(7’)  
wan   hoqil   soto   la
PERF   AF.die   president   IAM

‘The president has died’  (Syanuh)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Covers all the prototypical perfect contexts in all three varieties

TMAQ 139

(8) ?tehoq=ku muyaw l=ga
AF.arrive=1SG.NOM homeIAM=TOP

wa=ku=nia s-biru saying tegami la
PERF=1SG.NOM=3SG.GEN IF-write two letter IAM

‘When I came home, he had written two letters for me’ (Pyanan)

*(however, a resultative form is preferred here; the informants comment on wa-form that it is more about the fact that one situation preceded the other, while logically it is the state of the letters being written which is relevant here, and not the sequence of situations)*
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Perfect of result: not resultative (applying a stativity test of [Nedjalkov & Jaxontov 1988])

(9) \( wa=mu \ s-quji \ (*na) \ lukus \)
    \( \text{PERF}=1\text{SG.GEN} \ \text{IF}=\text{hang} \ \text{CNT} \ \text{dress} \)
    ‘I have hung the dress’ (Pyanan)

Intended with continuative: ‘The dress is still hanging there hung up by me’

• there is also a resultative in Atayal, which passes this test:

(10) \( tiu=mu \ s-quji \ na \ lukus \)
    \( \text{RES.DIST}=1\text{SG.GEN} \ \text{IF}=\text{hang} \ \text{CNT} \ \text{dress} \)
    ‘The dress is still hanging there hung up by me’ (Pyanan)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Pluperfect context: possible, but restricted to certain syntactic contexts

(11)  uka ana qutux tngarux  wa=nia  crik-un
    NEG.EXIS even one bear PERF=3SG.GEN hit-PF

‘There was no bear (amongst those bears) killed by him’

(Skikun)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Experiential context: possible, but restricted
  (‘You are not eating. Why?’)

(12) wayal=saku m-aneq la
     PERF=1SG.NOM AF-eat IAM
     ‘I have already eaten it’  (Pyanan)

OK: ...and I know how to eat it
OK: ...and I am already full
#and I didn’t like it
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Hot-news (TMAQ 133)

(13)  **wa**  (si)  **m-hoqil**  **sotow=ta**  **la**  
  PERF  AS  AF-die  president=1PL.INC  IAM  
  ‘Our president just died (all of a sudden)’  (Pyanan)

*The original stimulus was changed due to the lexical restriction on *wa*-construction: it is incompatible with the basic movement predicate *mwah* ‘come’, probably due to the deictic conflict between *mwah* and *wayal*
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Persistent situation?

(14)  ¿pira  riax  wa=su  p-lkus-un
how.many  day  PRF=2SG.GEN  VRB-dress-NAF
lukus=su  qani  la
dress=2SG.GEN  DEM.PROX  IAM

‘How long have you been wearing this dress?’ (Pyanan)

*will be discussed later

**inacceptable with most speakers, while some only allow this construction in interrogatives
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Unlike perfective: does not mark sequences in narratives

(15) \( abi=sami \quad kia \quad qutux \quad k.in.gb\ian \quad qasa \)
sleep=1PL.EXC.NOM there one night DEM.DIST
\( nanu \quad m-wah=sami \quad k.in.suxan=nia \quad la \)
so AF-come=1PL.EXC.NOM tomorrow=3SG.GEN IAM
\( m-wah-sami \quad muyaw \quad l=ga \)
AF-come=1SG.EXC.NOM home IAM=TOP
\( yaki=maku \quad hab-un \quad kakay \quad l \)
grandmother=1SG.GEN pierce-PF leg IAM

‘We slept the night there and, well, the next day we returned. We returned home, and my grandmother got her leg pierced’
• Is rare in narratives: terminal unrecoverable change

(16) **wal si usa** m-yup squ in-nwah-an=nia

  PERF AS AF.DEP.go AF-enter into DP-come-LF=3SG.GEN

  **p<in>sbk-an loyi ma**

  <DP>crack-LF back REP

  ‘(One boy saw that there are only woods and beasts here where we live), so he went back into where the stone cracked and where he came from (and was never seen again)’. (From a legend of Atayal people origin)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Is rare in narratives: terminal unrecoverable change

(17) ipay qasa l=gà wa m-yup ska rgiax ro
Y. DEM.DIST IAM=TOP PERF AF-enter among mountain &
wa m-yuŋay l=gà ro
PERF AF-monkey IAM=TOP &
wayal uyi ska rgiax ro ini wah la
AF.PERF.go too among mountain & NEG AF.CNG.come IAM

‘So Yipay entered the mountains, she became a complete monkey, was off to the mountains and never came back’. (The end of the legend of the woman-monkey)
• Has a strong completive implication for telic predicates

(18) \textit{wa=ku s<m>liap miquy la} \\
\text{PRF=1SG.NOM <AF>weed grass IAM} \\
‘I have weeded out all the grass’ (Pyanan)

(19) \textit{wa koh-un masin\text{"{a}} qu \text{"{n}arux qasa la} } \\
\text{PRF frighten-PF M. DEF bear DEM.DIST IAM} \\
‘Masing has (already) frightened that bear to death’ (Pyanan)
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Has a strong completive implication for telic predicates

(20) \text{wayal}=\text{mu} \text{ kyoh-an} \text{ saying} \text{ bling} \ (\text{la})
\text{PERF}=1\text{SG.GEN} \text{ dig-PF} \text{ two hole IAM}

‘I \underline{have} \underline{dug} \underline{two} \underline{holes}’

#but somebody filled them back again \hspace{1cm} \text{(Pyanan)}

(21) (\text{?wa} \text{ m-takuy})/ \text{ m-in-takuy} \text{ qhoneq} \text{ qani} \text{ ha}
\text{PERF} \text{ AF-fall} \text{ AF-DP-fall} \text{ tree} \text{ DEM.PROX} \text{ PTCL}
\text{ro?} \text{ nia} \text{ pckrx-un} \text{ loyi}
& \text{RES} \text{ put.upright-PF} \text{ back}

‘This tree \underline{had} \underline{fallen} \text{ but was put back upright}’ \hspace{1cm} \text{(Skikun)}
WA CONSTRUCTION

• Is inchoative with states (restricted)

(22) \textit{wa=k}u \textit{baq} \textit{pnet} \textit{quleh} \textit{la}  \\
PERF=1SG.NOM AF.can AF.angle fish IAM  \\
‘I have learned how to angle’  
(Pyanan)

(23) \textit{wa} \textit{betunux} \textit{balay} \textit{laqi} \textit{sayun} \textit{la}  \\
PERF AF.pretty very child S IAM  \\
‘Sayun’s daughter has grown very pretty’  
(Pyanan)

(24) \textit{*wa} \textit{m-hal} \textit{balay} \textit{qba=mu} \textit{la}  \\
PERF AF-hurt very arm=1SG.GEN IAM  \\
Intended: ‘My hand has started to hurt very much’
WA CONSTRUCTION: SUMMARY

• Obligatory in the perfect-of-result contexts;
• Possible in hot-news contexts;
• Restricted in experiential and pluperfect function;
• Contrasted with resultative by not passing basic stativity tests;
• Rarely used in narratives, the functions being different from that of perfective and prototypical perfect;
• Completive implication for telic processes;
• Inchoative meaning for statives (lexically restricted);

→Core perfect with a strong perfectivising effect
• incompatible with auxiliaries;
• takes a non-standard negation marker;
• defective paradigm, lexically restricted;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>LF</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>factative</td>
<td>$m- / &lt;m&gt; / \emptyset$</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;in&gt;-form</td>
<td>$min- / &lt;min&gt; / ,?$</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;in&gt;...-an</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Pluperfect context: competition (both forms restricted; the restriction could be syntactic: mainly used in relative clauses)

(25) k<n>ya’=mu kt-ngarux p<n>sing-an=mu
    <DP>shoot=1SG.GEN  late-bear   <DP>take.picture-LF=1SG.GEN
    ‘(That is) a picture that I took of the bear I had killed’

(26) uka ana qutux tngarux wa=nia crik-un
    NEG.EXIS  even one bear PERF=3SG.GEN hit-PF
    ‘There was no bear (amongst those bears) killed by him’
• Experiential context: high competition

(27) \textit{m-in-nsiaq}=su \quad qnxan=su \quad qani
AF-DP-smile=2SG \quad life=2SG \quad DEM.PROX

(28) \textit{wal}=su \quad \textit{m-siaq} \quad qnxan=su \quad qani
PERF=2SG \quad AF-smile \quad life=2SG \quad DEM.PROX

(29) \textit{nbaq}=su \quad \textit{m-siaq} \quad qnxan=su \quad qani \text{ (Pyanan only)}
EXP=2SG \quad AF-smile \quad life=2SG \quad DEM.PROX

‘Have you ever smiled?’
• <in>-experiential has a wider range, is comparable to Mandarin *guo* and does not imply any experience involved

(30)  \[ m-n-aneq=saku \quad uy\text{ }/la \]
AF-DP-eat=1SG.NOM too /IAM
‘I have eaten that / already’ (and I didn’t like it at all)

(31)  \[ m-in-sul\text{ }\text{ }s-kawas \quad rgiax \quad qasa \]
AF-DP-burn ADV-year mountain DEM.DIST
‘That mountain has burned last year’
nbaq-experential seems to be an innovation of Pyanan variety and is restricted to the contexts where some particular skill has been obtained through the experience

(32) *nbaq=saku m-anæq uyiy /la
EXP=1SG.NOM AF-eat too /IAM
Intended: ‘I have eaten that / already’
<\text{IN}>-\text{FORM}

• Discontinuous past: a situation, that took place in the past and no longer does

(33) \textit{m-in-smoya}=ku \textit{tiqah gal-an pcbaq biru}
\text{AF-FP-wish}=1\text{SG.NOM} \text{a.little take-LF} \text{AF.teach book}

‘I wanted to be a teacher (now I don’t)’

• Antiresultative: a situation, the result of which has been cancelled

(34) \textit{m-in-shreq likuy=nia qu kneril qasa}
\text{AF-FP-leave} \text{man}=3\text{SG.\text{GEN} DEF woman} \text{DEM.DIST}

‘That woman once left him (but now they are back together)’
\(<IN>\)-FORM

• NB: discontinuity and the cancelled result is only an implicature

\((35)\)  \(s<\text{n}>\text{oya}=\text{mu} \quad \text{sraral} \quad \text{squleq} \quad \text{qasa}\)

\(<\text{DP.PF}>\text{like}=1\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{before} \quad \text{human} \quad \text{DEM.DIST}\)

\(\text{misu} \quad \text{qani} \quad \text{ga} \quad \text{sy-on}=\text{maku} \quad \text{na}\)

\(\text{now} \quad \text{DEM.PROX} \quad \text{TOP} \quad \text{like-PF}=1\text{SG.GEN} \quad \text{CNT}\)

‘I used to like that man. I still like him’
• NB: discontinuity and the cancelled result is only an implicature

(36) *m-in-shreq* *hya qu* *kneril=nia*

AF-DP-

leave 3SG DEF woman=3SG. GEN

si.ski misu qani ga ini psqun la

till now DEM.PROX TOP NEG CNG.unite IAM

‘His wife left him, and they have not yet reunited’
• Outside the discontinuous past contexts: persistent situation?

(37) tiuxal nʔavi p-in-lkus-an=mu lukus qani la
    three night VRB-DP-dress-LF=1SG GEN dress DEM.PROX IAM
    ‘I have been wearing this dress for three days’

*Only when measuring time intervals and seemingly only in locative voice form; could be considered as a special form for time interval measurement (limitative)
<in>-form falls into a prototypical discontinuous past gram (see [Plungian & van der Auwera 2006]). It has developed all possible functions of such a form:

- discontinuous past
- experiential
- pluperfect
- antiresultative

It shares a number of functions with the wa-form (experiential, pluperfect), but the latter is highly restricted in such usage.
THE PERFECT OF PERSISTENT SITUATION

It may seem that the perfect and the discontinuous past both may have the persistent situation reading

(33)  \textit{tiuwalriax} \textit{p-in-Ikus-an}=\textit{mu}

three day \textit{VRB-DP-dress-LF}=1\textit{SG.GEN}

\textit{lukus}=\textit{mu} \quad \textit{qani} \quad \textit{la}

dress=1\textit{SG.GEN} \quad \textit{DEM.PROX} \quad \textit{IAM}

‘I have been wearing this dress for three days’
However it is in fact the particle *la* that introduces the inclusive reading; without it no persistence is implied

(34) tiuwalriax  *p*-in-likus-an=mu

three day   VRB-DP-dress-LF=1SG.GEN

lukus=mu   qani

dress=1SG.GEN   DEM.PROX

‘I *wore* this dress for three days’

→the *wa*-construction and the <*in*>-form have a limitative function here, which seems to be unusual for both perfect and discontinuous past
THE PERFECT OF PERSISTENT SITUATION

With *wa*-perfect this also works for a quantified indefinite incremental theme

(35)  

\[
\begin{align*}
wa=k & \quad nbuw & \quad qutux & \quad yuyut & \quad qwaw \\
\text{PERF=1SG.NOM} & \quad \text{AF.drink} & \quad \text{one} & \quad \text{bottle wine}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I have had one bottle of wine’

(36)  

\[
\begin{align*}
wa=k & \quad nbuw & \quad qutux & \quad yuyut & \quad qwaw & \quad la \\
\text{PERF=1SG.NOM} & \quad \text{AF.drink} & \quad \text{one} & \quad \text{bottle wine} & \quad \text{IAM}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I have had one bottle of wine (I am not done drinking though)’
Another perfect relative

• The iamitive marker *la is used whenever a situation boundary exists and is relevant.

• It is obligatory with punctual readings, and also in most of the wa-perfect instances (but not with quantified time interval or incremental theme; also not in experiential contexts)

(37) *(wayal) m-hoqil mrhuw=ta *(la). (TMAQ 67)

PERF AF-die head=1PL.INC IAM

‘Our president has died’
SUMMARY

• The semantic zone of perfect is crowded in Atayal, taken by:
  • almost perfect *wa*-perfect;
  • discontinuous past *<in>*-form;
  • a pure experiential *nbaq*-construction;
  • iamitive marker *la*

• first two of those have opposite implications/implicatures and are incompatible, but however they are sometimes interchangeable;

• both exhibit a limitative usage, not expected with perfects;

• the iamitive is compatible with both, obligatory in the core perfect contexts and is responsible for persistent situation readings in the limitative constructions;
SUMMARY

• the three experientials differ as to whether there is an experience of any kind, and what experience that is
  • nbaq-construction implies a certain skill obtained,
  • wayal-construction implies a positive experience,
  • <in>-form does not imply any experience whatsoever);

• it could be the case that in pluperfect the perfect and the discontinuous are distributed according to whether or not the result of the situation should hold at some point;

• in the limitative the infixed form is normally used, while the perfect is restricted to interrogatives with some speakers and completely unacceptable with others;
the whole picture of the perfect zone in Atayal is as unusual as unusual can be
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