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Abstract
One known puzzle in Creole systems is that temporal interpretation seems to be constrained by stativity (Bickerton 1974). For decades, the relevant division has been, roughly: bare stative verbs mean present, bare nonstatives mean past. In Capeverdean, a Portuguese-based Creole, we do indeed have: N sabe risposta “I know the answer”, N kume pexe “I ate fish”. The above generalization, however, is inaccurate: most Capeverdean statives pattern with nonstatives in this respect. Crucially, also sabe “know” may pattern with nonstatives, challenging further this traditional view. In this paper I argue that the distinct temporal readings above can only be explained via the internal structure of events. A Become subevent (Dowty 1979) accounts for N sabe risposta – “I got to know the answer”, with its consequent state (Moens & Steedman 1988) being “[now] I know.” In contrast, there is no consequent state as “I eat fish” for “I ate fish” (cf. “I’ve eaten.”). 1

1. Introduction
In Capeverdean, a Portuguese-based Creole language, the strategy for building temporal interpretations is said to be constrained by stativity (Bickerton 1974). There are, however, some challenges to this perspective, namely that most Capeverdean statives pattern with nonstatives. This study shows that the crucial element at stake (possibly also in other Creoles) is the fact that sabe “know” or konxe “be familiar with” are not basic statives. They may be interpreted as eventive (culmination: “get to know”) or reveal an internal structure (Become subevent (Dowty 1979) plus consequent state (Moens & Steedman 1988)), in which case they are taken as derived states. This paper is organized as follows: section 2 describes the puzzle; section 3 organizes verbs and morphemes; section 4 discusses the semantics of each morpheme; section 5 explains the current proposal on sabe and konxe.

2. The empirical puzzle
In the next subsections, distinct Capeverdean temporal interpretations will be described. In 2.1 the traditional description is presented; in 2.2 some relevant empirical complications are added that will make clear the inevitability of rethinking the notion of stativity and its relevance as a basic property of some lexical verbs. In 2.3 previous approaches are summarized.

1 I would like to thank Marlyse Baptista, Luís Filipe Cunha, Hamida Demirdache and Peter Hallman for their comments and suggestions. Thanks also to my colleagues at CLUNL, to the audience in Going Romance 2008 and to two anonymous reviewers. All errors are, however, my own responsibility. Finally, I am deeply grateful to my Capeverdean informants in Santiago and in particular to Ana Josefa Cardoso, in Lisboa. This research project is funded by FCT – SFRH/BPD/28631/2006. Its continuation is included in the project ‘Events and Subevents in Capeverdean’ (PTDC/CLE-LIN/103334/2008).
2.1. Simple statements

From the following non-overtly marked forms, we may indeed conjecture that there is a contrast between (sabe 1) and konxe (2), on the one hand, and eventive predicates like kume (3), on the other hand. Note that Capeverdean has no overt agreement morphology (for person or number).

(1)  
\[N \text{ sabe risposta.}\]  
[present]  
1SG know answer  
“I know the answer.”

(2)  
\[N \text{ konxe Lisboa.}\]  
[present]  
1SG know Lisboa  
“I know [am familiar with] Lisboa.”

(3)  
\[N \text{ kume pexe.}\]  
[past]  
1SG eat fish  
“I ate fish.” / * “I eat fish.”

Under the traditional perspective, the description can be extended to the combinations of these verbs with three overt temporal morphemes available. Among the alleged contrasts when no further context is provided, we observe: (i) the habitual reading of preverbal ta seems blocked with sabe and konxe (4)-(5), but it is allowed with eventives (6); (ii) postverbal -ba marks past with sabe and konxe (7)-(8), but with eventives it marks past perfect (9); (iii) preverbal progressive sata seems prohibited with sabe and konxe (10)-(11), but allowed with eventives, in present/past (12).

(4)  
\[N \text{ ta sabe risposta.}\]  
* “I know the answer.”

(5)  
\[N \text{ ta konxe Lisboa.}\]  
* “I am familiar with Lisboa.”

(6)  
\[N \text{ ta kume pexe.}\]  
“I eat fish.”

(7)  
\[N \text{ sabeba risposta.}\]  
“I knew/used to know the answer.”

(8)  
\[N \text{ konxeba Lisboa.}\]  
“I was/used to be familiar with Lisboa.”

(9)  
\[N \text{ kumeba pexe.}\]  
“I had eaten fish.” / * “I ate fish.”

(10)  
* \[N \text{ sata sabe risposta.}/\text{ sata sabeba risposta.}\]  
“I am/was knowing the answer.”

(11)  
* \[N \text{ sata konxe Lisboa.}/\text{ sata konxeba Lisboa.}\]  
“I am knowing Lisboa.”

(12)  
\[N \text{ sata kume pexe.}/\text{ sata kumeba pexe.}\]  
“I am/was eating fish.”
2.2. Some complications

There are, however, two crucial problems for these generalizations. The first (Silva 1985; Suzuki 1994; Baptista 2002; Pratas 2007; Borik & Pratas 2008) is that the above considerations do not hold for other verbs viewed as statives – for instance in Silva (1985). In fact, according to my informants, non-overtly marked *lenbra* “remember” (13), *ntende* “understand” (14) and *kridita* “believe” (15), among others, pattern with eventives (even in the relevant – stative – reading; this note is important, since these verbs may also enter nonstative predicates, such as *lenbra* meaning “recall”).

(13)  
\[ N \ \textit{lenbra} \ \textit{di} \ \textit{kel} \ \textit{storia-la}. \]
\[ 1\text{SG} \ \text{remember of} \ \text{DEM-story-LOC} \]
“I remembered that story.”  / * “I remember that story.”

(14)  
\[ N \ \textit{ntende} \ \textit{tudu kuza}. \]
\[ 1\text{SG} \ \text{understand} \ \text{all} \ \text{thing} \]
“I understood everything.”  / * “I understand everything.”

(15)  
\[ N \ \textit{kridita} \ \textit{na bo}. \]
\[ 1\text{SG} \ \text{believe in} \ 2\text{SG} \]
“I believed in you.”  / * “I believe in you.”

Even more significantly, we have a second problem (also noted in previous works). In certain broader environments, also *sabe* and *konxe* pattern with eventives. In other words, certain predicates that involve these verbs exhibit: a past reading for a non-overtly marked form (16)-(17) and combinations with habitual *ta* (18) or progressive *sata* (19)-(20).²

(16)  
\[ (\text{Onti } ) \quad N \ \textit{sabe} \ \textit{ma} \ \textit{bebe} \ \textit{di} \ \textit{Luordes} \ \textit{dja} \ \textit{nase}. \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad 1\text{SG} \ \text{know} \ \text{COMP-baby of Luordes} \ \text{just BE-born} \]
“(Yesterday) I knew that Lurdes’ baby was born.”

(17)  
\[ (\text{Onti } ) \quad N \ \textit{konxe} \ \textit{bo maridu} \ \textit{na festa}. \]
\[ \text{yesterday} \quad 1\text{SG} \ \text{know} \ 2\text{SG} \ \text{husband} \ \text{LOC-party} \]
“(Yesterday) I met your husband at the party.”

(18)  
\[ \textit{Tudu bes ki} \quad N \ \textit{ta purgunta-u, bu ta sabe/konxe risposta}. \]
\[ \text{all time that} \quad 1\text{SG HAB ask-2SG 2SG HAB know} \ \text{answer} \]
“Every time I ask you, you know the answer.”

(19)  
\[ \textit{Gosi ki} \quad N \ \textit{sata} \ \textit{sabe} \ \textit{ma} \ \textit{bu txiga}. \]
\[ \text{now} \quad 1\text{SG PROG know} \ \text{COMP-2SG arrive} \]
“It is (only) now that I’m getting to know that you arrived.”

(20)  
\[ N \ \textit{sata gosta} \ \textit{di} \ \textit{aula}. \quad N \ \textit{sata} \ \textit{konxe algen txeu}. \]
\[ 1\text{SG PROG like of class. 1SG PROG know people many} \]
“I am enjoying the class. I’m meeting many people.”

---

² The following abbreviations are used: HAB: habitual; PROG: progressive; PST: past; TERM: terminative; COMP: complementizer; LOC: locative; REL: relative; DEM: demonstrative; 1SG: first person singular (and so on).
A further analysis of the relevant semantic properties of these verbs is needed, in order to account for the above contrasts. Which property is responsible for the behaviors in (1)-(2) and, on the other hand, in (16)-(20)?

There are two possibilities: (i) stativity itself needs a more precise description (we must find/define some sub-property that is relevant among Capeverdean verbs; perhaps this could be extended to similar problems in other languages, namely Creoles); (ii) stativity is basically innocent here.

In the next subsection, some previous proposals will be reviewed. In different ways, they have confronted the generalization based on stativity.

2.3. Prior approaches

For Baptista (2002), the distinction between verbs that represent a state and those representing an action is shown morpho-syntactically in Capeverdean, in the forms that verbs assume for various tenses. In discussing Silva’s (1985) groups of verbs (according to properties regarding control and imperatives), the author focuses on whether they behave as nonstatives in their tense interpretation. Hence, it is argued that kridita “believe” is not stative; sabe “know” is nonstative when it takes morphology typical of eventives. As for morpheme -ba, if suffixed to a stative it yields “simple past tense”, if suffixed to a nonstative it yields past perfect. The morpheme ta means both realis (aspect/tense marker for habitual and imperfectivity) and irrealis (mood function, for future or conditional, a property first noted in Suzuki (1994)). Two different ta are mentioned: this TMA marker and an embedded infinitival marker (e.g. with matrix perception verbs).

Departing from Baptista (2002) and references therein, Pratas (2007) also mentions grades of stativity. It is assumed that a zero morpheme combined with some statives (“inherently atelic”) cannot have a perfective reading (Bonhemeyer & Swift 2002). With nonstatives, it cannot have an imperfective reading. Nonstatives are considered as “not inherently atelic”, which is different from being “inherently telic”. This means that the contribution of the zero morpheme is not simply to maintain the perfectivity traditionally associated with telicity.

In the line of Demirdache & Uribe-Etxebarria (2000), Borik and Pratas (2008) propose that there are two temporal projections that bring up two types of relations: within and after; (i) at T₁, where Reference time 1 (R₁) is introduced, we may obtain sata or the zero morpheme (within or after for R₁ and Event time); (ii) at T₂, where R₂ (Speech time) is introduced, we may obtain, or not, the past morpheme -ba (after or within for R₂ and R₁). The sabe-class verbs are incompatible with T₁ (they merge higher; they do not take zero or sata). As for the morpheme ta, not included in the two projections described, it heads a projection T₃. This ta-projection is incompatible with T₁; hence, verbs project either T₁+T₂, or T₂+T₃.

As we have just seen, none of these approaches has provided a detailed semantic analysis of the predications formed from verbs like like sabe and
In this study I contend that it is not stativity, as some property of the base, that plays the crucial role here, but rather the fact that these events may have a complex structure (as derived states, they are different from both eventive and stative bases). This will be discussed in 4 and 5. Next section organizes the facts leading to this proposal: verbs are ordered in groups (3.1) and temporal contributions of morphemes are illustrated (3.2).

3. Verbs and morphemes revisited

In order to comprehend this Capeverdean puzzle we need to: list the verbs according to their combinations with the morphemes available (3.1); fully understand the possible temporal contributions of each morpheme (3.2).

3.1. The verbs

A listing of Capeverdean verbs can trace a division between:

– those that necessarily show: past reading for non-overtly marked forms, complex reading for ta (habitual/future/conditional), ongoing reading with sata; these are in Group 1 (all of them follow Bickerton’s prediction for nonstatives; note, however, that not all of them fall under this label);

– and those that may show an idiosyncratic behavior, such as a present reading when there is no overt morpheme; these are the verbs in Group 2 (note that Bickerton’s general prediction for statives is inaccurate at least for verbs in (b); they seem to follow it in certain contexts, but not in others).

Group 1
(a) all eventives: kore “run”, txiga “arrive”, le “read”, lenbra “recall”, etc.;
(b) aspectual auxiliaries: kumesa “begin”, para di “stop”, dexta di “quit”, fika “stay”, kontinua “go on”, etc.
(c) stative bases: kridita “believe”, skisi “forget”, lenbra “remember”, spera “wait”/“expect”, konsigi “be able”, divinha “guess”, ntende “understand”, txera “smell”, obi “listen”/“hear”, odja “see”, etc.

Group 2
(a) verbs whose bare form (no ø at stake here) is necessarily interpreted as present (some of these verbs display modal properties): kre “want”, gosta “like”, parse “seem”, meste “need”, ten “have”, tena “have momentarily”, sta “be” (stage-level), e “be” (individual-level), pode “can”, debe “must”.3
(b) lexical verbs that, when not overtly marked, may indeed be interpreted as present, but also as past, if a relevant context is provided: sabe “know”, konxe “be familiar with” (and any other that is yet to be recorded).

3 This is not, however, a homogenous list. Besides the common feature of being interpreted as present when there is no overt morpheme, they have idiosyncrasies of their own; except for e “be”, they may take ta in certain contexts, and some may take progressive sata.
In this listing, we observe two significant facts: (i) the relevant property for a division line is not the basic stativity of verbs (Group 1 includes statives and nonstatives); (ii) the truly intriguing facts concern Group 2 (b).

3.2. Various combinations

This subsection illustrates the contributions of Capeverdean morphemes. It is supported by the possible combinations of eventive predicates (kume pexe “eat fish”) with ø (zero morpheme), ta, sata, -ba, as illustrated in (21)-(26).

(21) ø V

N kume pexe na djanta. [terminative]
1SG ø eat fish LOC dinner
“I ate fish at dinner.”

(22) ta V

a. N ta kume pexe tudu dia. [present habitual]
   1SG HAB eat fish every day
   “I eat fish every day.”

b. Manha, N ta kume pexe na djanta. [future]
   tomorrow 1SG HAB eat fish LOC dinner
   “Tomorrow, I will eat fish at dinner.”

(23) sata V

N sata kume pexe. [present progressive]
1SG PROG eat fish
“I am eating fish.”

(24) ø V -ba

N kumeba pexe na djanta y dipos N ba deta. [past perfect]
1SG ø eat.PST fish LOC dinner and after 1SG go lie
“I had eaten fish at dinner and then I went to bed.”

(25) ta V -ba

a. Un bes, N ta kumeba pexe tudu dia. [past habitual]
   one time, 1SG HAB eat.PST fish every day
   “In the old days, I used to eat fish every day.”

b. Si N podeba, N ta kumeba pexe tudu dia. [conditional]
   if 1SG can.PST, 1SG HAB eat.PST fish every day
   “If I could, I would eat fish every day.”

(26) sata V -ba

Kelora N ka bai pamodi N sata kumeba. [past prog]
that time 1SG NEG go because 1SG PROG eat.PST
“At that time I did not go/leave, because I was eating.”
In the next section I will discuss the values for the different morphemes and the operations in which they participate.

4. Complex operations

The semantic contributions of some morphemes have been one of the most appreciated objects of study regarding Capeverdean grammar. Here I present my own current analysis of the four morphemes under discussion: in 4.1 we have sata, φ and -ba; in 4.2 we have the more idiosyncratic ta.

4.1. Tense (-ba) and aspect (sata and φ)

Uncontroversially, -ba marks past; hence, it heads a T projection for tense. Also undisputed is the progressive meaning of sata.

Zero – φ –, however, has been largely debated: past or perfective, tense or aspect? There are strong reasons to assume that non-overtly marked forms of eventive verbs are in fact marked by φ. (21) indeed has a ‘simple past’ interpretation. But if it were simply that eventive verbs are lexically marked for past (hence, no φ would be at stake here), there would be no reason for the verb in (23) not to show a past progressive reading; compare (26), where past progressive is obtained by sata V-ba. A similar reasoning would hold if we assumed that in (21) there is φ functioning as a past marker. It should be able to shift (to past) the tense of any sentence. Thus, it is not clear why progressive in the past needs -ba.

The alternative proposal assumed here is that φ is a null operator that adds a terminative aspect (viewpoint) to the event in question. The temporal interpretation in (21) – preterit – is merely an effect of this aspectual operation. The assertion made is linked to a reference time. When no overt information is provided this is, by default, utterance time: “[now] I eat.”, or “[now] I’ve eaten.”

Note that this does not involve any effects of telicity (Aktionsart) on a previous atelic predicate. Djon φ nada “[now] Djon has swum” is still an atelic event (process). We know this because: (i) we can apply to it a duration adverbial expression like “for two hours”; (ii) the cumulativeness and homogeneity that is characteristic of atelic events is unchanged – the truth-conditions that hold for the event also hold for subparts of it; hence, “John swam from 9 to 11” entails that “John swam from 9 to 10”.

Recall that telic predicates, which have a natural endpoint of their own, also need a covert operator for past readings. This has a completion effect: it imposes a completive interpretation on the culmination (Kratzer

---

4 For the aspeccal classes of eventive verbs, I use the correspondents in Moens (1987) to the terms in Vendler (1957): process, culminated process and culmination instead of activity, accomplishment and achievement.

5 This is not the case with telic predicates, of the type “write one letter”: “Djon wrote one letter from 9 to 11” does not entail that “Djon wrote one letter from 9 to 10”.

---
2004; Hallman 2009a). Otherwise the predicate would receive a partitive reading. This fact accounts for a well-known crosslinguistic puzzle (part of the Imperfective Paradox). Consider the following pair (Hallman 2009a:30):

(27)  
(a) Osbert crossed the street.
(b) Osbert was crossing the street.

As the author states, “the telicity of the underlying verb phrase […] does not project to the progressive derivative; the progressive makes no commitment to real world developments after the reference time.” For this reason, (27b) fails to entail (27a). On the other hand, since “the normal completion of an event guarantees the existence of normal initial subintervals of that event, (27a) entails (27b).”

I argue that a similar operator – a null counterpart to the progressive morpheme – exists in Capeverdean, with the differences that this applies to the base of the verb (not to past) and it also operates on atelic predicates. It adds a termination to atelic predicates and a completion to telic ones (28).

(28)  
\( \phi \) applied to atelic bases → termination
\( \phi \) applied to telic bases → completion

These effects (that will, nevertheless, be both indicated as TERM, since they depend on the predicate only, not on the nature of the operator) are visible when we observe the following oddness / impossibility:

(29)  
?? Djon \( \phi \) nada y inda e sata nada.\(^6\)
Djon TERM swim and still 3SG PROG swim
“Djon swam and he is still swimming.”

(30)  
* Djon \( \phi \) trabesa strada y inda e sata trabesa-l.
Djon TERM cross street and still 3SG PROG cross-3SG
“Djon crossed the street and he is still crossing it.”

Assuming that this null operator is in complementary distribution with the progressive morpheme, we have the projection where both \( \phi \) and sata are inserted: a T projection responsible for aspectual operations.

4.2. Modal situations with ta

The most enigmatic of all Capeverdean morphemes is, however, preverbal ta: it enters habituals, futures and conditionals (both future and past), and also some embedded non-finites, namely with perception verbs (N obi

\(^6\) Djon nada parmanha interu y inda e sata nada “Djon swam all morning and is still swimming” is good, but here we have two distinct events: “Djon swam all morning” is one closed/bounded event (the morning, an argument of this event, has ended); “Djon is still swimming” is another.
minimus ta kanta. “I heard the children sing”) or aspectual auxiliaries (N kumesa ta kanta “I started to sing”).

4.2.1 “Aspectual perspective”

As proposed in Cunha (2007) for Portuguese forms of quantifying over events, a predicate marked for habituality expresses a generalization and acquires properties typical of individual-level states. More specifically, the habitual brings an “aspectual perspective” more than it acts as an operator. Thus, the habitual does not change/hide all the aspectual properties of the basic event. This differs, for instance, from iteration (another expression of repetition), which has punctual predicates as input and whose outputs are typically processes; consider “cough”, “jump” or “knock at the door”.

Let us now turn to the referred expression of habitual/generic in Capeverdean, departing from bases with distinct aspectual properties: processes (31)-(32); culminated process (33); culmination (34).

(31) Djon ta fumaba, mas gosi e ka ta fuma mas.
    “Djon used to smoke, but now he doesn’t smoke anymore.”
(32) Tudu manha ta txobi na Lisboa.
    “Every morning it rains in Lisboa.”
(33) Maria ta kore dos kilometru tudu dia dimingu
    “Mary runs two kilometers every Sunday.”
(34) Pursor ta txiga tardi tudu dia.
    “The teacher arrives late every day/always.”

If this expression of a property is (partially) similar to states, then it is not surprising that typical states (e.g. e grandi “be tall” (individual-level), sta duente “be sick” (stage-level)) do never take ta. They never take sata either; this is so because progressives, too, aspectually pattern with states (this similarity will be explored below).

4.2.2. Marking the uncertain

In some contexts, ta means future. But other relevant environments for this morpheme are conditionals, which use the same combinations as habituals (past and future). In Pratas (2007), the analysis of Capeverdean conditionals is supported by the proposal in Iatridou (2000) for Modern Greek. Consider a usual ‘if p, q’ relation (an antecedent in Portuguese would be subjunctive):

(35) Si N fikaba na Praia un anu, N ta papiaba kriolu.
    “If I stayed in Praia (city) for a year, I would speak Creole.”

This is a Future Less Vivid (FLV) type of conditional, as those in Modern Greek in Iatridou (2000:234). The author presents examples of FLV (36a) and of Future Neutral Vivid (FNV) (36b).
(36) a. An eperne afto to siropi θa γινοματα kala.
   if take.PAST.IMP this syrup FUT become.PAST.IMP well
   “If he took this syrup he would get better.”

b. An pari afto to siropi θa γινι kala.
   if take.NONPAST.PER the syrup FUT become.NONPAST.PER well
   “If he takes this syrup he will get better.”

The sentence in (36b) clearly refers to the future and might be an instruction to a caretaker; (36a) might be so, as well, with the possible difference being on the speaker’s side: whereas in (36a) for him/her the most likely is ~p (the antecedent is not actualized in the real world), in (36b) there is no such belief. Thus, counterfactuality is here not an entailment, but an implicature. It is different from a past counterfactual (PC): cf. English (37a) and (37b,c).

(37) a. If he had taken the syrup, he would have gotten better. (PC)

b. If he took the syrup, he would get better. (FLV)

c. If he takes the syrup, he will get better. (FNV)

Iatridou (2000) contends that the past imperfective in (36a) is fake tense (fake past) and fake aspect (fake imperfective), since the event is interpreted perfectly and might occur in the future. Pratas (2007) applies the same line of reasoning to Capeverdean FLV conditionals. Consider (38a).

(38) a. Si e koreba faxi e ta txigaba sedu. (FLV)
   if 3SG run.PST quickly 3SG TA arrive.PST early
   “If he ran quickly he would arrive early.”

b. Si e kore faxi e ta txiga sedu. (FNV)
   if 3SG run quickly 3SG TA arrive early
   “If he runs quickly he will arrive early.”

In the consequent clause we have also a fake aspect and a fake tense: in fact, nothing determines that the time location of the arrival cannot be in the future; as for aspect, it is certainly not a habitual interpretation, it must be episodic. For the arrival to be possibly (not necessarily) interpreted as habitual, something different should be said in the antecedent:

(39) Si e ta koreba faxi e ta txigaba sedu.
   if 3SG HAB run.PST quickly 3SG TA arrive.PAST early

The sentence in (39) has the following interpretation: if he had the property of running quickly, he would be able to arrive early (e.g. yesterday/tomorrow/etc., or every morning/every Sunday/always/etc.).
As for past counterfactuals (PC), in Capeverdean they have the same expression as FLV’s, and its specific meaning is given contextually.\textsuperscript{7}

In sum, if we take for granted that conditionals, both in past and future, are forms of referring to possible worlds (also in FNV, as (38b), the consequent is dependent on the actualization of the antecedent condition), then what we have here is a modal contribution of the morpheme \textit{ta}. This is consistent with what happens in Portuguese, where consequents in FLV and FNV may be (and often are) built with past / present habituals:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(40)] a. Se ele tomasse o xarope, ficava melhor. [FLV]
\item[(40)] b. Se ele tomar o xarope, fica melhor. [FNV]
\end{enumerate}

All the elements in the above description lead to this proposal: \textit{ta} has a complex function (it is a crosslinguistic fact that distinct constructions may involve similar morphological combinations). This function, in its multiple expressions, seems incompatible with terminative \textit{φ} and progressive \textit{sata}: they are in complementary distribution. Its incompatibility with other state-like constructions (such as \textit{e bunitu} “be beautiful”, and also progressives) falls out nicely from the fact that it is the expression of a property and is (partially) similar to states. As for the incompatibility with the terminative morpheme, only a specific preterit reading is available for predications with \textit{ta}, in the form \textit{ta V-ba} (the so-called past imperfective).

\textbf{5. Where \textit{sabe} and \textit{konxe} are not stative bases}

Stativity, as a lexical property of certain verbs, is insufficient to account for these facts. This paper traces a division between those Capeverdean verbs whose non-overtly marked form means past (Group 1: all eventives, most stative bases, aspectual auxiliaries) and those whose non-overtly marked form means present (Group 2: (a) some verbs that show modal properties, and (b) verbs like \textit{sabe, konxe}). As we observe here, there are stative predicates in both groups. But one question remains: which is the relevant feature that triggers distinct behaviors regarding temporal morphemes/interpretations?

\textit{5.1. A crucial kind of state: consequent states}

My proposal is that Capeverdean stative bases in Group 1 (c) are of the type that supports a process-like reading (still a simple internal structure), even if they remain different from processes.\textsuperscript{8} On the other hand, there is one kind

\textsuperscript{7} There are other past counterfactual environments (Pratas 2007), where a \textit{wish} predicate embeds a nonfinite and the latter also takes a ‘past’ morpheme.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(i)] \textit{N kreba} \textit{serba} \textit{veterinario}, \textit{mas N bai pa pursor}.
\end{enumerate}

“I had wanted to have been a veterinarian, but I am a teacher.”

\textsuperscript{8} Cunha (2004) has proposed for Portuguese a division within the states group: (i) those that can be phased (‘estados faseáveis’), and thus support a more process-like reading; (ii) those that cannot be phased (‘estados não faseáveis’), entirely showing stative properties.
of states at stake here: the particular consequent states (Moens & Steedman 1988) of certain (not all) culminations. The language has, therefore, the following culmination available: $N$ sabe “I got to know”, or (if we express the binding of its event argument by a default reference time, as has been here assumed) “[now] I have known”). Sometimes, this culmination occurs independently: $sabe$ may show a nonstative behavior (e.g., the sentence in (16), $N$ sabe ma bebe di Lurdes dja nase. “I’ve known that Lurdes’ baby was born.”). But that culmination may also occur as part of a complex event – in other words, it may constitute a subevent of the Become type (Dowty, 1979), on whose consequent state the temporal interpretation is anchored.

In Gehrke & Grillo (in press) there is a related proposal for statives that can undergo passivization: “know”, “believe”, “own”: “know-verbs allow a reading where the state denoted by the verb is re-interpreted as a consequent state, a state having come into existence […]” (p.15)

The mechanics proposed here, however, is somewhat different: instead of adding a Become predication to a stative base, I argue that the base is a telic event (culmination), which, together with its own consequent state, may participate in a complex event structure. Moreover, Capeverdean kridita “believe” does not pattern with $sabe$; and as for “own”, the only equivalent is ten “have”, which has modal properties. This particular kind of consequent state – and, thus, the possible anchoring of the temporal interpretation in this stative situation – is the distinctive semantic feature of these Capeverdean events. There are empirical grounds to assume that there is no similar aspectual operation available for other events, not even for those stative bases that, in certain contexts, show an eventive (more precisely, telic) counterpart, like the “recall” meaning for lenbra (instead of “remember”). In these cases, the two entries (stative and nonstative) occur independently. We will see a fine-grained distinction in the next subsection.

5.2 Interaction with point adverbials

We have some means to confirm the particular behavior of those derived states. We may test, for instance, the interaction of $sabe$ with point adverbial predicates. Vlach (1981:284) points out for English that the one “defining characteristic of stative sentences is their way of interacting with point adverbials.” The author is arguing in favor of a parallel between states and progressives. But this test may also reveal a distinction between, on the one hand, certain (derived) states and, on the other hand, eventives in a non-progressive form (even if these are from Group 1(c). Consider English:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(41) a. Max was here when I arrived.} & \quad \text{[state]} \\
\text{b. Max was running when I arrived.} & \quad \text{[progressive]} \\
\text{c. Max ran when I arrived.} & \quad \text{[process]}
\end{align*}
\]

One diagnostics for these states is through the interaction with “start”/“stop” operators: ‘estados não faseáveis’ are bad with both; ‘estados faseáveis’ are good with “start”, bad with “stop”; basic processes are good with both. These are under study for Capeverdean.
In (41a,b) Max was here/running prior to my arrival; in (41c). Max started running when I arrived. Let us now apply this to these Capeverdean verbs.

(42) a. *Kantu ki bu txiga Mayra ø kore.* [process]  
   “When you arrived Mayra ran.”

b. *Kantu ki bu txiga Mayra sabeba risposta.* [state]  
   “When you arrived Mayra knew the answer.”

c. *Kantu ki bu txiga Mayra lenbra di kel storia.*  
   “When you arrived Mayra had recalled that story.”

In (42a) Mayra started running at the instant of the arrival (ø kore is not a state). In (42b) Mayra already knew the answer prior to the arrival (sabeba risposta is a state). In (42c) there is a sort of sequential reading (lenbraba is interpreted eventively, a culmination); nothing is said on whether Mayra still remembered the story at the arrival instant. If we do not add past -ba to lenbra, we still have a terminative reading, and the sequence is reversed (the reading is like (42a)). In any case, this is not a state. This is the point here.

5.3 Temporal results

As for its temporal interpretation, this sabe state apparently behaves similarly to other derived states, such as progressive derivatives and also habituals (the latter, as we have seen, show properties of states, although they do not erase all the aspectual features of the base eventive predicates).

In order to account for this behavior, I will follow Hallman (2009b). The author argues that progressives pattern with states because “both types of predicates are true of moments of time, in opposition to eventive predicates, which are true of intervals” (p. 19). This idea is supported by the parallel presented in Vlach (1981) for progressives and states: the progressive saturates the event argument of an event description, deriving a non-eventive expression. Therefore, both progressives and states are licit in the present tense in English (as in Capeverdean), while eventives are not (in a non-habitual reading).

The temporal interpretations available for Capeverdean predicates straightly follow from this perspective. We have “[now] I know” (where “now” is a moment, not an interval) as a logical consequent state of “[now] I’ve known”. On the other hand, for other telic events (culminated processes, culminations) we have consequent states of the type “[now] I’ve eaten one fish”, which never means “[now] I eat on fish”. In the same fashion, even the telic situations formed from verbs that are considered stative bases plus the relevant type of arguments do not enter events with a complex internal structure of the sort accessible for sabe. This is what we have seen with lenbra. But we have also the example of kridita “believe”: “[now] I believe you” is not a logical consequent state for “[now] I have believed you.”
In (43) we observe a sample of different interpretations for each morpheme. All sentences can be shifted to past if postverbal -ba is inserted, at a higher temporal projection. In this case, the instant of evaluation would not be “now” (the utterance time) but some given “then” (a reference time anterior to utterance time). Note also that the event in (43c) denotes an event with a complex internal structure: ø applies to its subevent, of the Become type, not to the state on which the temporal interpretation is anchored; this is why it is not represented here.

(43)  

a. N ø kume pexe. “[now] I have eaten fish.”

b. N ø sabe risposta. “[now] I have known the answer.”

c. N sabe risposta. “[now] I know the answer.”

d. N sata kume pexe. “[now] I am eating fish.”

e. N sata sabe mas txeu. “[now] I am learning more.”

f. N ta kume pexe. “[now] I have the property of eating fish.”

g. Tudu bes ki pursor ta purgunta-m un kuza N ta sabe risposta.

“[now] I have the property of knowing the answer every time that the professor asks me something.”

As a closing note: judging by the sentences in (43) we observe that all of them are true of instants of time. And they are licit in the present tense. This may lead us to conjecture that all these Capeverdean environments contain, in fact, a sort of stative situations. Note, also, that this is different from Bickerton’s generalization.

Finally, resuming the possibilities in section 1: (i) stativity itself needs a more precise description (we must find/define sub-properties that are relevant for Capeverdean verbs; perhaps this could be extended to similar data in other languages, namely Creoles); (ii) stativity is basically innocent here. As it may be clear at this point, the hypothesis in (i) is correct. I hope to have contributed to the definition of that more precise notion. Some Capeverdean derived states, and not stative bases, are the ones whose non-overtly marked form is interpreted as present. This includes: typical states like e grande “be tall” or sta duente “be sick”; the ones that enter certain complex event structures (culmination plus consequent state), like sabe and konxe in some contexts; also progressives and habituals, whose operators stativize their base predicates.

6. Concluding remarks

Stativity, as a semantic property of some basic predicates, does not account for the distinct temporal interpretations of Capeverdean N sabe risposta “I know the answer” and N kume pexe “I ate fish”. Actually, basic stative verbs pattern with eventives in this respect. In this study I propose that Capeverdean stative bases show a process-like behavior, keeping a simple internal structure. On the other hand, they participate, in certain contexts, in predicates that denote typically telic events (culminations). In this last
property, they pattern with *sabe* and *konxe* which, given the right context, may also show a culmination reading – in this case them, too, behave as eventives regarding temporal morphology.

The crucial element at stake in the language (possibly also in other Creoles) is the fact that verbs like *sabe* “know” and *konxe* “be familiar with”, but not stative bases, may reveal this complex internal structure (a Become subevent – “got to know” – plus a consequent state). For their occurrence as a culmination, we have “[now] I’ve known” (where the reference time and utterance time coincide). For their occurrences as derived states, and assuming that states are true of instants, we have “[now] I know”. Conversely, consequent states for other verbs are not part of any complex event of this type. For “[now] I’ve eaten one fish”, for instance, there is no logical interpretation of the type “[now] I eat one fish”.
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