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1. This talk

- The present talk offers a characterization of the resources that the speakers of Kakataibo (Panoan, Peru) find in their language for situating the information they present from the perspective of their addressees.
- The mechanisms to be presented today establish a distinction between information that is assumed by the speaker as proximal vs. non-proximal to addressee.
- From the perspective of conversational analysis, the semantic contrasts to be discussed and illustrated here relate to the notions of epistemic status and epistemic stance (HERITAGE 2012a,b).
1. This talk

• The most salient characteristics of the mechanisms used in Kakataibo to encode addressee’s perspective have to do with:
  – the diversity of the relevant forms, which belong to various morphosyntactic paradigms, and
  – the semantic and pragmatic features that play a role in their configuration (these features interact with modality, mirativity, speech genre and type of speech act).

• Similar phenomena have been described for other languages: Kogi (Arwako-Chibchan, Colombia; BERGQVIST 2012), Andoke (isolate, Colombia; LANDABURU 2007, quoted in BERGQVIST submitted), Awetí (Tupian, Brazil; DRUDE 2005, quoted in BERGQVIST submitted) and Yurakaré (isolate, Bolivia; GIPPER 2011), among others.
1. This talk

- This talk presents the following structure:
  - in §2 and §3 I give some basic information about the Kakataibo people and their language;
  - in §4 I describe and illustrate the grammatical forms that encode speech genre and addressee’s perspective distinctions in Kakataibo;
  - in §5 I look at the data presented in §4, proposing the notion of pragmatic markedness as a possible explanatory tool for the understanding of the whole system.
2. The Kakataibo people

- The Kakataibo people (also known as “Kashibo-Kakataibo”, “Kashibo” and “Uni”, among other denominations) belong to the Panoan language family and live in the Peruvian regions of Huánuco and Ucayali, along the Aguaytía, Shamboyacu, San Alejandro, Sungaroyacu and (more recently) Pisqui Rivers.
2. The Kakataibo people

- According to the most recent Census of Indigenous Communities of the Peruvian Amazon (INEI: 2007), currently the Kakataibo people number about 1879.
- However, the Kakataibo’s political organization (FENACOCA) considered their number to be closer to 3,000 or 3,500 in 2007.
- The prehistoric ancestors of the Kakataibo people were hunters, fishermen and gatherers, and those economic activities are still important for the Kakataibo people today.
- However, currently, agriculture has become the most important source of subsistence for most Kakataibo families and people live inside the market economy.
2. The Kakataibo people
3. The Kakataibo language

- Kakataibo is the westernmost Panoan language and, therefore, the one closest to the Andes Mountains. SHELL (1965), D’ANS (1973), LOOS (1999) and FLECK (2013) coincide in treating this language as the only member of its branch.
- As described in ZARIQUIEY (2011b), there are four extant Kakataibo dialects, spoken in the Lower Aguaytía, Upper Aguaytía, Sungaroyacu and San Alejandro Rivers.
- ‘Nokamán’, a variety named and minimally documented by TESSMANN (1930), was a fifth dialect of the language, now extinct (ZARIQUIEY 2013).
- Among the living varieties, the most divergent is the San Alejandro one, with the Upper Aguaytía and Sungaroyacu varieties being highly similar to each other, and (to a lesser degree) to the Lower Aguaytía variety, which is the variety studied in this paper.
3. The Kakataibo language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Palato-Alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal (retroflex)</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k&lt;sup&gt;w&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;kw&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>ñ&lt;sub&gt;t&lt;/sub&gt; s&lt;sub&gt;ts&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>f&lt;sub&gt;ch&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>j&lt;sub&gt;sh&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>g&lt;sub&gt;x&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
<td>ñ&lt;sub&gt;b&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i &lt;ë&gt;</td>
<td>u &lt;u&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. The Kakataibo language

- In terms of its syntactic profile, Kakataibo is a (mainly) postpositional and agglutinating language with synthetic verbal morphology.
- The language shows both head and dependent marking, and a complex system of grammatical relations (which includes ergative, tripartite, accusative, neutral and even horizontal alignments).
- Verbs are lexically transitive or intransitive (with only 4 ambitransitive verbs in the whole language) and they exhibit interesting processes of transitivity harmony and transitivity agreement (which will be the topic of another talk at the Syntax and Semantics Circle).
3. The Kakataibo language

• Word order is pragmatically-oriented but there is some tendency to verb-final sentences.
• There is not a fixed order in the noun phrase, and most modifiers (including adjectives) are allowed to appear after or before the nominal head.
• Other relevant features are the existence of a rich switch-reference system used in clause-chaining and tail-head linkage structures, and the pervasive use of nominalizations in discourse.
4. Encoding addressee’s perspective in Kakataibo

- In Kakataibo there are various morphological elements that allow the speaker to situate the information from the perspective of the addressee.
- These morphemes primarily encode the speaker’s expectations regarding whether or not the event is perceptually accessible from the perspective of the addressee.
- However, other contextual factors may also play a role in their semantic configuration, as summarized in (1):

(1) Proximal to the addressee:
(i) events that are potentially perceivable by the addressee;
(ii) actual events that are assumed by the speaker to be known by the addressee;
(iii) already mentioned events that are assumed by the speaker to be to some extent familiar to the addressee; or/and
(iv) events that are assumed by the speaker to involve the addressee on an emotional level and, therefore, be relevant from his or her perspective.
4.1. Epistemic status, epistemic stance and addressee’s perspective

- Epistemic status: the knowledge status of both speaker and addressee: [K+] vs. [K-] (HERITAGE 2012a,b)
  - e.g., “And you never called the police?”: the speaker assumes him or herself as [K-] and requests information from a [K+] recipient.
  - “Let me tell you something about John...”: the speaker assumes him or herself as [K+] and treats the hearer as [K-] participant.
  - “It’s a beautiful day, isn’t it?”: the speaker implies a relatively equal access to the information from both perspectives (S=[K+] and H=[K+])

- Epistemic stance: the linguistic expression of the epistemic status of speaker and hearer at different points of a verbal interaction (it has important consequences for the design of turns at talk).
4.1. Epistemic status, epistemic stance and addressee’s perspective

• As we can clearly see in (1), the category of ‘proximal to the addressee’ in Kakataibo is defined by four different semantic/discursive features, which equally point towards a [k+] addressee (but differently from non-rhetoric questions, also presuppose a [k+] speaker).

• In this sense, the markers encoding ‘proximal to the addressee’ indicate that the speaker is projecting an epistemic symmetry between him or her and the addressee.

• In turn, the markers that encode ‘non-proximal to the addressee’ indicate that the speaker assumes an epistemic asymmetry between him or her ([k+]) and the addressee ([k-]).
4.2. Speech genre distinctions and addressee’s perspective

- As mentioned above, in order to understand how addressee’s perspective is encoded in Kakataibo, we need to look at various morphological forms that belong to different paradigms.
- One of these paradigms is the set of second position enclitics found in the language, which are positionally-fixed elements that appear as the second constituent of every sentence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot I</th>
<th>Slot II</th>
<th>Slot III</th>
<th>Slot IV</th>
<th>Slot V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech genre</td>
<td>mood</td>
<td>evidentiality</td>
<td>subject cross-reference</td>
<td>mirativity, modality and addressee’s perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ka</em> ‘narrative’</td>
<td><em>ra</em> ‘interrogative’</td>
<td><em>is</em> ‘reportative’</td>
<td><em>a</em> ‘3’</td>
<td><em>mēi</em> ‘mirative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ri</em> ‘conversational’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>mina</em> ‘2’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>na</em> ‘1sing’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(na)nuna</em> ‘1plur’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>pa</em> ‘certitudinal, non-proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>pūē</em> ‘mirative, non-proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2. Speech genre distinctions and addressee’s perspective

• While in narratives or story-telling speech acts in Kakataibo, we exclusively find the narrative enclitic (see the fragments in (5) and (6), below), conversations are extremely dynamic and we find interesting interactions between *ka* ‘narrative’ and *ri* ‘conversational’ within them.

• The fragment of a conversation offered in (2) illustrates how this distinction works in natural speech.

• In this interaction, two women talk about a tapir calf that was found in the jungle by their cousin, who adopted it as a pet.

• Most people in the village were emotionally involved with this domesticated tapir calf and used to look after it; but, suddenly, the tapir calf was killed by a group of outsiders.
Example 2

(2) Kakataibo [FE.ME-tapir-2007]

01ME: y  aín  'ibu  ría  nish-kian-i  kwan-a-n
and  3p.GEN owner  CON.3p  hate-going.INTR-S/A>S(SE)  go-PERF-1/2/3p
‘And its owner went very upset.’

02  usa=ma  ka
that-COMP=NEG  NAR.3p
‘this should not happen (lit. it is not like that).’

03FE: ajá
yes
‘yes’

04ME: kwan-kē  atian  ría  uni=kama=n  nu  ūni-xun-ēxan-n
go-NOM  then  CON.3p  man=PLU=ERG  1pl.ABS  tell-APPL-days.ago-1/2/3p
‘When he was gone, then, the men told us’

05  siun  isa  rētē-kan-a-x-a  ki-xun
tapir.ABS  REP.3p  kill-PLU-PERF-3p-unmarked  say-S/A>A
‘saying: ‘(they said that they) killed the baby tapir.’

06  atian  ūni-xun-kē  nu=n  kwat-kēx  ūnamē  ūnamē  tunki-ia  uni
then  tell-APPL-NOM  1pl=A  hear-O>S(PE)  night  night  grumble-A/S>O  man
‘Before they told us we had heard in the middle of the night that the man
made noise, like shooting a gun.’
Example 2

07 usa=ma
    that-COMP=NEG
    NAR.3p
    ‘This should not happen (lit. it is not like that).’

08FE: ajá ‘e=n=ribi rina ŋanta-ma-shi ‘i-ia kwat-ëxa-n
    yes 1sg=A=also CON.1p morning=NEG=ONLY be-A/S>O hear-days.ago-1/2/3p
    ‘yes... I also heard so before it dawned.’

09ME: ajá a las siete de la noche sapiria ‘i-ëxan-n
    yes at.seven.p.m. DUB.CON.3p be-days.ago-1/2/3p
    ‘yes... was it at seven p.m.?'

10FE: a esa hora ria ‘i-ëxan-n
    at.that.time CON.3p be-days.ago-1/2/3p
    ‘It was at that time.’

11ME: y anu ria ain ‘ibu=n bë-ëxan-n
    and then CON.3p 3p.GEN owner=ERG bring-days.ago-1/2/3p
    ‘And then its owner brought it.’

12 usa=ma
    that-COMP=NEG
    NAR.3p
    ‘This should not happen (lit. it is not like that).’
'ë=n  'unan-kē=ma=bi   ka   'ë  Pablo=n  ka-ëxan-x-in
1SG=a  know-NOM=NEG=same  NAR.3p  1SG.O  pablo=ERG  say-past(days)-3p-PROX
‘When I did not know it yet, Pablo told me.’

“‘ó  kaisa  rëtē-kan-a-x-a
tapir.ABS  NAR.REP.3p  kill-PLU-PERF-3p-unmarked

‘ë  ka  ain  ‘ibu=n  ka-a-x-a
1SG.ABS  NAR.3p  3p.GEN  owner=ERG  say-PERF-3p-unmarked

bi-kin-nun  ka-a-x-a
pick.up-APPL-PURP  say-PERF-3p-unmarked
“(It is said that they) killed the tapir; its owner said it to me... he asked me
to help him to pick it up”.

ka  ki-ëxan-x-in
NAR.3p  say-days.ago-3p-PROX
‘He said.’

18ME:  ah
oh!
‘Oh! [surprise]’
4.2. Speech genre distinctions and addressee’s perspective

• The shared information, in association with which both speech act participants are equally K+ is presented using *ri* ‘conversational’ (lines 1, 4 8-11).

• This is clear from the responses that these utterances trigger in the addressee, which in two cases include the Spanish form *ajá* ‘yes’ (lines 3 and 9).

• However, at some point in the conversation (line 13), speaker FE shifts to *ka* ‘narrative’ and this clitic is then used until the end of her participation.
4.2. Speech genre distinctions and addressee’s perspective

• This shift has to do with the fact that FE tells ME how she was told about the tapir’s decease, information that ME was not aware of.

• Therefore, by changing to ka ‘narrative’, FE claims herself to be in a more advantageous position regarding accessibility to the information, which is unfamiliar to the addressee.

• In Heritage’s terms, FE shifts to ka ‘narrative’ because she assumed the information as new from ME’s perspective and therefore ME becomes a [K-] participant. This is clearly demonstrated by ME’s response in line 18, ah, which, differently from ajá ‘yes’, encodes surprise.
4.3. Addressee’s perspective in the narrative genre

- Table 2 (adapted from ZARIQUIEY 2011a: 433) is a simplified representation of the main inflectional categories of the Kakataibo verb in the narrative genre:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot I</th>
<th>Slot II</th>
<th>Slot III</th>
<th>Slot IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-bait ‘durative, the same day’</td>
<td>-on ‘the day before’</td>
<td>-n ‘first/second person subject cross-reference’</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nêt ‘durative, the night before’</td>
<td>-êxan ‘days ago’</td>
<td>- and zero ‘third person subject’</td>
<td>-a ‘unmarked’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pun ‘hours ago’</td>
<td>-yantan ‘months ago’</td>
<td>-a ‘perfective’</td>
<td>-in ‘proximal to’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-rabê ‘habitual non-remote past’</td>
<td>-i ‘imperfective’</td>
<td>-a ‘perfective’</td>
<td>the addressee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-imê ‘durative remote past’</td>
<td>-akê ‘remote past’</td>
<td>cross-reference’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-itsin ‘conditional’</td>
<td>-a ‘stative’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kêan ‘frustrative’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final pormanteau inflectional morphemes**

- kian: ‘habitual, remote past, third person’
- kin: ‘habitual, remote past, first/second person’
- ie:: ‘accusatory speech act, non-proximal to the addressee’
4.3. Addressee’s perspective in the narrative genre

• The encoding of addressee’s perspective within the verbal morphology of the language is associated with
  – slot IV (which includes the suffixes -a ‘functionally unmarked’ and -ín ‘proximal to the addressee’)
  – but also with the portmanteau marker -ié: ‘accusatory speech act, non proximal to the addressee’.

• As indicated in table 2, in Kakataibo, the encoding of addressee’s perspective in the verbal inflectional slot
  IV is only accessible for third person subjects.

• In addition, verbal morphology varies in the conversational speech genre: the verb equally ends in -n, regardless
  of the person of the subject and the addressee’s perspective markers do not appear even with third person subjects.
4.3. Addressee’s perspective in the narrative genre

(3) Kakataibo [elicited examples]
(a) ‘ē-n kana pi-a-n
   1p-A NAR.1p eat-PERF-1/2p
   ‘I ate.’
(b) mi-n kamina pi-a-n
   2p-A NAR.2p eat-PERF-1/2p
   ‘You ate.’
(c) a-n ka pi-a-x-a
   3p-A NAR.3p eat-PERF-3p-unmarked
   ‘(S)he ate (the event may or may not be proximal to the addressee).’
(d) a-n ka pi-a-x-ín
   3p-A NAR.3p eat-PERF-3p-PROX
   ‘(S)he ate (the event is proximal to the addressee).’
4.3. Addressee’s perspective in the narrative genre

(4) Kakataibo [elicited examples]
(a) ‘ë-n rina pi-a-n
   1p-A CON.1p eat-PERF-1/2/3p
   ‘I already ate (you are offering food to me).’
(b) mi-n rimina pi-a-n
   2p-A CON.2p eat-PERF-1/2/3p
   ‘You already ate (you are asking for food).’
(c) a-n ria pi-a-n (*-ín, *-a)
   3p-A CON.3p eat-PERF-1/2/3p
   ‘(S)he already ate (you are offering food to her/him)’
Example 5
Example 5

• Fragment of a narrative about three Kakataibo men that grouped the Kakataibo people from different clans around 1920-1930.

• The fragment starts with a sequence of non-proximal (or functionally unmarked) verbal forms (ended in -a). Suddenly, a proximal verbal form with -í'n is introduced.

• Why? My hypothesis: I (the addressee) knew very well Nicolás Aguilar, who was a good friend of mine and used to live in Yamino, the place where the narrative was told. The use of -í'n can be explained because of these contextual facts.
Example 6

Cauchoribi usaribi okëshin
they also worked with rubber
Example 6

- Fragment of a narrative about how the Kakataibo worked for “patrones” in the rubber industry around 1920-1930.
- The fragment comes from a long sequence of proximal verbal forms with -íñ. This sequence is used to indicate that the presented events constitute a single cohesive narrative unit, which, as soon as it is introduced in the narrative, becomes proximal to the addressee.
- The unit is broken by a crucial piece of information: that these products used to be taken to Tingo Maria to be sold.
- This “new” information is assumed as non-proximal to the addressee and therefore it is introduced by a non-proximal verbal form.
- Interestingly, it creates a new narrative unit which is followed, again, by proximal verbal forms.
4.3.1. Addressee’s perspective in the inflectional slot IV

• Final note
  – The use of the marker -ín ‘proximal to the addressee’ never appeared in the narratives I recorded during my first months in the Kakataibo village of Yamino, most likely because I was not a proper addressee yet.
  – As soon as I developed some communicative skills in Kakataibo, people in the village started to use the mechanism illustrated in this section.
  – This fact indirectly supports the claim that the forms described in this section certainly relate to the perspective of the addressee.
4.3.2. The marker -ié: ‘accusatory speech act, non-proximal to the addressee’

- The form -ié: ‘accusatory speech act, non-proximal to the addressee’ is an inflectional suffix used to tell the addressee that somebody else is doing something to his / her detriment.
- The interesting point about this suffix is that it is only used if the event is assumed by the speaker to be non-proximal from the perspective of the addressee in the sense that the information is not perceptually accessible for him or her and, therefore, is also new from his or her perspective [K-].
- The use of this marker usually implies that the addressee is emotionally involved in the event, which is occurring to his or her detriment.

(7) Kakataibo [elicited example]

Goliath=n kamënë mi=n kuriki mëkamat-ië:
goliath=ERG NAR.3p.MIR you.GEN money.ABS steal-3p.accusation.NON.PROX
‘Look!, Goliath is stealing your money!’
4.4. Addressee’s perspective in the conversational genre

• Although the pragmatic expectations in the conversational genre are that the information being presented is proximal to both the speaker and the addressee, Kakataibo offers specialized forms within this genre to indicate that a piece of information presented by the speaker is contextually relevant to the addressee, but is not known by him or her, or is not perceptually accessible from his or her perspective.

• The enclitics =pa ‘certitudinal, non-proximal to the addressee’ and =pënë ‘mirative, non-proximal to the addressee’ are used when the information is new to the addressee and, crucially, when the location of the addressee and the location of the event are not the same.
4.4. Addressee’s perspective in the conversational genre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slot I</th>
<th>Slot II</th>
<th>Slot III</th>
<th>Slot IV</th>
<th>Slot V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech genre</strong></td>
<td><strong>mood</strong></td>
<td><strong>evidentiality</strong></td>
<td><strong>subject cross-reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>mirativity, modality and addressee’s perspective</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ka</em> ‘narrative’</td>
<td><em>ra</em> ‘interrogative’</td>
<td><em>is</em> ‘reportative’</td>
<td><em>a</em> ‘3’ <em>mina</em> ‘2’ <em>na</em> ‘1sing’ <em>(na)muna</em> ‘1plur’</td>
<td><em>mëë</em> ‘mirative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ri</em> ‘conversational’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>pa</em> ‘certitudinal, non-proximal to the addressee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>pëë</em> ‘mirative, non-proximal to the addressee’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Addressee’s perspective in the conversational genre

Figure 2. The use of $=pa$ ‘certitudinal, non proximal to the addressee’

Figure 3. The use of $=pëné$ ‘certitudinal, non proximal to the addressee’
4.4. Addressee’s perspective in the conversational genre

(8) Kakataibo [elicited example]

\[ mi=n \quad bēchikē \quad riapa \quad abat-kas-i \quad \text{‘itin} \]
\[ 2sg=\text{GEN} \quad \text{son.ABS} \quad \text{CON.3p.CERT.NON.PROX} \quad \text{escape-DES-S/A} > \text{S(SE)} \quad \text{be.PROG} \]

‘Your son is willing to escape (I discovered it and then went to tell you and it is true).’

(9) Kakataibo [elicited example]

\[ mi=n \quad bēchikē \quad riapēnē' \quad abat-kas-i \quad \text{‘itin} \]
\[ 2sg=\text{GEN} \quad \text{son.ABS} \quad \text{CON.3p.MIR.NON.PROX} \quad \text{escape-DES-S/A} > \text{S(SE)} \quad \text{be.PROG} \]

‘Look! Your son is willing to escape (I am seeing it, but not you, because you are not close to the location of the event).’
4.5. Summary of the section

Table 3 Summary of the properties of addressee’s perspective markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>speech genre markers</th>
<th>Addressee’s perspective markers</th>
<th>slot</th>
<th>meaning</th>
<th>portmanteau</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ka</strong> ‘narrative’</td>
<td>-ɨn</td>
<td>verbal inflectional slot IV</td>
<td>‘proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>verbal inflectional slot IV</td>
<td>‘unmarked’</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-iēː</td>
<td>pormanteau verbal inflectional suffix</td>
<td>‘accusatory speech act / non proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ri</strong> ‘conversational’</td>
<td>=pəa</td>
<td>second position enclitic</td>
<td>‘certitudinal / non proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=pēnē</td>
<td>second position enclitic</td>
<td>‘mirative / non proximal to the addressee’</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Speech genre, addressee’s perspective and pragmatic markedness

• First of all, speech genre is not equal to addressee’s perspective, since in both the narrative and the conversational speech genres, it is possible to express that the information is proximal and non-proximal from the perspective of the addressee.

• However, both genres carry some presuppositions about the relation between the information and the addressee.

  – In the narrative genre, a [K-] addressee is expected: presenting information that the addressee is already aware of represents the pragmatically marked communicative situation for a narrative and crucially it triggers the use of -ín ‘proximal to the addressee’ (a prosodically salient and very specialized form).

  – In the conversational genre, a [k+] addressee is expected: presenting information that the addressee is not aware of represents the pragmatically marked communicative situation in this genre and crucially it triggers the use =pa ‘certitudinal, non-proximal to the addressee’ and =pênê ‘mirative, non-proximal to the addressee’.
5. Speech genre, addressee’s perspective and pragmatic markedness

– Thus, we find a general correspondence between pragmatic markedness and formal markedness in both the narrative and the conversational speech genres.

– The marker -ié: ‘accusatory speech act, non-proximal to the addressee’ is a bit more complicated.

– It presumes a strong involvement of the addressee in the event (this form is used if the event directly affects him or her) and in these circumstances, a situation in which the information is not accessible or known to the addressee is also pragmatically marked.
5. Speech genre, addressee’s perspective and pragmatic markedness

• Thus, the forms presented here are used to encode that the speaker believes that there is something unexpected in the relation between the addressee and the information presented in the utterance.

• This is done by means of constructions that, in addition to allowing the speaker to present him/herself as a K+ participant, let him or her express his or her assumptions about the epistemic status the addressee.

• This clearly produces multiple-perspective constructions (Evans 2005), which are defined as “constructions that encode potentially distinct values, on a single semantic dimension, that reflect two or more distinct perspectives or points of reference in the utterance” (Evans 2005: §3.1).
5. Speech genre, addressee’s perspective and pragmatic markedness

• In Kakataibo, these symmetries and asymmetries are formally marked if and only if they contradict the pragmatic expectations associated with the two speech genre categories described today.

• The fact that the pragmatically marked situations are also formally marked by means of the morphemes presented today is crucial for developing an explanatory account of the data.

• From a functional point of view, language is a communicative/interactional tool and therefore both speech act participants are equally relevant (this is also seen in spatial deictic systems, which may include categories based on both the speaker and the addressee; Anderson & Keenan 1985).

• And if De Haan’s (2005) claim that evidentiality is a deictic category is correct, then, it would be a type of speaker-based deictic category. Addresses' perspective markers in Kakataibo and elsewhere might be the counterpart of evidentiality in this deictic sense and might constitute a functional category poorly studied by typologist.
Thanks!

In memoriam,
Nicolás Aguilar
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>‘interclausal switch-reference tracking’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1p</td>
<td>‘first person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p</td>
<td>‘second person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3p</td>
<td>‘third person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>‘transitive subject’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABS</td>
<td>‘absolutive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>‘certitudinal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>‘conversational register’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>‘desiderative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>‘ergative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>‘genitive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIR</td>
<td>‘mirative’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAR</td>
<td>‘narrative register’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non.prox</td>
<td>‘non-proximal to the addressee’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>‘progressive’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>‘intransitive subject’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>‘simultaneous dependent event’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>