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Todays talk

• Epistemic marking in Kogi (Arwako)
• Issues in analyzing evidentiality
• Related qualification systems
• The details of epistemic marking in Kogi: level of grammar; indexical grounding of information; speaker expectations
• Summary
Kogi

- Arwako-Chibchan language spoken in the Sierra Nevada de Santa Marta, Colombia
- ~ 10,000 speakers
- Closely related to Ika (Landaburu 2000) and Damana (Trillos Amaya 1999)
- Headmarking, SOV, agglutinating, TAM, nominative-accusative (Bergqvist in prep.; Ortíz Ricaurte 1994)

Epistemic marking in Kogi

1. \textit{ei-kí} \textit{ni-zex}
   DEM-FOC NI-happen
   ‘That’s it (as agreed/as said).’

2. \textit{ei-kí} \textit{na-za}
   DEM-FOC NA-happen
   ‘That’s how it is (so you know/I think).’

(Bunkwa_090822)
Epistemic marking in Kogi (2)

(3) *ma kwisaté shi-ba-law*
   2SG.IND  dance  SHI-2S-be
   ‘Are you dancing (you look like you are)?

(4) *nas hanchibé sha-kwisate-tuk-(k)u*
   1SG.IND  good   SHA-dance-PROG-1S
   ‘Am I dancing well (in your opinion)?

(Kogí: *ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska-*)

- *ni-* marks a state/event that is “known to the hearer” (e.g. Ortiz Ricaurte 1994; Olaya Perdomo 2000)
- *shi-* is an interrogative form that corresponds to *ni-* (ibid.)
- *na-* “concerns something actual, but unknown to the hearer” (Olaya Perdomo 2000)
- *sha-* is an interrogative form that corresponds to *na-* (ibid.)
- *ska-* “concerns something possible” (ibid. 2000); ‘speculative’
Analyzing epistemic marking in Kogi

- Grammatically distinct from other categories by contrast (paradigmatically) and combinatorial possibilities (syntagmatically)
- Function-meaning is found in subtle differences of translation/interpretation of relevant utterances resulting from alternations in subject person, predicate semantics and speech-act context
- Partly comparable to corresponding alternations in evidential systems (e.g. Curnow 2003)

Preliminary results

- The markers signal a "complex epistemic perspective" (Bergqvist f.c.b) that features the point of view of the speaker and his/her estimation of the point of view of the addressee with regard to some eventuality
- The expressed perspectives of the speech participants from the subjective stance of the speaker co-varies with information status (Heritage 2012; cf. "intersubjective alignment" Du Bois 2007; cf. "territories of information" Kamio 1997) where one of the speech participants may be more entitled to information, and a process of estimating the knowledge/attention state of the addressee in the here-and-now
- Alignment with a certain status may be negotiated and diverged from in the adoption of speaker stance; a point-of-view that may be subject to challenge by the addressee (cf. Givón 1990; "epistemic conventions")
- Epistemic marking as "illocutionary modification" (Hengeveld 2004; cf. Dik 1997), interacts with speech-act level phenomena, but is separate from these
Issues of analysis: evidentials

• The semantic indeterminacy in some evidentials may be characterized in terms of “transfer effects” and multi-level functionality.
• Transfer effects are seen in changes to subject person
• multi-level functionality is seen in the sensitivity to/interaction with the illocutionary component of an utterance (e.g. Davis et al. 2007; Faller 2003)

Issues of analysis: evidentials

1. Evidentials, like some modals, are known to signal a “perceiver shift” when occurring in non-declarative contexts (e.g. Davis et al. 2007; Lehmann 2011)
2. Subject person may have effects on evidential meaning value (Curnow 2003)
3. Indeterminacy of utterance-level meaning as separate from propositional meaning; i.e. communicative intention vs. encoded meaning, e.g. Faller (2003, 2006, for reportative evidentials in Cuzco Quechua)
4. “Common ground” evidentials: Jaqaru (Aymaran, Hardman 1986): -ishi, denotes “a fact [that] is directly within the personal knowledge of both speaker and hearer”; Southeastern Tepehuan, (Uto-Aztecan, Willett 1991): sap “reported to speaker, unknown to hearer”, sac “reported to speaker, previously known to hearer”
Issues of analysis: perceiver shift

Duna (Trans-New Guinea, Duna-Bogaya; San Roque, presentation at Stockholm University, 2010)

• Perceiver perspective in questions: the addressee

(5) no rakare-\textit{yarua}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1SBJ & cold-SNS.C \\
\end{tabular}
\text{‘I am cold {I feel}.’}

(6) ko rakare-\textit{yarua}=pe
\begin{tabular}{ll}
2SBJ & cold-SNS.C=Q \\
\end{tabular}
\text{‘You are cold {you feel}?’}

Issues of analysis: perceiver shift (2)

• Evidentials signaling addressee-perspective

(7)A: \textit{Petrusi} ho-\textit{naoko}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
PSN & come-POT.OBS \\
\end{tabular}
\text{‘Petrus came {you could have seen}.’}

B: \textit{hutia}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
 & come.PFV.VIS.P \\
\end{tabular}
\text{‘Yes that’s right, Petros came {I saw}.’}
Issues of analysis: first person

Tucanoan (Ramirez 1997 in Curnow 2003:45)
• Visual evidential + 1SBJ = ‘volitional act’

(8) bapá bope-ápə
   plate break-RECPST:NON.3:VIS
   ‘I broke the plate {of my own will} (e.g. because I was angry)’

• Non-visual evidential + 1SBJ = ‘non-volitional act’

(9) bapá bope-ásə
   plate break-RECPST:NON.3:NON.VIS
   ‘I broke the plate {accidentally}’

Issues of analysis: first person

Qiang (LaPolla 2003)
• (“unmarked”) DECL + 1SBJ = ‘volitional act’
• Visual evidential + 1SBJ = ‘non-volitional act’

(10) qa the: ta de-we-z-u-a
    1SG 3SG LOC DIR-hit-CAUS-VIS-1SG
    ‘I hit him {accidentally} (the speaker having leant back and stretched his arms out without having looked behind him)’

(in Curnow 2003: 49)
Communicative intention vs. encoded semantics

- Illocutionary or propositional meaning?
- Grammatical tests: embedding; scope over/under other categories (tense, negation); challengeability; "interrogative flip" (Speas & Tenny 2003)
- Reportative in Cuzco Quechua (Faller 2003)
- Problems: inherent property of indexicals; cline or contrast?

Related forms of epistemic marking

Epistemic marking that paradigmatically situates the perspectives of both speech participants with regard to some object of reference (i.e. complex epistemic marking)
- "Engagement marking" (Andoke, isolate, Colombia; Landaburu 2007); formally separate from evidential contrasts found in the language and serves to signal eventualities as accessible/inaccessible to the speaker and the addressee, but also in terms of addressee-awareness at the moment of utterance (ibid: 25)
- "Verification marking" (Southern Nambikwara, Brazil; Kroeker 2001) marks utterances as either individually or collectively "observed"
Clause marking in Awetí (Drude 2005)

Awetí (Tupian, Brazil) a'yn and me

(11)a. oto me

‘He left (as you may know).’

b. oto a’yn

‘He left (this will be unknown to you).’

c. oto a’yn ne

‘He left (this will be unknown to you, but you expected it to happen).’

• Highly frequent and accompany (almost) every sentence.
• Non-obligatory
• Does not contribute to the propositional content of a sentence.

Epistemic marking in Kogi

Paradigmatic set of markers: ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska-

• Hypothesis: signal the epistemic position of the speaker and his/her expectations of the addressee’s (epistemic) position with regard to a discourse object.
• “Epistemic” covers the knowledge state, attention, and opinions of the speaker
• The expression of two distinct, but simultaneously calculated epistemic perspectives is called “complex epistemic marking” (cf. Evans 2007; Bergqvist f.c.b)
Kogi: \textit{ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska-}

- Prefixed to the light verb in auxiliary constructions (Bergqvist in prep.)

(12) \textit{meibak hibachi-\textasciitilde h\textasciitilde ni-gu-k\texttilde}\n
\hspace{1cm} yesterday work-INF NI-do-1S

\hspace{1cm} ‘Yesterday I was working.’

(Ortíz Ricaurte 1994: 224)

---

Kogi: \textit{ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska-} (2)

Grammatical features
- Only appear in finite auxiliary clauses
- Contrastive distribution (cf. Awetí)
- No restriction to certain temporal/modal contexts
- Scope over the entire sentence, including TAME and polarity operators

[See Handout for examples]
Analyzing *ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska*- (2)

- *ni-/na-* are *speaker-perspective* forms
- *shi-/sha-* are *addressee-perspective* forms
- *ska-* is outside the epistemic authority of either speech participant
- Contrast between *ni-/na-*: ‘shared’ /‘exclusive’
- Contrast between *shi-/sha-*: ‘shared’ /‘private’
ni-/na-

- *ni-* signals available/known information to the addressee and the speaker (4a)
- *na-* signals (presently) unavailable/unknown information to the addressee, which is known/available to the speaker (4b).
- Is this contrast identical to a separation between new/old information? No; assumptions about what is known or unknown to the addressee does not depend on whether some information is activated by the speaker in the ongoing discourse (cf. Prince 1981).
- Contrast between *ni-/na-* draws on what is called “communal, common ground” (Clark 1996; cf. “information status”, Heritage 2012) as well as the intrapersonal relationship between the speech participants. Compare (7) and (6)
- Communicative functions: *na-* is used to alert the addressee to something that speaker is (already) aware of. It can be the speaker’s opinions (2b) but may also be an assertion of a personal fact (4b; see Hanks 1990 for dimensionality in indexicals).

shi-/sha-

- The contrast between *shi-/sha-* is less obvious.
- *shi-* appears “tag-like” in that the expectations of the speaker concern both the state-of-affairs referred to and the addressee’s access to them (12b)
- *sha-* is a deferral to the opinions and mental states of the addressee, which although they may be accessible to a certain degree, are restricted with regard to the expressed assumptions of the speaker (9b; 12a)
Level of grammar

• Given the proposed separation into declarative and interrogative forms; what level of grammar is relevant for the analysis of epistemic marking in Kogi?
• Do the markers signal the speech act (cf. “basic illocutions”; c.f. Hengeveld 2007) or do they modify the speech act (cf. “illocutionary modification”, Hengeveld 2004), or neither?

Level of grammar (2)

• Both declarative and interrogative constructions are possible without the presence of ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska- (13, 14)
• However, a marker like shi- does not require additional means to achieve an interrogative function and ni- cannot occur in interrogative contexts
• What, then?
Illustration: Personal narrative

Context: A 'Mamo' is telling a group of Kogi elders and younger speakers about the time before the colonizers came. The narrative centers around the abundance of resources and the absence of illnesses. At various points in the story the Mamo uses the phrase 'that's what I saw' (13) featuring the addressee-directed forms sha- (14) and shi- (15):

13.  
     ei-ki  
     that-FOC see
     'That’s what I saw.'

14.  
     ei-ki  
     sha-tu-läx-ku-a~
     that-FOC SHA-see-PROG-1S-PERF
     'That’s what I saw.'

15.  
     ei-ki  
     shi-tu-läx-ku-a~
     that-FOC SHI-see-PROG-1S-PERF
     'That’s what I saw.'
Personal narrative (2): *ni-/na-*

- Preuss (1925) ~”The owner of the song”, Context for recording is (presumably) part of the process of teaching Dr. Preuss about the customs of the Kogi.
- Results in the use of forms featuring *na-*.
- No comparative attestations of *shi-/sha-*

(16) **na-klda**
    NA-be
    ’That’s (how I learned) it.’/’That’s how it was’

Conclusions

- If the paradigmatic nature of the markers is taken at face value then there should be no difference in propositional content in clauses that feature *shi-/sha-* or *ni-/na-* (cf. declarative-interrogative contrast)
- If the markers are analyzed as illocutionary modifiers that operate on a tier above the one where speech-act phenomena are found, then the meaning contrasts between them should not be characterized in terms of a declarative-interrogative opposition.
Conclusions

• "Supra-illocutionary" epistemic marking
• *ni-/na-/shi-/sha-/ska-* resembles "illocutionary satellites" (Dik 1997), in that they constitute a form of meta-commentary with ultimate reference to the subjective stance of the speaker and his/her expectations with regard to the addressee’s attention/access to knowledge
• Interacts with illocutionary phenomena and deictic categories such as tense, but is clearly distinct from these.

Summary

• Functionally, epistemic marking in Kogi signals the inter-subjective stance of the speaker as shaped by the status of information (cf. Heritage 2012), and the on-line estimation of the knowledge/attention state of the addressee
• Although these features are also relevant in analyzing evidentiality, epistemic marking in Kogi appear to be entirely non-propositional in contrast to the suggested cline between propositional and illocutionary meaning found in some evidentials
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