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There are some discourse connectives in Ashaninka that show conceptual and procedural encoding. This paper pretends to describe morphologically and pragmatically two of these connectives in terms of the cognitive effect their use is intended to bring about. The theoretical framework used in this investigation is based on the Relevance Theory and the concepts are related to the meaning or function of the discourse connectives. This has allowed explaining the use of these words from the listener's perspective, making an assumption of the speaker's communicative intention. The corpus has 20 utterances where the words irootaki and irojati are studied as discourse connectives. Irootaki, as a connective, introduces a consequent utterance and, as a verbalized pronoun, refers to an event or prior event. Its conceptual meaning is revealed in its morphosyntactic structure iroo-tak-i (3F-EP-PRFV-T) and it also influences when it acts as a connective to establish the cause-consequence semantic relation. Irojati, as a discourse connective, establishes an order between the utterances; however, the relationship between the clauses is not hierarchical but symmetrical. Its morphological structure iro-ja-t-i (3F-ADV-EP-T) is similar to irootaki in the sense that both have a referential feature.

1. Introduction

While analyzing narratives in Ashaninka language, I observed morphological words whose grammatical category was not clear neither its discourse function. They drew more attention when I discovered that they could be omitted without altering significantly the discourse coherence of the text. Searching previous studies about these words was not very promising. They were registered first inDiccionario ashëñinca by David Payne (1980) as irojatzi (adv.) and irootaki (v.i.). Mihas (2010) describes If we look at them isolately, without linguistic context, they have a meaning based on their pronominal root iroo-, however in discourse the may behave as what we call ‘connectives’.

The study of such words has been approached descriptively and their interpretation in discourse depends on the translator’s comprehension. That is why the theoretical framework used in this investigation is based on a cognitive theory applicable in linguistics with a pragmatic approach that has as main object of study the ostensive inferential communication. Relevance Theory has helped explaining the use of connectives taking into account not only the grammar but the context and cultural environment of the speaker and the perspective of the listener, the person who understands the statement and makes an assumption of the speaker's communicative intention.

The study of irootaki and irojati reveals important features that allow a broader view of this kind of lexical items. Moreover, these discourse connectives in Ashaninka can be inflected, i.e. are not invariable. Thus its role in discourse and the type of meaning that prevails will depend on the context and the speaker’s communicative intention.

On one hand the use of connectives allows the speaker underlining the information he considers important, on the other hand it guides the listener's inferential processes that allow processing better the information contained in the discourse. These inferential processes are exemplified here as explicatures and implicatures. The use of this resource is appropriate because of the outstanding opacity Ashaninka language has, it lacks a system of number and gender agreement, as well as case marking. Ashaninka shows variability of syntactic order and a reference system expressed in its morphology and syntax.

The cognitive approach allows explaining connectives in their function, meaning and how culture is represented through language.

2. Theoretical concepts

Sperber and Wilson (1986/1995) propose a Relevance Principle of natural base in order to explain communication; this principle is in charge of guiding the human comprehension process in the communicative act, whether verbal or whether not verbal. It is due to this Principle that our mind can get the maximum information from the ostensive stimulus that it receives.

According to this theory, the speaker tries to transmit some intentional mental states to the listener and it is possible because of the mind reading capacity that both interlocutors possess. To achieve it the speaker produces stimulus that have to be manifested to his listener, this stimulus combines elements of a verbal, kinesic and paralinguistic system (Portolés, 2001). From these stimuli, the listener constructs hypothesis of the speaker’s communicative intention.
The communication is ostensive because when we speak we show an intention to make manifest something and it is inferential because what it is said becomes an stimulus that allow an inferential process that happens due to the fact that the speakers share the same cognitive principle called Relevance which guides the inferential process (Portolés, 2001).

As speakers we are prepared to make an effort to formulate our thoughts and as listeners we wait for simply elaborated expressions. The communicator will have to prefer, and make to prefer, the stimulus that minimizes the listener’s effort from a range of possible stimuli, each of them capable of communicating the intentional and acceptable interpretation for the communicator. The target of the listener, on having interpreted an expression, is to identify the informative intention of the communicator.

2.1 Explicatures and implicatures

According to this approach, the context is always mental and consists of a set of assumptions that allow understanding a sentence; these assumptions are already in our memory but are in constant change due to the cognitive effect reached through ostensive communication. Blakemore (2002, p. 69) notes with respect to the person’s cognitive environment that it is the set of assumptions which she is capable of constructing and as accepting as true, or in other words, the set of assumptions which are manifest to her.

When the speaker utters a sentence communicates a set of assumptions that are classified as explicatures and implicatures. An explicit content statement or explicature is a communicated proposition obtained by a combination of decoding and inference that provides a premise for the derivation of contextual implications and other cognitive effects. The concept of explicatures is justified because it provides all the necessary information in order to understand an expression properly; it is also underdetermined from the point of view of its meaning (Carston, 2002, Ch. 1).

Implicature is an additional or implicit meaning that communicates the speaker and the hearer understand. Implicatures can arise apart from the speaker’s communicative intention because it depends on the cognitive environment of both interlocutors.

2.2 Conceptual and procedural encoding

Carston (2002, p. 357-359) says that concepts are stored in memory and have three kinds of information: a logic one, an encyclopaedic one and a lexical one. The information a word contained is related to grammar relations with other words and to the knowledge we have about the world. The conceptual meaning of a word is general and vague. Making it clear depends on the context.

Blakemore defines procedural meaning as not the codification of a constituent of a conceptual representation but the guide of the comprehension process so that the hearer can formulate a statement of the communicative intention of the speaker:

> an expression which encodes procedural information encodes information which is not a constituent of the conceptual representations over which inferential computations are performed (Blakemore, 2002, p. 82).

This means that while the conceptual meaning units allow creating representations of a possible world, the meanings of processing determine the way in which human cognition must treat the information provided by these units with conceptual meaning. However, the split between conceptual and procedural meanings is not clear and as I will show discourse connectives in Ashaninka show both of such encodings working together.

2.3 Discourse connectives

Blakemore (2002) found no distinction between Discourse markers or Discourse connectives, making reference to words that establish relationships or connections between units of speech. However she says that the generic term should be Discourse indicators. I have called connectives a set of words that belong to different grammatical categories but which have in a discourse level a procedural meaning because they indicate a series of relationships that help to guide the inferences that are established in any communicative act.

The term connective has been addressed in many theoretical approaches. Grammatically, connectives are surface reflection of underlying logical relationships, which can be grouped into two classes: syntactic coordination and subordination. From the point of view of conversation analysis, any element that links two members of speech and ensure continuity of the conversation will be considered connective (Pons, 1998, p. 23).

In this study I treat irotoki and rojati as connectives because they link units of speech and both show influence in the inferential process with the conceptual and procedural encoding they have.
3. Method

3.1 Data collection

The data collected to analyze the connectives in Ashaninka was obtained through open interviews in the indigenous language. The fieldwork was realized in October 2008 in the Gran Pajonal area (Peruvian Middle East jungle) in Ucayali region, in a native community called Kirahuanero. The questions were about life experience of the speakers, thus I obtained short stories, descriptions and arguments, and all related to the lifestyle of the Ashaninka people before and now.

For fieldwork I had a field assistant, Fanny Camaiteri Sebastian, 24 years old, bilingual and belonging to the native community Kirahuanero. She was first told about the aim of the study and the interviews. Her work was to make the interviews in her mother tongue. We used a focused sampling; I mean it was established in advance, after consultation, who would be the interviewers for this study. The field assistant was responsible for finding and selecting people to be interviewed. The researcher was responsible for recording interviews and interacting with people in the community.

3.2 Transcription and translation

Transcribing oral speech is a resource that we often use for linguistic analysis. For this study, I have used grapheme transcription and the necessary punctuation to identified syntactic units like sentences and paragraphs. The function of the punctuation marks is not to match with the phonetic breaks, but to identify units of information in the Ashaninka language.

Transcription and translation was conducted in Lima. Eliud Camaiteri Leiva, from Kirahuanero, 19 years old, student of the fifth year of secondary bilingual school, was commissioned to make the transcription and translation of six hours of recordings.

3.3 Coding discourse connectives

The work of transcription and translation allow identifying the units of analysis within the texts obtained. These basic units of speech called connectives presented variability either by a process of contraction or inflection. The result has been systematized in Table 1. The next step was to identify the discourse members of the immediate context related to the use of the connective.

Table 1. Frequency of connectives’ uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse connectives</th>
<th>Frequency of use</th>
<th>Total of analyzed cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irootaki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootaki</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootakikia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irootakira</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootakira</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootakirikia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rootakirakia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rojati</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roja</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rojatita</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Data analysis

The analysis starts in the process of transcription and interpretation of the utterances which contain the connectives; for this it is important to identify the connectives and the linguistic boundary in which they occur. In this section I will show the follow scheme of analysis for each connective: a brief morphosyntactic analysis in order to know their structure and syntactic function, therefore I intend to approach to their conceptual meaning, and finally I will considerate pragmatic aspects of the connectives to discuss the procedural encoding they have.

4.1 Irootaki connective

This connective establishes a cause-consequence relation among the statements that links. The main problem in identifying it was the dual role played on the basis of its referentiality. Irootaki is a verbalized pronominal phrase which refers to a feminine or neutral being. Its conceptual meaning is revealed in its morphosyntactic structure and it influences when it acts as a connective to establish the cause-consequence relation.
4.1.1 Morphosyntactic aspects

Irootaki is uttered [rö:taki], which is common in the variety of Ashaninka we are analyzing. Here /t/ occurs in initial position and the words that begin with /iv/, usually the third person masculine prefix or holder, presents deletion of the initial vowel (Vilchez, 1996).

Paying attention to the glossing of irootaki allows us to observe that it is a verbalized pronoun whose structure is ıroo-t-ak-i, where the root ıroo–is the pronominal root that refers to a female being, it comes from ıroori pronoun ‘she’, -ı is the epenthetic segment, -ak is the perfective and -i indicates time. Payne (1980) notes that it is a verb, a lexical item that can be an entry in a dictionary.

Rootaki can partly fulfil the function of a third person pronoun feminine or act as connective between two clauses that have a cause-consequence relation. In the last case, as a connective, it can be contracted in roota and in the inflectional process, the suffixes -ra, -ri, -kia and the combination of these, -rikia and -rakia are present. The suffix -kia means surprise, while -ra and -ri are referential suffixes: -ri is an indication of a male being and suffix -ra refers a place.

This analysis allows us seeing when it comes to function as a connective and when as a verbalized pronoun.

4.1.2 Pragmatic aspects

The functionality of irootaki as a connective is showed in (1). Here the speaker tells how he came to live in Kirahuanero, indicated by the adverb of place jaka:

(1) Nojeiki Bajo Chencorini, te nomatiro nojeiki nokiantapari jaka konkiki ari ijeiki konki jaka rirori noshintotiri. Rootaki opoñantari nojeikantapari roñaaka jaka. I returned to live in Bajo Checorini, I did not get used to live in here, in my father in law, and my father in law lived here, he whose daughter is with me. That is why I started staying here now.

The cause-consequence relationship is established between the implicature that comes from a. and b.:

a. Te nomatiro nojeiki Bajo chencorini
   “I did not get used to live in Bajo Chencorini.”

b. Ijeiki konki jaka (Kirahuanero)
   “My father in law lived here”

Implicature:

c. Arika ijeiki Konki Kirahuaneroki, eejati aawiake ajeiki Kirahuaneroki.
   “If my father lives in Kirahuanero, my wife and I can live in Kirahuanero too.”

and the clause headed by rootaki: opoñantari nojeikantapari roñaaka jaka “I started staying here now”. It may be said that rootaki concerns the wife of the speaker, noshintoti ikonki “father in law’s daughter”, but the cause-consequence relationship is established above the referentiality relationship. Moreover, as Mihas (2010) point out, irootaki does not work alone in the construction of cause-consequences relations, it usually works with the suffix -ant presented in the verb inflection as we can see in the last expression. My conclusion is supported by an exchange test of the discourse members around irootaki:

d. Opoñantari nojeikantapari roñaaka jaka, ijeiki konki jaka rirori noshintotiri.
   “I began now to live here because my father in law lived here, I’m with your daughter.”

From this test it is possible to obtain a causal relation between the utterances. This test ensures the procedural meaning of irootaki.

In (2), I show an example of irootaki as a verbalized pronoun. Here the speaker expresses his desire to have in the community a bilingual teacher who teaches in Ashaninka; rootaki introduce a paraphrase of what was said before and his function with respect to its referent is anaphoric. Unlike the previous case, here rootaki is a pronominal referent.

(2) Naaka nokoyi profesora yoterini neentsite opoki yotantiri rowaga apantekira, añañekira nokemitaka nari, rootaki nokoyiri opoki profesora rooperori yoterini neentsite. I want a teacher to teach my children, someone who knows what is in our dialect, who speak as I do, that is what I want a good teacher to teach my children.

The same function is found in the example (3). This time, at a community meeting, a member makes manifest his wish to have a bilingual teacher in the community. The case shown in (3) supports the points made in (2), it also shows the contrast in both cases about the gender of the bilingual teacher. In (2) teacher is female and in (3) the teacher is male. Thus (3) confirms that rootaki is coreferential with the central idea that the speaker communicates and not specifically with the bilingual teacher.

(3) nokante nari ipoki profesor yotirori apantekiri iyotanchawori atomi iyotanchawori ijankinawete rootaki nokoyiri. Tema maaweni tee ayoweti, rootaki nokoyiri neentsite iyote.
I say I want a teacher who knows our language to come, so our children will know how to write, that is what I want it. Most of us do not know, that is what I want my son to know.

In (4), the consequence introduced by rootaki is the end of a process:

(4) **Ikanti rowaga yotirori roori ontyawete eekiro owamethayiro aminakotero akante jakami, kantetiro ontyawete jaka kantetiro ya rootenti ayiro arikia anakiro ari ya ninka ñaaki pashini janta yaanakiro ninka ñaaki pashini anakiro omatero pashinipaeni rootaki roñaak ikanti iyotayitantawori.**

It is said that what she knew, weaving, she taught what she has looked at what we do here, it is made like this, it is stretched here and It is made like this, this is taken, the one who has learnt takes it and show somewhere else and it is like this, others do so now we have learned.

The last text contains the following assumptions that correspond to the way women learn to weave:

a. **yotirori roori ontyawete**
   “what she knew is to weave”

b. **owamethayiro aminakotero**
   “she teaches what she has looked”

c. **ninka ñaaki pashini janta yaanakiro**
   “who sees, takes it there to someone else”

d. **omatero pashinipaeni**
   “others do it”

e. **roñaak iyotayitantawori**
   “now we have learned to weave”

In (5) it is showed a case in which a premise is the direct cause. In this case the inflection of irootaki is rootakira and although it may refer to waka ‘cow’, I show that it actually introduces a result.

(5) **nojeikantabitakari mapariki roñashirenkakina waka, royitanawo nowaniri, rootakira nopokantari, roñaaka jaka nojeikapotantapakari, roñaaka jaka jee tekatika waka.**

I was in Mapari, cows annoyed me, they ate my mandioc; that is why I came; now here I am living well, now here yes there is no cow.

The premise a. locates the place where the narrated events occur. The premise b. is the causal one; c. is an additional clause that specifies b.

a. **nojeikantabitakari mapariki**
   “I was staying in Mapari.”

b. **roñashirenkakina waka**
   “Cows annoyed me.”

c. **royitanawo nowaniri**
   “Cows ate my mandioc.”

In d. rootakira intrrduces de consequence:

d. **rootakira nopokantari**
   “That is why I came (to Kirahuanero).”

To sum up, the cause-consequence relation is between b. and d.

In (6) the speaker tells how he came to live in Kirahuanero; it can be noticed how are built two cause-consequence relations in his narrative:

(6) **paerani ijankinakotakina piri iñaaga, rowaga ijankinataki ikanti rowaga: “Thame rowaga janta apatochawo iñaak akoyi amoshikatero”, rootaki apuntatabetari apohantakari roñaaka jaka nojeikantarika. Rootakirakia rowaga nojeikapotantapaki niyowane nari jaka.**

Before your father enrolled me in the water, this enrolled me, it is said: “let’s go there to meet us to the water we want to obtain”, that is why I was signed up and I started to live here now. That is why I came to stay here.

a. **paerani ijankinakotakina piri iñaaga**
   “In the past your father enrolled me in the water.”

b. **Thame rowaga janta apatochawo iñaak akoyi amoshikatero**
   “Lets’ go there, we want to pull together water.”
The following implicature is obtained from a. and b.

c. *Ikoyi timatsi iñaa nampitsiki*
   “They wanted to have water in the community.”

This implicature would be the direct cause of the first consequence:

d. *Rootaki apuntatabetari*
   “That is why I was signed up.”

The second connective introduces the principal and general result and that degree of importance is reflected with the presence of the suffixes -ra and -kia:

e. *Rootakirakia nojeikaperantapaki niyowane nari jaka*
   “That is why I came to stay here.”

In a context of direct speech (7), the cause-consequence relation is established between the sentences involved. The speaker tells us that due to constant fighting between Asheninkas, a man named Carrillo complained it to others:

(7) “¿Itaka pantiri?” ikanti: “tekatsi, nomanata”, ikanti: “¿eeroka kirimari itaka powamantari pisheninka?”. *Ikanti rootakira Kariyoni ikanti rikamantake.*
   “What do you do?” they say: “nothing, shooting arrow” he say: “why you kill your partner?” They say that is why Carrillo says he has complained.

The cause-consequence relation is established between the implicature a., which is the causal premise, and b., which is the consequence.

a. *Irowamantakari asheninkapaeni*
   “The Asheninka were killing each other.”

b. *Rootakira Kariyoni rikamantake*
   “That is why Carrillo has complained.”

If we change the premises order, omitting rootakira, we are going to obtain a causal relation.

c. *Kariyoni rikamantake, irowamantakari asheninkapaeni*
   “Carrillo has complained, [because] the Asheninka where killing each other.”

In (8), we can observe also the anaphoric characteristic of rootaki.

(8) *Nopokantari nokoyi nokimijante rowaga congreso rootaki nopokantari.*
   I have come I want to listen to the congress that is why I have come.

The consequence that is introduced by rootaki is already known and is assumed by both the speaker and the listener, therefore rootaki only reinforces the idea. Note a. where the causal premise contained in b. is omitted.

a. *Nopokantari... rootaki nopokantari*
   “I have come ... that is why I have come.”

b. *Nokoyi nokimijante rowaga congreso*
   “I want to listen to the congress.”

Following this interview, the same speaker points out in detail the reasons for his presence in the community meeting and use rootaki in his argumentation to emphasize his presence at the meeting. The causal premise is *aapithate aipatite* “They are going to take our land.”

   I listened to that they are going to take our land here. That is why now I have come. It is said: “settlers now will take your land”. That is why I am coming.

In the dialog which is showed in (10), rootaki introduces a consequence and rootakira acts as an anaphora of the consequence that Lydia makes explicit:

(10) *Lydia: Rootaki pamantakavo.*
   “That is why you have brought her.”

   *Fanny: Jee, rootakira, okoyi iyote roori paerani ikamantakari pimi.*
   “Yes, that is why, she wants to know how your husband died.”
The premises that are in a cause-consequence relation are a. and b. In such an order:

a. *Okoyi iyote roori paerani ikamantakari pimi.*
   “She wants to know how your husband die.”

b. *Namantakawo*
   “I have brought her.”

Lydia does not use the connective as pronoun reference, but to introduce a consequence, since they already know the reason for the visit of the researcher.

### 4.2 Rojati connective

This connective has been described as an adverb in *Diccionario Ashéninka* by David Payne (1980) and its corresponding gloss is ‘just’ and ‘to’. Judith Payne (1989: 286) notes that *irojati* is an adverb that indicates the end of an action and the beginning of another, the translation she uses is ‘therefore’ and ‘so it is’.

#### 4.2.1 Morphosyntactic aspects

*Rojati* has a morphological structure based on the derivation of the pronoun *iro*- which can be feminine or neutral according to its referent. *Roja* is a demonstrative pronoun that means ‘she or it there’, where *-ja* is a locative adverbial suffix. Then *rojati* would be a verbalized pronoun, the result of the derivation of the demonstrative pronoun: *roja-t-i* (pronoun-epenthesis-time). It is important to mention that as a connective it can be inflected: it can be performed as *roja*, which is a contracting form, and as *rojatita* or *rojatikia* where the suffixes *-ta* and *-kia* are ways of showing emphasis.

*Rojati* is used to refer a feminine entity, that is, it usually has an implicit reference associated with female beings.

(11) *Rokakontanaro reentsite: rojati ironta, rojatikia ironta, jatatate Kirinka.*
   He left her daughters with me: she over there, she over there, and the one who went to Ucayali.

In (11) the speaker points directly at their daughters while uttering the phrase *rojati ironta* ‘she over there’. Clearly it is not working as a connective here but we are going to see it in the next section.

#### 4.2.2 Pragmatic aspects

*Rojati* links two units of discourse establishing a symmetrical sequence with a clear referential use associated with sequences where location is changed. In examples (12) and (13) we have the repetitive use of the connective separating each statement but linking them in a sequence.

(12) *Nopokaki jaka rojati nantarotapaka jaka niabitaka escuelaki rojatita noñantakari nayiri roja nantakari.*
   I came here then I grew up here I used to go to school then I found my husband then I joined him.

This form of discourse reveals a list of situations. In this case the referential use is put aside but the hearer, here it is more important to separate the information in sequences than to refer to an entity. However it is implicit in the context: *rojati* may refer to the place where each action happened, but that information is secondary in the understanding of the hearer.

In (13) the speaker recounts his itinerant stay between Kirahuanero and Bajo Chencorini communities seeking to be admitted as a member of one of them.

(13) *Nojeikabitaka, nojeikabitaka, roja nopokanta, roja eeja nojeikapa Bajo Chenkorini roja eejati namitapaero namptisi.*
   I used to live (there), then I came (here), then I was also in Bajo Chencorini, then I turned also in that community.

*Rojati* is used here to separate and to order units of information. So it introduces b, c and d, while highlighting the sequencing of the narrative:

a. *Nojeikabitaka naaka Bajo Chenkorini*
   “I stayed in Lower Chencorini.”

b. *Nopokanta naaka Kirahuanero*
   “I came to Kirahuanero.”

c. *Nojeikapa naaka Chenkorini*
   “I went to stay in Bajo Chencorini.”

d. *Namitapaero naaka namptisi*
   “I went to look for a community.”
In (14) and (15) the speaker employs rojati in a context that involves different locations. In both cases the connective implies the ending of an event and the beginning of another.

14) Nojeikabitaka pashinki nonampiki Chaña riteki. Rojati nopokanta jaka.
   I was in another community, Chañarite. Then I came here (Kirahuanero)

15) Nojeikapaki, nojeikapaki Quiterivoki, roja nojeikantabitakari Mapariki, roñashirenakahina waka
   I lived in Quiterivavo many years, and then, when I was living in Mapari, the cows annoyed me.

The example in (16) relates the intention to carry out two actions, here the connective is used to separate the events in temporal sequences:

16) Nayiri janta nocharineki izanaka rojati jatanaki Amaliakinta.
    I will take her there in my grandfather now and then I will go there in Amalia.

Rojati establishes a sequence of actions that are going to carry out as part of an itinerary; also this connective is used to make a list of actions in order to describe an activity. However it does not introduce the ending of the sequence as it happens in (17) and (18) where the speaker is telling how she makes a rustic rug.

17) Roñaka nohekawotni nowapintaki oshekitaki, rojati noshitashni maaweni; namini shibitha antamiki jata nina maninaminatni roja noshikapawo.
   Now I cut it and bring it when it is enough, then I fasten it; I look for a kind of bindweed in the jungle I look for it repeatedly then I fasten it.

18) Rowaga nimpitatiro nari noshitashi, nimpitatakiro roja, nobetikantakawo teka kameethanaki.
   This is what I twist, my rustic rug, I twist it and then I fix it if it is not good.

In (17) and (18) it could be said that roja refers to the bindweed or the rug, respectively, but it does not. In (17) the bindweed ‘shibitha’ appears as the pronominal suffix -wo in the verbal inflection of nohekawoti ‘I cut it’ and noshikapawo ‘I fasten it’. In (18) it is the demonstrative rowaga which has such a function.

19) Ikanti okantakiro: “¿Cha pikoyi? — piyoteinawo, piyoteinawo”; ikanti rojati okantanakawo: “Paminakotenawo nari”.
   It is said that she told her: “What do you want? - Show me, show me”, it is said that then she answered: “Look at me, doing it”

In (19) the connective links in a sequence of events the speech acts introduced by the verb -kant- ‘say’.

   a. okantakiro...
      “she said to her...”
   b. Okantanakawo...
      “she (someone else) said in response...”

Rojati connective function is to link the clauses a and b as part of a story. In this regard I must note that the prefix o- indicates a female reference, but in both cases the reference is different.

In (20) it is explained how to make a hole in the lower lip and placed an ornament. The connective rojati is used to show different acts in this process.

20) Notobiriashitaka rojati nantakawori okarenthatanaki.
   “I cut it then I do a hole when it gets slippery.”

5. Interpretation and conclusion

According to the morphosyntactic analysis, the connectives contractions are syllabic reduction and no morphological, while in the process of inflection the connectives have different morphemes related to the emotional state of speakers. These suffixes are two and are described in next table.

**Table 2. Admiring suffixes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>emphasis, urgency, focalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-kia</td>
<td>surprise, emphasis, intensity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another suffixes present in the connectives inflection are those that indicate reference -ri (third person masculine) -ra (location).

All suffixes are present in the verbal inflection and it was analyzing verbs that they were inventoried and classified (Payne, 1989; Mihas, 2010). The fact that they appear in the connectives inflection indicates the importance of the connectives on the final interpretation of the utterances.

### Table 3. Morphological variation of connectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Connectives</th>
<th>Grammatical Contraction</th>
<th>-rakia</th>
<th>-kia</th>
<th>-ta</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irootaki</td>
<td>roota</td>
<td>rootakirakia</td>
<td>rootakia</td>
<td>rootakirikia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irojati</td>
<td>roja</td>
<td>rojatirakia</td>
<td>rojatika</td>
<td>rojattita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, there is enough evidence for each connective to be considered a word belonging to a lexical category and to be defined by their function in the sentence.

According to the pragmatic analysis, it can be assumed that the procedural encoding of each connective is linked to the conceptual encoding of its root and to the meaning of the inflectional suffixes that give to the connective the final structure. The conceptual encoding is preserved and restricts the semantic instructions that define the possible inferences.

### Table 4. Balance between conceptual and procedural meaning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conective</th>
<th>Conceptual encoding</th>
<th>Procedural encoding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irootaki</td>
<td>Denotes the existence of a feminine or neuter being.</td>
<td>Consequence in relation to a previous cause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irojati</td>
<td>Denotes the existence of a feminine or neuter being.</td>
<td>Balanced or symmetrical sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column headed by “Procedural encoding” corresponds to the semantic instructions provided by the connectives in order to get an optimum understanding of the utterances. With regard to the conceptual encoding, this refers to the first idea that the connective in question evoke on the speaker without a specific context.

Irootaki is a connective that makes explicit the conclusions that can be obtained from the cause-consequence relation between utterances. The main characteristics of irootaki are: to give prominence to a location, not hierarchical order between the members of the discourse linked, the final conclusion is the result of the narrative sequence and referential feature inherent.
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