

UC Berkeley

Charlene Conrad Liebau Library Prize for Undergraduate Research

Title

Proto-Omagua-Kokama: Grammatical Sketch and Prehistory

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1vx978rq>

Author

O'Hagan, Zachary

Publication Date

2011-05-01

Proto-Omagua-Kokama:
Grammatical Sketch and Prehistory

Zachary J. O'Hagan
University of California, Berkeley

May 9, 2011

Acknowledgments

No linguistic work is possible without the native speakers of the thousands of languages that exist around the globe. I am thus foremost indebted to the speakers of Omagua, who have shared in countless hours of work the inner workings of their language: Lino Huanío Cabudiva, Alicia Huanío Cabudiva, Lazarina Cabudiva Tuisima, Arnaldo Huanaquiri Tuisima, Amelia Huanaquiri Tuisima and, posthumously, Manuel Cabudiva Tuisima. Their knowledge, dedication and good-humoredness made all of our work informative and immensely enjoyable. Second, I owe an immeasurable gratitude to my advisor, Professor Lev Michael, for introducing me to the Omagua language. His high expectations, detailed and constructive criticism and pervasive good-humoredness are the most one could ask for in an advisor. My second reader, Professor Andrew Garrett, provided a much needed differing perspective on the historical processes at work in Proto-Omagua-Kokama, and I wish I could do all of his remarks justice in this thesis. I would also like to thank my colleagues in the Omagua documentation project, which carried out fieldwork in San Joaquín de Omaguas, Perú, in the summer of 2010: Vivian Wauters, Tammy Stark and Clare Sandy. Their support and friendship in the field, as well as their insights into Omagua, have been invaluable. Zoela Huanaquiri Marín and Benedita del Águila Cabudiva, both of Iquitos, facilitated our all getting to know each other and brought many more speakers of Omagua into the fold than expected. Lastly, to my friends and family, who perhaps saw less of me during the writing of this than they or I would have liked, my love and appreciation.

Contents

1	Introduction	9
1.1	Language Introduction	11
1.2	Methodology and Sources	12
I	Proto-Omagua-Kokama	
	Root Structure	15
2	POK Verb Root Structure	17
2.1	PTG Person-Cross-Referencing Prefixes	18
2.2	PTG Suffixal Morphology	24
2.2.1	Nuclear Case	25
2.2.2	Serial Verbs	25
2.2.3	Oblique-Topicalized Construction	26
2.3	PTG Prefixes Frozen on POK Verbs	27
2.3.1	1SG.ERG <i>*a-</i>	28
2.3.2	1PL.INCL.ERG <i>*ja-</i>	28
2.3.3	3.ERG <i>*o-</i>	29
2.3.4	3.ABS <i>*i-</i> , <i>*ts-</i> and <i>*t-</i>	29
2.3.4.1	Verb Subclass 1A: <i>*i-</i> & <i>*∅</i>	30
2.3.4.2	Verb Subclass 1B: <i>*i-</i> & NASALIZATION	31
2.3.4.3	Verb Subclass 2A: <i>*ts-</i> & <i>*t-</i>	31
2.3.5	Unidentified <i>yu-</i>	32
2.3.6	PTG Stems Frozen from Subordinate Clauses	33
2.3.7	Summary of Frozen Prefixes by Predicate-Type	35
2.4	Patterning Across Verbs	35

2.4.1	Type of Predicate	36
2.4.2	Morphological Status of Person Prefix	38
2.4.3	Discourse Referent Frequency	38
2.4.4	Event Semantics	38
2.5	Remaining Distributions	40
2.5.1	Ergative Prefix Distribution	40
2.5.2	Absolutive Prefix Distribution	40
3	POK Postposition Root Structure	41
3.1	POK Postpositions Derived from TG Postpositions	42
3.2	POK Postpositions Not Derived from TG Postpositions	43
3.3	Non-Inherited PTG Postpositions	46
II	Topics in POK Grammatical Domains	49
4	POK Person-Marking	53
4.1	Omagua & Kokama Person-Marking	53
4.2	Historical Evidence for POK Person-Marking	56
4.2.1	Person-Marking Paradigms from Espinosa (1935)	57
4.2.2	Person-Marking Data from Jesuit Texts	59
4.3	POK Person-Marking Reconstruction	60
4.3.1	POK Person-Markers with Textual Evidence	61
4.3.2	POK Person-Markers with PTG Evidence	62
5	Nominalization	65
5.1	Agent Nominalizers: <i>*-tara</i> , <i>*-wara</i> & <i>*-suri</i>	65
5.2	Absolutive Nominalizers: <i>*-may</i> & <i>*-n</i>	69
5.3	Other Nominalizers	73
5.3.1	<i>*-ts^wár</i> ADVERBIAL.NOMZ	73
5.3.2	<i>*-wa</i> EVENT.NOMZ	75
5.3.3	<i>*-pan</i> ABUNDANTIVE.NOMZ	75
5.3.4	<i>*-ta</i> INSTRUMENTAL.NOMZ	76
6	Verbal Tense-Aspect-Mood	79
6.1	Desiderative and Tense	81
6.2	Verbal Aspectual Marking	88

6.3	Pluractionality	90
6.3.1	Distributivity & Frequentativity: Reduplication	91
6.3.2	Distributivity & Iterativity: <i>*-ka</i>	93
6.4	Epistemic Modality	95
6.4.1	Certainty: <i>*=tina</i>	95
6.4.2	Uncertainty: <i>*=taku</i>	98
6.4.3	Hypothetical: <i>*=mia</i>	99
7	Negation	103
7.1	Clausal Negation in Omagua & Kokama	104
7.2	PTG <i>*n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i</i>	105
7.3	PTG <i>*-e?im</i>	110
7.4	PTG <i>*ruã</i>	112
7.5	PTG <i>*eme</i>	114
7.6	Conclusions	115
8	Evaluatives	117
8.1	Diminutive <i>*-kira</i> & Augmentative <i>*-wasu</i>	117
8.2	Intensifiers	118
8.2.1	<i>*=katu</i>	118
8.2.2	<i>*-eté</i>	119
8.2.3	<i>*=semay</i>	119
8.3	Affective <i>=tfasu</i>	122
9	Concluding Remarks	123
A	Introduction to Historical Texts	125
B	<i>pater noster</i>	131
C	Catechism Fragment	135
D	Full Catechism	143

List of Tables

2.1	Proto-Tupí-Guaraní Cross-Referencing Prefixes	20
2.2	Subclasses of PTG Verb Roots	22
2.3	PTG Verb Subclass Examples	22
2.4	PTG Ergative-Absolutive Cross-Referencing, Polysyllabic Roots	23
2.5	PTG Absolutive-Only Cross-Referencing, Polysyllabic Roots	23
2.6	PTG Ergative-Absolutive Cross-Referencing, Monosyllabic Roots	24
2.7	Prefix Occurrence by Person of Arguments (C-Initial, Polysyllabic Root)	24
2.8	PTG Cross-Referencing Prefixes Frozen in POK	27
2.9	POK Roots with Frozen <i>*a-</i>	28
2.10	POK Roots with Frozen <i>*ja-</i> , Consonant-Initial Stems	29
2.11	Frozen <i>*i-</i> & <i>*ja-</i> on POK Vowel-Initial Roots	29
2.12	POK Roots with Frozen <i>*o-</i>	30
2.13	Groupings of PTG Verbal Predicates	30
2.14	Subclass 1A: POK Roots with Frozen <i>*i-</i>	31
2.15	Subclass 1A: POK Verb Roots Without Frozen Prefixes	32
2.16	Subclass 1B: POK /p/-Initial Verb Roots With Frozen <i>*i-</i>	33
2.17	Subclass 1B: POK Bare /p/-Initial Verb Roots	33
2.18	Subclass 2A: POK Verb Roots with Frozen <i>*ts-</i>	34
2.19	Subclass 2A: POK Verb Roots with Frozen <i>*t-</i>	34
2.20	Unidentified Frozen <i>yu-</i>	35
2.21	Trans. & Active Intrans. with Frozen <i>*i-</i> and <i>*ts-</i>	36
2.22	Summary of Prefixes by Predicate-Type	37
2.23	Semantic Distribution of POK Verbs By Frozen Prefix	39
3.1	PTG Postpositions & POK Inheritances	41

3.2	POK Postpositions Derived from TG Postpositions	42
3.3	POK Postpositions Not Derived from TG Postpositions	44
3.4	PTG Postpositions Not Inherited into POK	47
4.1	Modern Omagua Person-Markers	55
4.2	Modern Kokama Person-Markers	55
4.3	Kokama Person-Markers per Espinosa (1935)	57
4.4	Omagua Person-Markers per Espinosa (1935)	58
4.5	Proto-Omagua-Kokama Person-Markers	60
4.6	PTG Absolutive Prefixes & Free Pronouns	63
5.1	PTG & POK Nominalizers & Attestations	66
5.2	Distribution of <i>-may</i> ABS.NOMZ in Omagua	70
5.3	Kokama Nouns Derived with <i>-pan</i>	76
5.4	Omagua Nouns Derived with <i>-pa</i>	76
5.5	Omagua & Kokama Forms with <i>-ta</i> SC INSTR.NOMZ	77
6.1	PTG & POK TAM Categories & Forms	80
6.2	Omagua & Kokama Tense Enclitics	82
6.3	POK Tense Enclitics	85
6.4	Internal Reduplication of Leftmost Non-Initial CV in Kokama	92
6.5	Internal Reduplication of Initial CV.CV in Kokama	92
6.6	Other Reduplication Patterns in Kokama	93
7.1	PTG Negators, POK Reflexes & Attestations	103
7.2	POK Negators Derived from <i>*e?im</i>	110
8.1	PTG Evaluatives, POK Reflexes & Attestations	117
8.2	Kokama Roots Containing <i>-tseme</i>	121

Chapter 1

Introduction

This thesis treats grammatical correspondences between Proto-Omagua-Kokama, the parent language of modern Omagua and Kokama, and Proto-Tupí-Guaraní, the parent language of members of the Tupí-Guaraní language family. In reconstructing certain forms of Proto-Omagua-Kokama, it also treats grammatical correspondences between that proto-language, on the one hand, and Omagua and Kokama, on the other. Specifically, this work delineates correspondences between lexical roots, the person-marking system, nominalizers, TAM markers, negators and evaluatives.

Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK) is historically and linguistically intriguing because it does not appear to exhibit a genetic relationship with any language family. Rather, the genesis of POK involved the interaction of multiple languages, of which a Tupí-Guaraní (TG) language played a dominant role. As a result, both lexical and grammatical morphemes and constructions have origins in different languages. Evidence for the atypical genesis of Proto-Omagua-Kokama comes from the freezing of morphologically and semantically complex TG stems as unanalyzable roots; the inheritance of grammatical forms and constructions from various languages, some of which do not have functional equivalents in TG languages; the simplification of TG paradigms such as person-cross-referencing and of the treatment of syntactic phenomena such as dependent clauses; a low rate of lexical inheritance (i.e., reduction in forms in semantic domains such as kinship); and the emergence of a genderlect system.

Omagua and Kokama were originally classified as Tupí-Guaraní, principally due to lexical similarities with TG languages (McQuown, 1955; Rodrigues, 1958; Loukotka, 1968; Lemle, 1971). However, Rodrigues (1984) proposed that the grammars of Omagua and Kokama are so different from those of other TG languages that they were not classifiable as Tupí-Guaraní. In her doctoral dissertation, Ana Suelly Cabral (1995) demonstrated, given phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical ev-

idence, that Kokama cannot be genetically classified at all. She proposes that the genesis of Kokama occurred in a contact situation, wherein Tupinambá, a TG language, served as the lexifier, and other languages, at least one Arawakan, served as substrates. She claims that the majority of lexical items are TG, while the majority of grammatical morphemes are non-TG. In later work (Cabral and Rodrigues, 2003), she argues that this scenario was one of rapid creolization that occurred in Jesuit mission settlements. Her proposal accounts for the striking resemblance of Kokama lexical items to those of TG languages, and for its grammatical divergence from them. While this work similarly assumes a TG lexifier language, it does not assume Tupinambá to be that language.

Though path-breaking, there are limitations to Cabral's work. First, there is a lack of thorough analysis of the systematicity in the morphology frozen as part of complex TG stems. Second, her language consultants were speakers of Brazilian Kokama, which by the late 1980's and early 1990's (the time of fieldwork), was largely extinct (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 3). Thus some grammatical forms and structures are absent in her description, which weakens the claims that can be made about the simplification of Kokama grammar. This has been offset by fieldwork carried out by Rosa Vallejos Yopán among the Kokama and Kokamilla of Perú. This work, and recent Omagua fieldwork carried out by the author and colleagues, casts new light on the grammatical complexity of these languages and suggests that they are not the product of rapid creolization. Lastly, because of Cabral's focus on processes of simplification and substrate influence, there is a lack of discussion of the complexity of the TG forms and functions that were retained in POK.

The present work is thus motivated by two goals. First, an analysis of frozen PTG verbal and postpositional stems is given, which characterizes this historical process as more regular and rule-governed than argued in Cabral (1995). Second, an analysis of several different POK grammatical domains is given, which highlights areas of the grammar that show both the retention and lack of inheritance of PTG grammatical forms and constructions. The impetus underlying this second goal is to portray POK as grammatically complex in relation to PTG, and suggest that this complexity is not the result of rapid creolization. Given this division, the thesis is segmented into two parts, which is intended to reflect the different mechanisms whereby TG features were inherited into POK. That is, TG person-cross-referencing prefixes are the only forms that were inherited into POK as part of frozen stems. The grammatical forms and constructions that are the subject of Part II were either retained as productive grammatical morphemes, or not at all. Part II is not intended to be a comprehensive grammatical description of POK, nor does it capture all grammatical phenomena relevant to its purpose. Nevertheless, a principal result of the delineation of the ways in which POK resembles PTG is a more informed identification of a Tupí-Guaraní lexifier language.

Central to this thesis is its reliance on historical sources of Omagua. These come by way of

the early ethnolinguistic work of Father Lucas Espinosa (1935), as well as various 17th- and 18th-century Jesuit texts (Suárez, 1968; Uriarte, 1952, 1986; Hervás Y Panduro, 1787). In addition to the fieldwork done by Rosa Vallejos, the author and colleagues, these sources provide evidence of an even higher degree of retained grammatical complexity than would otherwise be known. That is, in some cases these retentions involve forms and structures that have fallen out of both Omagua and Kokama, and in other cases have been retained by only one of the daughter languages. The Jesuit texts are included in full, glossed and translated, in Appendices B, C & D. Appendix A introduces them further.

From here, §1.1 introduces the modern languages; §1.2 discusses the methodology involved in the reconstructions relevant to this work. Additional road maps are given at the outsets of Parts I & II. Before proceeding, it is necessary to clarify that, although modern Omagua and Kokama strongly resemble each other formally, grammatical differences obtain between the two which warrant treating them as logically separate entities for description. However, the two languages are more similar than dissimilar, such that it is not difficult to delimit the grammatical features of the proto-language. Thus the features of the genesis of POK outlined in the first paragraph hold equally for Omagua as well as for Kokama. As such, prior work done on Kokama can valuably inform, and in many cases stand in for, work on Omagua specifically and on POK more broadly. However, it will be made clear at all points which forms and constructions exist in which language. This is intended to add clarity to a scholarly tradition that has not dealt with Kokama and Omagua as separate entities (Cabral, 1995, 2007, 2011; Cabral and Rodrigues, 2003).

1.1 Language Introduction

At the time of European arrival in the New World, Omagua and Kokama were spoken across a wide region, from the Aguarico River in Ecuador to the Iça River in Brazil (Myers, 1992; Newsom, 1996; Oberem, 1967; Porro, 1981; Reeve, 1993). Today, these languages are spoken predominantly in the Departamento de Loreto, Perú. While speakers of Kokama may number over one thousand (Vallejos Yopán, 2010), there are likely less than twenty speakers of Omagua, none of whom is fully fluent.

Omagua is spoken by a portion of elderly residents and natives of San Joaquín de Omaguas, a village on the Amazon River south of Iquitos. Fieldwork in 2010 identified seven speakers of Omagua, ranging from 74 to 91 years old at the time of writing. There are varying degrees of fluency across these remaining speakers based on their level of fluency during youth and early adulthood, with some speakers appearing to have been fully fluent. In general, the most fluent speakers are women. It is assumed that other elders also possess some knowledge of the language, and future work aims

to collect data from as wide of a range of speakers as possible.

Kokama has two dialects: Kokama and Kokamilla. Kokama is spoken in the area surrounding Nauta, at the confluence of the Marañón and Ucayali rivers. Kokamilla is spoken near Lagunas, at the confluence of the Marañón and Huallaga. The principal differences between the two dialects, as well as between them and Omagua, are phonological. Phonologically, Omagua appears to be more closely related to the Kokama dialect, which reflects their closer geographic proximity.

Omagua and Kokama are typologically simple with regard to the absolute number of grammatical forms and structures. Many forms are unmarked across a variety of syntactic constructions (e.g., there is no nominal or verbal agreement), and many clause-level syntactic phenomena (e.g., conjunction and embedding) are often carried out via juxtaposition. This is illustrated by the Omagua sentences in (1.1) & (1.2).

(1.1) *ta sita umai yapisara yawara*

ta sita umai yapisara yawara
 1SG.MS want see man dog
 ‘I want/wanted to see the man’s dog.’

(1.2) *yapisara yawara sita umai ta*

yapisara yawara sita umai ta
 man dog want see 1SG.MS
 ‘The man’s dog wants/wanted to see me.’

Many TAM, reason and temporal clause-linking, and plural markers are non-obligatory clitics. Obligatory clitics include person-markers, spatial-relational markers and some purposives. There are few morphological suffixes, which include valence-changing morphology (e.g., *-ta* CAUS and *-ka* RECIP), nominalizers (Ch. 5) and evaluatives (Ch. 8).

1.2 Methodology and Sources

The reconstruction of Proto-Kokama-Omagua is an ongoing project, the work for which has been sectioned in various ways, carried out by various people, and informed by different kinds of data. The phonological and grammatical reconstruction of proto-forms is currently being carried out at the University of California, Berkeley, by the author and Vivian Wauters. The present work employs that data to make informed representations of the phonological shape and grammatical function of proto-forms. It is important to note that non-identity sound correspondences between Omagua and

Kokama are few, and mainly confined to minor vowel alternations and the spirantization of fricatives in Kokama. Oftentimes for the morphemes relevant to the reconstruction here, forms in the two languages are identical. In some cases, the Kokama forms represent truncated forms of Omagua cognates, which is a language-wide historical pattern, and for those we reconstruct the longer form, which shows TG cognates.

Data on Kokama comes from Vallejos Yopán (2004, 2005, 2009, 2010).¹ To a lesser extent contribute the works of Lucas Espinosa (1935) and Norma Faust of the Summer Institute of Linguistics (1959; 1963; 1971; 2008). Omagua data comes from fieldwork carried out by the author and colleagues at UC Berkeley; from a text corpus produced by Arnaldo Huanaquiri Tuisima; and from recordings produced in 2004 by Edinson Hamancayo Curi with Arnaldo Huanaquiri Tuisima and Manuel Cabudiva Tuisima.

The grammatical reconstruction relies on a synthesis of historical and current data. Data for Old Omagua comes from three 18th-century religious texts (Hervás Y Panduro, 1787; Uriarte, 1986; Suárez, 1968), as well as from various 18th and 19th century word lists (Gilij, 1965; Hervás Y Panduro, 1784, 1787; Adelung, 1813; Marcoy, 1866; von Martius, 1867; Castelnau, 1851; Orton, 1875; Vacas Galindo, Vacas Galindo). The provenance and authorship of the religious texts will be discussed extensively as part of Michael & O'Hagan (in prep), which treats them in their own right.

Proto-Tupí-Guaraní data comes from Cheryl Jensen (1989; 1990; 1998) and Charles Schleicher (1998). Jensen's work has been treated as primary in scholarship on TG languages, yet Schleicher's reconstruction diverges from hers in significant and informed ways. Schleicher employs extensive internal reconstruction to posit many aspects of Pre-PTG, which is crucial to explaining much of the synchronic irregularity in PTG. The use of PTG data here, then, occasionally derives from conflicting analyses, which will be noted. However, this is not problematic for the analysis of POK, as PTG data is used here to present POK against a TG grammatical frame, the true structure of which is informed by the the frozen TG stems and the retention of grammatical forms and functions in POK. In some cases, the analysis of the distribution of POK grammatical forms relies heavily on the grammar behind the distribution of their PTG/TG cognates. In these instances, the reader should bear in mind that these analyses may be subject to modification following the more detailed reconstruction of Proto-Tupí-Guaraní currently being carried at UC Berkeley by Michael et al.

¹At times I modify the glossing inherent in those works in order to better fit the discussion in this work, though these changes have no effect on the analyses presented by Vallejos Yopán.

Part I

**Proto-Omagua-Kokama
Root Structure**

Chapter 2

POK Verb Root Structure

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze the distribution of the person-cross-referencing prefixes of morphologically and semantically complex TG verb stems that were frozen as roots in POK. The sentences in (2.1) and (2.2), from modern Omagua and PTG, respectively, illustrate this process.

(2.1) *ra usu ra ukakati*

<i>ra</i>	<i>usu</i>	<i>ra</i>	<i>uka</i>	<i>=kati</i>
3SG.MS	go	3SG.MS	house	=ALLATIVE

‘He goes to his house.’

(2.2) **otsó tsóka koti*

<i>o-</i>	<i>tsó</i>	<i>ts-</i>	<i>ók</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>koti</i>
3.ERG	go	3.ABS	house	-REF	ALLATIVE

‘He goes to his house.’

Notice that Omagua *usu* ‘go’ is a root that derives from a combination of PTG 3.ABS **o-* and **tsó* ‘go’. Omagua *uka* ‘house’, on the other hand, does not exhibit the frozen 3.ABS prefix **ts-*. In addition to the overtly prefixed roots in (2.2), morphosemantically complex PTG verb stems consist of two other possible shapes: those with roots modified by morphophonological processes, such as nasalization; and those with no additional morphology. These latter two types consist of stems that function as deverbal nominals and generic nouns (see below). POK verb roots reflect all three of these stem shapes.

Despite the freezing of complex TG stems, POK also retained a large number of simple TG roots. The factors that determined whether a morphosemantically complex TG stem versus root were inherited are unclear. However, for those that do derive from complex stems, the types of frozen

forms are constrained and patterned: only a subset of TG prefixes and other morphophonological processes that cross-reference person on nouns, verbs and postpositions are reflected in POK roots. No suffixal morphology was frozen (though see §2.2). Furthermore, the particular prefix frozen is predictable based on two criteria: 1) the type of predicate (transitivity and semantic status); and 2) the morphological status of the prefix (bound vs. non-bound). Given the wider range of cross-referencing prefixes on verb roots (in comparison to nouns and postpositions), two further criteria serve to predict which prefix was frozen: 3) the discourse frequency of particular referents; and 4) the event semantics of the verb.

Chapter 2 is organized as follows: §2.1 introduces the PTG person-cross-referencing system, which constitutes the only prefixal morphology frozen as part of POK roots; §2.2 introduces three PTG suffixes, in order to show that no PTG suffixes were frozen in POK, though they may appear to have been upon initial inspection; §2.3, in a series of subsections, presents POK verb roots classified by what PTG prefix is frozen; §2.4 offers motivations for the distribution of TG prefixes across POK verb roots.

For the discussion of the PTG cross-referencing system, I rely on Cheryl Jensen's reconstruction of PTG morphosyntax (Jensen, 1989, 1998), and augment that analysis with the work of Charles Schleicher (1998). While a more current reconstruction of Proto-Tupí-Guaraní is being carried out by Michael et al., Jensen's work serves as a sufficient base. My goal is to identify TG roots, a task which is already realizable given extant cognate sets and other phonological reconstructions (Lemle, 1971; Mello, 2000). I diverge from Jensen's terminology in order to make it more transparent in explaining the respective phenomena it describes, which in turn captures generalizations in PTG grammar that are reflected in POK. I note these divergences throughout.

2.1 PTG Person-Cross-Referencing Prefixes

PTG main clause morphosyntax was governed by a split-ergative (active-stative) alignment system, and employed separate ergative and absolutive prefixes to mark person on verbs. Both ergative and absolutive prefixes appeared on a transitive verb given person-hierarchy restrictions (see below). Dependent clauses were strictly ergative, and only absolutive prefixes appeared on a transitive verb (i.e., coreferential S-arguments were not realized).¹ The ergative paradigm coöccurred with transitives and active intransitives, cross-referencing the A and S_A, as in (2.3) & (2.4), respectively.

¹Schleicher disagrees with Jensen in analyzing dependent clauses. He analyzes all dependent clauses as nominalizations, in which case the absolutive marking on dependent verbs is really possessive marking on nouns (cf., Schleicher (1998, p.220-227)). This analytical stance is unimportant here.

(2.3) *atsepják.

a- ts- epják
 1SG.ERG- 3.ABS- see
 ‘I see him/her/it.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 518)

(2.4) *aporatséj.

a- poratséj
 1SG.ERG- dance
 ‘I dance.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 517)

The absolutive paradigm coöccurred with monovalent predicates, cross-referencing S_P on stative intransitives (2.5), pronominal possessors ((2.10) & (2.11)) and pronominal arguments of postpositions; as well as with transitives, cross-referencing P (2.4).²

(2.5) *tʃé katú.

tʃé katú
 1SG.ABS be.good
 ‘I am good.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 499)

In addition, two other paradigms existed. Two portmanteau prefixes occurred on transitive verbs to cross-reference first-person subjects and second-person objects simultaneously, as in (2.6) & (2.7).

(2.6) *oroepják.

oro- epják
 2SG.PORT- see
 ‘I/we like you (SG).’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 522)

(2.7) *opoepják.

opo- epják
 2PL.PORT- see
 ‘I/we like you (PL).’
 (ibid.)

²This split was not categorical, as some statives received ergative prefixes (see Schleicher (1998, p.227-234)).

The final paradigm, formally similar to the ergative paradigm, was employed to mark coreferential persons across phrases and clauses. This paradigm crosscuts the the domains of the ergative and absolutive paradigms, cross-referencing both coreferential syntactic subjects on verbs and possessors on nouns. This is shown in (2.8)-(2.9), respectively.

(2.8) *atsó wiporatséjta.

a- tsó wi- poratséj -ta
 1SG.ERG- go 1SG.COREF- dance -SER
 ‘I went to dance.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 530)

(2.9) *otjĩ otsepják.

o- tjĩ o- ts- epják
 3.COREF- mother 3.ERG- 3.ABS- see
 ‘He saw his own mother.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 504)

Lastly, a series of independent pronouns existed, which coöccured with the cross-referencing prefixes. There was no third-person independent pronoun, and the third-person prefixes of the other paradigms were underspecified for number (i.e., could denote singular or plural referents). Ergative, absolutive, portmanteau and coreferential will be used as shorthand to refer to these paradigms, respectively. This terminology differs from Jensen, who refers to the ergative prefixes as Set 1, absolutive prefixes as Set 2, coreferential prefixes as Set 3 and portmanteau prefixes as Set 4. Table 2.1, adapted from Jensen (1998), summarizes these forms. Gray shading indicates that no form existed.

Table 2.1: Proto-Tupí-Guaraní Cross-Referencing Prefixes

	ERG	ABS	PORT	CO-REF	Free Pronouns
1SG	a-	tjé (r-)		wi-	itjé
1PL.EXCL	oro-	oré (r-)		oro-	oré
1PL.INCL	ja-	jané (r-)		jere-	jané
2SG	ere-	né (r-)	oro-	e-	ené
2PL	pe-	pé (n-)	opo-	peje-	pe...ẽ
3	o-	i-, ts-, t-		o-	

Third-person absolutive markers are morphologically bound (henceforth absolutive prefixes), while absolutive markers for all other persons are not (henceforth absolutive markers). The epenthetic segments **r-* and **n-* (in parentheses) occur when an absolutive marker precedes a vowel-initial root, but does not when it precedes a consonant-initial root, as in (2.10) & (2.11).³

(2.10) *tʃé tʃi

tʃé tʃi
 1SG.ABS mother
 ‘my mother’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 499)

(2.11) *tʃé ruḅ

tʃé r- uḅ
 1SG.ABS EPNTH- father
 ‘my father’
 (ibid.)

Likewise, the third-person prefixes **ts-* and **t-* attaches to vowel-initial roots, while **i-* attaches to consonant-initial roots. Given these distributions, it appears that word-level phonotactic constraints dispreferred vowel hiatus across morpheme boundaries. As a result, third-person prefixes (which Gildea (2002) argues to be older) resolve hiatus with different allomorphs. The remaining absolutive markers (argued to be younger, derived from the free pronouns (ibid.)) resolve hiatus via the epenthesis of **r-* and **n-*. These processes crosscut verbs, nouns and postpositions. However, note that vowel hiatus does occur elsewhere in the system, as with all ergative and coreferential prefixes.

The epenthetic **r-* has been heavily debated in TG studies, and is most often referred to as the “linking prefix”.⁴ In this tradition, all inflectable roots are split into two classes, one whose forms take the linking prefix (Class 2), and one whose forms do not (Class 1). I maintain this class terminology, because there is a small set of vowel-initial roots that select 3.ABS **i-*, and before which no epenthetic segment occurs. In light of this, a phonotactic constraint is not a complete predictor of prefix selection.⁵ These subclasses are summarized in Table 2.2, from Jensen (1998). Note that **jo-* and **jots-* occurred instead of **i-* and **ts-* on monosyllabic roots.⁶

³Epenthesis also takes place between two nouns in a possessive relationship.

⁴Payne (1994) has argued that the *r-* is an inverse marker.

⁵Jensen suggests that the V-initial roots which select **i-* were at one time consonant-initial. (Schleicher (1998, p. 129) concurs with this analysis.) She similarly reconstructs consonant-initial roots for some Wayampí forms that are synchronically vowel-initial (Jensen, 1989, p. 87).

⁶See Schleicher (1998, p. 113-135) for a more thorough discussion of these “form classes”.

Table 2.2: Subclasses of PTG Verb Roots

	Subclass	3.ABS	Deverbal
C-Initial	1A	i- ~ jo-	ROOT
	1B	i- ~ jo-	#C → [+nasal]
V-Initial	2A	ts- ~ jots-	t-

Deverbal nominals could also be derived from verbs, yielding forms similar to, and sometimes identical to the original verb. Different morphophonological processes derived these forms, which further split Class 1 into two subclasses. Class 1A consists of vowel-initial roots that likely previously had onsets (see above) and consonant-initial roots that do not begin with /p/. These forms underwent no change to form deverbal nominals. Class 1B consists of /p/-initial roots only. Initial /p/ was nasalized to form deverbal nominals. Class 2A consists of all other vowel-initial roots, which were prefixed by *t-.⁷ Table 2.3 exemplifies these subclasses.

Table 2.3: PTG Verb Subclass Examples

	Subclass	Example	Gloss
C-Initial	1A	*i-kér	‘he sleeps’
		*tʃé kér	‘I sleep’
		*kér	‘sleeping’
	1B	*i-poratséj	‘he dances’
		*tʃé poratséj	‘I dance’
		*moratséj	‘dancing’
V-Initial	2A	*ts-ekó	‘he is’
		*tʃé r-ekó	‘I am’
		*t-ekó	‘being’

In addition to the syntactic (transitive or intransitive) and semantic (active or stative) properties of the predicate, a person hierarchy (where 1 > 2 > 3) additionally governs cross-referencing on verbs, whereby only the hierarchically superior argument is cross-referenced on transitive verbs,

⁷Class 2A is used here instead of Class 2, because additional subclasses of vowel-initial roots exist for nouns.

except when A is first-person and P is third-person, in which case both A and P are cross-referenced by the ergative and absolutive prefixes, respectively, as in Table 2.4.⁸ The use of 3.ABS prefixes to cross-reference P on transitive verbs has fallen out of some daughter languages. However, such languages still preserve absolutive prefixes on intransitive verbs.

Table 2.4: PTG Ergative-Absolutive Cross-Referencing, Polysyllabic Roots

SUBJECT	C-Initial	Gloss	V-Initial	Gloss
1SG	a-i-potár	I want him/her/it	a-ts-epják	I see him/her/it
1PL.EXCL	oro-i-potár	We want him/her/it	oro-ts-epják	We see him/her/it
1PL.INCL	ja-i-potár	We want him/her/it	ja-ts-epják	We see him/her/it
2SG	ere-i-potár	You want him/her/it	ere-ts-epják	You see him/her/it
2PL	pe-i-potár	You want him/her/it	pe-ts-epják	You see him/her/it
3	o-i-potár	He/she/it wants him/her/it	o-ts-epják	He/she/it sees him/her/it

When A is second- or third-person, only the absolutive prefix occurs, as in Table 2.5.

Table 2.5: PTG Absolutive-Only Cross-Referencing, Polysyllabic Roots

OBJECT	C-Initial	Gloss	V-Initial	Gloss
1SG	tʃé potár	He/she/it wants me	tʃé repják	He/she/it sees me
1PL.EXCL	oré potár	He/she/it wants us	oré repják	He/she/it sees us
1PL.INCL	jané potár	He/she/it wants us	jané repják	He/she/it sees us
2SG	né potár	He/she/it wants you	né repják	He/she/it sees you
2PL	pé potár	He/she/it wants you	pé nepják	He/she/it sees you
3	o-i-potár	He/she/it wants him/her/it	o-ts-epják	He/she/it sees him/her/it

Monosyllabic predicates received different 3.ABS prefixes, as in Table 2.6.

Table 2.22 summarizes the prefixes that appear on verbs with A and P of different person (adapted from Jensen (1998, p. 524)). Question marks indicate that there is no discussion in the PTG literature of the relevant form, although contexts with verbal arguments of these persons seem pragmatically uncommon. Grayed cells indicate that contexts with verbal arguments of those

⁸When A is first person and P is second person, the portmanteau prefixes are used.

Table 2.6: PTG Ergative-Absolutive Cross-Referencing, Monosyllabic Roots

SUBJECT	C-Initial	Gloss	V-Initial	Gloss
1SG	a-jo-pín	I plane it	a-jots-éj	I wash him/her/it
1PL.EXCL	oro-jo-pín	We plane it	oro-jots-éj	We wash him/her/it
1PL.INCL	ja-jo-pín	We plane it	ja-jots-éj	We wash him/her/it
2SG	ere-jo-pín	You plane it	ere-jots-éj	You wash him/her/it
2PL	pe-jo-pín	You plane it	pe-jots-éj	You wash him/her/it
3	o-jo-pín	He/she/it plane it	o-jots-éj	He/she/it wash him/her/it

persons are semantically incongruous. The reflexive prefix **je-* occurs following the ergative prefix when A and P are identical. The portmanteau prefixes **oro-* and **opo-* are underspecified with regard to the number of A. The occurrence of **tʃé* 1SG.ABS and **oré* 1PL.EXCL.ABS on transitive verbs is ambiguous as to whether A is second- or third-person.

Table 2.7: Prefix Occurrence by Person of Arguments (C-Initial, Polysyllabic Root)

		P-Argument					
		1SG	1PL.EXCL	1PL.INCL	2SG	2PL	3
A-Argument	1SG	a-je-	?	?	oro-	opo-	a-i-
	1PL.EXCL	?	oro-je-		oro-	opo-	oro-i-
	1PL.INCL	?		ja-je-			ja-i-
	2SG	tʃé	oré	?	ere-je-		ere-i-
	2PL	tʃé	oré	?		pe-je-	pe-i-
	3	tʃé	oré	jané	né	pé	o-i-

2.2 PTG Suffixal Morphology

All POK roots are vowel-final, despite the fact that both vowel- and consonant-final roots exist in PTG. POK roots that are cognate to PTG consonant-final roots end in either /a/ or /i/, which makes it appear as if these forms exhibit frozen suffixal morphology, namely from the PTG “nuclear

case” suffix $*-a \sim *-\emptyset$, the serial verb suffix $*-a \sim *-\acute{a}bo \sim *-ta$, or the oblique-topicalized suffix $*-i \sim *-w$. These suffixes are presented in §§2.2.1-2.2.3, respectively, in order to show that POK final /a/ and /i/ are not attributable to these suffixes.

2.2.1 Nuclear Case

In PTG, consonant-final roots are predicative, despite whether they are otherwise classified as nouns or verbs. Vowel-final roots, on the other hand, may be either predicative or referential. In order for consonant-final roots to function referentially, they must end in /a/, which has traditionally been considered a “nuclear case” suffix $*-a$. However, $*-a$ only attaches to consonant-final roots when functioning referentially (note the $*-\emptyset$ “allomorph” for vowel-final roots). This is shown in the Tupinambá sentence in (2.12).⁹

(2.12) *kujã osarõ omemira serekóbo.*

<i>kujã</i>	<i>-∅</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>s-</i>	<i>arõ</i>	<i>o-</i>	<i>memir</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>s-</i>
woman	-NUCL	3.ERG-	3.ABS-	care.for	3.COREF-	child.of.woman	-NUCL	3.ABS-
<i>erekó</i>	<i>-bo</i>							
keep.with	-SER							

‘The woman cares for her child, keeping it with her.’
(Jensen, 1998, p. 506)

In light of this, it seems more accurate to say that words of a certain class (nouns) have certain phonotactic requirements, namely that they end in a vowel. This also avoids the descriptive awkwardness of calling $*-a$ a suffix. For glossing purposes, however, I continue to segment it as if it were a suffix, though I gloss it as REF, for referential.

In addition to exhibiting a final /a/ on roots that are cognate to PTG consonant-final roots, POK roots exhibit a final /a/ on roots that are cognate to PTG **vowel**-final roots, which suggests that the appearance of /a/ on these forms in POK is not derivative of the same phonotactic constraints present in PTG, but from a broader phonotactic constraint that all roots be vowel-final. In some cases /a/ was the vowel used to satisfy this constraint, while in other cases it was /i/ (cf., §2.2.3).

2.2.2 Serial Verbs

Jensen (1998) distinguishes her nuclear case suffix $*-a \sim *-\emptyset$ from the serial verb suffix $*-a \sim *-\acute{a}bo \sim *-ta$. This is in line with her treatment of functionally serial verbs as a dependent clause-type. Schleicher (1998), on the other hand, considers the serial verb suffixes event nominalizers (his

⁹I modify the glosses of cross-referencing prefixes from the original.

“gerundives”), which fits his analysis of serial verbs (really all dependent clauses) as nominals. He does not discuss any nuclear case suffix, and it is unclear if he considers the event nominalizers to stand in for the former, i.e., to allow consonant-final roots to function referentially. If that is the case, referential nouns would exhibit additional allomorphy in comparison to Jensen’s analysis, additionally ending in **-áħo* or **-ta*.

Serial verbs were employed in purposive constructions, as shown in (2.13). Alignment is pure ergative-absolutive, and only S and P are cross-referenced on the verb, i.e., coreferential A is not realized.¹⁰

(2.13) **otsó imoʔéħo*

<i>o-</i>	<i>tsó</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>moʔé</i>	<i>-ħo</i>
3.ERG	go	3.ABS	teach	SER
‘He went to teach him.’				
(Jensen, 1998, p. 529)				

Despite the fact that PTG stems were frozen from both independent and dependent clauses (see §2.3.6), I argue that the serial verb suffixes were not frozen because the serial verb suffix was retained as a productive morpheme *-wa* EVENT.NOMZ (see §5.3.2).¹¹ There are no other instances wherein a grammatical morpheme was retained as a productive morpheme and inherited via a frozen stem.

2.2.3 Oblique-Topicalized Construction

In PTG sentences with a fronted adverbial (adverb, postpositional phrase, or temporal subordinate clause), the verb is suffixed by **-i* (consonant-final roots) or **-w* (vowel-final roots), as in (2.14). Jensen (1998) calls this the oblique-topicalized construction (OBTOP).¹² Though not synchronically a dependent clause-type, alignment in oblique-topicalized constructions is strictly ergative-absolutive, and only S & P are cross-referenced.

(2.14) **kwetsé iʔári*

<i>kwetsé</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>ʔári</i>	<i>-i</i>
yesterday	3.ABS-	fall	-OBTOP

¹⁰In Schleicher’s analysis, this is simply possessive marking on nouns.

¹¹Note that POK *-wa* EVENT.NOMZ is an example of a generalization whereby a single PTG allomorph came to attach to roots of all shape. (This is additionally known to have occurred with the agentive nominalizer (see §5.1).) It is possible that, with this pattern in mind, the appearance of referential **-a* on POK roots that are cognate to PTG vowel-final roots is attributable to a similar generalization.

¹²Other authors have referred to it as an “inverted sentence” (Bendor-Samuel, 1972), “Indicative II” (Rodrigues, 1953) and the “circumstantial” (Rodrigues, 1981) (see Jensen (1998, p. 526)).

‘Yesterday he fell.’
(Jensen, 1998, p. 526)

While many POK verbs end in /i/, I argue that /i/ is merely another segment used to satisfy the phonotactic constraint on vowel-final roots. This is because, given the alignment and cross-referencing described above, all /i/-final POK roots should exhibit frozen absolutive prefixes only. However, /i/-final roots show both frozen ergative and absolutive prefixes, which would have been an ungrammatical verb stem in PTG.¹³

In §2.3, final segments that are not part of TG cognate roots have been segmented, despite the fact that such segments are not attributable to TG suffixes. In cases where roots exhibiting the same prefix also exhibit a variety of final segments, examples are given to demonstrate this.

2.3 PTG Prefixes Frozen on POK Verbs

This section describes the PTG cross-referencing prefixes frozen in POK roots, in order to show that, when freezing occurred, it was regular and largely predictable. Subsections 2.3.1-2.3.6 are organized by POK roots that show a particular frozen prefix. Data is given in a series of tables that compare frozen POK roots with the segmentation of productive PTG morphemes. Morphosemantic characteristics of the POK predicates of each category are discussed.

Frozen cross-referencing prefixes are a subset of the ergative and absolutive paradigms, and consist of 1SG.ERG *a-, 1PL.EXCL.ERG *ja-, 3.ERG *o- and 3.ABS *i-, *ts- and *t-. Table 2.8 recalls the overall paradigm with frozen prefixes in boldface.

Table 2.8: PTG Cross-Referencing Prefixes Frozen in POK

	ERG	ABS	PORT	COREF	Free Pronouns
1SG	a-	tʃé (r-)		wi-	itʃé
1PL.EXCL	oro-	oré (r-)		oro-	oré
1PL.INCL	ja-	jané (r-)		jere-	jané
2SG	ere-	né (r-)	oro-	e-	ené
2PL	pe-	pé (n-)	opo-	peje-	pe...ẽ
3SG	o-	i-, ts-, t-		o-	

¹³Note that the lack of /w/-final roots in POK is not an argument against the /i/-final roots deriving from oblique-topicalized verbs, for two reasons. First, if POK phonotactics required all roots to be vowel-final, /w/ would have been dispreferred anyway. Second, other morphemes are known to have generalized one allomorph to all word shapes.

Non-third-person absolutive markers were not frozen, such that all frozen forms are bound morphemes. POK roots show all three 3.ABS allomorphs, which indicates that the full range of root subclasses was present in the lexifier language. Furthermore, no coreferential prefixes were frozen.¹⁴ There are two potential reasons for this. On the one hand, coreferential prefixes have a narrower distribution in discourse than other prefixes; on the other hand, some TG daughter languages have lost all non-third-person forms, and it may be that the lexifier language had similarly lost these forms prior to the genesis of POK. Lastly, frozen cross-referencing prefixes indicate that POK verb stems were frozen out of both main (§§2.3.1-2.3.4) and subordinate (§2.3.6) clauses.

2.3.1 1SG.ERG **a-*

POK forms with frozen 1SG.ERG **a-* are transitive or active intransitive verbs, as in Table 2.9.

Table 2.9: POK Roots with Frozen **a-*

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
<i>apuka</i>	‘laugh’	<i>a-</i>	<i>puka</i>	∅	‘I laugh’
<i>apupuri</i>	‘cook’	<i>a-</i>	<i>pupur</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘I cook’
<i>atika</i>	‘throw’	<i>a-</i>	<i>tik</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘I throw’

2.3.2 1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-*

POK forms with frozen *1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-* are also transitive or active intransitive verbs, as in Table 2.10.

In addition to the preceding forms beginning with /*ja*/, another prefix-root combination yielded the same surface result [*ja*]. That is, because POK phonology does not permit vowel hiatus between identical vowels in polysyllabic words, /*a*/-initial PTG roots prefixed with 1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-* or 3.ABS **i-* both surface as [*ja*]. Given the way that frozen cross-referencing morphology patterns with respect to verbal semantic characteristics (see §2.1 & §2.4.1), we would expect that stative vowel-initial verb roots would take **i-* (or **ts-*), while active verb roots would take **ja-*. Note that this reasoning entails that *i*-prefixed vowel-initial roots belonged to subclass 1A, i.e., formerly had

¹⁴One form, *ikwani* ‘go.IMP’ (a morphologically irregular imperative of ‘go’) shows a frozen 2SG.IMP prefix **e-* not described above, one of two prefixes (with **pe-*) that occurred on imperatives (Tupinambá *ekûâi* (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 92), Kamaiurá has a cognate root for imperative ‘go’ *kwã* (Seki, 2000)).

Table 2.10: POK Roots with Frozen **ja-*, Consonant-Initial Stems

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	<i>yapita</i>	‘stay’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>pituʔu</i>	\emptyset	‘We stay’
	<i>yaparafi</i>	‘dance’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>poratséj</i>	\emptyset	‘We dance’
	<i>yaupara</i>	‘flee’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>upar</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We plant’
	<i>yawafima</i>	‘arrive’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>watfem</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We arrive’
Transitive	<i>yatima</i>	‘plant’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>tim</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We plant’
	<i>yapifika</i>	‘grab’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>pitsik</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We grab’

onsets. Comparative exemplars are given in Table 2.11.

Table 2.11: Frozen **i-* & **ja-* on POK Vowel-Initial Roots

		POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
		Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	<i>i-</i> stems	<i>yapara</i>	‘be twisted’	<i>i-</i>	<i>apar</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘It is twisted’
		<i>yapua</i>	‘be round’	<i>i-</i>	<i>apua</i>	\emptyset	‘It is round’
	<i>ja-</i> stems	<i>yapika</i>	‘sit down’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>apik</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We sit down’
		<i>yasuka</i>	‘bathe’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>asuk</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘We bathe’
Transitive	<i>ja-</i> stems	<i>yasai</i>	‘cover’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>asai</i>	\emptyset	‘We cover’
		<i>yatika</i>	‘bite, prick’	<i>ja-</i>	<i>atika</i>	\emptyset	‘We prick’

2.3.3 3.ERG **o-*

POK forms with frozen 3.ERG **o-* are consonant-initial, active intransitive verbs, as in Table 2.12.¹⁵

2.3.4 3.ABS **i-*, **ts-* and **t-*

Recall that, unlike all other cross-referencing prefixes, roots of different subclasses take different allomorphs of the third-person absolute prefix. In addition, each subclass employed a unique

¹⁵The only exception is POK *umai* ‘see’, which derives from TG cognates for ‘look’ INTR (cf., Tapirapé *maʔé*).

Table 2.12: POK Roots with Frozen **o-*

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
<i>ukai</i>	‘burn’	<i>o-</i>	<i>kay</i>	\emptyset	‘He/she/it burns’
<i>umanu</i>	‘die’	<i>o-</i>	<i>manõ</i>	\emptyset	‘He/she/it dies’
<i>ufima</i>	‘leave’	<i>o-</i>	<i>tʃem</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it leaves’
<i>upaka</i>	‘wake up’	<i>o-</i>	<i>pak</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it wakes up’
<i>uwari</i>	‘fall down’	<i>o-</i>	<i>ʔar</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘He/she/it falls down’
<i>uyupi</i>	‘descend’	<i>o-</i>	<i>jip</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘He/she/it descends’

morphophonological process to derive deverbal nominals. This is summarized again in Table 2.13.

Table 2.13: Groupings of PTG Verbal Predicates

	Subclass	3.ABS Allomorph	Deverbal
C-Initial	1A	i-	ROOT
	1B	i-	#C → [+nasal]
V-Initial	2A	ts-	t-

Because the cross-referencing of person and the derivation of deverbal nominals combine to delimit these subclasses, subsections 2.3.4.1-2.3.4.3 treat the relics of these morphophonological processes on POK roots together. Section 2.3.4.1 treats Subclass 1A; §2.3.4.2 treats Subclass 1B; and §2.3.4.3 treats Subclass 2A.

2.3.4.1 Verb Subclass 1A: **i-* & * \emptyset

Verbs that exhibit the relics of the morphophonological processes of this subclass consist of stative intransitives that are vowel-initial or begin with a consonant that is not /p/. Table 2.14 gives vowel- and consonant-initial overtly prefixed with **i-*.¹⁶

Furthermore, some consonant-initial verb roots that do not begin with /p/ show no overt cross-referencing, as shown in Table 2.15. These forms correspond to the deverbal nominals of Subclass

¹⁶Vowel-initial roots were additionally presented in Table 2.11.

Table 2.14: Subclass 1A: POK Roots with Frozen *i-

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
V-Initial	<i>yapara</i>	‘be twisted’	<i>i-</i>	<i>apar</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘It is twisted’
	<i>yapua</i>	‘be round’	<i>i-</i>	<i>apua</i>	∅	‘He/she/it is round’
C-Initial	<i>iruru</i>	‘be swollen’	<i>i-</i>	<i>ruru</i>	∅	‘He/she/it is swollen’
	<i>irawa</i>	‘be bitter’	<i>i-</i>	<i>rap</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘It is bitter’
	<i>ikiana</i>	‘be dry’	<i>i-</i>	<i>kan</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it is dry’
	<i>ikira</i>	‘be green’	<i>i-</i>	<i>kir</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it is green’

1A. They are stative intransitive, active intransitive and transitive verb roots beginning with /t/, /k/, /ts/, /tʃ/ and /j/. It is impossible to know whether these roots derive from deverbal nominals or simplex verb roots that were retained without frozen prefixes.

2.3.4.2 Verb Subclass 1B: *i- & NASALIZATION

Verbs that exhibit the relics of the morphophonological processes of this subclass consist of stative and active intransitive roots that begin with /p/. POK verb roots show reflexes of PTG stems overtly prefixed with *i-, given exhaustively in Table 2.16. No deverbal nominals (#p → m) have been found for this subclass.¹⁷

Furthermore, some POK verbs have /p/ onsets, which was not a surface realization of any PTG verb stem. Either a /p/-initial verb was prefixed by *i-* or the /p/ was nasalized. Exemplars are given in Table 2.17.

These forms provide proof that PTG **roots** were frozen, and not just morphosemantically complex stems. Note, however, it is still impossible to differentiate the forms in Table 2.15 as semantically simplex or as deverbal nominals, since both are identical for that subclass.

2.3.4.3 Verb Subclass 2A: *ts- & *t-

Verbs that exhibit the relics of the morphophonological processes of this subclass are stative or active intransitives that are vowel-initial. Stative exemplars are given in Table 2.18.

¹⁷Some POK nouns exhibit this nasalization, cf., §??.

Table 2.15: Subclass 1A: POK Verb Roots Without Frozen Prefixes

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	<i>kwaruka</i>	‘urinate’	\emptyset	<i>karuk</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘urinating’
	<i>kapi</i>	‘defecate’	\emptyset	<i>kaʔaβ</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘defecating’
	<i>kuru</i>	‘smallpox’	\emptyset	<i>koroj</i>	\emptyset	‘roughness’
	<i>sapukui</i>	‘summon’	\emptyset	<i>tsapukaj</i>	\emptyset	‘shouting’
	<i>tini</i>	‘be white’	\emptyset	<i>tin</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘whiteness’
	<i>yafú</i>	‘cry’	\emptyset	<i>jatseʔo</i>	\emptyset	‘crying’
Transitive	<i>karay</i>	‘scratch’	\emptyset	<i>karãy</i>	\emptyset	‘scratching’
	<i>kwatiara</i>	‘write’	\emptyset	<i>kwatiar</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘drawing’
	<i>susu</i>	‘suck’	\emptyset	<i>tʃuʔu</i>	\emptyset	‘biting’
	<i>turuka</i>	‘shake out’	\emptyset	<i>torok</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘ripping’

POK verb roots that derive from the deverbal nominals of this subclass are stative intransitives, active intransitives and transitives, as shown in Table 2.19.

2.3.5 Unidentified *yu-*

Some POK verbs exhibit a frozen morpheme *yu-*, as listed exhaustively in Table 2.20. The final two forms are not assured members of this class.

The sequence *yu-* is currently unidentified, although two possibilities as to its origin may be raised. First, these forms may have originally begun with 1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-*, which subsequently raised to /u/ via an unknown sound change. However, note that a [+round] segment either immediately follows *yu-* or appears nearby in the word. That suggests a process of rounding assimilation. If that is the mechanism, then **ja-* is likely not the origin, given the forms in Table 2.10 with [+round] segments in a similar position that did not undergo rounding assimilation. Second, *yu-* may be a reflex of the reciprocal **jo-*, as shown in the Tupinambá example in (2.15).

(2.15) jajokutúk.

<i>ja-</i>	<i>jo-</i>	<i>kutúk</i>
1PL.INCL.ERG-	RECIP-	pierce

Table 2.16: Subclass 1B: POK /p/-Initial Verb Roots With Frozen *i-

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
<i>ipu</i>	‘sound’	<i>i-</i>	<i>pu</i>	∅	‘It sounds’
<i>ipuku</i>	‘be long’	<i>i-</i>	<i>puku</i>	∅	‘He/she/it is long’
<i>ipufi</i>	‘be heavy’	<i>i-</i>	<i>potsij</i>	∅	‘He/she/it is heavy’

Table 2.17: Subclass 1B: POK Bare /p/-Initial Verb Roots

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	<i>prwa</i>	‘be flat’	∅	<i>peβ</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘be flat’
	<i>pitani</i>	‘be red’	∅	<i>pitani</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘be red’
Transitive	<i>piruka</i>	‘peel’	∅	<i>pirok</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘peel’

‘We pierced each other.’
(Jensen, 1998, p. 535)

Note, however, that **jo-* occurs between an ergative prefix and the root, and not by itself. Furthermore, some verbs would be semantically odd as reciprocals, e.g., ‘swallow each other’.

2.3.6 PTG Stems Frozen from Subordinate Clauses

A large number of transitive and active intransitive POK verbs are frozen with the third-person absolutive prefixes **i-* and **ts-*. A selection of them is shown in Table 2.21.

I argue that these forms derive from frozen subordinate verbs. Recall that cross-referencing on subordinate verbs follows a pure ergative-absolutive alignment, and that only S and P are cross-referenced on the subordinate verb. This is shown for intransitives in Tupinambá in (2.16) and for transitives in Asuriní do Tocantins in (2.17).

(2.16) *sjé sóreme...*

sjé *só* *-reme*
1SG.ABS go -SUBORD

Table 2.18: Subclass 2A: POK Verb Roots with Frozen **ts-*

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
<i>saku</i>	‘be hot’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>akub</i>	\emptyset	‘He/she/it is hot’
<i>sariwa</i>	‘be happy’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>orib</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it is happy’
<i>suní</i>	‘be black’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>un</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘He/she/it is black’

Table 2.19: Subclass 2A: POK Verb Roots with Frozen **t-*

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Stative Intr.	<i>tipi</i>	‘be deep’	<i>t-</i>	<i>ipi</i>	\emptyset	‘depth’
	<i>tiwiti</i>	‘be smelly’	<i>t-</i>	<i>ewut</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘smelliness’
	<i>timisama</i>	‘be full’	<i>t-</i>	<i>iniséma</i> (Tb.)	?	‘fullness’
Active Intr.	<i>tapiara</i>	‘delay’	<i>t-</i>	<i>apearō</i> (Tb.)	\emptyset	‘delaying’
Transitive	<i>takita</i>	‘nail’	<i>t-</i>	<i>akitá</i> (Tb.)	\emptyset	‘nailing’

‘If/when I go...’
(Jensen, 1998, p. 528)

(2.17) *inoporamo...*

i- nopo -ramo
3.ABS- hit -SUBORD
‘When (someone) hits him/her/it...’
(ibid.)

In this analysis, POK intransitive roots with frozen absolutive prefixes derive from the intransitives of constructions like (2.16), while transitive roots with frozen absolutive prefixes derive from the transitive verbs of constructions like (2.17). This analysis also clarifies the ambiguity in the prefixing of /a/-initial verb roots described in §2.3.2. That is, /a/-initial transitive verb roots may have been frozen from a main clause, in which case they were frozen prefixed by 1PL.INCL **ja-* and cross-referenced for A, or from dependent clauses, in which case they were frozen prefixed by 3.ABS **i-* and cross-referenced for P. Similarly, /a/-initial active intransitive verb roots may have

Table 2.20: Unidentified Frozen *yu-*

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
<i>yukuka</i>	‘embrace’	?	<i>kok</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘? embrace(s)’
<i>yumi</i>	‘give’	?	<i>meʔen</i>	∅	‘? give(s)’
<i>yumiana</i>	‘push’	?	<i>moayan</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘? push(es)’
<i>yumukuni</i>	‘swallow’	?	<i>mokon</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘? swallow(s)’
<i>yumunu</i>	‘send’	?	<i>mono</i>	∅	‘? send(s)’
<i>yupi</i>	‘braid’	?	<i>pẽ</i>	∅	‘? braid(s)’
<i>yumuita</i>	‘teach’	?	<i>moʔé</i>	∅	‘? teach(es)’

been frozen from main clauses, in which case they were frozen prefixed by 1PL.INCL **ja-* and cross-referenced for S, or from dependent clauses, in which case they were frozen prefixed by 3.ABS **i-* and also cross-referenced for S. Whether a POK transitive or intransitive verb root shows relics of the 1PL.INCL **ja-* or 3.ABS **i-* will additionally be elucidated by the pragmatic participant selection principle described in §2.4.4.¹⁸

2.3.7 Summary of Frozen Prefixes by Predicate-Type

Table 2.22 summarizes which cross-referencing prefixes are found frozen on which verbal predicate-types.

2.4 Patterning Across Verbs

It is currently unknown what motivated whether a PTG verb was retained in POK in its simplex root form, or in its morphosemantically complex stem form. Furthermore, in cases where a complex stem was frozen, it is unknown what the mechanism was whereby the prefixes of certain stems were

¹⁸A previous hypothesis attempted to account for the absolutive prefixes on these forms by way of positing that they derived specifically from frozen dependent serial verbs. However, this cannot account for the frozen absolutive prefixes on active intransitive verb roots, because the S of a dependent active intransitive is by definition coreferential with the syntactic subject of the main clause (either S or A), in which case the dependent serial verb is not cross-referenced by prefixes of the absolutive paradigm, but by prefixes of the coreferential paradigm.

Table 2.21: Trans. & Active Intrans. with Frozen **i-* and **ts-*

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	<i>yapika</i>	‘sit down’	<i>i-</i>	<i>apik</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it sits down’
	<i>yasuka</i>	‘bathe’	<i>i-</i>	<i>atfuk</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it bathes’
	<i>ipama</i>	‘stand up’	<i>i-</i>	<i>pam</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it stands up’
	<i>sasima</i>	‘shout’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>atsem</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘He/she/it shouts’
	<i>samu</i>	‘dive’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>amō</i> (Tb.)	\emptyset	‘He/she/it dives’
Transitive	<i>iruri</i>	‘bring’	<i>i-</i>	<i>rur</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘X brings him/her/it’
	<i>inupa</i>	‘hit’	<i>i-</i>	<i>nupã</i>	\emptyset	‘X hits him/her/it’
	<i>sikii</i>	‘pull’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>ekij</i>	\emptyset	‘X pulls him/her/it’
	<i>situni</i>	‘smell’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>etun</i>	<i>-i</i>	‘X smells him/her/it’
	<i>sasawa</i>	‘cross’	<i>ts-</i>	<i>atsaß</i>	<i>-a</i>	‘X crosses him/her/it’

reanalyzed as part of the root. The purpose of this section is to argue that, in cases where a TG prefix was frozen as part of a POK root (§§2.3.1-2.3.6), it is possible to delimit four factors that governed which prefix was frozen. These are: 1) the type of predicate (transitivity and semantic status); 2) the morphological status of the person prefix (bound vs. non-bound); 3) the frequency of particular discourse referents; and 4) the event semantics of the verb. They are discussed below in §§2.4.1-2.4.4.

2.4.1 Type of Predicate

The frozen prefixes of POK roots reflect their potential distributions in PTG, as outlined in §2.1 and summarized in Table 2.22. That is, absolutive prefixes appear on stative intransitives (derived from main clauses and cross-referencing S), on active intransitives (derived from dependent clauses and cross-referencing S) and on transitives (derived from dependent clauses and cross-referencing P). Ergative prefixes appear on transitives (derived from main clauses and cross-referencing A) and active intransitives (derived from main clauses and cross-referencing S).

In addition, some POK verb roots appear to derive from the deverbal nominals prefixed by **t-* (Table 2.19). There are two potential explanations for this. First, it may be that deverbal nominals were simply reanalyzed as verbs. However, this explanation is unsatisfying, because it goes against

Table 2.22: Summary of Prefixes by Predicate-Type

Predicate-Type	Ergative			Absolutive		
	* <i>a</i> -	* <i>ja</i> -	* <i>o</i> -	* <i>i</i> -	* <i>ts</i> -	* <i>t</i> -
Transitive	✓	✓	∅	✓	✓	✓
Active Intransitive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stative Intransitive	∅	∅	∅	✓	✓	✓

the assumption of the retention of TG forms **with** their corresponding functions. That is, nouns should not have been reinterpreted as verbs. A second, more likely possibility is that POK verb roots that show a reflex of **t*- actually derive from TG verb stems of an additional Subclass 2B. Jensen (1998) reconstructs this subclass (and additional ones) for nominal PTG roots, but does not do so for verbal roots. Unlike Subclass 2A, Subclass 2B is characterized by the prefixation of **t*- to cross-reference a third-person absolutive argument **and** to derive deverbal nominals (which yields an ambiguity irrelevant here). If this subclass existed for verbal roots in the lexifier language of POK, then the appearance of frozen **t*- follows the same patterning as the **ts*- prefix of Subclass 2A. Additional support for this argument comes from Lemos Barbosa (1970), who claims that Tupinambá *inisema* ‘be full’ (cf., Table 2.19) was of Subclass 2B.¹⁹ This is an important clue as to a particular lexifier language, and more investigation is needed into the subclasses of verb roots in other TG daughter languages.

If the reflex of **t*- can be ascribed to a cross-referencing prefix in the lexifier language, this highly suggests that no deverbal nominals were frozen as POK verbs at all. Recall from §2.3.4.2 that there are no attestations of POK verb roots derived from deverbal nominals of Subclass 1B (i.e., no nasalized /p/), and that those potentially derivative of the deverbal nominals of Subclass 1A are also analyzable as derivative of bare verb roots, given their formal identity to one another in PTG. Recall also that it is known from /p/-initial verb roots in POK that bare TG verb roots were retained in POK.

¹⁹He indicates subclass membership via the listing of the prefixes that coöccurred with the root under discussion, in this case ‘(t t)’, indicating the use of *t*- to both cross-reference absolutive arguments and derive deverbal nominals.

2.4.2 Morphological Status of Person Prefix

Only bound morphemes were frozen, which entails that non-third-person absolutive markers were not frozen. It is possible that the genesis of POK occurred before the set of free PTG pronouns was reduced to form the first- and second-person absolutive markers, at which point it is likely that the free pronouns filled the function of the latter. However, this is unlikely, both because it implies an extremely old age for POK, and because the epenthetic **r-*, which intervenes between absolutive markers and the root, was frozen to some nominal roots. Rather, unlike the bound cross-referencing prefixes, the non-bound markers, given their formal similarity to the free pronouns, had some salience for speakers as actually denoting referents. This is evidenced by the fact that these markers and the PTG free pronouns compose a subset of the POK person-marking system (see Table 4.1).

2.4.3 Discourse Referent Frequency

Discourse frequency accounts for the fact that no second-person prefixes were frozen, which is otherwise odd, given that, except for the 1PL.EXCL.ERG, all non-second-person prefixes are attested on frozen PTG stems. Note that in declarative utterances, first- and third-person referents are far more common than second-person referents. That is, speakers tend to talk about themselves or non-discourse participants, but not their addressee. I posit that these broad discourse trends constrained the freezing of PTG stems to those cross-referenced for first- or third-persons.

2.4.4 Event Semantics

The three criteria above fall short of predicting the number of the prefix frozen. This is necessary for ergative-prefixed stems, where the 1SG.ERG, 1PL.INCL.ERG and 3.ERG are all attested. In addition, bivalent and active monovalent predicates that show frozen absolutive morphology (Table 2.21), despite the fact that they derive from dependent clauses where only one prefix was susceptible to freezing, require an explanation as to why a singular prefix appears, and not a plural ergative prefix. Such an explanation will also partially explain why these verbs were frozen out of dependent clauses, and not main clauses.²⁰

The distribution of frozen prefixes appears to be conditioned by what I (non-technically) term the pragmatic participant selection of the verb. On the one hand, verbs that depict canonically multi-participant eventualities are marked by either singular or plural prefixes. The possibility for prefixes of either number is likely because there is an available single-participant reading for any eventuality

²⁰Importantly, although third-person cross-referencing prefixes coöccured with plural full NPs, it appears that in the absence of a full NP, the default reading was a singular one.

in which a multiple-participant reading is also construable. On the other hand, verbs that depict single-participant eventualities exhibit singular prefixes. Active intransitives and transitives with frozen ergative prefixes reflect cases in which this participant selection targeted syntactic subjects. Transitives with frozen absolutive prefixes reflect cases in which this participant selection targeted syntactic objects. This line of reasoning can be extended to differentiate the ambiguous cases of **ja-* versus **i-* (§2.3.6). Although the reasoning is circular, I posit that multi-participant verbs that begin with /a/ exhibit a frozen *ja-* and are derivative of main clauses, while single-participant events of the same type exhibit a frozen *i-* and are derivative of dependent clauses. While this distribution by participant number is not categorical, Table 2.23 presents the glosses of a selection of forms that depict this distribution. Note that no POK transitive verbs appear prefixed by 3.ERG **o-*.

Table 2.23: Semantic Distribution of POK Verbs By Frozen Prefix

	Singular				Plural
	Ergative		Absolutive		Ergative
	<i>a-</i> 1SG.ERG	<i>o-</i> 3.ERG	<i>i-</i> 3.ABS	<i>ts-</i> 3.ABS	<i>ja-</i> 1PL.INCL.ERG
Intransitive	enter laugh tremble	go sleep walk fall down die end	lie down sit down bathe sink stay sit down	dive shout respond burn fart	hide dance row flee
Transitive	kill cook throw drop		lend hit take eat count roast close	pull await cross, wade hear, listen to smell forget look for	plant catch, hunt for

This distribution originates from the frequency of typical versus atypical instantiations of given eventualities in the world. That is, a predicate like DANCE is more likely to depict a group activity than an individual one (though the latter is construable), while a predicate like SLEEP is more likely to depict an individual activity than a group one. Crucially, the most canonical participant

number was treated as primary, such that the freezing of a stem targeted only that stem marked by the cross-referencing prefix of that number. Presumably the verb DANCE occurred in a variety of instantiations with singular cross-referencing prefixes, but this was not the stem frozen.

2.5 Remaining Distributions

Two distributions of prefixes on verb roots remain: 1) only 1SG.ERG **a-* and 1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-* appear on transitive verbs (§2.5.1); and 2) POK transitive do not show a frozen absolutive prefix cross-referencing P (**i-*, **ts-* or **t-*) (§2.5.2).

2.5.1 Ergative Prefix Distribution

3.ERG **o-* is frozen to active intransitives only, whereas 1SG.ERG **a-* and 1PL.INCL.ERG **ja-* are frozen to both active intransitive and transitive verb roots. Due to the person hierarchy, these three forms were only prefixed to transitive verbs when the object was third-person. Thus frozen **a-* and **ja-* reflect utterances where first-person agents act upon third-person patients. To account for this, I appeal to reasoning of a similar strain to discourse frequency discussed in §2.4.3. To the extent that discourse is about speakers relating their actions in the world to an addressee, it seems intuitively more common to refer to third-person patients when the agent is first-person (i.e., the speaker) rather than third-person.

2.5.2 Absolutive Prefix Distribution

Recall from Tables 2.4 and 2.6 that on PTG transitive verbs, third-person absolutive prefixes cross-referencing P were obligatory, no matter the person of A. However, there are no reflexes of the absolutive prefixes in this position on any POK transitive verbs. This indicates that the lexifier language was a TG language in which object prefixing on transitive verbs had fallen out.²¹ This makes Cabral's (1995) proposal of Tupinambá as the lexifier language particularly untenable, as Tupinambá preserved the use of absolutive prefixes on transitive verbs (Lemos Barbosa, 1956).

²¹Note that, even in languages that lost absolutive-prefixing on transitive verbs, absolutive-prefixing was preserved on main clause stative intransitives and all subordinate verbs, when syntactically appropriate (see §2.3.6).

Chapter 3

POK Postposition Root Structure

POK postpositions are oblique-licensing NP-final enclitics that either relate the position or motion of one referent with respect to another, or license additional grammatical arguments with no spatial implications (e.g., =*supi* DATIVE). Some postpositions have as their source a PTG postposition, some of which exhibit frozen cross-referencing prefixes. Others have as their source a complex expression of relational noun and locative suffix. PTG postpositions fall into the same root subclasses as nouns and verbs. However, as with verbs, not all subclasses are represented. PTG postpositions are summarized in Table 3.1, with inherited forms in boldface, and non-inherited forms grayed out.¹

Table 3.1: PTG Postpositions & POK Inheritances

Class 1		Class 2	
PTG	Gloss	PTG	Gloss
*tsupé	‘to, for (DAT)’	*etsé	‘with respect to’
*tsuwí	‘from’	*etsebé	‘with’
*kotì	‘to, toward (LOC)’	*oɓaké	‘in front of’
*paḃē	‘with (company)’	*enoné	‘ahead of’
*pé	‘to, for’	*upí	by means of, within an area, according to
*potsé	‘lying with’		
*pipé	‘in’		

Although not all PTG postpositions were retained in POK, all POK postpositions are of TG

¹Unlike verbal and nominal roots, no vowel-initial postpositions receive the **z-* suffix, which means that no vowel-initial postpositions are of Class 1A.

origin. Section 3.1 treats postpositions derived from TG postpositions; §3.2 treats postpositions derived from non-postpositions; §3.3 treats TG postpositions that were not retained, and presents alternate POK constructions that fill the resultant functional gap.

3.1 POK Postpositions Derived from TG Postpositions

POK postpositions derived from TG postpositions are summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2: POK Postpositions Derived from TG Postpositions

POK	Gloss	PTG	Gloss
*= <i>kati</i>	ALLATIVE, LOCATIVE	* <i>koti</i>	‘in, toward’ (LOC)
*= <i>suy</i>	ABLATIVE	* <i>tsuwí</i>	‘from’
*= <i>rupi</i>	PROLATIVE	* <i>r-</i> + * <i>upí</i>	EPNTH + ‘within an area’
*= <i>supi</i>	DATIVE	* <i>tsupé</i>	‘to, for’ (DATIVE)
*= <i>pupi</i>	INSTRUMENTAL	/p/ + * <i>upí</i>	(?) + ‘by means of’
*= <i>ipipi</i>	INESSIVE	* <i>i-</i> + * <i>pipé</i>	3.ABS + ‘in’

(3.1) & (3.2) exemplify the allative and locative uses of =*kati* in modern Omagua, respectively.

(3.1) *kunumi aki, ra usu patirikati, ra kumata.*

kunumi aki, ra usu patiri =kati, ra kumata
 young.man enter, 3SG.MS go priest =ALLATIVE, 3SG.MS greet
 ‘The young man goes in, he goes to the priest, he greets [him].’
 (AHT, AYJ10:67.43.8)

(3.2) *rana yawfima wipi ritamakati.*

rana yawfima wipi ritama =kati
 3PL.MS arrive one village =LOCATIVE
 ‘They arrive at a village.’
 (AHT, AYJ10:14.39.7)

(3.3)-(6.21) exemplify the remaining postpositions in the order given in Table 3.2.

(3.3) *akia wiha ufimata wawankirakana yukufisuy.*

akia wiha ufima -ta wawankira =kana yukufi =suy
 DEM.PROX.MS old.woman emerge -CAUS child =PL.MS pot =ABLATIVE

‘This old woman removes the children from the pot.’
(AHT, MCA2:250.18.3)

(3.4) *ra usu, ra usu ipasu simarupi.*

ra usu, ra usu ipasu sima =rupi
3SG.MS go, 3SG.MS go lake shore =PROLATIVE
‘He goes, he goes along the lake shore.’
(AHT, GLH4:13.2.9)

(3.5) *Pepe yumi mafta tanasupi.*

Pepe yumi mafta tana =supi
Pepe give machete 1PL.EXCL.MS =DATIVE
‘Pepe gives the machete to us.’
(AHT, Green:43)

(3.6) *mi sakita yipupi.*

mi sakita yi =pupi
2SG cut axe =INSTRUMENTAL
‘You cut with the axe.’
(ZJO 2010, p. 126, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

Postpositions derive from consonant initial roots cross-referenced for person (= *ipipi*), vowel-initial roots prefixed by the epenthetic **r*- (= *rupi*) and bare consonant-initial roots (= *kati*, = *suy* and = *supi*). = *pupi* is currently unidentified, although it appears (like = *rupi*) to also come from PTG **upí*, which also has the meaning of ‘by means of’ (Table 3.1). However, there is no known prefix *p-*. It may also come from *pipé*, though this root was also retained as an inessive = *ipipi*.

3.2 POK Postpositions Not Derived from TG Postpositions

POK postpositions that derive from a relational noun plus locative suffix (and other word classes) are summarized in Table 3.3.

Examples (3.7)-(3.13) illustrate these postpositions in the order given in Table 3.3.²

(3.7) ...aikiaara tuyukari ini yuritiupa rafi, iwatinmay ritamakati ini ususmuni.

²I do not exemplify Kokama forms here, as many Kokama forms show apocope of the final CV, which is outside the scope of the current discussion.

Table 3.3: POK Postpositions Not Derived from TG Postpositions

POK	Gloss	PTG	Gloss
*= <i>ari</i>	DIFFUSE LOCATIVE	* <i>ar</i> + * <i>-i</i>	‘topside’ + PART.LOC
*= <i>ariwa</i>	SUPERESSIVE	* <i>ar</i> + * <i>i</i> + * <i>-bo</i>	‘topside’ + EPNTH + DIFF.LOC
*= <i>wiripi</i>	SUBESSIVE	* <i>wir</i> + * <i>i</i> + * <i>-pe</i>	‘underside’ + EPNTH + PUNCT.LOC
*= <i>kakura</i>	ADESSIVE	?	?
*= <i>kwarapi</i>	INESSIVE, LOCATIVE	* <i>kwar</i> + * <i>-a</i> + * <i>-pe</i>	‘hole’ + REF + PUNCT.LOC
*= <i>mitiripi</i>	‘in the middle of’	* <i>piter</i> + * <i>i</i> + * <i>-pe</i>	‘middle’ (GEN) + EPNTH + PUNCT.LOC
*= <i>mukui</i>	COMMITATIVE	* <i>mokōj</i>	‘two’

ikiara tuyuka =ari ini yuriti =upa rafi, iwati
 DEM.PROX.MS land =DIFF.LOC 1PL.INCL remain =CPL NON.ASSERT, high.up
-may ritama =kati ini usu =sinuni.
 -ABS.NOMZ village =ALL 1PL.INCL go =PURP.
 ‘...and when we cease to remain on this Earth, in order to go to Heaven.’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(3.8) *rumay amiti wipi misaariwa piwamay.*

rumay amiti wipi misa =ariwa piwa -may
 food EXST one table =SUPERESSIVE be.flat -ABS.NOMZ
 ‘There is food on top of a flat table.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 109, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(3.9) *amiti wipi awa iarawiripi ipukumay.*

amiti wipi awa iara =wiripi ipuku -may
 EXST one person canoe =SUBESSIVE be.long -ABS.NOMZ
 ‘There is a man underneath the long canoe.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 109, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(3.10) *ra yapikata mura rakakura.*

ra yapika -ta mura ra =kakura
 3SG.MS sit.down -CAUS 3SG.MS 3SG.MS =ADESSIVE
 ‘He makes her sit down next to him.’
 (AHT, MSP2:166.47.2)

(3.11) *awa sɪwɪkakarapɪ Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua?*

awa sɪwɪka =kwarapɪ Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua
 who stomach =INESSIVE God son.of.man person 3SG.MS become long.ago
 ‘In whose womb did God’s son become a man long ago?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(3.12) *ta paranamitripi.*³

ta parana =mitripi
 1SG.MS river =in.the.middle.of
 ‘I am in the middle of the river.’
 (ZJO 2010, LHC, Dict.)

(3.13) *ini sawakana, roayapa ini sukanamukui umanu?*

ini sawa =kana, roaya =pa ini su =kana =mukui umanu
 1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS, NEG =INTERR 1PL.INCL body =PL.MS =COM die
 ‘Our souls, don’t they die with our bodies?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

Five forms (*=ari*, *=ariwa*, *=wiripi*, *=kwarapɪ* and *=mitripi*) consist of a relational noun, some intervening segment and a locative suffix, either **-pe* PUNCTUAL.LOC, **-bo* DIFFUSE.LOC or **-i* PARTITIVE.LOC. These locative suffixes differ from spatial postpositions in being morphologically bound, which is reflected in the fact that postpositions were retained in POK as productive morphemes, while the locative suffixes appear to have been inherited only as part of frozen stems, though they may have been productive previously. Jensen (1998, p. 514) states that many TG daughter languages also exhibit postpositions formed from the combination of either **ar* ‘topside’ or **wir* ‘underside’ and a locative suffix. However, she argues that these forms must have been morphologically complex in PTG because the frozen suffix differs across daughter languages. These forms are unanalyzable in modern Omagua and Kokama because **ar*, **wir* and the locative suffixes are not productive.⁴

Two forms (*=kakura* and *=mukui*) do not derive from relational nouns. The source of *=kakura* is currently unidentified; Cabral (1995) has suggested that it derives from a combination of *kaku* ‘cheek’ and *-ra* LOCATIVE, though is unknown what locative she is referring to. The commitative *=mukui* grammaticalized from the numeral ‘two’. At first glance, the grammaticalization of a numeral as a postposition is surprising, given that numerals quantifying over a referent precede the head noun in PTG. However, Lemos Barbosa (1956, p. 99-100) shows for Tupinambá that numerals also appear following the head noun in a possessive construction, in which case they receive the referential suffix

³The loss of the second /i/ appears to have been phonemicized in modern Omagua.

⁴The partitive and diffuse locatives are additionally unproductive in various TG daughter languages (ibid.).

*-*a* and either function as ordinals (not quantifying over the head noun), or quantify over the head noun, yielding a reading of ‘together’. When the possessor is a prefix, the reading seems to have been unambiguously an ordinal one, as in (3.14).

(3.14) *ʃé mosapira*

ʃé *mosapira* *-a*
 1SG.ABS three -REF
 ‘The third one from me.’
 (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 100)

However, a nominal possessor yields the two readings, as in (3.15).

(3.15) *abá mokôia*.

abá *mokôia* *-a*
 man two -REF
 ‘The second man’ or ‘Two men together’
 (ibid.)

Given that POK =*mukui* does not quantify over its host, I argue that it grammaticalized from contexts in which the ordinal reading of the construction-type in (3.15) was the more salient. In cases where two NP subjects preceded the verb, this reading would have been forced, as in (3.16), because it appears that the ‘together’ reading of (3.15) only occurred when a single NP filled a given argument slot.

(3.16) [[[NP] [NP *mokôia*] [VP]]

In this scenario, the second of two conjoined NPs was reinterpreted as an oblique argument, after which the =*mukui*-marked NP shifted to postverbal position, the standard position for obliques in POK and its daughter languages, as was shown in (3.13).

3.3 Non-Inherited PTG Postpositions

This section discusses PTG postpositions that were not retained in POK and presents alternative forms and constructions that fill the functional gap left by the lack of retention of these forms. Non-inherited PTG postpositions are summarized in Table 3.4.⁵

⁵The reconstruction of some postpositions appears to be redundant. Note that both **tsupé* and **pé* are glossed as ‘to, for.’ Additionally, **etsé* and **etsebé* are glossed as ‘with respect to’ and ‘with’, respectively. However, Tupinambá has *esé* for ‘with’ (Lemos Barbosa, 1970).

Table 3.4: PTG Postpositions Not Inherited into POK

Class 1		Class 2	
PTG	Gloss	PTG	Gloss
* <i>paḅē</i>	‘with’ (company)	* <i>etsé</i>	‘with respect to’
* <i>pé</i>	‘to, for’	* <i>etseḅé</i>	‘with’
* <i>potsé</i>	‘lying with’	* <i>oḅaké</i>	‘in front of’

The committative **paḅē* was replaced due to the grammaticalization of the numeral ‘two’ as a committative (see §3.2).⁶ POK retained a dative based on PTG **tsupé* (*=*supi*), not on **pé*. No POK postposition conveys the meaning ‘lying with’ or ‘with respect to’, though clausal juxtaposition conveys the latter meaning. POK exhibited an instrumental *=*pupi*, which appears to derive from PTG **upí* ‘by means of, within an area, according to’, not a reflex of the instrumental **etseḅé*. However, the origin of the initial segment /p/ is unknown.

As shown in Table 3.3, POK froze a series of combinations of a locative noun and locative suffix as postpositions. In addition, POK also retained a parallel construction to express three kinds of spatial relationships, which involved a POK locative noun and spatial postposition (given that the TG locative suffixes appear to not have been productive in POK). The spatial configurations are ‘in front of’, ‘behind’ and ‘around’, and can be illustrated by data from modern Omagua. ‘In front of’ consists of *siwapi* ‘front, forehead’ (< PTG **siḅ* ‘forehead’) and =*kati* LOCATIVE (< PTG **koti* ‘in, toward’), as in (3.17).

(3.17) *ta uka siwapikati*

ta uka siwapi =kati
 1SG.MS house front =LOC
 ‘I am in front of a house.’ [Lit. I am at the house’s front.]
 (ZJO 2010, p. 128, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

‘Behind’ consists of *yatkupi* ‘back’ (< PTG **kupe* ‘back’) and =*kwara* LOCATIVE (< PTG **kwara* ‘hole’), as in (3.18).⁷

(3.18) *ta uka amiti iakua yatkupikwara.*

⁶It is impossible to know whether **paḅē* was retained and subsequently lost, or never inherited at all.

⁷Note that modern Omagua shows a truncation of the POK inessive/locative **kwaraḅi* (cf., Table 3.3).

ta uka amiti iakua yatkupi =kwará
 1SG.MS house EXST stream back =LOCATIVE

‘My house is behind the stream.’ [Lit. ‘My house is at the stream’s back.’]
 (ZJO 2010, p. 94, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

‘Around’ consists of *sapita* ‘base, stern, buttress root’ (cf., Tupinambá as *opitá* ‘popa, pé de árvore’), and *=ari* DIFF.LOC (< PTG **ar* ‘topside’ and **-i* DIFF.LOC), as in (3.19).

(3.19) *amiti iwirana uka sapitari*

amiti iwira =na uka sapita =ari
 EXST tree =PL.FS house base =DIFF.LOC

‘There are trees around the house.’ [Lit. There are trees at the house’s base.]

In contrast to the postpositions *=ariwa* and *=wiripi*, these constructions are best analyzed as synchronically complex because *sapita* and *siwapi* are productive lexical items, whereas *ar* and *wir* are not. Note that origin of the ‘*sapita=ari*’ construction must have followed the freezing of the TG sequence **ar-i* ‘topside’-DIFF.LOC as a diffuse locative *=ari*, as its composition would otherwise be semantically anomalous (i.e., ‘at the base’s topside’). Given that this construction is reconstructable for POK, it suggests that *=ari* DIFF.LOC is an old morpheme, perhaps providing evidence against the retention of PTG **ar* ‘topside’ and **-i* DIFF.LOC as productive morphemes.’

Part II

Topics in POK Grammatical Domains

Part II is divided into chapters that treat grammatical domains within which Proto-Omagua-Kokama retained a relatively high degree of grammatical complexity from a Tupí-Guaraní language. It is not intended to be a comprehensive grammatical sketch of POK. The evidence from these chapters casts doubt on the rapid creolization scenario put forward by Cabral and Rodrigues (2003). However, in line with the aims of this work overall, Part II falls short of making specific claims about the sociolinguistic characteristics of the genesis of POK. Rather, as with Part I, it seeks to delineate the ways in which POK resembles PTG. Unlike Part I, however, Part II is particularly concerned with domains in which TG forms were either fully retained in POK or show no reflexes whatsoever. That is, there are no widespread patterns of morphological freezing other than those that involve the cross-referencing prefixes discussed in Part I.

Part II relies heavily on historical data. This is essential, given that, from the perspective of the modern languages, some TG forms appear not to have been retained. However, early colonial texts on Omagua (described in Appendix A) exhibit additional TG forms that add complexity to the grammatical portrait of POK. This indicates that a portion of the simplification of modern Kokama and Omagua derives from natural processes of language change. Furthermore, given that I assume that TG-related forms in modern Omagua, 17th- & 18th-century Omagua and modern Kokama derive from a TG lexifier language that participated in the genesis of POK, I infer that TG forms found in any of these languages were present in POK. However, due to the lack of data on Kokama from the early colonial period, it is impossible to know to what extent 18th-century Omagua is similar to POK.

Part II is divided into chapters along functional lines. Expositively, each chapter discusses both the TG and non-TG forms of the relevant domain from the perspective of the daughter languages, discusses relevant attestations in Old Omagua, as well as reflexes in PTG, and justifies a reconstruction for POK.⁸ Chapter 4 treats person-marking; Chapter 5 nominalization; Chapter 6 TAM; Chapter 7 negation; and Chapter 8 evaluatives.

⁸See Cabral (1995) for a more complete discussion of presumed non-TG forms and constructions.

Chapter 4

POK Person-Marking

POK person-marking is simplified in comparison to the interaction of free pronouns and cross-referencing prefixes that constitute PTG person-marking. This is due to the fact that bound PTG person-marking forms were inherited into POK as parts of roots, leaving only non-bound forms (which were fewer and had a narrower distribution in PTG) to serve as person-markers. Section 4.1 introduces the Omagua and Kokama person-marking systems; §4.2 provides historical evidence that proto-forms and -functions cannot be reconstructed based solely on the daughter languages. A reconstruction of POK person-marking follows in §4.3, along with additional justification based on the relations of POK person-markers with the PTG system.

4.1 Omagua & Kokama Person-Marking

Omagua and Kokama person-marking consists of two formally related paradigms of pre-stem markers: a set of independent, stressable pronouns and a set of phonologically reduced proclitics, which have overlapping syntactic functions. Pronouns serve to mark the arguments of verbal and non-verbal predicates, functioning as subjects and objects of the former. Proclitics serve to mark the arguments of verbal predicates only, functioning as subjects, direct objects and indirect objects. Proclitics additionally function as possessors. In all environments proclitics must have a rightward host, either the verb, a VP-final enclitic (e.g., tense), an oblique-licensing postposition, or a possessed NP.

Examples (4.1)-(4.5) come from modern Omagua. In (4.1), both the 2SG pronoun and proclitic mark the verbal object, and the rightward host of the latter is the reason enclitic; in (4.2), the pronoun marks the the verbal subject and the proclitic the possessor; in (4.3), the proclitic marks an indirect object; and in (4.4) the proclitic marks the verbal subject.

(4.1) *tsɪ fikwarata mɪ tsɪ sita nɪ =ikua.*

tsɪ fikwarata mɪ tsɪ sita nɪ =ikua
 1SG.FS follow 2SG 1SG.FS love 2SG =CL.REASON
 ‘I follow you because I love you.’
 (ZJO 2010, LHC)

(4.2) *mɪ yatima mɪ ku.*¹

mɪ yatima nɪ ku
 2SG sow 2SG farm
 ‘You sow your farm.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 134, LHC & AHC, corrected form)

(4.3) *amiti nɪ =supi wipi iwirawasu?*

amiti nɪ =supi wipi iwirawasu
 EXST 2SG =DATIVE one spear
 ‘Do you have a spear?’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 77, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(4.4) *rasuy ikumɪ tana uri kumisasmuni umawa kumisapupɪ nɪsmusmuni.*

rasuy ikumɪ tana uri kumisa =smuni umawa kumisa =pupɪ nɪ
 then today 1PL.EXCL.MS come speak =PURP Omagua language =INSTR 2SG
sinu =smuni
 hear =PURP
 ‘Then today we’ve come to speak in Omagua so that you can hear [it].’
 (LHC, 09AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.1.trans)

Although both pronouns and proclitics may coöccur as subjects and objects in a main clause with typical SVO word order, it appears that there is a grammatical restriction in certain types of purposive clauses with SOV word order, where the pronoun must be used to mark the object, even though there is a rightward host, as shown in (4.5).

(4.5) *rasuy ta uri akiakati mɪ kumisakasmuni.*

rasuy ta uri akiakati mɪ kumisaka =smuni
 then 1SG.MS come here 2SG talk.to =PURP
 ‘Then I came here to talk to you.’
 (LHC, 06AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

¹Note the ungrammaticality of **mɪ yatima mɪ ku*.

Here, the coreferential subject is not realized in the purposive clause. However, when the subject of a =*smuni*-purposive clause is not coreferential with that of the main clause, the dependent subject is realized, and word order is standard SVO. The use of the proclitic *ni* in (4.5) yields an interpretation with non-coreferential subjects, i.e., ‘Then I came here so that you could talk to X’.²

In addition to the distributional restrictions on pronouns and proclitics, three persons are distinguished in singular and plural, as well as an inclusive. Person-markers code the gender of the speaker in the first- and third-persons. Omagua and Kokama paradigms are presented in Table 4.1 & 4.2. Pronouns are to the left of the slash, proclitics to the right. Segments in parentheses indicate vowels that often undergo deletion preceding a vowel-initial stem. Kokama data summarizes the analysis in Vallejos Yopán (2010).

Table 4.1: Modern Omagua Person-Markers

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH
1	tá / t(a)=	tsí / ts(i)=	taná / tan(a)=	tsiná / tsm(a)=
1INCL			ini / in(i)=	ini / in(i)=
2	ni / n(i)=	ni / n(i)=	ipi / p(i)=	ipi / p(i)=
3	mura / r(a)=	ai / i=	raná / ran(a)=	iná / in(a)=

Table 4.2: Modern Kokama Person-Markers

	SINGULAR		PLURAL			
	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH		
1	ta / t(a)=	etse / ts(a)=	tana / tan(a)=	penu / pen(u)=		
1INCL			ini / ni(a)=	ini / ni(a)=		
2	ene / n(a)=	ene / n(a)=	epe / ep(i)=	epe / ep(i)=		
3	uri / r(a)=	=ura	ay / y(a)=	=ay	rana / ran(a)=	inu / in(u)=

Vallejos Yopán (2010) argues that there are three sets of person-markers in Kokama: long forms, short forms and clitics. In relation to Table 4.2, short forms correspond to the singular proclitics **including** the parenthetic vowel. She indicates that there is no long/short form distinction in

²There exist additional coreference restrictions on different types of purposive clauses that are outside the scope of this work. However, see Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 617-634).

plural forms, which otherwise pattern like singular short forms (i.e., they have the final vowel). However, there is no functional difference between her short forms and clitics, and it is descriptively more general to posit that short forms are additionally reduced by final-vowel deletion to form proclitics, in which case the category of short forms is eliminated. I argue that it is necessary to maintain separate pronominal and proclitic paradigms, given differences in historical inheritance and syntactic distribution on the one hand (cf., §4.3), and patterns of phonological reduction on the other. That is, Kokama “clitics” are formed via typical processes of final-vowel deletion that also occur elsewhere in the language, whereas the proclitics (subsuming Kokama short forms and clitics) are morphologically distinct from pronouns, formed in some cases by the deletion of the **initial** vowel.³ The pronoun/proclitic alternations are an inheritance from PTG, whereas Vallejos’ short form/clitic distinction is not.

Moreover, there are differences between the two systems. The Kokama 1SG.FS, 2SG, 1PL.EXCL.FS and 3PL.FS proclitics differ from their Omagua counterparts in final-vowel quality, and Omagua has lost the formal difference between pronominal and proclitic 1SG.FS. Kokama has a distinct 1PL.EXCL.FS form unattested in Omagua. The 1PL.INCL & 2PL proclitics are formed via different vowel-deletion processes. The distinction of the pronominal and proclitic forms of the 1PL.EXCL & 3PL by way of stress does not exist in Kokama. Lastly, a nominative/accusative distinction exists in Kokama for the 3SG; however, a formal difference only exists for the masculine speech forms.⁴

4.2 Historical Evidence for POK Person-Marking

This section reviews data on older stages of Omagua and Kokama, which indicates that the person-marking system of POK cannot accurately be reconstructed based solely on evidence from the daughter languages. Section 4.2.1 treats the full person-marking paradigms for both languages that come from Espinosa (1935). Section 4.2.2 treats evidence for the forms of the 3SG, 1PL.EXCL.MS and 3PL.MS, which come from 17th- and 18th-century Jesuit texts (de Velasco, 1941; Uriarte, 1952, 1986; Suárez, 1968; Hervás Y Panduro, 1787).

³This is particularly evident in the Kokama forms where pronouns and proclitics are markedly different, as in the 1SG.FS, 2SG, 3SG.MS & 3SG.FS.

⁴Cabral (1995) alternatively claims that in Brazilian Kokama, *uri* or *ura* may appear in either syntactic position, but when both subject and object are third-person, the former must function as subject and the latter as object. It is unclear if the same conditions hold for Peruvian Kokama. The fact that Omagua *mura* can appear as subject and object suggests that the restriction in Kokama is an innovation, perhaps via the distribution described by Cabral.

4.2.1 Person-Marking Paradigms from Espinosa (1935)

Espinosa (1935) analyzes the Kokama system differently than Vallejos Yopán (2010) and Cabral (1995), as is summarized in Table 4.3.⁵

Table 4.3: Kokama Person-Markers per Espinosa (1935)

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH
1	ta	itsi	tana	tsinu
1INCL			ini	ini
2	eni	eni	e <i>pi</i>	e <i>pi</i> , <i>pinu</i>
3	uri	uri, <i>ain</i>	rana	rana, <i>inu</i>

Although Espinosa does not grasp the inclusive/exclusive distinction, I include it in Table 4.3 based on the following observation by him (emphasis in original).

Nótese la distinción entre **eni** (*tú*) y **ini** (*nosotros*); **tana** es la forma corriente para expresar el pronombre de primera persona del plural; **ini**...tiene más extensión. Así dicen: **ini...jara**, *nuestro Dueño (Dios), señor de todos* (Espinosa, 1935, p. 33).⁶

Note from Table 4.3 that Espinosa gives only pronominal forms (his *pronombres personales*). For the 2PL.FS, 3SG.FS and 3PL.FS, he lists two forms, indicating parenthetically next to each pairing, ‘respect. [respectivamente, ZJO] al hombre y a la mujer’ (ibid.). His 1PL.EXCL.FS is cognate to the modern Omagua form, and the modern Kokama form for the 1PL.EXCL.FS is listed as 2PL.FS. Thus in this analysis, the masculine speech forms for the 2PL, 3SG & 3PL, when uttered by men, denote referents of either sex. The same forms, when uttered by women, denote only male referents. The unique feminine speech forms for these categories (*pinu*, *ain* & *inu*), thus encode the gender of the speaker **and** the referent. Although I do not reconstruct multiple feminine speech forms for POK (see §4.3), Espinosa’s analysis warrants further exploration and potential explanation, given what appears to be his otherwise strong command of Kokama, as presented in Espinosa (1935).

First, his analysis of the Omagua system is nearly perfect, as shown in Table 4.4. He notes the differences between the two languages in 1SG.FS and 3SG.MS pronominal forms, as well as the stress

⁵Table 4.3 does not include the author’s numerous vowel diacritics, which capture phonetic realizations of these forms. I convert his orthographic <ê> to <ts> (IPA [ts]).

⁶Translation: “Note the distinction between **eni** (*you*) and **ini** (*us*); **tana** is the form used today to express the first person plural pronoun; **ini**...has a broader application. Thus they say: **ini...jara**, *our Lord (God), lord of all.*”

differences on the 1PL.EXCL and 3PL forms of both genderlects. In his work, Omagua data is given via footnotes to all forms for which there is an alternation with Kokama. For the 3SG.FS & 3PL.FS, he indicates that Omagua women only utter one form. Crucially, he makes no such indication for the 2PL forms. This detail suggests his Kokama data are not errors, and also that some duality in the female speech forms survived in the Omagua of the early 20th century. However, *pinu* is not attested in modern Omagua.

Table 4.4: Omagua Person-Markers per Espinosa (1935)

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH
1	ta	tsi	taná	tsiná
1INCL			?	?
2	eni	eni	epi	epi, pinu
3	mura	ain	raná	iná

In order to account for these multiple feminine speech forms, note that all Kokama person-markers unique to the feminine genderlect are of TG origin, whereas those unique to the masculine genderlect are not. I posit that women may have acquired the male person-markers in addition to maintaining native TG pronominal forms.⁷ Forms inherited from male speakers were subsequently reanalyzed as actually referring to males. Men, on the other hand, did not acquire the female forms. This analysis is elegant in two ways. First, it posits a Kokama cognate to Omagua *tsiná* 1PL.EXCL.FS. Second, it associates the Kokama 2PL.FS *pinu* with a morpheme that it resembles formally, *epi*. That is, the 1PL.EXCL.FS & 3PL.FS appear to be derived from a combination of a singular proclitic and plural marker, and it is possible that *pinu* was formed in the same way. In order to explain the reanalysis of a 2PL as a 1PL.EXCL, note that the utterance of an intensionally 2PL and 1PL.EXCL by two opposed groups, one to the other, has the same referential extension. That said, this may be the mechanism whereby Espinosa misinterpreted the intensional function of *pinu* as a 2PL, but note that he made no such error with the parallel masculine speech forms. Explaining Espinosa’s potential error by way of the extensional identity between a 2PL and 1PL.EXCL does not explain the multiple forms for the **third-person** feminine speech forms, either. Nevertheless, in assuming Espinosa’s analysis, one must also claim that unique masculine and feminine speech forms are the result of two historical processes: male speakers never inherited female speech forms, whereas women inherited them and

⁷Women are known to have adopted the masculine speech word for ‘woman’, *wainú* (cf., lexical data cited by Adelung (1813, p. 611)).

subsequently lost them in both languages. This process seems unlikely.

4.2.2 Person-Marking Data from Jesuit Texts

The following examples show historical exemplars of the differences between Omagua and Kokama in the 3SG.MS, 1PL.EXCL.MS and 3PL.MS. The first differs in the presence of the initial segment /m/; the latter two differ in the quality of the final vowel. Translations and emphases are my own.

The first attestation of Kokama 3SG.MS *ura* is evident as early as 1681, in a letter written by Padre Juan Lorenzo Lucero, the founder of the mission among the Kokama at Lagunas, as in (4.6). The first attestation of Omagua *mura* comes from the catechism fragment, as in (4.7).

(4.6) kakiri tanu papa, kakiri **ura**. Dios ikatutanari.

kakiri tanu papa, kakiri ura. Dios ikatu -ta n(a) =ari.
 live 1PL.EXCL.MS father, live 3SG.MS. God be.good -CAUS 2SG =IMPF.
 ‘May our father live, may he live. God will make you good.’
 (de Velasco, 1941)

(4.7) Diossimay ra ikuasmuni, **mura** ra ipufitasmuni...

Dios =simay ra ikua =sinuni, mura ra ipufi -ta =sinuni
 God =INTSF 3SG.MS know =PURP, 3SG.MS 3SG.MS be.heavy -CAUS =PURP
 ‘In order to know great God, in order to suffer Him...’
 (Suárez, 1968)

The first attestation of the Omagua 1PL.EXCL comes from the *pater noster*.

(4.8) **tanu** rumay ni yumi ikumi **tanusupi**.

tanu rumay ni yumi ikumi tanu =supi
 1PL.EXCL.DM food 2SG give today 1PL.EXCL.DM =BENEFACTIVE
 ‘Give us this day our daily bread.’ [Lit. ‘Today you give our food to us.’]
 (Hervás Y Panduro, 1787, p. 99)

The first attestation of the Omagua 3PL.MS comes from the full catechism.

(4.9) upakatu **rana** ïamukui **rana** yamimïa rafi

upa =katu rana ïa =mukui rana yamimïa rafi
 all =INTSF 3PL.MS heart =COMMITATIVE 3PL.MS grieve NON.ASSERT
 ‘Grieving with their whole heart...’
 (Uriarte, 1952, p. 231)

The appearance of final /u/ for the 1PL.EXCL.MS in Old Omagua, and its appearance on Kokama 1PL.EXCL.FS and 3PL.FS, indicate that /u/ was the final vowel of the 1PL.EXCL & 3PL forms of both genderlects in POK. All relevant Omagua forms underwent a change in both masculine and feminine forms, whereas Kokama underwent the same change only in masculine forms (see §4.3).

4.3 POK Person-Marking Reconstruction

Given the historical forms discussed in §§4.2.1-4.2.2, and additional comparisons to TG pronouns and cross-referencing prefixes (see below), I propose the following reconstruction of the POK person-marking system. TG-inherited forms are in boldface.

Table 4.5: Proto-Omagua-Kokama Person-Markers

	SINGULAR		PLURAL	
	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH	MASC. SPEECH	FEM. SPEECH
1	tá / t(a)=	etse / tse	tanu	tsenu
1INCL			ini	ini
2	ene / n(e)	ene / n(e)	epe / p(e)	epe / p(e)
3	mura / r(a)=	ai / i=	ranu	inu

There are three types of reasoning that contribute to the reconstruction of these forms. First, there are those forms which are identical (disregarding the typical sound correspondence [e]/[i]) in the daughter languages (i.e., Kokama as described by Vallejos Yopán (2010)) and which are not contradicted by any historical data. These are POK **ta* 1SG.MS, **ini* 1PL.INCL and **epe* 2PL. Second, there are those forms which are not identical in the daughter languages, but which are reconstructable based on 17th- and 18th-century textual data. These are POK **mura* 3SG.MS, **tanu* 1PL.EXCL.MS and **ranu* 3PL.MS. Third, there are those forms which are not identical in the daughter languages, and which 17th- and 18th-century textual data does not elucidate. These are POK **etse* 1SG.FS, **tsenu* 1PL.EXCL.FS, **ene* 2SG, **ai* 3SG.FS and **inu* 3PL.FS. For these forms it is necessary to compare them to cognates in PTG, as well as to parallel masculine speech forms for which there is historical documentation (i.e., **tsenu* and **inu*). Lastly, it is at times difficult to determine how one of the daughter languages developed a certain proclitic form; this will be noted throughout. §§4.3.1-4.3.2 discuss forms of the second and third type, respectively.

4.3.1 POK Person-Markers with Textual Evidence

The forms under discussion here are **mura* 3SG.MS, **tanu* 1PL.EXCL.MS and **ranu* 3PL.MS. First, I propose that, prior to the 1680's (the time of the Lucero letter), the initial segment of Old Kokama *mura* was lost. I argue that the loss of /m/ is an innovation based on an analogy to the 3SG.FS *ai*. That is, Kokama 3SG.FS *ai* corresponds to its proclitic form by way of the deletion of #V. Old Kokama 3SG.MS *mura*, then, was reduced so that it exhibited the same correspondence to its proclitic form *ra*, before which time it would have corresponded to its form via the deletion #CV. 3SG.FS *ai* was inherited from PTG (see §4.3.2), in light of which we can know that the derivation of proclitics did not occur in the opposite direction (i.e., pronouns derived from proclitics). Moreover, if *mura* were the innovation, the initial segment /m/ would have to derive from a non-TG prefix, a process which is never known to have occurred in the history of POK. And if it were ever productive, the derivation of proclitic *ra* would have originally had to involve the deletion of that prefix in addition to the first syllable (vowel) of the root, which is not parallel to the feminine speech form process.

Furthermore, based on the fact that modern Kokama accusative *ura* appears instead of *uri* marking a nominative argument in the Lucero letter (see (4.6)), it is likely that no nominative-accusative distinction existed for Kokama third-persons at this time, and that *uri* entered the Kokama system subsequent to this period.⁸ Recall that Cabral (1995) claims that *ura* and *uri* are interchangeable as syntactic subjects and objects in Brazilian Kokama, except when both are third-person, in which case *uri* must mark the subject and *ura* the object. I propose as a hypothesis, then, that *uri* entered Kokama in free syntactic variation with *ura*, and that the Brazilian Kokama system represents the beginning of a nominative-accusative split, but only with dual third-person arguments. The Peruvian Kokama system reported by Vallejos Yopán (2010), then, represents an extension of this system to all realizations of a third-person pronoun, irrespective of the person of the other argument. That Brazilian Kokama may represent an older system is supported by the fact that Brazilian Kokamas are known to have split off from Peruvian Kokamas in the 19th century.

Regarding **tanu* 1PL.EXCL.MS and *ranu* 3PL.MS, both forms in the modern languages have a final /a/ instead of /u/. However, *tanu* is present in both the Lucero letter (1681) and the Omagua *pater noster* (likely late 17th-century). Although no records of sufficient age exist to definitively show a parallel form **ranu* for either language, I infer that this was the original 3PL.MS form based on analogy to **tanu* (and also to the corresponding feminine speech forms, see below). Furthermore, I argue that there is no motivation to reconstruct both pronouns and proclitics for the first persons exclusive and the third persons of either genderlect. This is because, even in modern Kokama, there

⁸Note that there is no trace of any nominative-accusative distinction elsewhere in the Kokama system or in any known stage of Omagua.

is no formal distinction between pronouns and proclitics of these categories; such distinctions only exist for the 1SG, 2SG, 3SG and possibly 2PL (see below). The distinction is realized in modern Omagua only via a final-stress pattern (see Table 4.1). However, 17th- and 18th-century Omagua documents indicate no word-final stress on 1PL.EXCL & 3PL forms. In light of this, the only formal characteristic differentiating pronominal and proclitic forms of these categories is eliminated in the reconstruction.

I propose that this penultimate stress, then, permitted final-vowel lowering (/u/ → /a/), which was underway in Omagua by the 18th century (see (4.9)).⁹ In Omagua this lowering eventually occurred across 1PL.EXCL and 3PL forms of both genderlects. However, in Kokama only the relevant masculine speech forms underwent the lowering.¹⁰ Omagua subsequently derived pronominal forms for the 1PL.EXCL and 3PL by analogy to the stress alternations of the 1SG.MS. This would have been necessary to distinguish a possessive phrase from a non-verbal clause (see §4.1).

4.3.2 POK Person-Markers with PTG Evidence

The forms under discussion here are POK **etse* 1SG.FS, **tsenu* 1PL.EXCL.FS, **ene* 2SG, **epe* 2PL, **ai* 3SG.FS and **inu* 3PL.FS. These forms differ in the daughter languages, and are not attested in Old Kokama or Old Omagua. As such, it is necessary to compare them to TG cognates as well as to corresponding masculine speech forms for which there is historical data.

Regarding 1PL.EXCL.FS **tsenu* and 3PL.FS **inu*, these forms correspond to the Kokama forms *tsinu* and *inu* reported by Espinosa (1935) (see Table 4.3). Modern Omagua has a final /a/ in these forms. However, recall that the Omagua *pater noster* shows a final /u/ on the 1PL.EXCL.MS *tanu*, and that it was argued in §4.3.1 that the 3PL.MS also originally had a final /u/. Although there are no attestations of feminine speech forms in Old Omagua, I infer that the vowel change /u/ → /a/ that took place in the relevant Omagua masculine speech forms also took place in the feminine ones.¹¹ In Kokama, this change occurred only in masculine forms. The same argument for a lack of division of the 1PL.EXCL and 3PL into pronominal and proclitic forms that was given for masculine speech forms can be applied to the feminine speech forms.

The accurate reconstruction of the remaining forms **etse* 1SG.FS, **ene* 2SG, **epe* 2PL and **ai* 3SG (and their corresponding proclitics) requires looking at their form and function of their TG cognates. These forms (with the exception of *ai*), derive from either TG free pronouns or non-third-

⁹This appears to be an idiosyncratic sound change unique to this set of forms.

¹⁰It is possible that the sound change became salient as a genderlect distinction and thus did not occur in feminine speech forms.

¹¹Note that it is merely a historical coincidence that all old texts are in the male genderlect, given that they were all written by men (and do not quote women).

person (non-bound) absolutive cross-referencing markers. Furthermore, their functional distribution in POK is largely predictable based on their distribution in PTG (see below). These forms are summarized again in Table 4.6. Inherited forms are in boldface; non-inherited forms are grayed out. Non-existent categories are in black.

Table 4.6: PTG Absolutive Prefixes & Free Pronouns

	ABS	Pronouns
1SG	tjé (r-)	itjé
1PL.EXCL	oré (r-)	oré
1PL.INCL	jané (r-)	jané
2SG	né (r-)	ené
2PL	pé (n-)	pe...ẽ
3	i-, ts-, t-	

The 1SG.FS pronoun and proclitic derive from the PTG 1SG.ABS and 1SG.PRON forms, respectively; the 2SG pronoun and proclitic derive from the 2SG.ABS and 2SG.PRON, respectively. Regarding their distribution, recall that in PTG absolutive markers functioned as pronominal possessors, and free pronouns served as arguments on all predicate-types, all functions which were inherited into POK (see §4.1). However, the distribution of absolutive markers was additionally generalized in POK. That is, in PTG these forms marked S_P on stative intransitives and hierarchically superior P on transitives in independent clauses; and all S-arguments in subordinate clauses. In POK, their cognates, in addition to marking the subject of intransitives and the objects of transitives, which have functional parallels in the PTG alignment just discussed, also mark the subjects of transitives (A) (yielding a quasi-nominative-accusative alignment), a function these forms would never have had in any clause-type in PTG. I attempt to account for this by way of the following analogy: because absolutive markers could already mark the syntactic subject (S) and object (P) on different predicate-types (see above), and because the formally similar pronouns marked syntactic subjects (S & A) and objects (P) on all predicate-types, absolutive markers were reinterpreted as having the same distribution as the pronouns. To motivate this, I propose that the person hierarchy was either falling out of the lexifier language or was not salient to speakers of POK. In this scenario, absolutive markers encoding hierarchically superior arguments on transitive verbs would not have obligatorily been interpreted as not syntactic objects (P), but also potentially as syntactic subjects (A).¹² However, this process did not replace their function as marking syntactic objects, which was

¹²This may have been additionally motivated by the person-marking system and alignment of a substrate language.

retained in POK. Furthermore, because the generalization occurred unidirectionally from absolutive markers to pronouns, pronouns did not adopt the functional distribution of absolutive markers (e.g., nominal possession). While the pronouns were inherited with the independent stress characteristic of the PTG forms, the absolutive markers were not, which accounts for their phonologically bound status in POK.

The above explanation does not account for the vowel alternations that exist between Kokama on the one hand, and Omagua and PTG on the other, in the proclitic forms of the 1SG.FS and 2SG. I do not currently have an explanation for this, though the fact that the vowel quality of the Omagua forms corresponds to that of the PTG forms through a language-wide vowel change of /e/ → /ɪ/ strongly suggests that the Kokama vowel alternation is an innovation. Similarly, the presence of distinct forms in Kokama for the pronominal and proclitic forms of the 1SG.FS that have distinct cognates in PTG suggests that the loss of a formal difference between pronoun and proclitic for this category in Omagua is an innovation. The distinction between pronoun and proclitic was subsequently made via a stress alternation analogous to the 1SG.MS.

Regarding POK *2SG *epe/pe*, note that the PTG split morpheme **pe...ẽ* 2PL was not retained, but only the 2PL.ABS **pé*. I argue that the POK 2PL pronoun was formed by analogy to the **ene/ne* alternation that existed in the 2SG, which was inherited from TG (see above), in which case it adopted the distributions inherent in the pronoun-proclitic alternation in the 2SG, namely that new pronominal **epe* could not function as a possessor, as is attested in the daughter languages. A final outstanding issue with the 2PL is the discrepancy between proclitic forms between modern Omagua and modern Kokama proclitic forms. Compare Omagua *ɪpɪ/pɪ* with Kokama *epe/ep(i)*. In Omagua, the proclitic involves the expected deletion of the initial vowel; the presence of a form *pɪ* is particularly significant here as this was the only form retained from TG. In Kokama, by contrast, the initial vowel is preserved in the proclitic form *ep(i)*, despite the inheritance of a TG form **pé*. However, Cabral (1995, p. 329) gives a cognate *pe* for Brazilian Kokama. Given that the Brazilian Kokama are known to have broken off from the Peruvian Kokama in the 19th century, and that Brazilian Kokama *pe* is cognate to Omagua *pɪ*, this suggests that the Peruvian Kokama proclitic form is an innovation, perhaps by analogy the proclitic patterns for the 1PL.EXCL and 3PL (see Table 4.2).

Lastly, the PTG deictic **aʔe* ‘he, that one there [visible or invisible]’ was inherited to fill the absent slot of 3SG pronoun, for which no form existed in PTG (Jensen, 1998, p. 551). Jensen (ibid.) indicates that the employment of this deictic as a pronominal form was common in some TG daughter languages.

Chapter 5

Nominalization

POK inherited six of eleven TG nominalizers as productive grammatical morphemes. In addition, three nominalizers are of unknown origin. These forms are summarized in Table 5.1 (adapted from Schleicher (1998, p. 144)). Non-inherited forms are grayed out, and the four rightward columns indicate at which historical moment and in which language the form is attested. All TG-related nominalizers in POK were originally retained with their corresponding function. Forms which are consonant-final in PTG show a final /a/ (see §2.2.1). The sections below discuss POK nominalizers of different types: §5.1 discusses agent nominalizers; §5.2 absolutive nominalizers; and §5.3 nominalizers of non-core arguments.¹

5.1 Agent Nominalizers: **-tara*, **-wara* & **-suri*

POK had three agent nominalizers, **-tara* AGT, **-wara* HAB.AGT and **-suri* HAB.AGT, the first two of which are of TG origin. The nominalizer **-tara* derives from one of three allomorphs (**-ár* ~ *-tsár* ~ *-tár*) of the agentive nominalizer reconstructed for PTG. These allomorphs attach to consonant-final, vowel-final and glide-final roots, respectively, as in (5.1)-(5.3).

¹Nominalization is a source of disagreement between Jensen (1998) and Schleicher (1998). Jensen argues that PTG had a series of subordinate clause-types, while Schleicher argues that the majority of those subordinate clauses are large juxtaposed nominals. This disagreement mainly concerns the EVENT.NOMZ in Table 5.1, which corresponds to Jensen’s serial verb suffix. Schleicher’s reconstruction suggests that “serial verbs” are simply nouns, and that the absolutive cross-referencing that Jensen claims is indicative of an older clause-type is really the absolutive cross-referencing used on all monovalent predicates, including nouns. Additionally, while Jensen does not reconstruct the habitual agent, proclivitive or origin nominalizers, her and Schleicher’s analyses concur with regard to all other nominalizers. Their disagreements are not relevant to the inheritance of POK forms, and the following discussion will not make note of them.

Table 5.1: PTG & POK Nominalizers & Attestations

PTG	Function	Form	Function	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
*-ár ~ -tsár ~ -tár	AGENT	*-tara	AGENT	✓	✓	✓	✓
*-βór	HAB.AGT	*-wara	HAB.AGT	✓	✓	∅	✓
*-βaʔe	CLAUSAL	*-may	ABSOLUTIVE	✓	∅	✓	✓
*-a ~ -áβo ~ -ta	EVENT	*-wa	EVENT	∅	✓	∅	✓
*-ts ^w ár	ADVERBIAL	*-suara	ADVERBIAL	∅	∅	✓	✓
n/a	n/a	*-pan	ABUNDANTIVE	✓	✓	∅	✓
*-pír	PATIENT	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
*-iwár	ORIGIN	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
*embí-	PATIENT	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
*-áβ ~ -tsáβ ~ -táβ	CIRCUMSTANTIAL	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
*-ts ^w ér	PROCLIVITIVE	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
∅	∅	*-surí	HAB.AGT	✓	✓	✓	✓
∅	∅	*-n	ABSOLUTIVE	✓	✓	∅	✓
∅	∅	*-ta	INSTRUMENTAL	✓	✓	∅	✓

(5.1) *oré repjákkár

oré r- epjákk -ár
 1PL.EXCL.ABS EPNTH- see -AGT.NOMZ
 ‘The one who see us’ [Lit. ‘Our seer’]
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 540)

(5.2) *ijukátsár

i- juká -tsár
 3.ABS- kill -AGT.NOMZ
 ‘His killer’
 (ibid.)

(5.3) *ipwájtár

i- pwáj -tár
 3.ABS order -AGT.NOMZ

‘One who order is it’ [Lit. ‘Its orderer’]
(ibid.)

Note that (5.1) & (5.3) are translated as relative clauses, and that (5.2) could similarly be translated ‘One who kills it’. In these constructions, the patient is realized as the possessor, though the possessor is not obligatory. In modern Omagua, *-tara* does not appear to be involved in these functionally relative clauses.² Rather, it derives agentive nouns from verbs, which function as single core arguments to the verb, as in (5.4).

(5.4) yapá ini usu umaitara kamatatarana.

yapá ini usu umai -tara kamata -tara =na
HORT 1PL.INCL go see -PURP work -AGT.NOMZ =PL.FS
‘Let’s go see the workers.’
(ZJO 2010, p. 134, LHC & AHC)

Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 593-595) describes the Kokama cognate as a nominalizer employed to functionally relativize A.³ In these constructions, the “relative clause” may follow or precede the head noun, as in (5.5) & (5.6), respectively (2010, p. 593). This is in keeping with a productive strategy of NP-modification via NP-NP-juxtaposition present in both languages.

(5.5) yawara tsa= mimira karuta -tara yapana =uy

yawara tsa= mimira karuta -tara yapana =uy
dog 1PL.FS son.of.woman bite -REL.A run =PAS1
‘The dog that bit my son escaped.’

(5.6) nana erurata napitsara muna tsa= tukini =uy

nana erura -tara napitsara muna tsa= tukini =uy
pineapple bring -REL.A man steal 1SG.FS= hammock =PAS1
‘The man who brought the pineapple stole my hammock.’

Vallejos Yopán (2010) does not provide any examples in which a *-tara*-marked noun functions as a single core argument, as in (5.4). In this way, the two daughter languages have diverged in the functional extent of **-tara*, with Kokama employing it in a wider range of functionally more complex expressions (as in PTG), although in both languages it may still be considered a nominalizer.

²However, this may be a result of language attrition and the difficulty on the part of many Omagua speakers to produce sentences with a relative clause translation.

³As she states, ‘KK does not have a specific subordination construction whose canonical function is to encode a relative clause. The language makes use of nominalized structures for functionally relative constructions’ (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 584).

Both **-tara* AGT.NOMZ and **-suri* HAB.AGT.NOMZ are attested in Old Omagua, as in (5.7).⁴

(5.7) ni sapiaritipa aikiara upakatu dios kumisamaykana, aisituy dios, upai ikuatara, roaya wifanisuri, roaya mitasuri, dios kumisaikua?

ni sapiari =tipa aikiara upa =katu dios kumisa -may
 2SG believe =INTERR DEM.PROX.DM all =INTSF God say -ABS.NOMZ
 =kana, aisituy dios, upa -i ikua -tara, roaya wifani
 =PL.MS, true God, all -? know -AGT.NOMZ, NEG be.deceiving
 -suri, roaya mita -suri, dios kumisa =ikua
 -HAB.AGT.NOMZ, NEG be.deceptive -HAB.AGT.NOMZ, God say =CL.REASON
 ‘Do you believe all the words of God, true God, all-knowing, not deceitful, not deceptive, because God said [them]?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

In addition to **-suri* (above), not known to be TG, POK possessed an additional habitual agent nominalizer **-wara*, from PTG **-bor* HAB.AGT.NOMZ. It appears in both daughter languages, as exemplified in (5.8). It is not attested in the religious texts.⁵

(5.8) ikuatawarataka uriari.

ikua -ta -wara =taka uri -ari
 know -CAUS -HAB.AGT =UNCERT come -PROG
 ‘Maybe the teacher is coming.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2004, p. 20)

Speakers of Omagua have largely lost control of the semantic distinction between the two habitual agent nominalizers. However, Vallejos Yopán (2004) contrasts Kokama *-wara* with *-tsurin* in the following way.

With *-wara*, the general reading of the resulting word is the habitual doer of the event expressed by the verb, someone who has a duty or job. In contrast, with *-tsurin* the result is someone expert in doing something and who likes to do it.

(Vallejos Yopán, 2004, p. 30)

⁴Note that *-tara* AGT.NOMZ appears to be far less frequent in modern Omagua than in the religious texts. Speakers seem to prefer the use of *-wara* over *-tara*, potentially because the latter is also homophonous with a purposive suffix, as shown in (5.4).

⁵In addition, **-wara* functions endocentrically. It may attach to nouns to derive a variety of meanings, as in Omagua *manipiarawara* ‘fisherman’ (Sp. *anzuelero*), from *manipiará* ‘fishhook’. It appears to have retained this polyfunctionality from its TG source, as the Tupinambá cognate *-bor* could also function endocentrically (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 264).

Omagua speakers appear to concur with this distinction, though in general they have lost control of the fine-grained semantic distinctions between the agent nominalizers. Lastly, note that PTG **-βor*, the cognate of *-wara*, is only attested in Tupinambá and Old Guaraní (Schleicher, 1998, p. 148), which severely limits candidate lexifier languages.

5.2 Absolute Nominalizers: *-may & *-n

POK exhibited two absolutive nominalizers **-may* and **-n*, which derived a noun referring to the S of intransitives and the P of transitives. The former has fallen out of Kokama, whereas Omagua possesses both *-may* and *-n*.⁶ The discussion here begins with the distribution *-may* in modern Omagua before discussing its origins in Tupí-Guaraní. Following that, **-n* is more briefly discussed.

In (5.9), *-may* derives a noun that refers to the S_P of a stative intransitive, and in (5.10) it derives a noun that refers to the P of a transitive verb. In both examples, the derived noun functions as the sole NP in its new argument position.

(5.9) *tfunanimaymukui ta usu ukakati.*

<i>tfunani</i>	<i>-may</i>	<i>=mukui</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>usu</i>	<i>uka</i>	<i>=kati</i>
be.small	-ABS.NOMZ	=COM	1SG.MS	go	house	=ALLATIVE

‘I go with the small one to the house.’
(TES 2010)

(5.10) *tana yumi nisupi upa ni piatamay.*

<i>tana</i>	<i>yumi</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>=supi</i>	<i>upa</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>piata</i>	<i>-may</i>
1PL.EXCL.MS	give	2SG	=DATIVE	all	2SG	ask.for	-ABS.NOMZ

‘We give you everything you ask for.’
(TES 2010)

In addition, *-may*-derived nouns that refer to P may be juxtaposed with a non-derived noun in an NP-NP juxtaposition. These derived nouns can additionally be possessed to yield a functionally relative clause. (5.11) exemplifies this in object position.

(5.11) *tana ipurakasari carretera ipi piatamay.*

<i>tana</i>	<i>ipuraka</i>	<i>=sari</i>	<i>carretera</i>	<i>ipi</i>	<i>piata</i>	<i>-may</i>
1PL.EXCL.MS	make	=FUT	highway	2PL	ask.for	-ABS.NOMZ

‘We will build the highway that you all ask for.’
(LHC, 09AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.3.trans)

⁶There is frozen evidence that *-may* was once productive in Kokama (see §8.2.3).

-may-derived nouns that refer to the S of an active verb must obligatorily appear with a juxtaposed noun, also yielding functionally relative clauses. This is shown by the grammaticality and ungrammaticality of (5.12) & (5.13), respectively.

(5.12) *yapisara yapanamay usu kamatatara.*

yapisara yapana -may usu kamata -tara
 man run -ABS.NOMZ go work -PURP
 ‘The man who ran is going in order to work.’
 (TES 2010)

(5.13) **yapanamay ru panarakana.*

yapana -may ru panara =kana
 run -ABS.NOMZ eat plantain =PL.MS
 ‘The one who runs eats bananas.’ (intended interpretation)
 (TES 2010)

Table 5.2 summarizes these distributions. Grayed-out constructions are ungrammatical.

Table 5.2: Distribution of *-may* ABS.NOMZ in Omagua

Construction	Arg. Referred To	Construction	Arg. Referred To
[TR.V- <i>may</i>] _{NP}	P	[NP TR.V- <i>may</i>] _{CPLX.NP}	P
[STAT.INTR.V- <i>may</i>] _{NP}	S	[NP STAT.INTR.V- <i>may</i>] _{CPLX.NP}	S
ACT.INTR.V- <i>may</i>	∅	[NP ACT.INTR.V- <i>may</i>] _{CPLX.NP}	S

POK **-may* derives from the PTG clausal nominalizer **-baʔé*. Examples (5.14)-(5.16) show the clausal nominalizer on stative intransitive, active intransitive and transitive verbs, respectively.

(5.14) **ikatúbaʔé.*

i- katú -baʔé
 3.ABS be.good -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
 ‘He one that is good.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 542)

(5.15) **otsóbaʔé.*

o- *tsó* *-baʔé*
 3.ERG- go -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
 ‘The one who goes.’
 (ibid.)

(5.16) *oisuʔúbaʔé*. (Tupinambá)

o- *i-* *suʔú* *-baʔé*
 3.ERG- 3.ABS- bite -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
 ‘The one that bit him.’
 (ibid.)

Note that, as a clausal nominalizer, PTG **-baʔé* attaches to a fully cross-referenced verb stem. However, it follows a nominative-accusative alignment, and does not appear to derive nouns referring to P, as shown for Omagua. The question is, then, how did POK **-may* develop an ergative-absolutive distribution, particularly a split ergative distribution (as can be seen by the different requirements on stative and active intransitive verbs nominalized with *-may* in Table 5.2)? In general, the answer to this question lies outside the scope of this work, as it appears that the use of cognates to **-may* to derive nouns referring to P was already extant in some TG daughter languages, such as Wayampí, where the cognate *maʔẽ* derives nouns referring to either A or P, as in (5.17) & (5.18).⁷

(5.17) *enupã maʔẽ*

e- *nupã* *maʔẽ*
 1SG.ABS- hit CLAUS.NOMZ
 ‘The one that hit me’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 543)

(5.18) *anupã maʔẽ*

a- *nupã* *maʔẽ*
 1SG.ERG- hit CLAUS.NOMZ
 ‘The one that I hit’
 (ibid.)

Note that only the Wayampí cross-referencing prefixes serve to differentiate between the two readings. Given that these prefixes are not productive in POK, it may have been that the types of nouns that POK **-may* derived were obscured, leading to this morpheme only deriving nouns that refer to the P of transitive verbs. Note that, since not all TG daughter languages employ cognate of

⁷It also derives nouns referring to S, as well, representing a language in which PTG **-baʔé* is most polyfunctional. What is peculiar about the function of POK **-may* is that it does not derive nouns referring to A.

*-*baʔé* to nominalize P, the distribution of this clausal nominalizer is a diagnostic for determining a TG lexifier language.⁸ Finally, a remaining question to be answered in future work is, given that PTG *-*baʔé* attached to a fully formed VP, how did POK *-*may* come to derive nouns referring to S_P and P from argument-less verbs. Note that the requirement for a fully formed VP remained when deriving nouns referring to S.

In contrast to PTG *-*baʔé*, POK *-*n* is of unknown origin. The earliest attestations of it come from Espinosa (1935), which he analyzes (incorrectly) as a passive, as in (5.19).

(5.19) ta papa tsitan ta

ta *papa* *tsita* *-n* *ta*
 1SG.MS father love -ABS.NOMZ 1SG.MS
 ‘I am loved by my father.’ [Lit. ‘My father’s loved thing is me.’]
 (Espinosa, 1935, p. 55)

Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 585-592) analyzes *-n* as a nominalizer of S & P (in her terms O) functionally involved in relative clause formation. The resultant relative clause may precede or follow the NP. (5.20) & (5.21) give examples of it preceding.

(5.20) victor ikaran awa.

victor *ikara* *-n* *awa*
 Victor sing -NOMZ person
 ‘Victor is a person that sings.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 585)

(5.21) tana erutsuka rana yumin karamina.

tana *erutsu* *-ka* *rana* *yumi* *-n* *karamina*
 1PL.EXCL.MS bring -ITER 3PL.MS give -NOMZ corrugated.iron
 ‘We carry the corrugated iron that they donate.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 590)

In Old Omagua and the modern languages, juxtaposed NPs follow an $NP_{MOD} NP_{HEAD}$ order, where the former noun modifies the latter. Because of this, I consider the preposed order in (5.20) & (5.21) to be the older syntactic realization of functionally relative clauses. Postposed order is perhaps a result of the influence of the translation of Spanish relative clauses. *-n* has fallen out of the speech of most speakers of Omagua, due to both the phonological reduction of closed syllables and distributional pressure from *-may*. When a verb is not nominalized with *-may* or *-n* overtly, it

⁸This was first pointed out by Stark (2010, p. 16).

may show a final stress pattern resultant from the erstwhile closed syllable, which results in a stress clash, as in (5.22).

(5.22) *taná uri ritama nuásúy.*

taná *uri* *ritama* *nuá* =*suy*
 1PL.EXCL.MS come village be.big.ABS.NOMZ =ABLATIVE
 ‘We come from the big village.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 109, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

5.3 Other Nominalizers

The following discussion treats three remaining PTG nominalizers and one nominalizer of unknown origin: **-ts^wár* ADVERBIAL.NOMZ (§5.3.1); **-a* ~ *-áβo* ~ *-ta* EVENT.NOMZ (§5.3.2); *-pan* ABUNDANTIVE.NOMZ (§5.3.3); and *-ta* INSTRUMENTAL.NOMZ (§5.3.4).

5.3.1 **-ts^wár* ADVERBIAL.NOMZ

The PTG adverbial nominalizer **-ts^wár* indicates ‘that which which is characterized by the preceding circumstances (indicated by an adverb or a postpositional phrase)’ (Jensen, 1998, p. 544). Jensen’s adverbial nominalizer subsumes Schleicher’s adverbial and origin nominalizers (see Table 5.1), as evidenced by the examples she cites from Kayabí and Tupinambá, as shown in (5.23) and (5.24), respectively.

(5.23) *Cuiabápe wat*

Cuiabá *-pe* *-wat*
 Cuiabá -LOC -ORIGIN.NOMZ?
 ‘The ones from Cuiabá’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 544)

(5.24) *pópeswára*

pó *-pe* *-swar* *-a*
 hand -LOC -ADV.NOMZ? -REF
 ‘That which is in the hand’
 (ibid.)

PTG **-ts^wár* was inherited into POK as **-suara*; however, it is evident in only two attestations from Old Omagua, shown in (5.25).

(5.25) *roaya dioskaisuara purai ra umanu iminua.*

roaya dios -kai -suara purai ra umanu iminua
 NEG God -? -ADV.NOMZ CONTRASTIVE.FOC 3SG.MS die long.ago
 ‘It was not as God that He died long ago.’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

In (5.25), *-suara* attaches to a noun. It is thus inaccurate to describe *-suara* as a nominalizer in Old Omagua (though it may have been in POK). Rather, in these limited examples, it functions as denominal adverbializer, which modifies some predicate by way of stipulating the set of attributes of some other referent which stand in for those of the referent of the argument (here verbal subject).⁹ In this function it seems to resemble a similitive. However, a separate similitive *=ya* is attested in Old Omagua, which also attaches to nouns, as in (5.26).¹⁰ The similitive is productive in Kokama, though it does not appear to be so in Omagua.

(5.26) *roaya miarakanayakatu ini sumukui rana umanu.*

roaya miara =kana =ya =katu ini su =mukui rana umanu
 NEG monkey =PL.MS =SIM.MS =INTSF 1PL.INCL body =COM 3PL.MS die
 ‘They don’t die with our body like those [souls] of animals.’

The similitive, then, contrasts with the adverbializer semantically, in that the former stipulates the set of attributes which characterize or partially redefine those of the referent of the argument, while the adverbializer stipulates the set of attributes which wholly stand in for those of the referent of the argument. With the adverbializer, the original referent essentially becomes another, while this is not the case with the similitive.¹¹ This is shown by the pair of English examples below, the first of which would in theory contain *-suara*, the latter *=ya*.

(5.27) He worked all day **as** the President, but was a good father to his children in the evening.

(5.28) He worked all day **like** the President, but was a good father to his children in the evening.

I posit that **-suara* was originally inherited into POK as an adverbial nominalizer with the distribution outlined by Jensen, but was subsequently reanalyzed as an adverbializer. However, I cannot currently explain the mechanism that motivated the reversal in function from a deadverbial nominalizer to a denominal adverbializer.

⁹In this way its function resembles what has been called attributive case in TG studies, reconstructed by Jensen (1998) as **-ramo ~ -amo*. This suffix attaches to nouns in PTG, but was not inherited into POK.

¹⁰In response to, ‘Our souls, don’t they die with our bodies?’

¹¹Omagua has innovative constructions that appear to be sensitive to this semantic distinction (i.e., *mtiru* versus *-sana*). However, comparative constructions in general are outside the scope of this work.

5.3.2 *-*wa* EVENT.NOMZ

Following Schleicher’s (1998) analysis, PTG exhibited an “abstract nominalizer” *-*a* ~ -*áβo* ~ -*ta* (C-final, V-final & G-final roots, respectively), here retermed an event nominalizer. This suffix corresponds to Jensen’s serial verb suffixes. The allomorph for consonant-final roots was retained as an event nominalizer *-*wa* in POK.

The POK event nominalizer *-*wa* is not attested in Omagua. However, it is described by Vallejos Yopán for Kokama (2010, p. 253), as in (5.29).

(5.29) ay inuumi tsuniwa

<i>ay</i>	<i>inu=</i>	<i>umi</i>	<i>tsuni</i>	<i>-wa</i>
already	3PL.FS=	see	be.dark	-EVENT.NOMZ
‘They already see darkness.’				

Because of its existence in both Kokama and TG, I consider it reconstructable for POK. Further work will determine its productivity in Omagua.

5.3.3 *-*pan* ABUNDANTIVE.NOMZ

The POK abundantive attaches to intransitive verbs and nouns, and derives a noun characterized by an abundance of the quality/action (for verbal heads) or referent (for nominal heads) denoted by the head. The derived noun may denote a location or an individual.¹² Omagua has -*pa*, whereas Kokama has -*pan*. I tentatively reconstruct POK *-*pan*, given correspondences between closed and open syllables in Kokama and Omagua, respectively. However, -*pa*/*-pan* does not show the preservation of word-final stress in Omagua typical of this correspondence.¹³ This morpheme overlaps functionally with the absolutive nominalizer *-*may* in attaching to statives and with the agentive nominalizers in attaching to active intransitives. At present it is unclear what the fine-grained semantic distinctions of this overlap are. Table 5.3 (adapted from Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 254)) illustrates Kokama nouns derived from statives and other nouns with -*pan*. Spanish translations are given to offset awkward English translations.

Table 5.4 illustrates -*pa* on active intransitives and nouns in Omagua.

An abundantive nominalizer has not as of yet been reconstructed for PTG. However, various daughter languages exhibit a nominalizer with the same function. Particularly illustrative is the

¹²Along with *-*wara*, *-*pan* is the only other POK nominalizer that may also function endocentrically.

¹³Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 254-255) speculates that the abundantive may derive from the sequence -*pa-n* CPL-ABS.NOMZ. However, the completive and abundantive may coöccur, and reduplication of grammatical morphemes is otherwise unattested in the language.

Table 5.3: Kokama Nouns Derived with *-pan*

Head	Segmentation	Gloss	Spanish	English
STATIVE	<i>yamima-pan</i>	be.sad-ABUND	penoso	someone grieving
	<i>yumira-pan</i>	be.furious-ABUND	rabioso	a crazy-person
	<i>akitfa-pan</i>	be.scared-ABUND	miedoso	coward
NOUN	<i>itaki-pan</i>	stone-ABUND	pedregal	quarry
	<i>miriti-pan</i>	aguaje-ABUND	aguajal	aguaje farm
	<i>panara-pan</i>	banana-ABUND	bananal	banana farm

Table 5.4: Omagua Nouns Derived with *-pa*

Segmentation	Gloss	Spanish	English
<i>apuka-pa</i>	laugh-ABUND	riedón	someone who laughs a lot
<i>yaupara-pa</i>	flee-ABUND	huyedón	someone who always runs away
<i>wainú-pa</i>	woman-ABUND	homosexual	gay man

Tupinambá cognate *-por*, which has the same distribution described above, appearing on intransitives and nouns (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 265).¹⁴ Based on this evidence I tentatively include it here as derivative of TG.

5.3.4 **-ta* INSTRUMENTAL.NOMZ

Both Omagua and Kokama exhibit a non-productive instrumental nominalizer *-ta*, which is frozen to a small set of verb roots, and derives nouns that denote the tool used to carry out the action denoted by the verb. Table 5.5 shows a small set of forms from Omagua.¹⁵

Additional Omagua forms may show relics of this suffix, but no verb root has been attested (e.g., *kumata* ‘strainer’ and *wauta* ‘fan’). Its non-TG origin remains unknown, though I argue that it is reconstructable for POK due to the fact that it attaches (or did so historically) to roots of TG origin, which indicates that it was not inherited from a non-lexifier language as part of a frozen stem.

¹⁴Other cognates are Tenetehára *-pôr* (Boudin, 1978); Kamaiurá *-pot* (Seki, 2000); and possibly Paraguayan Guaraní *-pi* ~ *-mbi* (Canese and Alcaraz, 2001).

¹⁵*yupita* comes from Tessmann (1930), cited by Espinosa (1935, p. 185).

Table 5.5: Omagua & Kokama Forms with *-ta* SC INSTR.NOMZ

Segmentation	Gloss	Translation
yapina-ta	cut.hair-INSTR.NOMZ	scissors
yapukui-ta	row-INSTR.NOMZ	oar
yupi-ta	braid-INSTR.NOMZ	Sp. <i>trenzador</i>

Chapter 6

Verbal Tense-Aspect-Mood

This chapter describes POK tense-aspect-mood categories and the forms that mark those categories, in order to illustrate two points that differentiate TAM from the other grammatical domains of Part II. First, tense-aspect-mood is a domain in which POK retained only one of many extant TG forms. Second, POK tense-aspect-mood categories are nevertheless largely parallel to those of PTG, but are marked either by forms of unknown origin or by TG forms that originally exhibited a different function. With regard to TG forms with different functions, in some cases grammaticalization processes that appear to have occurred in the prehistory of PTG occurred independently in POK. In other cases, the function of POK forms represent a novel grammaticalization process. Section 6.1 treats the desiderative and tense; §6.2 temporal aspect; §6.3 pluractionality; and §6.4 epistemic modality.

Extensive discussion of TAM is lacking in Jensen (1998) and Schleicher (1998), largely because many TAM markers have been described by TG researchers as “particles”, and no systematic work has been carried out to reconstruct those forms and analyze their syntactic properties. An aim of current work at UC Berkeley is to adequately describe and reconstruct these particles. However, due to the incipient stages of that project and the lack of data on some Omagua TAM forms, the discussion here is limited to the set of forms that are either discussed in Jensen (1998) or Schleicher (1998), or for which descriptions exist in Kokama and Omagua.

Table 6.1 summarizes PTG tense-aspect-mood markers in comparison with those in the history of POK. It differs from other tables in this thesis in that it aligns PTG and POK forms per a given function, such that forms that appear on the same line may not be cognate. That function may be one that exists in only PTG, only POK, or in both PTG and POK. This format is intended to show which POK forms encode functions with correlates in TG (and whether or not those POK

forms are of TG or unknown origin) in contrast to those POK forms that encode functions without correlates in TG (which are necessarily of non-TG origin). With this in mind, a \emptyset should be read as indicating that there exists no cognate with the specific relevant function. However, a cognate with a different function may exist (cf., POK $*=mia$). A question mark should be read as indicating that it is unknown whether such a cognate exists. The four rightmost columns indicate in which languages a cognate form is attested. I use reconstructed POK forms when possible.¹

Table 6.1: PTG & POK TAM Categories & Forms

Category		PTG Form	Form	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
Tense	PAST	\emptyset	$*=suri$	✓	✓	\emptyset	✓
			$=ikwá$	\emptyset	✓	\emptyset	\emptyset
			$*=uí$	✓	✓	\emptyset	✓
	FUTURE	$*-potar$	$=usu$	✓	✓	\emptyset	\emptyset
			$=sari$	✓	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
			$=á$	\emptyset	✓	\emptyset	\emptyset
Desid. Modality	DESIDERATIVE	$*-potar$	$*seta$	✓	✓	✓	✓
			$*putari$	\emptyset	\emptyset	✓	✓
Sentential Mod.	FRUSTRATIVE	$-biã$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
Temp. Aspect	IMPERFECTIVE	\emptyset	$*=ari$	✓	✓	✓	✓
	COMPLETIVE	$*-paḅ$	$*=upa$	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pluractionality	ITERATIVE	?	$-kapa$	✓	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
			$*-ka$	\emptyset	✓	\emptyset	✓
	DISTRIBUTIVE	[monosyll. redup.]	$*-ka$	\emptyset	✓	\emptyset	?
	FREQUENTATIVE	[bisyll. redup.]	?	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
Epistemic Mod.	CERTAINTY	\emptyset	$*=tina$	✓	✓	✓	✓
	UNCERTAINTY	\emptyset	$*=taku$	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
	HYPOTHETICAL	\emptyset	$*=mia$	✓	✓	✓	✓

¹For the sake of simplicity, I do not include reduplication strategies present in POK and the modern languages in this chart, though see §6.3.

6.1 Desiderative and Tense

POK desiderative constructions involved one of two matrix verbs, **seta* or **putari* ‘want’, and a complement. With **seta*, complementation is carried out via clausal juxtaposition, as in (6.1), from modern Omagua. A coreferential argument is not realized in the complement clause.

(6.1) *ta sita yatima sandiana ta piripitasmuni.*

<i>ta</i>	<i>sita</i>	<i>yatima</i>	<i>sandia</i>	<i>=na</i>	<i>ta</i>	<i>piripi</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>=smuni</i>
1SG.MS	want	plant	watermelon	=PL.FS	1SG.MS	buy	-CAUS	=PURP

‘I want to plant watermelons in order to sell [them].’
(LHC, 10AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

**seta*, of unknown origin, has been retained in both modern languages, whereas **putari* has fallen out. POK **putari* derives from PTG **potar* ‘want’. This form is only attested once in the history of these languages (in Old Omagua), in a nominalized form, as shown in (6.2). As such, its requirements on complementation cannot be determined with certainty, as with **seta*.

(6.2) *rasimay kumisamaypupi ra ni putarimaypupi purai.*

<i>ra</i>	<i>=simay</i>	<i>kumisa</i>	<i>-may</i>	<i>=pupi</i>	<i>ra</i>	<i>ni</i>	<i>putari</i>	<i>-may</i>
3SG.MS	=INTSF	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=INSTR	3SG.MS	NEG	want	-ABS.NOMZ

=pupi purai.
=INSTR CONTRASTIVE.FOC
‘With his words and not with his desires.’
(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

The expression of tense in the modern languages is carried out via a series of non-obligatory V- or VP-final enclitics. Omagua exhibits three tense markers (two in the past and one in the future), while Kokama exhibits five (three in the past and two in the future). These forms are summarized in Table 6.2.

The three Omagua tense markers are exemplified in (6.3)-(6.5). (6.3) comes from a story in which the speaker is reflecting on memories of his grandfather, who has been dead for over fifty years. (6.4) comes from a brief story relating what the speaker did after the previous day’s linguistic work. (6.5) comes from a story discussing what would happen if the local government built a road connecting San Joaquín de Omaguas to the local Iquitos-Nauta highway.

(6.3) *ta amui iminua ra ukuasuri upai makati. ra ususuri ipasunakati umanutatara iwasuna.*

<i>ta</i>	<i>amui</i>	<i>iminua</i>	<i>ra</i>	<i>ukua</i>	<i>=suri</i>	<i>upai</i>	<i>makati.</i>	<i>ra</i>
1SG.MS	grandfather	long.ago	3SG.MS	go.about	=DIST.PST	all	where.	3SG.MS

<i>usu</i>	<i>=suri</i>	<i>ipasu</i>	<i>=na</i>	<i>=kati</i>	<i>umanu</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-tara</i>	<i>iwasu</i>	<i>=na</i>
go	=DIST.PST	lake	=PL.FS	ALLATIVE	die	-CAUS	-PURP	paiche	=PL.FS

Table 6.2: Omagua & Kokama Tense Enclitics

Category		Omagua	Kokama
PAST	DISTAL	= <i>suri</i>	= <i>tsuri(ay)</i>
	MEDIAL	∅	= <i>ikwá</i>
	PROXIMAL	= <i>í</i>	= <i>uy</i>
FUTURE	PROXIMAL	= <i>sari</i>	= <i>utsu</i>
	DISTAL		= <i>á</i>

‘A long time ago, my grandfather used to go about everywhere. He would go the lakes to kill paiche [fish sp].’
(LHC, 06AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

(6.4) *tsi usuí kawakati. tsi usuí iwírakana iruratara, ta uka upatamira.*

tsi usu =í kawa =kati. tsi usu =í iwira =kana
1SG.FS go =PROX.PST jungle =ALLATIVE. 1SG.FS go =PROX.PST tree =PL.MS
irura -tara, ta uka upa -ta -mira
bring -PURP, 1SG.MS house end -CAUS -PURP
‘I went to the jungle. I went to bring back trees to finish my house.’
(LHC, 06AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

(6.5) *urisari* carro nuamayna rana irususimuni awana, pero ro tana umay mañapkatu rana ipurakasari.

uri =sari carro nua -may =na rana irusu =sinuni awa
come =FUT car be.big -ABS.NOMZ =PL.FS 3PL.FS take =PURP person
=na, pero ro tana umay mañapkatu rana ipuraka =sari
=PL.FS, CONJ NEG 1PL.EXCL.MS see when 3PL.MS make =FUT
‘Big cars will come to take people [i.e., to Iquitos], but we don’t see when they’re going to build [it].’
(LHC, 09AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.3.trans)

In Kokama, these forms are always VP-final enclitics (SVO word order). In Omagua, they may appear VP-finally only with pronominal objects, otherwise they attach directly to the verb.² Kokama exhibits three past tenses distinguished by the temporal distance of the moment described by an utterance from the moment of utterance itself. Omagua possesses only two. The past tense

²When pronominal objects and tense enclitics cooccur, a proclitic is used.

categories shared by both languages (distal and proximal) show cognate forms.³ The future tense categories are not parallel and do not show cognate forms. In Kokama, a proximal-distal distinction exists, as with the past tenses. Additionally, future =*á*, unlike =*utsu*, encodes a dual irrealis future reading, but is falling out of the language (Vallejos Yopán, 2004). The Omagua future, =*sari*, on the other hand, is not sensitive to temporal distance or reality status. Omagua does exhibit a clitic =*usu*, cognate to Kokama =*utsu* FUT. However, this form functions primarily as an andative, as is evidenced by the ungrammaticality of sentences in which it attaches to verbs where an andative reading would be semantically incongruous (6.6) & (6.7).

(6.6) *amitiusu uka.

amiti =usu uka
 EXST =AND house
 ‘There will be a house [i.e., in this spot].’ (intended interpretation)
 (ZJO 2010, p. 63, LHC & AHC, OMG given)

(6.7) *amua wata uriusu musaprika patiri.

amua wata uri =usu musaprika patiri
 another year come =AND three priest
 ‘Next year three priests will come.’ (intended interpretation)
 (ZJO 2010, p. 62, LHC & AHC, OMG given)

In addition, it may appear with past adverbs, such as *ikwafi* ‘yesterday’, as in (6.8).

(6.8) *ikwafi tsi yasukusu.*

ikwafi tsi yasuka =usu
 yesterday 1SG.FS bathe =ANDATIVE
 ‘Yesterday I went to bathe.’
 (AHC, 06AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

In both languages, I assume =*usu*/=*utsu* to result from the grammaticalization of the full POK verb **usu* ‘go’, which has been retained in both languages. I assume Omagua =*usu* ANDATIVE to represent a prior point in the grammaticalization trajectory from ‘go’ to FUTURE. Given that Omagua =*usu* has not fully grammaticalized beyond an andative, I consider only the andative function reconstructable for POK.

³Vallejos Yopán (2004) suggests that the Kokama medial past =*ikwá* grammaticalized from *ikwatfi* ‘yesterday’. This Kokama-internal process accounts for its absence in Omagua and for its anomolous relic final stress.

There are no attestations of the past tense markers in the religious texts.⁴ However, two strategies are attested to express a future, which provide an account of the origin of distinct future markers in each modern language: the use of the imperfective =*ari*, and a complex sequence =*usuari* (a combination of the andative and imperfective).⁵ These are shown in (6.9)⁶ & (6.10), respectively.

(6.9) *ini sawakana muriapai tina rana kakiriari.*

ini sawa =kana muriapai tina rana kakiri =ari.
 1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS always CERT 3PL.MS live =IMPF
 ‘Our souls will live forever.’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(6.10) *mura kwarafipupi uyawiritipa ini kakiriusuari?*

mura kwarafi =pupi uyawiri =tipa ini kakiri =usu =ari
 3SG.MS day =INSTR again =INTERR 1PL.INCL live =AND =IMPF
 ‘That day, are we going to live again?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

I propose that modern Kokama =*á* FUT is a reduction of imperfective =*ari*, which accounts for the fact that it bears stress and is irrealis in nature. Furthermore, the apocope of the final CV of grammatical morphemes is widely attested in the history of Kokama.⁷ That =*á* derives from =*ari* is evidenced by data from Espinosa (1935), where constructions with =*utsu* are interchangeable with those with =*ari*. That is, one actually sees the full =*ari* being interpreted functionally as a future.⁸

(6.11) *rana juka rutsu*

rana juka ra =utsu
 3PL.MS DEM.DIST.MS 3SG.MS =FUT
 ‘They will be.’ [Lit. ‘Them, that [one] they will be.’]
 (Espinosa, 1935, p. 44)

(6.12) *rana juka rari*

rana juka ra =ari
 3PL.MS DEM.DIST.MS 3SG.MS =FUT
 ‘They will be.’ [Lit. ‘Them, that [one] they will be.’]
 (ibid.)

⁴This is despite a narration of Christian history, which would be expected to exhibit the distal past marker =*suri*.

⁵See Appendix D, examples (D.47), (D.48), (D.53) & (D.54) for all attestations of =*usuari*.

⁶As part of a response to, ‘Our souls, don’t they die with our bodies?’

⁷E.g., Kokama =*ka* LOC & =*pu* INSTR in comparison to modern and Old Omagua =*kati* LOC & =*pupi* INSTR.

⁸Segmentation and glossing are my own.

The fact that markers of temporal reference may originate in aspectual markers is not surprising. That is, different types of temporal reference may stem from a pragmatic implicature whereby markers of ‘closed’ aspects (in the sense of Smith (1991)) come to be interpreted as markers of past tense, and markers of ‘open’ aspect (ibid.) come to be interpreted as markers of future tense. Note, however, that the POK completive **=upa* was not reinterpreted as a marker of past tense.

Similarly, I propose that Omagua *=sari* FUT is a reduction of Old Omagua *=usuari*, by way of three processes. First, given that the labialization of post-consonantal /u/ is a common way to resolve vowel hiatus in modern Omagua, the underlying sequence /sua/ would have likely been realized as [swa] in fast speech. In this position, [w] may have been difficult to perceive, and was thus subsequently lost. This leaves an intermediate form *usari*. I propose that initial /u/ was lost as an additional vowel hiatus resolution strategy, which would have been facilitated by the fact that /u/ was located in an unstressed syllable, which are often reduced via vowel deletion in the modern languages.

In each language, then, the future derives from the imperfective, which was additionally retained. In turn, Kokama has since grammaticalized a new future *=utsu* from an andative, which is phasing out the older *=á*, and Omagua is on its way to doing so. Given the grammaticalization trajectories across the two languages, I consider andative *=usu* and imperfective *=ari* to be reconstructable for POK. I do not reconstruct any future tense morphemes for the same reason, as summarized in Table 6.3.

Table 6.3: POK Tense Enclitics

Category		POK
PAST	DISTAL	<i>=suri</i>
	PROXIMAL	<i>=uí</i>

I reconstruct *=suri* and not *=suriay* (see Table 6.2) for the distal past because modern *=tsuriay* is only found in the Kokamilla dialect of Kokama. I do not reconstruct a medial past because of its absence in modern Omagua and explanation by way of language-internal grammaticalization in Kokama. I reconstruct *=uí* for the proximal past given evidence from Espinosa (1935) and known sound changes that occurred between POK and Kokama. Espinosa (1935, p. 40-41) contrasts Kokama proximate past *úi* with Omagua *uí*, and states the following.

El Omagua usa la misma desinencia, con la particularidad de que el acento pasa a la *i* (uí), con algunas excepciones en que es *í* simplemente. Esta última forma contracta se

emplea siempre que el verbo termina en *i*...⁹

Despite his claims about underlying =*uí*, Espinosa provides no examples in which /u/ surfaces. This parallels the findings from Omagua fieldwork, in which only =*í* surfaced. However, given that there is little data on this form, I assume Espinosa's underlying analysis to be correct, at least for some point in time. Regarding Kokama sound changes (see above), many Kokama forms correspond to Omagua and TG cognates in having shifted stress leftward one syllable (with a variety of phonological results).¹⁰ Although some of this correspondence remains to be understood via additional phonological reconstruction, I propose that a similar stress shift occurred with the proximal past, yielding Kokama =*ui*.

The discussion of Omagua and Kokama future markers fits into the larger discussion of POK tense-aspect-mood in that no TG tense morphology was retained in POK. The future tense morphemes in Omagua and Kokama, which are of TG origin, are the result of the language-internal grammaticalization of TG forms with previously different functions. Lastly, the fact that POK exhibited tense distinctions only in the past is expected from a cross-linguistic perspective. Given data collected from 60 languages, Dahl (1983, p. 107) claims that 'in general, the distinctions in the past appear to be more well developed – that is, to be more numerous and well defined than those in the future.' Given that the past tense markers are of unknown origin, searching for languages with a two-way past tense distinction may be fruitful for locating a non-TG language involved in the genesis of POK.

Unlike POK, tense and desiderative constructions in TG languages are formally related. That is, many TG languages exhibit future and desiderative suffixes that derive from the full verb **potar* 'want' (recall Old Omagua *putari*). Tupinambá, the oldest recorded TG language, has only a desiderative based on this form, as in (6.13).¹¹

(6.13) *erekarupotar*.

<i>ere-</i>	<i>karu</i>	<i>-potar</i>
2SG.ERG-	eat	-DESID
'You want to eat.'		
(Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 148)		

Urubú-Ka'ápor has both a desiderative and future based on **potar*.

(6.14) *oho tar katu*

⁹Translation: 'Omagua uses the same ending, with the distinction that the accent moves to the *i* (*uí*), with some exceptions in which it is simply *í*. This last contracted form is always used with verbs that end in *i*.'

¹⁰An in-depth discussion of this process lies outside the scope of this work.

¹¹Segmentation and glossing of (6.13)-(6.16) are at times adapted to better fit the present discussion.

o- ho tar katu
 3SG- go DESID INTSF
 ‘He really wants to go.’
 (Kakumasu, 1986, p. 385)

(6.15) *oho ta tipe*

o- ho ta tipe
 3SG- go FUT ?
 ‘He intended to go, but didn’t.’
 (ibid.)

Wayampí has a future *-ta* that is identical to the desiderative, as in (6.16).

(6.16) *apitata.*

a- pita -ta
 1SG.ERG- stay -DESID/FUT
 ‘I will stay.’ ~ ‘I want to stay.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 536)

Based on these three languages, it appears that in various TG languages a desiderative has grammaticalized into a future. In some cases (Urubú-Ka’ápor), grammaticalization occurred in tandem with phonological reduction, such that the two resultant morphemes are synchronically distinct. In other cases (Wayampí), the desiderative itself seems to have already been reduced to a minimum CV, such that no additional phonological reduction accompanied its grammaticalization into a future, and the synchronic forms are identical. At present it is not clear whether these grammaticalization processes are shared retentions or independent innovations because the time-depth of various daughter languages is not known in relation to Tupinambá. That is, a future may have grammaticalized from a desiderative in Tupinambá subsequent to its being documented in the 16th and early 17th centuries.

A future based on **potar* is not attested in Old Omagua, modern Omagua, or Kokama. However, both modern languages exhibit a purposive *-tara*, as in (6.17) from Omagua and (6.18) from Kokama. I consider this form and function reconstructable for POK.

(6.17) *rasuy ta urí akiasirupi ta usu umaitara rana yumisarikia.*

rasuy ta urí =í akiasirupi ta usu umai -tara rana
 then 1SG.MS come =DIST.PST around.here 1SG.MS go see -PURP 3PL.MS
yumisarikia
 play
 ‘Then I came here [and then] I went to see them play.’
 (LHC, 09AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.1.trans)

(6.18) *apu uriu arutsu yumitara*

apu uri =uy arutsu yumi -tara
 chief come =PST rice give -PURP

‘The chief came to give rice.’

(Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 619)

In **-tara* purposive clauses, the ellipsed nominative argument is coreferential with the absolutive argument of the main clause.¹² I propose that POK **-tara* PURP has its origins in the TG future morphemes described above. Future work will depict this process, as well as chart the origin of other POK purposives.

6.2 Verbal Aspectual Marking

POK had two temporal aspectual clitics **=ari* IMPERFECTIVE and **=upa* COMPLETIVE. The former was illustrated in §6.1. The latter is illustrated in (6.19), from Old Omagua.¹³

(6.19) ...*aikiara tuyukari ini yuritiupa rafi, iwati*
may ritama =kati ini usu =smuni.

aikiara tuyuka =ari ini yuriti =upa rafi, iwati
 DEM.PROX.MS land =DIFF.LOC 1PL.INCL remain =CPL NON.ASSERT, high.up
-may ritama =kati ini usu =smuni.
 =ABS.NOMZ village =ALL 1PL.INCL go =PURP.

‘...and when we cease to remain on this Earth, in order to go to Heaven.’

(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

In both daughter languages **=upa* has been reduced to *=pa*, which appears to be a direct retention of PTG **-paβ* CPL. However, the initial /u/ in the Old Omagua form suggests that it is a grammaticalization from a POK verb with frozen morphology (PTG 3.ERG **o-*). Indeed, PTG exhibited a full verb **paβ* ‘end’ (INTR), and POK exhibited the full verb **upa* ‘end’ (INTR), which survives in the modern languages (cf., (6.4)). I propose then, that just as the PTG completive appears to have grammaticalized from the full verb ‘end’, so did the POK completive; that is, it underwent an identical grammaticalization process language-internally.¹⁴ This explanation has the benefit of

¹²Omagua and Kokama have two additional purposives with different coreferentiality relationships.

¹³As part of a response to, ‘Why did God create us?’

¹⁴Jensen (1998, p. 537) claims that the PTG completive may distribute over participants (following an ergative-absolutive alignment): completive-marked intransitive verbs indicate that all subjects have performed the action, and completive-marked transitive verbs indicate that the action has been performed on all objects. POK **=upa*, based on its interpretations in the daughter languages, also appears to have yielded such readings, which makes its grammaticalization trajectory additionally similar to that of the PTG completive. However, a distributive reading of

not positing a process of degrammaticalization (from suffix to clitic), as these aspectual markers appear to be clitics in the modern languages, optionally appearing outside of other grammaticalized enclitics such as *=usu* ANDATIVE.¹⁵ Furthermore, in this story temporal aspectual markers (see below for **=ari* IMPF) fit into a larger class of aspectual markers that have grammaticalized from full verbs, including **=usu* (above) and **=yuriti* DURATIVE.

POK **=ari* IMPF also resulted from a language-internal grammaticalization process, namely from **=ari* DIFF.LOC (cf., §3.2). Gildea (2002) (citing Heine et al. (1991, p. 214-215)) claims that the creation of forms indicating progressive aspect (the modern function of *=ari*) often derive from locative constructions cross-linguistically. This is evident in the history of English, as in (6.20).

(6.20) Peter is at/in/on working → Peter is working

According to Heine et al. (1991),

in such cases, a verb in some nominalized form, such as a participle, a gerundial, or an infinitive ('work-ing'), takes the place of the noun phrase ('at home').

In POK, contrary to the claims made by Heine et al. (1991), locative morphology attached to a bare verb, i.e., there is no other morphological relic of the formation of an imperfective other than the locative itself. However, this is to be expected, as other postpositions may attach directly to a verb, as with the instrumental *=pupi*, which derives manner adverbial clauses in Omagua.

(6.21) *ta usu uwatapupi*.

<i>ta</i>	<i>usu</i>	<i>uwata</i>	<i>=pupi</i>
1SG.MS	go	walk	=INSTR
‘I go walking.’			

Although the exact construction whereby the diffuse locative grammaticalized as an imperfective does not appear to still exist in the modern languages, by analogy to the permissibility of postpositions on bare verbs, as in (6.21), I propose this grammaticalization process occurred via constructions like (6.22) (parallel to (6.20) above).

(6.22) *ta kamatari*.

the POK completive **=upa* is also attributable to the presence of POK **upa* ‘all’. That is, the ambiguity between a completive and a distributive may alternatively result from the underlying homophony between the universal quantifier and the completive. (The homophony between these forms is a historical accident.) There was no such underlying homophony in PTG, such that the alternative readings are attributable to the completive itself.

¹⁵A detailed discussion of the syntactic properties of specific suffixes versus clitics is outside the scope of this thesis.

ta kamata =ari
 1SG.MS work =DIFF.LOC
 ‘I am at working.’ (proposed reading)

The fact that it is the diffuse locative postposition (and not other locative markers) involved in this process seems to make good semantic sense, as one could argue that, just as the diffuse locative is employed to indicate that one referent exists distributed across another, the eventuality denoted by an imperfective-marked verb is in a non-technical sense distributed across time, e.g., it may contain an eventuality denoted by a perfective-marked (punctual) verb. The use of a diffuse locative to indicate that an eventuality is spread through time also has a correlate in Tupinambá, as seen from the minimal pairs in (6.23) & (6.24).¹⁶

(6.23) *ʃe pó wirpe seków.*

ʃe pó wir -pe s- ekó -w
 1SG.ABS hand underside -PUNCT.LOC 3.ABS be -OBTOP
 ‘It is under my hand.’
 (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 238)

(6.24) *ʃe pó wirbo seków.*

ʃe pó wir -bo s- ekó -w
 1SG.ABS hand underside -DIFF.LOC 3.ABS be -OBTOP
 ‘It is constantly/always under my hand.’
 (ibid.)

However, Tupinambá falls short of grammaticalizing the diffuse locative as an imperfective, as it does not appear on bare verbs. As with the completive, POK *=*ari* IMPF represents the POK-internal grammaticalization of TG forms that appear to have similar functions. However, evidence has been shown for not considering these forms retentions.

6.3 Pluractionality

POK exhibited two strategies to express different types of pluractionality: reduplication and the use of a verbal suffix *=*ka*. In this discussion, ‘iterative’ is used to indicate the undefined repetition of an eventuality carried out by a singular (or multiple) participant(s); ‘distributive’ is used to indicate the distribution of the iteration of that eventuality over participants, such that the eventuality was carried out by a singular participant multiple times; ‘frequentative’ is used to indicate the

¹⁶I have converted the author’s Portuguese-based orthography and glossed the examples.

undefined repetition of an eventuality carried out by a singular (or multiple) participant(s) **over a sustained period of time** (and in this way contrasts with ‘iterative’).¹⁷ Section 6.3.1 describes the pluractional readings of reduplication patterns in PTG and the modern languages, in order to show that, despite some structural similarities, POK reduplication is an internal innovation independent of TG reduplication patterns. Section 6.3.2 describes the pluractional readings of *-ka* in the modern languages, which have some overlap with the functions of reduplication.

6.3.1 Distributivity & Frequentativity: Reduplication

PTG exhibited two reduplication patterns to convey different types of pluractionality. Root-internal reduplication of the final CV resulted in a distributive reading. The argument over which an eventuality is distributed is the absolutive one, as shown in (6.25) & (6.26).

(6.25) oimokókón.

o- i- mokó-kó-n
 3.ERG- 3.ABS- swallow.REDUP
 ‘He swallowed them one after another.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 538)

(6.26) opópó-r.

o- pó-pór.
 3.ERG- jump.REDUP
 ‘They jumped, one after another.’
 (ibid.)

Root-internal reduplication of the first CV.CV sequence resulted in a frequentative reading, as in (6.27). If the stem is less than two syllables, person prefixes are included in the reduplicant.

(6.27) orotsórotsó.

oro- tsó-ro-tsó
 1PL.ERG go.REDUP
 ‘We go frequently.’
 (ibid.)

POK exhibited two morphological reduplication patterns, as can be seen in modern Kokama: the internal reduplication of the leftmost non-initial CV (Table 6.3.1); and the internal reduplication of

¹⁷This treatment basically follows that in Yu (2003).

the initial CV.CV (Table 6.3.1).¹⁸ Although reduplication is productive in Kokama, there is apparently no semantic difference between the CV and CV.CV patterns; either may yield a ‘continuity’, ‘intensification’, ‘iterative’ or ‘distributive’ reading (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 369-372).

Table 6.4: Internal Reduplication of Leftmost Non-Initial CV in Kokama

Root	Gloss	Reduplicated Stem	Gloss
<i>ipama</i>	‘stand up’	<i>ipa-pa-ma</i>	‘stand up for a while’
<i>yaparari</i>	‘sink’	<i>yapa-pa-rari</i>	‘sink very deep’
<i>kakiri</i>	‘live’	<i>kaki-ki-ri</i>	‘live in various places’
<i>iyi</i>	‘grill’	<i>iyi-yi-ka</i>	‘grill something well done’
<i>itika</i>	‘throw/leave’	<i>iti-ti-ka(-ka)</i>	‘divorce’

Table 6.5: Internal Reduplication of Initial CV.CV in Kokama

Root	Gloss	Reduplicated Stem	Gloss
<i>tfikari</i>	‘look for’	<i>tfika-tfika-ri</i>	‘keep on looking for’
<i>tsapuki</i>	‘call’	<i>tsapu-tsapu-ki</i>	‘keep on calling’
<i>pariatu</i>	‘suffer’	<i>paria-paria-tsu</i>	‘constant suffering’
<i>tsakamika</i>	‘cross’	<i>tsaka-tsaka-mika</i>	‘intertwine, interweave’
<i>mitfiku</i>	‘wrinkle’	<i>mitfi-mitfi-kuka</i>	‘wrinkle, fold’
<i>kupetake</i>	‘limp’	<i>kupe-kupe-taka</i>	‘hobble, be lame’

Three forms do not fit into either of these patterns, as shown in Table 6.3.1. The first two forms reduplicate the initial CVC (in the first case from a CV.C and in the second from a CVG). The second form reduplicates the initial VC (from V.C).

Reduplication in Omagua is not productive. However, this is likely due to a high level of language attrition, as some speakers were able to assign a specific meaning to a reduplicated stem when prompted in elicitation. This can be seen in *sikii* ‘pull’ and *sikiki* ‘pull from one side and another’ ~ ‘stretch’. Another speaker, AHT, remembered only the reduplicated stems of some roots, as in *sasisima* ‘shout’ for *sasima*, and *isisiy* ‘be.scared’ for *isiy*. These forms exhibit the internal reduplication of the second CV, as in Kokama.

¹⁸These tables summarize forms discussed by Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 369-370).

Table 6.6: Other Reduplication Patterns in Kokama

Root	Gloss	Reduplicated Stem	Gloss
<i>yuti</i>	‘stay’	<i>yut-yuti</i> ~ <i>yututi</i>	‘stay for a long time’
<i>maynani</i>	‘take care of’	<i>may-maynani</i>	‘protect’
<i>ariwa</i>	‘be on top’	<i>ar-ariwa-ka</i>	‘be in a pile’

Given the productivity of reduplication in Kokama, and the (more or less) frozen forms in Omagua, I consider POK to have exhibited the same reduplication pattern described for Kokama. However, I argue that this is not a retention from Tupí-Guaraní, as POK and PTG only share one of two reduplication patterns, the reduplication of the initial CV.CV. The other pattern is distinct in both languages, with PTG reduplicating the final CV, and POK reduplicating the leftmost non-initial CV.¹⁹

6.3.2 Distributivity & Iterativity: *-ka

Modern Kokama employs the verbal suffix *-ka* to convey the singular or multiple iteration of an eventuality (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 553-559). This is shown in (6.28) & (6.29), respectively.

(6.28) *tsa mimirarakatsuri, wepe napitsara.*

tsa *mimira* *-ra* *-ka* =*tsuri*, *wepe* *napitsara*
 1SG.FS son.of.woman -VBZR -ITER =DIST.PST, one man
 ‘I had a baby again, a boy.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 553)

(6.29) *raepetsui ta era tikitakaura ikiakatika.*

raepetsui *ta* *era* *tikita* *-ka* =*ura* *ikia* =*ka* =*tika*
 afterwards 1SG.MS be.good tie -ITER =3SG.MS.OBJ DEM.PROX.MS =LOC =CERT2
 ‘Then I tie it very well [i.e, multiple times], up to here.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 554)

¹⁹However, note that in a two-syllable word, the leftmost non-initial CV and the final CV are the same syllable. Jensen (1998, p. 538) simply states that the reduplicant is the final CV, but only provides examples with two-syllable roots. What is needed to be sure of the PTG reduplication pattern involving a CV are three-syllable words. It may turn out, given the ongoing PTG reconstruction work at UC Berkeley, that CV reduplication in PTG actually involves the same leftmost non-initial syllable as in POK, in which case the issue of the retention of TG reduplication patterns in POK will need to be reassessed.

However, as with CV reduplication, *-ka* may distribute over arguments (participants) if they are plural, though plural arguments do not force this distributivity. (6.30) exemplifies a distributive reading, while (6.31) exemplifies the retention of the iterative reading.

(6.30) *raepetsui tana tsatsawaka ikian puyo.*

raepetsui tana tsatsawa -ka ikian puyo
 afterwards 1PL.EXCL.MS cross -ITER DEM.PROX.MS creek
 ‘Then we went across this creek.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 355)

(6.31) *ajan yiatipura ini tsikika ajamia.*

ajan y= iati =pura ini tsiki -ka aja -mia
 DEM.PROX.FS 3SG.FS= tip =FOC 1PL.INCL go.out -ITER DEM.PROX.FS -MOD
 ‘We pull its tip out (multiple times).’ [Lit. make its tip go out]
 (ibid.)

Iterativity in Omagua is realized with the suffix *-kapa*, which appears to combine Kokama *-ka* and the modern perfective *=pa*, though the form is unanalyzable. This is shown in (6.32) & (6.33).

(6.32) *yapisara mutjakapa ra wainú.*

yapisara mutfa -kapa ra wainú
 man kiss -ITER 3SG.MS woman
 ‘The man gives a lot of kisses to his wife.’
 (TES 2010)

(6.33) *amana uwarikapa.*

amana uwari -kapa
 rain fall -ITER
 ‘The falls and stops, falls and stops.’
 (TES 2010)

Initial fieldwork indicates that Omagua *-kapa* does not distribute over participants as does Kokama *-ka*. Given that Omagua *-kapa* appears to combine two morphemes historically, I reconstruct **-ka* for POK. I currently reconstruct only an iterative reading for **-ka*, unless further data from Omagua indicates that *-kapa* may yield distributive readings.

6.4 Epistemic Modality

This section discusses three epistemic modality markers that can be reconstructed for POK. These are *=*tina* CERTAINTY, *=*taku* UNCERTAINTY and *=*mia* HYPOTHETICAL.²⁰ Additionally, the history of *=*tina* will be shown to be interrelated with an optative marker, which can be reconstructed as *=*tene*. These are discussed in §§6.4.1-6.4.3, respectively, beginning with their form and function in the modern languages.

6.4.1 Certainty: *=*tina*

Modern Kokama =*tin* is a second position clitic used ‘to express certainty regarding the proposition expressed in a given utterance’ (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 487). This is shown in (6.34).

(6.34) tsapapatin mutsanaka yatsuriay.

<i>tsa=</i>	<i>papa</i>	<i>=tin</i>	<i>mutsanaka</i>	<i>ya</i>	<i>=tsuri</i>	<i>=ay</i>
1SG.FS	father	=CERT	cure	3SG.FS	=DIST.PST	=already

‘My father indeed cured him.’
(Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 488)

There are two attestations of Old Omagua =*tina*, both of which appear to indicate the certainty of the proposition on the part of the speaker (a priest). In (6.35), he asserts that Jesus is a true God, and also a true human; in (6.36) he asserts that our souls live forever after death. They both appear in second position, based on which I reconstruct POK *=*tina* as a second position clitic. It is not known to be of Tupí-Guaraní origin.

(6.35) muratina aisitui Dios, aisitui awa w(1)ranu, ini yara, ini yumunuy(1)p(1)tatarara.

<i>mura</i>	<i>=tina</i>	<i>aisitui</i>	<i>Dios,</i>	<i>aisitui</i>	<i>awa</i>	<i>w(1)ranu,</i>	<i>ini</i>	<i>yara,</i>	<i>ini</i>
3SG.MS	=CERT	true	God,	true	person	COORD,	1PL.INCL	Lord,	1PL.INCL

yumunuy(1)p(1)ta -tara
redeem -AGT.NOMZ

‘He is the true God, a true man, our Lord and our Redeemer.’
(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(6.36) ini sawakana, muriapaitina rana kakiriari.

²⁰More data is needed on Omagua epistemic markers to determine the function of remaining POK forms with certainty. Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 484-498) discusses six epistemic modal clitics for Kokama. These are: =*tin* CERTAINTY, =*ray* SPECULATIVE, =*ía* REPORTATIVE, =*taka* UNCERTAINTY, (=)*mia* HYPOTHETICAL and (=)*era* APPREHENSIVE.

ini sawa =kana, muriapai =tina rana kakiri =ari
 1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS, always =CERT 3PL.MS live =IMPF
 ‘Our souls live forever.’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

Modern Omagua has an identical form *tina*, though this form functions as an optative, as in (6.37) & (6.38).²¹

(6.37) *tina raná ukayima.*

tina raná ukayima
 OPT 3PL.MS lose
 ‘May they lose!’
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 64, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(6.38) *tina ni usu iraya viajekwara.*

tina ni usu iraya viaje =kwara
 OPT 2SG go well journey =LOC
 ‘Have a good trip!’ [Lit. ‘May you go well on your journey!’]
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 127, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

Espinosa (1935) also reports an optative function for a truncated form *ti* that appear to be cognate to *tina*.²²

(6.39) *ti ramainaniura.* (Kokama)

ti ra= mainani =ura
 OPT 3SG.MS take.care.of =3SG.MS.OBJ
 ‘May he take care of her.’²³
 (Espinosa, 1935, p. 75)

(6.40) *ti ra mayana mura.* (Omagua)

ti ra mayana mura
 OPT 3SG.MS take.care.of 3SG.MS
 ‘May he take care of her.’
 (Espinosa, 1935, p. 75)

²¹There is no discussion of optatives in Vallejos Yopán (2010).

²²Glossing here follows current practices by Vallejos Yopán, the author and colleagues. I suspect the truncation here to be a result of fast speech

²³Original translation: ‘Que la cuide.’

The Old Omagua *pater noster* shows an optative *t(i)n(i)* as in (6.41).²⁴

(6.41) *mi nuamay ritama, t(i)n(i) ra uri tanu in.*

mi nua -may ritama, t(i)n(i) ra uri tanu in
 2SG big -ABS.NOMZ village, OPT 3SG.MS come 1PL.EXCL.MS ?
 ‘Thy Kingdom come...’ [Lit. ‘Your big village, may it come to us.’]
 (Hervás Y Panduro, 1787)

Note in examples (6.37)-(6.41), the optative marker appears clause-initially, in contrast to the certainty marker in (6.34)-(6.36), which appears in second position. This distributional difference, in combination with the fact that Old Omagua shows formally distinct markeres, suggests that the homophony in modern Omagua is a historical accident, and that the optatives in (6.37)-(6.40) are really cognate to Old Omagua *t(i)n(i)*, and not =*tina*. If this is the case, an account is needed of how the two forms became homophonous. I propose that this was due to two sound changes seen elsewhere in the history of POK and the modern languages. First, final /ɪ/ ~ /e/ may have lowered to /a/ in a process similar to the change of /u/ → /a/ in person-markers (cf., §4.3.1), namely as a high vowel in unstressed position. Second, the /ɪ/ ~ /e/ of the first syllable continued to raise to /i/. This process of vowel-raising is attested as a frequent result of the fast speech of modern Omagua speakers, and has likely been active as a mechanism in the rephonemicization of forms that historically had /ɪ/ or /e/ underlyingly.

Based on an Omagua-wide sound change of /e/ → /ɪ/ evident from the phonological reconstruction work being carried out at UC Berkeley, I reconstruct a POK form **tene* OPTATIVE, which exhibited a clause-initial position. With regard to its origin, **tene* appears to derive from a sequence of two TG clitics, as in (6.42) & (6.43) from Tupinambá.²⁵

(6.42) *eresótemone kori.*

ere- só =te =mo =ne kori
 2SG.ERG- go =FOC =NON.ASSERT =DEONTIC today
 ‘You are the one who should have gone today.’
 (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 331)

²⁴Vowels in parentheses here indicate that the transliteration of the segment into modern Omagua orthography is tentative given the lack of a modern Omagua cognate. See Appendix A for more information.

²⁵Glosses and segmentations here are determined by the analysis of other parts of Barbosa’s grammar. Principally, his “suffixes” *-te*, *-mo* and *-ne* are analyzed here as clitics given their variable hosts; =*te* (his “partícula de realce”) is analyzed as a focus marker functionally equivalent to subject cleft constructions in English; =*mo* (his “condicional”) is analyzed as a marker of non-asserted information that happens to appear often in conditionals; =*ne* adds a deontic reading.

(6.43) koritemone eresó .

kori =te =mo =ne ere- só
 today =FOC =NON.ASSERTED =DEONTIC 2SG.ERG- go
 ‘Today is when you should have gone.’
 (ibid.)

More investigation into Tupinambá is needed in order to determine if this sequence of clitics is obligatory as such, and more comparative work is needed to determine if other TG languages provide likelier candidate morphemes. Note that if POK **tene* does derive from a TG sequence, it would represent the only known retention of a TG tense-aspect-mood marker in POK.

6.4.2 Uncertainty: *=*taku*

The function *=*taku* in the modern languages can be summarized by Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 497): =*taka* ‘introduces an element of doubt to indicate the speaker’s uncertainty about the truth value of the statement.’ Modern Kokama has =*taka*, while Omagua has =*taku*. This marker may occur with a range of hosts, including pronouns, nouns and adverbs, as is shown by the Kokama examples in (6.44)-(6.46), respectively.

(6.44) aytaka yamimi iwira ikananri.

ay =*taka* *yamimi iwira ikana* -n =*ri*
 3SG.FS =UNCERT hide tree be.dry -ABS.NOMZ =DIFF.LOC
 ‘Maybe he is hiding around the tree that is dried.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 497)

(6.45) mukuika watataka tima ra iwamatsuriay.

mukuika wata =*taka* *tima ra iwama* =*tsuri* =*ay*
 two year =UNCERT NEG 3SG.MS collapse =DIST.PST =already
 ‘Maybe during two years it didn’t collapse.’
 (ibid.)

(6.46) ikuntaka ra tfikuarata iniutsu.

ikun =*taka* *ra tfikuarata* *ta ini* =*utsu*
 today =UNCERT 3SG.MS follow 1PL.INCL =FUT1
 ‘Maybe now they will follow us.’
 (ibid.)

It may also attach to interrogative pronouns, with two results. In declarative sentences, it derives indefinite pronouns, as in (6.47), from Kokama.

(6.47) makataka wirturio tseta erutsu ini, raepe ini utsu.

maka =taka wirturio tseta erutsu ini, raepe ini utsu
 where =UNCERT Victor want bring 1PL.INCL, there.MS 1PL.INCL go
 ‘Wherever Victor wants to lead us, there we go.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 498)

In information questions, it indicates that the lack of knowledge on the part of the speaker (already extant given an interrogative) is particularly pronounced, and may frequently be translated by English phrases such as ‘X in the world?’, where X is an interrogative pronoun. This is shown for Omagua in (6.48). In this context, the speaker has arrived at home and is surprised to find no one there.

(6.48) makati ina usu? makatitaku rana usu, niawa amiti.

makati ina usu? makati =taku rana usu, niawa amiti
 where 3PL.FS go? where =UNCERT 3PL.MS go, no.one EXST
 Where did they go? Where did they go, there’s no one [here].’
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 104, LHC)

Older records of Kokama show *taku* (Espinosa, 1935, p. 65). Because of this, I reconstruct the POK form as *=*taku*.²⁶ It is not known to be of Tupí-Guaraní origin.

6.4.3 Hypothetical: *=*mia*

Old Omagua, modern Omagua and modern Kokama mark the verb of a counterfactual clause with *=*mia*, as shown in (6.49)-(6.51), respectively.²⁷

(6.49) nuamay utfayara rafí, rana sawitímia Santísimo Sacramento?

nua -may utfayara rafí, rana sawití =mia Santísimo
 big -ABS.NOMZ sinner NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS find =COUNT Holy
Sacramento
 Sacrament
 ‘If they are a great sinner, will they find the Holy Sacrament?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(6.50) amai awana urímia, amiti uka rafí.

²⁶Note the similar /u/ → /a/ change, as with person-markers.

²⁷More work is needed to determine whether POK *=*mia* is suffix or clitic in modern Omagua. For the time being, I represent it as a clitic here.

amai *awa* =*na* *uri* =*mia*, *amiti* *uka* *rafi*
 DEM.PROX.FS person =PL.FS come =COUNT, EXST house NON.ASSERT
 ‘These people would come, if there was a house.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 65, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(6.51) *tima* *tʃipi* *-yara* *-ra* *utsu* =*taka*, *ni*= *erura* *ra* =*mia*
 NEG price -HAVE -COND FUT =UNCERT, 1PL.INCL= bring 3SG.MS =HYP
 ‘If it were not pricey, we might have brought it.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 390)

Kokama =*mia* has a wider distribution than counterfactuals, operating as a HYPOTHETICAL that depicts ‘situations as purely within the realm of thought’ (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 500). It appears in monoclausal sentences to express wishes, desires, suggestions, predictions and questions.

(6.52) *tseta* *tsa* *kamata* =*mia*
 want 1SG.FS work =HYP
 ‘I would like to work.’
 (ibid.)

It may seem that this function is influenced by the use of the same Spanish verb form in counterfactuals and many of the types of monoclausal sentences outlined above. However, this function appears to date back to Old Omagua, as in (6.53), which is a response to (6.49).

(6.53) *roaya* *mania* *rana* *sawiti* =*mia*
 NEG how 3PL.MS find =HYP
 ‘There is no way they would receive it [i.e., the Sacrament].’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

It may be that =*mia* was obligatory in responses to counterfactual interrogatives, and that this function was extended to monoclausal sentences which were not responses. More work is needed to determine whether the hypothetical function exists in modern Omagua. However, I consider both functions reconstructable for POK given the situation in Old Omagua. In that sense, it may be most descriptively accurate to adopt Vallejos’ analysis of Kokama =*mia* as a marker of hypothetical modality, which additionally marks the verbs of counterfactual clauses, given that both are notionally irrealis.

Regarding the origin of POK *=*mia*, it appears to derive from a TG frustrative. Although this form has not been reconstructed for PTG, it can be seen from the Tupinambá example in (6.54).

(6.54) *asausu' biã*.²⁸

a- s- ausu~~b~~ biã
1SG.ERG- 3.ABS- love FRUSTR

'Bem que eu o amava (mas nem por isso me correspondia).'

'I loved him (but he never reciprocated [the emotion] because of it).'

(Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 128)

Both hypotheticals and frustratives have inherent to their semantics the lack of full realization of the proposition their host (a verb) denotes. With a frustrative, this lack of full realization is anterior to the time of utterance, such that it is known to the speaker. With a hypothetical, it is posterior to the time of utterance, such that it is not known by the speaker. With this parallel semantic structure, I argue a TG frustrative cognate to Tupinambá *biã* was reanalyzed as a hypothetical in POK. This in turn was extended to mark counterfactual sentences, as suggested above.

If POK **=mia* does in fact derive from a form cognate to Tupinambá *biã*, this may serve as a tool in narrowing the selection of a TG lexifier language, as it does not appear that all TG languages share a cognate.²⁹ Furthermore, a TG origin for POK **=mia* weakens Cabral's claims for an Arawakan substrate to POK, as she proposes it has as its origin a cognate to proto-Maipurean **-mi* (Cabral, 1995, p. 271). However, given evidence from modern Kokama in particular, *=mia* is syntactically a clitic, in which case Cabral's proposal additionally suggests a process of degrammaticalization.³⁰ No other degrammaticalization processes are known to have occurred in the genesis or subsequent history of POK. That **=mia* derives from another clitic or a free form (the evidence from Tupinambá is inconclusive) seems more likely.

²⁸Here <'> indicates that the final consonant of this verb is deleted when it cooccurs with the frustrative.

²⁹Jensen (1998, p. 539) only mentions a Wayampí cognate *mijã*.

³⁰The main evidence in favor its clitic status is its VP-final position in (6.51). Further work on Omagua will determine if this form has a variable position within the verb phrase.

Chapter 7

Negation

This chapter discusses the formal and syntactic similarities between PTG and POK negators. POK exhibited five negators with distinct syntactic functions, which in turn derive from three TG negators (Jensen, 1998, p. 545-549). That is, in some cases, multiple POK negators derive from the same TG negator. POK negators show a high degree of functional repurposing, with three out of five POK negators exhibiting different syntactic functions and/or positions than their TG cognates. Following Van Valin and LaPolla (1997, p. 45-46), the discussion of POK negators distinguishes three types of negation: derivational negation, here glossed as PRIVATIVE (e.g., Eng. *headless*); core negation, which has scope over a core argument; and clausal negation, which has scope over the proposition. In addition, it is necessary to distinguish what I call an oblique negator, with scope over a non-core argument. PTG and POK negators are summarized in Table 7.1.¹

Table 7.1: PTG Negators, POK Reflexes & Attestations

PTG	Form	Scope	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
<i>*n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i</i>	<i>*ni</i>	OBLIQUE	✓	✓	✓	✓
	<i>*nati</i>	CORE	∅	∅	✓	✓
<i>*e?im</i>	<i>*-sima</i>	CORE	∅	∅	✓	✓
	<i>*-ima</i>	PRIVATIVE	?	✓	✓	✓
	<i>tima</i>	CLAUSAL	∅	✓	∅	∅
<i>*ruã</i>	<i>*roaya</i>	CLAUSAL	✓	∅	✓	✓
<i>*eme</i>	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅

¹Here scope refers to the function of the negator in POK.

I do not indicate the scope of PTG negators above, as evidence from TG daughter languages suggests that the functions of these forms reconstructed by Jensen (1998) are overly simplified (see below). Because most of the negators reconstructable for POK are no longer productive in the modern languages, the sections below are divided according to a particular PTG negation strategy (negator), within which I begin by discussing the scope of the relevant form. Particular emphasis is given to the evolution of that negator in Old Omagua, followed by evidence from the modern languages as available. Section 7.2 discusses the evolution of the PTG negator **n(a)-...-i*; §7.3 the negator **e?im*; and §7.4 the negator **ruã*. First, however, a brief introduction to the most common negation strategies in the modern languages is given in §7.1, in order to orient the reader with the general flavor of negation strategies in POK and its subsequent history.

7.1 Clausal Negation in Omagua & Kokama

Clausal negation in the modern languages is carried out via two distinct forms, Omagua *ro(a) ~ ru(a)* and Kokama *tima*.² They may precede the entire clause or occur between the subject and verb phrase. In Omagua, NEG SUBJ VP occurs as the unmarked order for subjects encoded by a person-marker, whereas SUBJ NEG VP occurs as the unmarked order for full-NP subjects, as in (7.1) & (7.2).

(7.1) wainukana roa sita usu

wainú =kana roa sita usu
 woman PL.MS NEG want go
 ‘The women don’t want to go.’
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 8, LHC, Sp. given)

(7.2) ro ra yaufima

ro ra yaufima
 NEG 3SG.MS arrive
 ‘He doesn’t arrive.’
 (CSS 2010 E1, p. 171, AHT, Sp. given)

While the Kokama negator *tima* may appear in the same positions as in (7.3) & (7.4), Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 530-536) does not report a distribution based on the word class of the NP.

²The Omagua negator shows the following phonetic realizations: [rua], [ru], [roa] and [ro]. Alternation between these forms varies is variable at the token level and holds no grammatical function. However, only the full form *ruá* or *roá*, often realized with final stress, is used as the free form ‘no’.

(7.3) *raepe ipira tima watari*

raepe ipira tima watari
 there.MS fish NEG lack
 ‘There, fish does not lack.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 531)

(7.4) *tima ratseta eyun*

tima ra= tseta eyu -n
 NEG 3SG.MS= want eat -NOMZ
 ‘He doesn’t want food.’
 (ibid.)

These morphemes may additionally negate a core argument, if that constituent is a fronted object (i.e., OSV from standard SVO), as in (7.5), from Kokama.

(7.5) *tima mari epe eyutsu*

tima mari epe ey =utsu
 NEG thing 2PL eat =FUT1
 ‘Nothing you will eat.’
 (ibid.)

7.2 PTG *n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i

The PTG circumfix *n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i negates an independent clause, whether the predicate is verbal or non-verbal.³ This is exemplified for Wayampí, in (7.6) & (7.7).

(7.6) *nijakuai*

ni- ja- kua -i
 NEG- 1PL.GENERIC- know -NEG
 ‘We don’t know’ or ‘Nobody knows.’⁴
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 545)

(7.7) *nipajei*

³The latter allomorph occurs with /j/-initial roots.

⁴Recall that PTG had two 1PL.INCL.ERG prefixes for active mono- and bivalent predicates, *ti- and *ja-. The latter has been replaced in Wayampí by the former (modern si-), under which circumstances PTG *ja- has developed a generic reading.

n- i- pajé -i
 NEG- 3SG- shaman -NEG
 ‘He does not have shamanistic qualities.’
 (ibid.)

In (7.7) the translation yields a ‘have’ interpretation, even though the predicate is a possessed noun. There is a highly debated construction-type in TG languages, which will not be treated in depth in this thesis, wherein a possessed NP may yield two (and in some cases three) readings: a possessed reading (e.g., ‘my X’), a non-verbal predicative reading (e.g., ‘I am X’), or a predicative reading involving ‘have’ (e.g., ‘I have X’).⁵ In affirmative declaratives, these readings are ambiguous. However, in negative declaratives, **n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i* yields the final reading only, while **n(a)-...rua(-i) ~ ni-...rua(-i)* (cf., §7.4) yields the non-verbal predicative reading, as in the minimal pair in (7.8) & (7.9) from Tupinambá.⁶

(7.8) *nda je sii.*

nda je si -i.
 NEG 1SG.ABS mother -NEG
 ‘I don’t have a mother.’
 (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 144)

(7.9) *nda je si ruã.*

nda je si ruã
 NEG 1SG.ABS mother NEG
 ‘I am not a mother.’
 (ibid.)

Two POK negators derive from PTG **n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i*: **nati* CORE.NEG and **ni* OBLIQUE.NEG. The single attestation of *nati* comes from the Old Omagua catechism fragment, as in (7.10).⁷

(7.10) **nati** *marai aikiara Dios mura.*

nati marai aikiara Dios mura.
 CORE.NEG thing DEM.PROX.MS God 3SG.MS
 ‘None of these things is God.’ [Lit. ‘God is no thing.’]
 (Suárez, 1968)

⁵The second reading is only possible with consonant-initial roots, as otherwise a prefix (epenthetic *r-* or one of the prefixes for an underspecified form) will serve to disambiguate.

⁶I maintain the author’s segmentations here.

⁷In response to, ‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the trees, which of these is God?’

I tentatively propose that **nati* comes from the negated PTG predicate **naʔei* (**n-* *aʔe -i*, NEG that NEG, ‘It is not that [thing]).⁸ In this case, the negated predicate was reinterpreted as a core negator. It is possible that *nati marai* was a lexicalized construction in Old Omagua. However, *marai* is used frequently to mean ‘thing’, which suggests that *nati* was at one time productive, even if in Old Omagua it was not. It has fallen out of both daughter languages.

In addition, POK appears to have retained the prefixal portion of the allomorph for /j/-initial roots, **ni-...-i*, as a negator of oblique constituents **ni*, as in (7.11), from Old Omagua.⁹

(7.11) *rasmay kumisamaypupi ra ni putarimaypupi purai.*

ra =*s*may *kumisa* -*may* =*pupi* *ra* *ni* *putari* =*may*
 3SG.MS =VERID say -ABS.NOMZ =INSTR 3SG.MS OBL.NEG want -ABS.NOMZ
 =*pupi* *purai*
 =INSTR CONTR.FOC
 ‘With his words, and not with his desires.’
 Uriarte (1952, 1986)

**ni* is the only negator found in both daughter languages. However, it was not discussed in §7.1 because the relation between its historical origin and modern distributions is not clear. I propose that, while the form **ni* derives from PTG **ni-...-i*, its functional distribution has been heavily influenced by Spanish *ni*, for two principal reasons. First, there exist constructions involving *ni* (as in (7.11)), the equivalent of which in Spanish does not employ *ni*.¹⁰ Second, neither clausal nor core negation in Old Omagua is carried out with **ni*; however, in both modern languages, *ni* may be employed in these functions, though such use is minimal in comparison to the negators *rua* ~ *roa* and *tima*. Its use in the modern languages to negate core arguments may derive from a combination of the TG and Spanish forms, due to constraints on *ni* in some constructions in which in Omagua and Kokama *ni* appears, but in which in Spanish it does not (see below). In Omagua, *ni* may negate a clause or a core argument, as in (7.12) & (7.13).

(7.12) *Julio rua usu ipira fikiaritari ni Pepe usu ipira fikiaritari.*

Julio rua usu ipira fikiari -tara ni Pepe usu ipira fikiari -tara.
 Julio NEG go fish look.for -PURP NEG Pepe go fish look.for -PURP
 ‘Neither Julio nor Pepe went to look for fish.’
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 68, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(7.13) *ro tsi nu panara ni supia.*

⁸Here, glottal stop was reinterpreted as /t/, which does not appear to have been a common sound change.

⁹In response to, ‘With what did God make all these things?’

¹⁰Spanish: **Con sus palabras, y ni con sus deseos.*

ro tsi ru panara ni supia.
 NEG 1SG.FS eat plantain NEG egg
 ‘I ate neither the plantains nor the eggs.’
 (ibid.)

Conspicuously (with regard to Spanish), *ni* cannot appear as a clausal negator or a **productive** core negator unless as part of a ‘neither...nor...’ construction. However, *ni* may occur as both an oblique-constituent and core negator for a limited, possibly lexicalized, set of forms, for which Spanish does not have a syntactically parallel construction. Its use as an oblique-constituent negator is shown in (7.14), and its use as a core negator in (7.15).

(7.14) *ro tsi amiasuka purara tsi mifu ni makatisirupi.*

ro tsi amiasuka purara tsi mifu ni makatisirupi
 NEG 1SG.FS can find 1SG.FS cat NEG by.where
 ‘I couldn’t find my cat anywhere.’¹¹
 (CSS 2010 E1, p. 160, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(7.15) *ni awa yapifikia surui*

ni awa yapifikia surui
 NEG person catch zúngaro
 ‘No one caught zúngaro [catfish sp].’¹²
 (CSS 2010 E2, p. 67, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

The core negator function is shown for Kokama in (7.16).

(7.16) *wapuru katupenpura aki tipifkaka ni awa emetepuka.*

wapuru katupe -n =pura aki tipifka =ka ni awa emete -puka
 ship show.up -NOMZ =FOC get.in Tipishka =LOC NEG people exist -when
 ‘The ship that shows up enters in Tipishka Lake when there’s no one.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 533-534)

Additionally, in Kokama *ni* may appear as a clausal negator with a broader distribution than in Omagua (i.e., outside of ‘neither...nor...’ constructions), as in (7.17). However, Vallejos states that the majority of the examples of this kind come from a single speaker who uses *ni* exclusively in place of *tima*, the clausal negator, which suggests that this function is an overgeneralization within a particular idiolect.

¹¹Spanish: *No podía encontrar mi gato ni donde.’

¹²Spanish: *Ni persona agarró zúngaro. However: Ni una persona agarró zúngaro.

(7.17) *ni tapiatua akitja*

ni tapia =tua akitja
 NEG savage =AUG be.scared
 ‘The savage has no fear.’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 534)

In summary, *ni* in modern Omagua may function as a productive clausal and productive core negator, but only in a ‘neither...nor...’ construction. It additionally appears as a core negator and oblique-constituent negator with a small set of (lexicalized?) forms, such as *ni awa* ‘no one’ and *ni makati* ‘nowhere’, respectively. While Vallejos Yopán (2010) does not discuss ‘neither...nor...’ constructions, Kokama similarly has a small set of forms that are negated by *ni*. While the majority of occurrences of *ni* in the modern languages may suggest that *ni* was only involved historically in the formation of negative indefinites (i.e., those that stood in for core arguments (*ni awa* ‘no one’) and oblique arguments (*ni makati* ‘nowhere’)), Old Omagua *ni* (see (7.11)) appears to have been productive in negating obliques generally. This is also evidenced by the use of *ni* to negate obliques in Kokama, as in (7.18).¹³

(7.18) *parana tsimari inu upaka ni tuntatfiruyara.*

parana tsima =ari inu upaka ni tuntatfiru -yara
 river shore =DIFF.LOC 3PL.FS go.out NEG pants -HAVE
 ‘They go out to the side of the river without pants’ [Lit. ‘not having pants’].
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 544)

In light of this, I posit that in POK **ni* negated oblique constituents only. Subsequently, the distribution of Spanish *ni* influenced POK via its occurrence in ‘neither...nor...’ constructions, which, in addition negating core arguments in that construction-type, permitted TG *ni* to negate **some** core arguments outside of ‘neither...nor...’ constructions. However, this was limited to indefinite pronouns. The clausal negator in both languages was extended to negate objects (when fronted), as was shown in (7.5). In both languages, the clausal negators *rua* ~ *roa* and *tima* were also generalized to negate oblique arguments. This is in line with the extension of these morphemes to negate fronted objects as well. Negation of oblique arguments is shown in (7.19), from Omagua.

(7.19) *ta sita yaprafi ro akiamukui.*

ta sita yaprafi ro akia =mukui.
 1SG.MS want dance NEG DEM.PROX.MS =COM
 ‘I want to dance not with this one [but with another].’
 (CSS 2010 E1, p. 148, OMG given)

¹³More fieldwork on Omagua is needed to determine if *ni* may still productively negate obliques in that language.

7.3 PTG *-eʔim

Between Old Omagua and the modern languages, three forms derive from PTG *eʔim.

Table 7.2: POK Negators Derived from *eʔim

PTG	Form	Function	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
*eʔim	-sima	CORE	∅	∅	✓	✓
	-ima	PRIVATIVE	?	✓	✓	✓
	tima	CLAUSAL	∅	✓	∅	∅

In PTG, *eʔim functioned both as a privative (i.e., ‘without X’) and as a negator of dependent verbs and nominalizations. However, if all dependent verbs are nominalizations, as Schleicher argues, then *eʔim can be said to be a core negator and a privative. It occurred following the verb root, in some languages following a nominalizer, and in others preceding the nominalizer. The former is shown in (7.20), from Kayabí.

(7.20) mojaḡareʔema

mojaḡ -ar -eʔem -a
 make -AGT.NOMZ -COR.NEG -REF
 ‘One who doesn’t make it.’
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 546)

POK subsequently codified the semantic distinction between core negation and privation morphologically, with -sima CORE.NEG and -ima PRIVATIVE, as in (7.21).

(7.21) ira kristianokana, Dios kumisamaypurakana ira amuyasukatatarakana,

irasimamaywasuima, rana umanu rafi, makati rana sawasuakana usu?

ira *kristiano* =kana, *Dios* *kumisa* -may =pura =kana *ira*
 good Christian =PL.MS, God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS good
amuyasukata -tara =kana, *ira* -sima -may -wasu -ima,
 obey -AGT.NOMZ =PL.MS, good -CORE.NEG -ABS.NOMZ -AUG -PRIV,
rana *umanu* *rafi*, *makati* *rana* *sawa* -sua =kana *usu*?
 3PL.MS die NON.ASSERT, where 3PL.MS soul -? =PL.MS go?

‘The good Christians, those who obey God’s commandments well, without evil, when they die, where do their souls go?’

(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

The core negator *-*sima* does not exist in either of the daughter languages, its function subsumed by either the clausal negators, or by *ni*. Furthermore, Vallejos Yopán (2010) does not discuss a privative or any cognate of *-*ima*, nor has one been attested in Omagua. However, Espinosa (1935) gives the following examples from Kokama & Omagua, respectively (my glosses, his translations).

(7.22) *suiima ura*.

sui -ima ura
tail -PRIV 3SG.MS
'He is without a tail.'
(Espinosa, 1935, p. 72)

(7.23) *suiimamay mura*.¹⁴

sui -ima -may mura
tail -PRIV -ABS.NOMZ 3SG.MS
'He is without a tail.'
(ibid.)

Thus, while the core negator does not appear to have survived into the 20th century, the privative did. Given that both the core negator and the privative would have functioned in complementary distribution with the oblique negator **ni*, and because both show a reflex in TG, I consider both reconstructable for POK.

Lastly, the Kokama clausal negator *tima* appears to derive from PTG *-*e?im*. However, unlike -*sima* and -*ima*, which retained their original syntactic position following the syntactic element over which they have scope, *tima* precedes its negated predicate (cf., (7.3) & (7.4)). Additionally, *tima* is the only negator that does not appear in Old Omagua. The earliest attestation of it is from a wordlist dating from the 1840's (Castelnau, 1851). Given the lack of data on Old Kokama, it is impossible to know whether *tima* represents an innovation that preceded or followed the period of the Jesuit texts. Furthermore, the assumption of an innovation is itself problematic (as assumed in Table 7.1). That is, POK may have exhibited all the negators discussed therein. The syntactic reanalysis exhibited by *tima* is not an incontrovertible argument in favor of retention or innovation either, as a similar reanalysis will be shown to have occurred for the clausal negator in modern and Old Omagua and reconstructed for POK, **roaya*. However, **roaya* exhibits less syntactic reanalysis, as it is involved in some types of clausal negation in TG languages (cf., §7.4). Regardless of the presence of these negators at different historical moments, the actual form of *tima* CLAUSAL.NEG and -*sima* CORE.NEG are mysterious, as both appear to have a TG person prefix frozen to them (i.e.,

¹⁴The appearance of the absolutive nominalizer -*may* is mysterious.

**s-* & **t-* 3.ABS).¹⁵ However, it does not appear that person prefixes ever attached directly to the negator **e?im*; rather, full pronouns were used. For the time being, I cannot explain their form.

7.4 PTG **ruã*

PTG **ruã* only occurs in languages of five of Rodrigues' eight Tupí-Guaraní subgroups (Rodrigues, 1984), with different distributions (see below). Based on the languages in which **ruã* occurs, Jensen (1998) reconstructs it as an adverbial negator, which appears to be similar to the term oblique negator used here. In data she cites from Old Guaraní, it seems that OG *ruwã* ~ *ruwãj* occurs in insolation following the stem when it negates an oblique (i.e., not a predicate), as in (7.24). Note that *ruwãj* appears to combine **ruã* and the suffixal portion **-i* of **n(a)-...-i* ~ *ni-...-i*. I maintain her segmentation and glossing.

(7.24) *tesaori katu pipe ruwãj*.

<i>t-</i>	<i>esa</i>	<i>-ori</i>	<i>katu</i>	<i>pipe</i>	<i>ruwãj</i>
UNSPF-	eye	-happy	good	with	NEG
‘Not with good eyes.’					
(Jensen, 1998, p. 547)					

When the negated oblique constitutes a non-verbal clause, the *na-* prefix of the circumfixal clausal negator appears.

(7.25) *na tferemimbota rupi ruwãj*.

<i>na</i>	<i>tfe</i>	<i>r-</i>	<i>emi-</i>	<i>mbota</i>	<i>r-</i>	<i>upi</i>	<i>ruwãj</i>
NEG	1SG.ABS	EPNTH-	PAT.NOMZ-	want	EPNTH-	by	NEG
‘It wasn’t by my own will.’							
(Jensen, 1998, p. 548)							

In Tupinambá **ruã* and **-i* appear to never coöccur. *ruã* coöccurs with *nda* (cognate to OG *na*) to negate non-verbal clauses, as in (7.26), with the order NEG PRED NEG ARG.

(7.26) *nda itá ruã ifé*.

¹⁵In light of this, it would be nice to explain presence of *tima* by stating that it derived from the subsequent fortion of /ts/ after the spirantization of POK fricatives occurred in Kokama. However, not only is subsequent fortion not attested elsewhere in Kokama sound changes, but spirantization is known to have occurred in the latter 19th century, following by ~ 30-40 years the data supplied in Castelnau (1851).

nda itá ruã ifé
 NEG stone NEG 1SG.PRON

‘I am not a stone.’

(Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 88)

Although I do not attempt a reconstruction of the PTG form and function here, it is odd that Jensen reconstructs **ruã* only as an adverbial nominalizer. I would like to propose that PTG **ruã* was a negator of constituents of various types (adverbials, pronouns, nouns), which appeared in isolation of any other negating morphemes. In cases where a constituent was the non-verbal predicate of a clause, it additionally cooccurred with the circumfixal negator. This is the situation for Old Guaraní.¹⁶ In Tupinambá the final *-i* would have been dropped in this cooccurrence. Recall that non-verbal clauses negated by the circumfixal negator received a ‘having’ reading, so in this analysis **ruã*, when it cooccurs with the circumfixal negator, functions to differentiate this reading from a simple non-verbal clause (i.e., ‘I am not X’).

Two forms are derived from **ruã*: Old Omagua *roaya* CLAUSAL.NEG and modern Omagua *rua* ~ *roa* CLAUSAL.NEG. Example (7.27) illustrates the former.¹⁷

(7.27) *ini sawakana, roayapa ini sukanamukui umanu?*

ini sawa =kana, roaya =pa ini su =kana =mukui umanu
 1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS, NEG =INTERR 1PL.INCL body =PL.MS =COM die

‘Our souls, don’t they die with our bodies?’

(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

roaya is attested as late as the 1850’s (Marcoy, 1866). However, modern Omagua exhibits only *rua* ~ *roa*. The former appears to derive from the cooccurrence of **ruã* and **-i* discussed for Old Guaraní above. The prevalence of this form from the late 17th century through at least the 1850’s suggests that this was indeed the prior form, and that *rua* ~ *roa* is a subsequent reduction, even though it is identical to an inheritable PTG form.

Like Kokama *tima*, *roaya* is the result of an extension from constituent to clausal negation, though the extension here is of a different type. That is, some variant of PTG **ruã* cooccurred with **n(a)-* in the negation of non-verbal clauses. Given that the prefixal portion was inherited with a different function in POK, what was interpreted as the clausal negator was the post-stem portion. This was subsequently generalized. In contrast, *e?im* does not appear to be involved in clausal negation in any TG language, thus its generalization represents a more significant syntactic reanalysis. It is important to emphasize that POK *roaya* more closely resembles Old Guaraní *ruwãj*

¹⁶...except that suffixal *-i* occurred with *ruwã* even when the prefixal portion was not realized.

¹⁷See exs. (7.1) & (7.2) for the latter.

(i.e., combined with suffixal *-i*), and that this coöccurrence apparently did not obtain in Tupinambá, Cabral's proposed lexifier language. However, this is not an incontrovertible argument for a non-Tupinambá lexifier language, as TG nasal segments in some cases correspond via processes of natural sound change to POK diphthongs.¹⁸

7.5 PTG **eme*

The PTG prohibitive follows a verb with an imperative second-person prefix, as in the following pair from Tupinambá.

(7.28) *erasó*

e- *rasó*
 2SG.IMP take
 'Take it!'
 (Jensen, 1998, p. 549)

(7.29) *erasóumé*

e- *rasó* *-umé*
 2SG.IMP take PROH
 'Don't take it!'
 (ibid.)

The POK prohibitive *inami* precedes the negated imperative and receives a default second-person reading, as in (7.30), from Omagua.

(7.30) *inami ukiri*

inami ukiri
 PROH sleep
 'Don't sleep!'

I reconstruct **inami* for POK, given *inami* in Omagua and *iná* in Kokama. The latter represents a Kokama-wide historical apocope process, whereby the final CV of many grammatical morphemes was deleted, which can be seen in the relic final stress, and in the prohibitive *inan* given by Espinosa (1935, p. 65).¹⁹ I currently analyze *inami* as non-TG.

¹⁸For example, PTG **marã* & POK **marai* 'thing'.

¹⁹Note that Vallejos Yopán (2010, p. 561) argues that Kokama *iná* derives from PTG **ani*, a free-response morpheme meaning 'no'. I disagree with that analysis, given *inami*.

7.6 Conclusions

This chapter has described POK negators in terms of their etymological relation with PTG forms. POK derived five negators from three PTG forms. In the span of time between TG and the daughter languages, there has been a near-total exchange of the distribution of these morphemes. That is, negators that in PTG have scope over the propositional (clausal negators) have scope only over constituents in POK, as with the oblique negator **ni* and core negator **nati*. Conversely, negators that have scope over constituents in PTG (**ruã* and **e?im*), have come to either function as clausal negators, or have dropped out of the modern languages. In POK this process had not fully occurred, with the exchange of function only having occurred with PTG **n(a)-...-i ~ ni-...-i* and **ruã*. POK maintained two forms derived from the PTG **e?im*, (**-sima* CORE.NEG and **-ima* PRIV), which have since fallen out of both daughter languages. The clausal negators in both modern languages, then, took on a role in negating constituents in object position (cf., §7.1).

Chapter 8

Evaluatives

POK inherited three evaluative markers from a TG precursor, in addition to having three forms of unknown origin. Two TG forms were not inherited. These are summarized in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: PTG Evaluatives, POK Reflexes & Attestations

PTG	Function	Form	Function	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
*- <i>watfú</i> ~ - <i>utfú</i>	AUGMENTATIVE	*- <i>wasu</i>	AUGMENTATIVE	✓	∅	✓	✓
*- <i>katú</i>	INTENSIFIER	*= <i>katu</i>	INTENSIFIER	∅	∅	✓	✓
*- <i>eté</i>	INTENSIFIER	*- <i>eté</i>	INTENSIFIER	∅	∅	✓	✓
*- <i>atsi</i>	INTENSIFIER	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
*- <i>?i</i>	DIMINUTIVE	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅	∅
∅	∅	*- <i>kira</i>	DIMINUTIVE	✓	✓	∅	✓
∅	∅	*= <i>semay</i>	VERIDICAL	✓	✓	✓	✓
∅	∅	*- <i>tfasu</i>	AFFECTIVE	∅	✓	∅	?

Sections 8.1-8.3 treat diminutives/augmentatives, intensifiers and the affective, respectively.

8.1 Diminutive *-*kira* & Augmentative *-*wasu*

The modern languages share the non-TG diminutive -*kira*, as shown in (8.1), from Omagua. This morpheme indicates the small size of the referent of the noun to which it attaches.

(8.1) *tsi wipi yawarakira tsi maray.*

tsɪ wipi yawara -kɪra tsɪ maray
 1SG.FS one dog -DIM 1SG.FS possession
 ‘I have a little dog.’ [Lit. ‘With respect to me, a little dog is my possession.’]

POK inherited the vowel-final allomorph of the PTG augmentative **-watfú ~ -utfú*. In the modern languages, this form functions to express the increased size of the referent. In (8.2) from Old Omagua, reproduced from (7.21), this size is represented metaphorically as magnitude.

(8.2) *ira kristianokana Dios kumisamaypurakana ira amuyasukatatarakana irasimamaywasuima,*
rana umanu rafɪ, makati rana sawasuakana usu?

ira kristiano =kana Dios kumisa -may =pura =kana ira
 good Christian =PL.MS God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS good
amuyasukata -tara =kana ira -sima -may -wasu -ima,
 obey -AGT.NOMZ =PL.MS good -CORE.NEG -ABS.NOMZ -AUG -PRIVATIVE,
rana umanu rafɪ, makati rana sawa -sua =kana usu
 3PL.MS die NON.ASSERT, where 3PL.MS soul -? =PL.MS go
 ‘The good Christians, those who obey God’s commandments well, without evil, when they die, where do their souls go?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

8.2 Intensifiers

POK exhibited three intensifiers: **=katu*, **-eté* and **=semay*. Only **=semay* survives in the daughter languages, thus a bulk of the data here comes from Old Omagua, with exemplifications from the modern languages where possible. These morphemes are treated in §§8.2.1-8.2.3, respectively.

8.2.1 **=katu*

Old Omagua *=katu* most frequently attaches to *upa* ‘all’. However, it appears productively outside of the committative *=mukui*, an argument for its status as a clitic.

(8.3) *upakatu ta ñamukuikatu ta sapiari.*

upa =katu ta ña =mukui =katu ta sapiari
 all =INTSF 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF 1SG.MS believe
 ‘I really believe [it] with all my heart.’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

Within PTG, **-katú* INTENSIFIER is a grammaticalization of the full verb **katú* ‘be good’. Data from the one extant sentence of Old Kokama suggests that POK also inherited the full verb, with frozen **i-* 3.ABS, as in (8.4).(de Velasco, 1941)

(8.4) *kakiri tanu papa, kakiri ura. Dios ikatutanari.*

kakiri tanu papa, kakiri ura. Dios ikatu -ta n(a)= =ari
 live 1PL.EXCL.MS father, live 3SG.MS. God be.good -CAUS 2SG= =IMPF
 ‘May our father live, may he live. God will make you good.’
 (de Velasco, 1941)

The fact that a POK clitic *=*katu* appears to have developed from a PTG suffix *-*katú* is problematic in terms of the rarity of degrammaticalization processes generally. I would like to propose that PTG *-*katú* may have actually been a clitic *=*katú*. More work is needed in the reconstruction of PTG to determine the morphological status of this form, as Jensen’s analysis (1998, p. 539) devotes less than a half-page to listing the form of intensifiers. Alternatively, given the independent POK grammaticalization processes that occurred in the domain of tense-aspect-mood, it may be that POK *=*katu* is a grammaticalization of the full verb **ikatu* (see above). However, this cannot be concluded with certainty, as there are no attestations of a full form intensifier =*ikatu* in Old Omagua.

8.2.2 *-*eté*

The attestation of Old Omagua -*eté* does not come from the religious texts, but from the ethnonym of a group of Omaguas that inhabited the area in and around the Tiputini river basin at the time of the first European explorations (Newsom, 1996). This group was known as the *Omaguayeté*. The form is not attested in the religious texts, nor in the daughter languages. However, given the existence of a cognate in PTG, I infer that it is likely reconstructable for POK.

8.2.3 *=*semay*

In Old Omagua, the veridical marker =*semay* may attach to a variety of hosts. (8.5)-(8.7) show it attaching to proclitics, nouns and numerals, respectively. When attaching to proclitics (i.e., in possessive NPs), it appears to have scope over the possessum.

(8.5) *rasimay kumisamaypupi ra ni putarimaypupi purai.*

ra =simay kumisa -may =pupi ra ni putari -may
 3SG.MS =INTSF say -ABS.NOMZ =INSTR 3SG.MS NEG WANT -ABS.NOMZ
 =*pupi purai*
 =INSTR CONTR.FOC
 ‘With his true words and not with his desire(s).’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(8.6) Dios tairas**imay** awa uwaka iminua.

Dios taira =sima awa uwaka iminua
 God son =INTSF man become long.ago
 ‘The true Son of God became a man long ago.’
 (Suárez, 1968)

(8.7) aikiara musaprika personakana wipis**imay** Dios mura.

aikiara musaprika persona =kana wipi =sima Dios mura
 DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one =INTSF God 3SG.MS
 ‘These three persons are truly one God.’
 (Suárez, 1968)

In (8.8), it coöccurs with =*katu* on an adjective *ira* ‘good’.

(8.8) ni safitatipa upakatu ni ñamukuikatu ini papa Dios, upakatu marainkana ni ukuata rafi, ra iras**imay**katuikua?

ni safi -ta =tipa upa =katu ni ña =mukui =katu ini
 2SG be.painful -CAUS =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG heart =COM =INTSF 1PL.INCL
papa dios, upa =katu marain =kana ni ukuata rafi, ra ira
 father God, all =INTSF thing =PL.MS 2SG pass.by NON.ASSERT, 3SG.MS good
=sima =katu =ikua
 =VERID =INTSF =CL.REASON
 ‘Do you love our Father God with all your heart, even though you may pass by [i.e., experience] all things, because He is really truly good?’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

Vallejos Yopán (2010) indicates that the Kokama cognate *-tseme* is not widely productive, but that in elicitation it functions as a general emphatic. Note that it can attach to verbs here.¹

(8.9) uwarikatseme na yapitfikaay.

uwarika -tseme na yapitfika =ay
 climb -EMPH 2SG catch =3SG.FS
 ‘(For God’s sake,) just climb and get it!’
 (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 269)

Kokama has a large set of forms which show a frozen *-tseme* as part of their root. These are listed in Table 8.2. Notice that the same form *aytseme* has an antonymous meaning in Kokamilla (KLL) and Kokama (KK).

¹Vallejos analyzes it as a suffix, however its distribution in Kokama is likely similar to that in Old Omagua, in which case the variety of hosts it may take suggests that it is in fact a clitic.

Table 8.2: Kokama Roots Containing *-tseme*

Form	Definition	Dialect
<i>anantseme</i>	not yet	KK & KLL
<i>aytsemeka</i>	it is true	KK & KLL
<i>aytseme</i>	(be) a little bit	KLL
<i>ukuatseme</i>	(be) a lot	KLL
<i>aytsewanan</i>	(be) a little bit	KK
<i>aytseme</i>	(be) enough	KK
<i>aytsemenan</i>	(be) too much	KK

In modern Omagua, the cognate =*sımay* maintains the veridical reading from the 18th century religious texts, as in *yapısarasımay* ‘a true man’ (Sp. *un verdadero hombre*). Like Kokama, it also has a more general emphatic function, as in (8.10).

(8.10) *ta yuwama kamata fitasımay yanikiy.*

ta yuwama kamata fita =sımay yanikiy
 1SG.MS daughter.in.law work (be.)many =EMPH slowly
 ‘My daughter-in-law works too slowly.’
 (ZJO 2010, p. 49, AHT, Sp. given)

Given its more limited semantic meaning in the religious texts, I posit that =*sımay* originally functioned as a VERIDICAL, and that with the loss of =*katu* it acquired a broader intensifier/emphatic meaning. With regard to its origin, *=*semay* appears to have grammaticalized from what in modern Omagua is the full NP *aisımay* ‘truth’ (cf., Kokama *aystemeka* in Table 8.2), the form of which appears to be composed of two morphemes, *aisı* ‘true’ ~ ‘be true’ (see below) and *-may* ABS.NOMZ. Interestingly, no form *aisı* ‘be true’ exists in the modern languages. However, a related adjectival form *aisıtui* ‘true’ appears in Old Omagua.

(8.11) *mura Jesukristo, Dios taira, aisıtui Dios, aisıtui awa...*²

mura Jesukristo, Dios taira, aisıtui Dios, aisıtui awa
 3SG.MS Jesus, God son.of.man, true God, true man
 ‘It is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, true God, true man...’
 (Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

²In response to, ‘Who is in the Holy Sacrament?’

It is unknown if there was productive Old Omagua suffix *-tui*. However, the related stems *aisitui* and *aisimay* suggest that there was, and that at one time there existed an adjective *aisi* ‘true’.³ Thus as late as the writing of the religious texts both the adjective and the reduction of the nominalized adjective (the veridical =*simay*) coexisted in the language. I propose that, because of this redundancy, the adjectival form was lost in the modern languages, preserved only in the nominalized forms *aisimay* (OMG) and *aytsemeka* (KK).⁴

8.3 Affective =*tfasu*

Modern Kokama exhibits an additional evaluative not attested in Omagua or known to be TG, the affective =*tfasu*, which indicates that ‘the morpheme expressed the speaker’s feelings of sympathy and distress regarding the entity which is being described’ (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 244), as shown in (8.12).

(8.12) *ta ayumatfasu yumayari ta.*

<i>ta</i>	<i>ayuma</i>		<i>=tfasu</i>	<i>yumayari</i>	<i>ta</i>
1SG.MS	brother.in.law.of.man		=AFF	help	1SG.MS

‘My poor little brother-in-law helps me.’
(ibid.)

I consider this likely to be either an innovation or borrowing in the history of Kokama.

³I specifically use the term adjective to reflect the fact that there is a small class of functionally adjectival words in Old Omagua (*ira* ‘good’, *ayaisi* ‘bad’ and *aisitui* ‘true’) that do not need to be nominalized to modify another noun. Other functionally adjectival forms are syntactically stative verbs. In modern Omagua, these few adjectives have collapsed into the class of stative verbs, and must be nominalized to function attributively.

⁴Note also that this is an argument that the Omagua absolutive nominalizer *-may* was at one time productive in Kokama.

Chapter 9

Concluding Remarks

This thesis has attempted to demonstrate that Proto-Omagua-Kokama is not as grammatically simplified as has been proposed by previous authors (cf., Ch. 1). Through the description of various grammatical domains, it has shown that POK resembles Proto-Tupí-Guaraní to a high degree in both the form and function of grammatical morphemes. Cases of severe grammaticalization are numerically few in comparison to the forms that show a function that is either identical to a TG function, or one that is differentiated along unsurprising lines of expected historical change. In cases where TG forms were simply not retained, many domains show non-TG forms that have a functional distribution largely parallel to the corresponding TG distribution. This is particularly evident in tense-aspect-mood marking (Ch. 6).

Specifically, the degree of grammatical retentions exhibited by POK suggests that it did not originate in a rapid creolization scenario. This can be emphasized impressionistically by the retention of TG person prefixes and pronouns in the POK person-marking system; the inheritance of six of eleven nominalizers, largely with the same function; TAM forms that largely mirror the function of PTG TAM forms; the retention of three out of four negators; as well as three out of five evaluative morphemes. Furthermore, the freezing of prefixal morphology, when it occurred, was shown to be relatively predictable. These prefixes, and the locative suffixes discussed in §3.2 appear to constitute the only frozen morphology in the language.

Future work aims to use this diagnostics suggested in this thesis as a method for identifying a TG lexifier language for POK. Additionally, the grammatical retentions and grammaticalization processes inherent in the history of POK can be used as a base for comparison with the grammatical results of other well-known and well-documented language contact situations, in order to more accurately determine the sociolinguistic characteristics of the genesis of Proto-Omagua-Kokama.

Appendix A

Introduction to Historical Texts

Appendices B-D are comprised of three extant Omagua texts that date from the Jesuit period: a *pater noster* (Our Father) prayer, a catechism fragment and a complete catechism, respectively. They constitute the only known records of Omagua before the 19th century, and the first time that all three have been included in the same work. Their inclusion here is meant to serve as a reference from which some examples in the body of the previous thesis derive, as well as a window into the structure of Old Omagua. In general, footnotes explaining grammatical phenomena within the texts are kept to a minimum, except where the analyses inherent in the current glossings contradict the analyses of previous authors (particularly Cabral (1995)). Michael and O'Hagan (in prep) will treat the the provenance, authorship and grammatical description of these texts in far greater detail than is presented here. A brief summary of their provenance and authorship is given below.

The two catechisms are grouped into pairs of question and response, with each separated as its own example. The indications 'Q:' and 'R:' signal the question and response, respectively. The *pater noster* has been broken up to allow for examples of reasonable length, and three dots at the end of a translation indicate that this division interrupts a sentence boundary. In the oldest publication of the *pater noster* (see below) there are no sentence breaks, although the difference between lines that begin with a capitalized letter and those that do not may have been intended to indicate such breaks.

For every part of a given text, there are six corresponding lines, as shown in (A.1).

(A.1) *Text as it appears in source (original orthography and word breaks)*

Text with source orthography and proper word breaks

Transliteration into modern Omagua orthography

Segmentation of previous line
 Gloss of previous line
 ‘Translation.’

Full punctuation is indicated in lines 3 & 6; sentence-internal punctuation is additionally given for gloss readability in lines 4 & 5. In most cases, original orthographic <e> and <ue> have been transliterated to IPA <ɪ> and <i>, respectively, based on modern Omagua phonology. In some cases, no modern Omagua cognate is known, in which cases the IPA vowels appear in parentheses.

The most recent publication of the Omagua *pater noster* is Rivet (1910, p. 168-169) (with French translation), who in turn copied it from Adelung (1813, p. 608-609) (with German translation), who in turn copied it from Hervás Y Panduro (1787, p. 98-99) (with Italian translation). The text in Appendix B is a replication of the latter, which is the first known publication of the text. It is currently thought that Father Samuel Fritz, the first missionary among the Omagua, was the author. Fritz is one of only two Omagua missionaries known to be of German descent, and the oldest Italian version shows the presence of orthographic <ck> and <k>, which are likely not to have been present in the orthographies of native Spanish-speaking Jesuits.¹ Furthermore, the lack of Quechua loan words, in contrast to the full catechism, suggests that it predates the establishment of a permanent settlement of San Joaquín de Omaguas in the 1720s, at which time Quechua made inroads as a *lingua franca* and language of religion.

The catechism fragment was analyzed most recently by Cabral (1995, p. 373-383), who copied it from Rivet (1910, p. 169-171), who in turn copied it from Suárez (1904).² The text in Appendix C is taken from a republication of the Suárez text (Suárez, 1968). The latter source indicates the following regarding the provenance of the catechism fragment.³

El manuscrito de donde hemos tomado estas piezas de la doctrina en los idiomas de las tribus salvajes del Oriente perteneció, indudablemente, a algún misionero jesuíta del siglo décimo octavo: creemos, sin peligro ninguno de equivocarnos, que fue del Padre

¹The other German was José Palme, who missionized among the Omagua only from 1763-1767 (Uriarte, 1986, p. 630). Note that Fritz’s missionary period among the Omagua, in contrast, lasted over thirty years.

²Cabral assumes the text to be in Kokama, despite historical and grammatical features that place it as Omagua. Working from a Kokama perspective makes some of her segmentation and glossing problematic, as will be noted.

³Translation (mine): “The manuscript from which we have taken these pieces of doctrine in the languages of the savage tribes of the East belonged, undoubtedly, to some Jesuit missionary of the 18th century: we believe, without danger of being in error, that it was from Father de Franciscis, a Sicilian, who was in Mainas when the Jesuits were expelled from the missions by order of Carlos III in 1767, since from that Father we possess some manuscripts with which it shares a striking resemblance.

Our habit of collecting old documents being known in Quito, this manuscript was turned over to us, it being said: ‘Perhaps this may be of use to you: it’s an old thing, and it seems that it will only be of use to you.’”

De Franciscis, siciliano, que estaba en Mainas, cuando los jesuítas fueron expulsados de las misiones por orden de Carlos Tercero en 1767, pues de ese Padre poseemos algunos manuscritos, con los cuales tiene mucha semejanza.

Conociendo en Quito nuestra afición a recoger papeles antiguos, nos fue obsequiado este manuscrito, diciéndonos: ‘Quizá esto la sirva a Ud.: es cosa vieja, y parece que sólo a Ud. le servirá.’⁴

Despite Suárez’s claims, it is unlikely that de Franciscis was the actual author of the fragment, as no Jesuit with the surname de Franciscis is known to have missionized among the Omagua.⁵ Furthermore, the missionary among the Omagua at the time of Jesuit expulsion (*contra* Suarez’s suggestion) was José Palme, a German, who resided in San Joaquín de Omaguas from 1763-1767 (Uriarte, 1986, p. 630).

The full Omagua catechism comes to us as an appendix to the diaries of Father Manuel J. Uriarte, who missionized among the Omagua from 1753-1757 (Uriarte, 1986). The diaries were first published by a Jesuit priest of Madrid, Father Constantino Bayle (Uriarte, 1952), but it is known that their publication had been in the works before the Spanish Civil War (Espinosa, 1935, p. 155), before

⁴The passage continues:

El manuscrito contiene toda la doctrina cristiana en el idioma de los Icaguates y de los Yameos: en el idioma de los Omaguas no tiene las oraciones, sino solamente las preguntas: además tiene dos catechismos en lengua quichua, por los cuales se conoce cuál era el aspecto o la fisionomía filológica (diremos así), que a fines del siglo décimo octavo presentaba el quichua, introducido y vulgarizado por los misioneros en las reducciones cristianas de la comarca oriental transandina.

En cuanto a la transcripción de la palabra de los idiomas de los salvajes, con los consonantes y las vocales de castellano, encargamos que se tenga presente las observaciones del Reverendo Padre Sodiro, presentadas en su carta sobre el lenguaje de los Colorados: creemos muy difícil, y en algunos casos imposible físicamente, representar por medio de signos eufónicos la pronunciación genuina de las palabras de los idiomas hablados por los salvajes.

[‘The manuscript contains the Christian doctrine in the language of the Icaguates and of the Yameos: in Omagua it does not have the prayers, only the questions: additionally there are two catechisms in the Quichua language, by which we can know what the appearance or philological features (so to speak) were, which at the end of the 18th century Quichua exhibited, introduced and corrupted by the missionaries in the Christian settlements Eastern trans-Andean region.

Regarding the transcription of the word of the savage languages with the consonants and vowels of Spanish, we suggest that the observations of the Reverend Father Sodiro be kept in mind, [those] presented in his letter about the language of the Colorados: we believe it to be very difficult, and in some cases physically impossible, to represent by way of sound symbols the authentic pronunciation of the words of the languages spoken by savages.’]

⁵However, it is possible that de Franciscis was the redactor of the manuscript given to Suárez.

which time they were part of the personal collection of Madrid bibliophile Antonio Graíño, who died in 1945 (Bustamante, 1945, p. 535). The first publication of the catechism itself is Espinosa (1935, p. 155-164), as part of an appendix to the author's ethnolinguistic study of the Kokama. At this time, Espinosa appears to have been working from the handwritten manuscript in Bayle's possession. The text in the first line of each question and response in this work have been taken from Uriarte (1952) and Uriarte (1986), as Espinosa is known to have altered word breaks and spellings in order to make the Omagua more comprehensible, as he indicates in the following passage.⁶

La copia del original me fué entregada para su corrección, la que he ejecutado uniendo o separando lo que era necesario, pero conservando intactos los signos o letras, excepto en aquellos casos en que el uso indebido de aquéllas incluía un error de concepto o alteraba el verdadero sentido de la frase.⁷

(Espinosa, 1935, p. 155)

The location of the original manuscript is not currently known, so it is impossible to compare the handwriting of the catechism to that of the actual diaries of Uriarte, so as to better assess authorship. The presence of Quechua loan words in this text (e.g., *auka* 'Indian, savage, rebel'), amongst other factors, suggests that it was written after Fritz's time (post 1720s).

Lastly, several Jesuit neologisms appear in the Omagua of these texts. These are listed in (A.2)-(A.6). Morpheme glossing will indicate literal translations of these neologisms, while the translation line will accommodate the intended religious meaning.

(A.2) *iwati(may) ritama*

<i>iwati</i>	<i>-may</i>	<i>ritama</i>
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village
'Heaven'		

(A.3) *tuyuka ritama*

<i>tuyuka</i>	<i>ritama</i>
land	village
'Earth'	

⁶In general, word breaks and spellings in the full catechism (*contra* those in the *pater noster* and catechism fragment) are quite poor, which suggests that the true original manuscript passed through the hands of a redactor who did not speak Omagua.

⁷Translation (mine): 'The copy of the original was delivered to me for its correction, which I have carried out joining or separating what was necessary, but preserving intact signs and letters, except for those cases in which the undue use of those included a conceptual error or altered the true sense of the phrase.'

(A.4) nuamay ritama

nua *-may* *ritama*
 be.big -ABS.NOMZ village
 ‘Kingdom’

(A.5) ipipmay tata tupa

ipipi *-may* *tata* *tupa*
 inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place
 ‘Hell’

(A.6) misa yawikitara patiri

misa *yawiki* *-tara* *patiri*
 mass make -AGT.NOMZ priest
 ‘celebrant’⁸

⁸The Catholic priest who presides over the celebration of the Eucharist.

Appendix B

pater noster

(B.1) *Tanu papa ehuatirami cate yuri timcui*

tanu papa ehuati ramicate yuritimcui

tanu papa, iwati ritamakati yuritimukui...¹

tanu *papa* *iwati* *ritama* =*kati* *yuriti* =*mukui*
1PL.EXCL.MS father high.up village =LOC remain =MANNER
'Our father, being in Heaven...'

(B.2) *Ene scira tenera muchamura*

ene scira tene ra mucha mura

...mi fira, t(1)n(1) ra mutfa² mura.

mi *fira*, *t(1)n(1)* *ra* *mutfa* *mura*
2SG name, JUSS 3SG.MS bless 3SG.MS
'...your name, may it be blessed.'

(B.3) *Ene nuamai ritama teneruri tanu in*

ene nuamai ritama tene ruri tanu in

mi nuamay ritama, t(1)n(1) ra tanu in.³

mi *nua* -*may* *ritama*, *t(1)n(1)* *ra* *uri* *tanu* *in*
2SG be.big -ABS.NOMZ village, JUSS 3SG.MS come 1PL.EXCL.MS ?
'Your Kingdom, may it come to us.'

¹The use of =*mukui* COMMITATIVE is likely a calque on the part of a Jesuit author by analogy to permissible manner constructions in which the instrumental =*pupi* attaches directly to the verb. Both are translated by Spanish *con*.

²Literally, 'kiss'.

³The final form *in* does not have cognates in modern Omagua, but note that the sentence is missing an allative or dative.

(B.4) *Ene putari tenera yahuckemura maeramania ehuatemai ritama cate*

ene putari tene ra yahucke mura maeramania ehuatemai ritamacate
 mɪ putari, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ra yawiki mura, mairamania iwati -may
 ritama =kati
 village =LOC
 ‘Your desire, may it be done exactly as in Heaven...’

mɪ putari, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ra yawiki mura, mairamania iwati -may
 2SG desire, JUSS 3SG.MS do 3SG.MS, CL.EXACT.SIM high.up -ABS.NOMZ
ritama =kati
 village =LOC

‘Your desire, may it be done exactly as in Heaven...’

(B.5) *maerai veranu aikiara tuyuca ritama cate veranu*

maerai veranu aikiara tuyuca ritamacate veranu
 ...mairai w(ɪ)ranu aikiara tuyuka ritamakati w(ɪ)ranu.

mairai w(ɪ)ranu aikiara tuyuca ritama =kati w(ɪ)ranu
 ? COORD DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC COORD
 ‘...as well as on this Earth.’

(B.6) *Tanu eocmai neyume icume tanu supe*

tanu eocmai neyume icume tanusupe
 tanu rumay ni yumi ikumi tanusupi.

tanu ru -may ni yumi ikumi tanu =supi
 1PL.EXCL.MS eat -ABS.NOMZ 2SG give today 1PL.EXCL.MS =DATIVE
 ‘Our food you give today to us.’

(B.7) *Tenepatatanu tanu eraecmamaicana*

tenepeta tanu tanu eraecmamaicana
 t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta tanu tanu irasimamaykana...⁴

t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta tanu tanu ira -sima -may =kana
 forgive 1PL.EXCL.MS 1PL.EXCL.MS good -CORE.NEG -ABS.NOMZ =PL.MS
 ‘Forgive us our evils...’ [Lit. ‘Forgive us our not good [things]...’]

(B.8) *maeramania tanu tenepeta tanu sahuayaracana*

maeramania tanu tenepeta tanu sahuayaracana
 ...mairamania tanu t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta tanu sawayarakana.

⁴Ditransitive constructions always involve an oblique-licensing postposition in POK and the modern languages, and the bare juxtaposition of two non-subject arguments here is likely a calque from Spanish, e.g., *perdónanos nuestras maldades*.

mairamania tanu t(i)n(i)p(i)ta tanu sawayara =kana
 CL.EXACT.SIM 1PL.EXCL.MS forgive 1PL.EXCL.MS enemy =PL.MS
 ‘...just as we forgive our enemies.’

(B.9) *Ename neischari tanu ucucui maca eraecmamai*

ename ne ischari tanu ucucui maca eraecmamai
 inami ni ifari tanu ukukuimaka irasinamay.

inami ni ifari tanu ukukui -maka ira -sima
 PROH 2SG leave 1PL.EXCL.MS fall.from.height -NEG.PURP good -CORE.NEG
 -may
 -ABS.NOMZ
 ‘Don’t allow us to fall [into] evil.’⁵

(B.10) *Ayaisimarae sui nimunuy epetatanu*

ayaisi maraesui nimunuyepeta tanu
 aisi maraisuy ni yumunuy(i)p(i)ta tanu

aisi marai =suy ni yumunuy(i)p(i)ta tanu
 bad thing =ABL 2SG save 1PL.EXCL.MS
 ‘Save us from the bad thing.’

⁵Note that a locative postposition is missing from the sentence.

Appendix C

Catechism Fragment

(C.1) Q: *Icuata epe ta zupe, amititipa Dios?*

Icuata epe tazupe, amititipa Dios?

ikuata ipi tasupi, amititipa Dios?

ikua -ta ipi ta =supi, amiti =tipa Dios
know -CAUS 2SG 1SG.MS =DATIVE, EXST =INTERR God
'Tell me, does God exist?'

(C.2) R: *Amiti mura.*

Amiti mura.

amiti mura.

amiti mura
EXST 3SG.MS
'He exists.'

(C.3) Q: *Maraitipa Dios mura?*

Maraitipa Dios mura?

maraitipa Dios mura?

marai =tipa Dios mura
thing =INTERR God 3SG.MS
'What is God?'

(C.4) R: *Eguate mai ritama, aiquiara tuyuca ritama, upacatu maraincama mucui, yaguequetara, guacutatara: yenenara semai viranu, muriai Dios mura.*

Eguatemai ritama, aiquiara tuyuca ritama, upacatu maraincama, yaguequetara, guacutatara: yene narasemai viranu, muriai Dios mura.

iwatimay ritama, aikiara¹ tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkana, yawikitara, wakutatara, ini yarasmay² wiranu,³ muriay Dios mura.

iwati -may *ritama*, *aikiara* *tuyuka ritama*, *upa =katu marain*
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village, DEM.PROX.MS land village, all =INTSF thing
 =*kana*, *yawiki -tara*, *wakuta -tara*, *ini yara =smay*
 =PL.MS, make -AGT.NOMZ, carry.in.arm -AGT.NOMZ, 1PL.INCL master =VERID
wiranu, *muriay Dios mura*
 COORD, thus God 3SG.MS

‘Heaven, Earth, all things, Creator, Protector, and our true Lord as well, such is God.’

(C.5) Q: *Marepupe tipa, Dios yagueque upacatu maraincama?*

Marepupetipa, Dios yagueque upacatu maraincama?

maripupitipa Dios yawiki upakatu marainkana?

mari =pupi =tipa Dios yawiki upa =katu marain =kana
 what =INSTR =INTERR God make all =INTSF thing =PL.MS
 ‘With what did God make all these things?’

(C.6) R: *Ra cumesia pupe purai.*

Ra cumesiapupe purai.

ra kumisapupi purai.

ra kumisa =pupi purai
 3SG.MS word =INSTR CONTR.FOC
 ‘With his words.’

¹Cabral (1995, p. 374) segments this form as *aikia* + *ra* ‘this’ + LOC. However, a locative meaning does not make sense in the question ‘What is God?’, nor is it present on the other predicates in this sentence of which ‘God’ is an argument. Furthermore, locative morphology does not attach to pronominal modifiers in POK or the modern languages, nor is there any known locative *ra*. The form is *aikiara* in all attestations in all religious texts, even when a locative meaning is not construable.

²Cabral (1995, p. 374) segments this as *si* + *may* ‘sweet’ + REL. While this is a possible and grammatical interpretation, its frequency in these texts outside of contexts where a meaning of ‘sweet’ is construable (i.e., on non-nominal hosts such as modifying numerals) suggests that it is the Old Omagua reflex of POK *=*smay* VERID. Recall that from §8.2.3 that the modern Kokama cognate *-tseme* is not widely productive, and that it occurs in a number of frozen roots (cf., Table 8.2).

³The etymology of *wiranu* has confounded many authors beginning with Adelung (1813). In all previous versions of this text it has been translated as ‘also’. It appears as the final element in a series of coordinated NPs or VPs, and is of TG origin (cf., Kamaiurá *weran*, a sequence of two clitics that attach to a right-dislocated (post-verbal) subject, a strategy for focusing one of a series of otherwise pre-verbal subjects (Seki, 2000, p. 248). See Michael and O’Hagan (in prep) for a lengthier discussion.

(C.7) Q: *Macate tipa Dios Juriti?*

Macatetipa Dios Juriti?

makatitipa Dios yuriti?

makati =tipa Dios yuriti
 where =INTERR God remain
 ‘Where is God?’

(C.8) R: *Eguatamai ritama cate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamacate, muriapai, Vayuriti veranu.*

Eguatamai ritamacate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamacate, muriapai, va yuriti veranu.

iwatimay ritamakati, aikiara tuyuka ritamakati, muriapay ra yuriti w(ɪ)ranu.

iwati -may ritama =kati, aikiara tuyuka ritama =kati, muriapay
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =LOC, DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC, always
ra yuriti w(ɪ)ranu
 3SG.MS remain COORD
 ‘He is always in Heaven as well as on Earth.’

(C.9) Q: *Aguerepa Dios amiti?*

Aguerepa Dios amiti?

awiripa Dios amiti?

awiri =pa Dios amiti
 how.many =INTERR God EXST
 ‘How many Gods are there?’

(C.10) R: *Uyepé titi.*

Uyepé titi.

wipi titi.

wipi titi
 one alone
 ‘Only one.’

(C.11) Q: *Guaraschi, Yasie, Sesuscana, Hueracana, eguatacana veranu, tomaritipa aiquiaracana*

Dios mura?

Guaraschi, Yasie, Sesuscana, Hueracana, eguatacana veranu, to maritipa aiquiaracana Dios mura?

kwaraʃi, yasi, sisukana, wirakana, iwirakana w(ɪ)ranu, to maritipa aikiarakana Dios mura?

*kwara**fi*, *yasi*, *sisu* =*kana*, *wira* =*kana*, *iwira* =*kana* *w(i)ranu*, *to mari*
 sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS tree =PL.MS COORD, ? what
 =*tipa* *aikiara* =*kana* *Dios mura*
 =INTERR DEM.PROX.MS =PL.MS God 3SG.MS
 ‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the trees, which of these is God?’

(C.12) R: *Natimarai aikiara Dios mura, Dios yagueque mai puracana, puravanu.*

Nati marai aikiara Dios mura, Dios yaguequemaipuracana puravanu.

nati⁴ marai aikiara Dios mura. Dios yawikimaypurakana puravanu.⁵

nati marai aikiara Dios mura. Dios yawiki -may =pura =kana
 NEG thing DEM.PROX.MS God 3SG.MS. God make -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS
puravanu
 ?

‘None of these is God. They are God’s creations.’

(C.13) Q: *Mareiqua tipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aikiara maraincama?*

Mareiquatipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aikiara maraincama?

marikuatipa Dios yawiki upakatu aikiara marainkana?⁶

⁴Cabral (1995, p. 377) segments this sequence as *na timara i* NEG ‘nothing’ EMPH. Her gloss of *timara* as ‘nothing’ is likely based on analogy to Kokama *tima mari* ‘nothing’ (literally, NEG ‘thing’). In modern Omagua the word for ‘thing’ is still *marai* (as it is here, unlike Kokama *mari*), and with that in mind, it seems more likely that *nati* is a single form involved in the derivation of negative indefinites, parallel to the Kokama construction *tima mari* (cf., §7.2).

⁵Cabral (1995, p. 377) suggests that *puravanu* here is *pura awa nu* EMPH ‘person’ PLUR. While the function (and possible segmentation) of this form is unknown, this story is unlikely: =*pura* occurs inside the plural enclitic in the religious texts and the modern languages, and it does not appear twice on the same host (here her claim implies that one gets the sequence =*pura =kana =pura*). Furthermore, where genderlect distinctions are present in the religious texts, they correspond always to the masculine genderlect. The segmentation of *nu* here corresponds to the feminine speech plural form. As an alternative, I speculate that this form has been obscured by a scribal error and that it is related to *purai* and *w(i)ranu*.

⁶Cabral (1995, p. 378) proposes to segment *marainkana* as *mara in kana* ‘thing’ LOC PLUR. Again, a locative meaning does not make sense here, but furthermore, her *in* can be explained by two historical facts. First, as mentioned above, the POK (and modern Omagua) word for ‘thing’ is **marai*; thus the /i/ of *in* actually belongs to the root. This form derives from the PTG word **marã* ‘thing’. I propose that the appearance of a the full nasal [n] is a Jesuit interpretation of nasality that was preserved on the final syllable of this word after the genesis of POK. Note that there appears to be a broader correspondence between TG and POK wherein final nasal vowels in the former correspond to surface diphthongs in the latter. The final [n] in *marain* only appears when the form is followed by consonant-initial morphology, a prime environment in which speakers of languages without nasal vowels (Spanish Jesuits) may have perceived them as a full consonant, whereas in word-final position they would have been less salient and not indicated in their orthography. (This argument is additionally supported by phonological patterns in modern Omagua, where a small class of words both with and without nasal vowels in the root show the realization of a final [n] when /k/-initial morphology is attached.)

marikua =tipa Dios yawiki upa =katu aikiara marain =kana
 why =INTERR God make all =INTSF DEM.PROX.MS thing =PL.MS
 ‘Why did God create all these things?’

(C.14) R: *Agoa era zenoni.*

Awa erazenoni.

awa irasmuni.

awa ira =smuni
 man good =PURP
 ‘So that man is good.’

(C.15) Q: *Mareiqua tipa Dios yagueque, varanu mura agoa?*

Mareiquatipa Dios yagueque, varanu mura agoa?

marikuatipa Dios yawiki w(i)ranu mura awa?

marikua =tipa Dios yawiki w(i)ranu mura awa
 why =INTERR God create COORD 3SG.MS man
 ‘Why did God also create man?’

(C.16) R: *Dios semai raicua zenoni, mura va ipuschita zenoni, racumesse puracana, va zenu zenoni; umanumaipura rayanaschina zenoni eguatemai, vitamacate.*

Diossemai ra icuazenoni, mura va ipuschitazenoni, racumessepuracana va zenuzenoni;

umanumaipura ra yanaschinazenoni eguatemai vitamacate.

Diossmay ra ikuasmuni, mura ra ipufitasmuni, ra kumisapurakana ra simusmuni,

umanumaypura ra yawafimasmuni iwatimay ritamakati.

Dios =simay ra ikua =smuni, mura ra ipufi -ta =smuni,
 God =VERID 3SG.MS know =PURP 3SG.MS 3SG.MS be.heavy -CAUS =PURP,
ra kumisa =pura =kana ra sinu =smuni, umanu -may =pura
 3SG.MS word =FOC =PL.MS 3SG.MS hear =PURP, die -ABS.NOMZ =FOC
ra yawafima =smuni iwati -may ritama =kati
 3SG.MS arrive =PURP high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =LOC

‘So that he may know the true God, so that he may suffer Him, so that he may hear his words, so that the dead may arrive in Heaven.’

(C.17) Q: *Ahua tipa Dios?*

Ahuatipa Dios?

awatipa Dios?

awa =tipa Dios
 person =INTERR God
 ‘Who is God?’

(C.18) R: *Dios Papa, Dios Taegre, Dios Espiritu Santo: aiquiara masia puereca Persona cana, uyepe titi Dios.*

Dios Papa, Dios Taegre, Dios Espiritu Santo: aiquiara masiapuereca Personacana, uyepe titi Dios.

Dios papa, Dios taira, Dios espiritu santo. aikiara musapirika personakana wipi titi Dios.

Dios papa, Dios taira, Dios espiritu santo. aikiara musapirika
 God father, God son.of.man, God spirit holy. DEM.PROX.MS three

persona =kana wipi titi Dios
 person =PL.MS one alone God

‘God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit. These three persons are one God alone.’

(C.19) Q: *Aiquiara musa puereca Persona cana, roaya tipa musa puereca Dios?*

Aiquiara musapuereca Personacana, roayatipa musapuereca Dios?

aikiara musapirika personakana, roayatipa⁷ musapirika Dios?

aikiara musapirika persona =kana, roaya =tipa musapirika Dios
 DEM.PROX.MS three persons =PL.MS, NEG =INTERR three God

‘These three persons, are they not three Gods?’

(C.20) R: *Roaya mura musa puereca Dios: adquiara musa puereca Persona cana, uyepe semai Dios mura, Santisima Trinidad nanirachira.*

Roaya mura musapuereca Dios: adquiara musapuereca Personacana, uyepesemai Dios mura, Santisima Trinidadnani ra chira.

roaya mura musapirika Dios. aikiara musapirika personakana wipismay Dios mura.

santisima trinidadnani ra fira.

roaya mura musapirika Dios. aikiara musapirika persona =kana wipi
 NEG 3SG.MS three God. DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one

=smay Dios mura. santisima trinidad =nani ra fira
 =VERID God 3SG.MS. holy trinity =LIM 3SG.MS name

‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are truly one God. Their name is the Holy Trinity.’

⁷Cabral (1995, p. 380) segments *roaya* as *roa ya* NEG 3+, presumably based on analogy to the Kokama 3SG.FS *ya=*. However, not only are feminine speech forms not attested elsewhere in the religious texts, but person-markers in POK and the modern languages only occur preceding a noun, verb or postposition, and never between a negator and an additional enclitic. Furthermore, a 3SG.FS proclitic does not make any sense in other contexts, e.g., in (C.20), where a 3SG.MS *mura* immediately follows *roaya*. See §7.4 for additional discussion of *roaya*, as well as Cabral (1995, p. 381) for additional problematic segmentations involving a supposed 3SG.FS *ya=*.

(C.21) Q: *Aiquiara muesa puereca Persona cana zui manis mai tipa ahuguaca emenua?*

Aiquiara muesapuereca Personacanzui, manismaitipa ahua guaca emenua?

aikiara musapirika personakanasuy, maniamaytipa awa uwaka iminua?

aikiara musapirika persona =kana =suy, maniamay =tipa awa
 DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS =ABL, which =INTERR man
uwaka iminua
 become long.ago

‘From these three persons, which became a man long ago?’

(C.22) R: *Dios Taegra semai, Ahuguaca emenua.*

Dios Taegrasemai, Ahua guaca emenua.

Dios tairasimay awa uwaka iminua.

Dios taira =simay awa uwaka iminua
 God son.of.man =VERID man become long.ago

‘The Son of God became man long ago.’

(C.23) Q: *Mareicua tipa Dios Teagra Ahuguaca emenua?*

Mareicuatipa Dios Teagra Ahua agua emenua?

marikuatipa Dios taira awa uwaka iminua?

marikua =tipa Dios taira awa uwaka iminua
 why =INTERR God son.of.man man become long.ago

‘Why did the Son of God become a man long ago?’

(C.24) R: Yenne va zaschita raschi, yenne eracema mai caza zui; yenne rusui epeta zenoni,

eguatemai ritamacati; yenne rayavaschimata zenoni veranu.

Yenne va zaschita raschi, yenne eracemamaicazazui yenne rusu iepetazenoni, eguatemai ritamacati yenne rayavaschimatazenoni veranu.

ini ra safita rafi, ini irasimamaykanasuy ini ra usuy₍₁₎p₍₁₎tasmuni, iwatimay ritamakati ini ra yawafimatasmuni w₍₁₎ranu.

ini ra safi -ta rafi, ini ira -sima
 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS be.painful -CAUS NON.ASSERT, 1PL.INCL good -CORE.NEG
-may =kana =suy ini ra usuy₍₁₎p₍₁₎ta =simuni, iwati
 -ABS.NOMZ =PL.MS =ABL 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS save =PURP, high.up
-may ritama =kati ini ra yawafima -ta =simuni w₍₁₎ranu
 -ABS.NOMZ village =LOC 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS arrive -CAUS =PURP COORD

‘So that, with Him loving us, He might save us from our evils and make us arrive in Heaven as well.’

Appendix D

Full Catechism

(D.1) Q: *Taegra cana pecumessa tasupe amititipa Dios?*

taegracana pe cumessa tasupe, amititipa dios?

tairakana, pi kumisa tasupi, amititipa Dios?

taira =kana, *pi* *kumisa* *ta* =supi, *amiti* =tipa *Dios*
son.of.man =PL.MS, 2PL say 1SG.MS =DATIVE, EXST =INTERR God
'Children, tell me, does God exist?'

(D.2) R: *Amiti mura.*

Amiti mura.

amiti mura.

amiti mura
EXST 3SG.MS
'He exists.'

(D.3) Q: *Marae tipa Dios?*

Maraetipa Dios?

maraitipa Dios?

marai =tipa *Dios*
thing =INTERR God
'What is God?'

(D.4) R: *Euate mairrisama, ay quiara tuyre carritama upacatu mara encana Yahuequetara, Yara huassu Dios mura.*

euatemai risama, ayquiara tuyreca ritama upacatu maraencana yahuequetara, yarahuassu dios mura.

iwatimay ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkana, yawikitara yarawasu Dios mura.

iwati -may *ritama*, *aikiara* *tuyuka* *ritama*, *upa* =*katu* *marain*
high.up -ABS.NOMZ village, DEM.PROX.MS land village, all =INTSF thing
=*kana*, *yawiki* -*tara* *yara* -*wasu* *Dios* *mura*
=PL.MS, make -AGT.NOMZ master -AUG God 3SG.MS

‘God is the Heaven, the Earth, all things, the Creator and the great Lord.’

(D.5) Q: *Mara e pupe Dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upacatu Mara encana?*

marapeupe dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upacatu maraencana?

maraipupi Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upakatu marainkana?

marai =*pupi* *Dios* *yawiki* *iminua* *aikiara* *upa* =*katu* *marain* =*kana*
thing =INSTR God make long.ago DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF thing =PL.MS

‘With what did God create all these things long ago?’

(D.6) R: *Rasemai cumessamai pupe raniputari maipupe purai.*

ra semai cumessamaipupe ra ni putarimaipupe purai.

rasimay kumisamaypupi ra ni putarimaypupi purai.

ra =*simay* *kumisa* -*may* =*pupi* *ra* *ni* *putari* -*may*
3SG.MS =VERID say -ABS.NOMZ =INSTR 3SG.MS NEG want -ABS.NOMZ
=*pupi* *purai*
=INSTR CONTR.FOC

‘With His true words and not with His desires.’

(D.7) Q: *Macate Dios yuriti?*

macate dios yuriti?

makati Dios yuriti?

makati *Dios* *yuriti*
where God remain

‘Where is God?’

(D.8) R: *Euatemairritama cate ayquiaratuya carritama cate, upacatu macate Dios yuritimura.*

euatemai ritamacate ayquiara tuyaca ritamacate, upacatu macate dios yuriti mura.

iwatimay ritamakati, aikiara tuyuka ritamakati, upakatu makati Dios yuriti mura.

iwati -may *ritama* =kati, *aikiara* *tuyuka* *ritama* =kati, *upa*
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =LOC, DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC, all
 =kati *makati* *Dios* *yuriti* *mura*
 =INTSF where God remain 3SG.MS
 ‘God is in Heaven, on Earth, everywhere.’

(D.9) Q: *Ahuxeca Dios amiti?*

Ahuxeca dios amiti?
 awirika Dios amiti?

awirika *Dios* *amiti*
 how.many God EXST
 ‘How many Gods are there?’

(D.10) R: *Vyete titi Dios.*

Vyete titi Dios.
 wipi titi Dios.

wipi *titi* *Dios*
 one alone God
 One God alone.

(D.11) Q: *Quasrachi Yaze cesucana Huera-cana, miara cana, Ehuatacana, roayatipa Dios?*

Quasrachi, yaze, cesucana, hueracana, miaracana, ehuatacana, roayatipa dios?
 kwarafi, yasi, sisukana, wirakana, miarakana, iwirakana, roayatipa Dios?

kwarafi, *yasi*, *sisu* =kana, *wira* =kana, *miara* =kana, *iwira* =kana, *roaya*
 sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS monkey =PL.MS tree =PL.MS, NEG
 =tipa *Dios*
 =INTERR God
 ‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds, the monkeys, the trees, are they not God?’

(D.12) R: *Roaya Dios mura, eyquiara upacatu, mara encana Dios yahueque maipura purai mura.*

roaya dios mura, eyquiara upacatu, mara encana dios yahuequemaipura purai mura.
 roaya Dios mura. aikiara upakatu marainkana Dios yawikimaypura purai mura.

roaya *Dios* *mura*. *aikiara* *upa* =kati *marain* =kana *Dios* *yawiki*
 NEG God 3SG.MS. DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF thing =PL.MS God make
 -may =pura *purai* *mura*
 -ABS.NOMZ =FOC CONTR.FOC 3SG.MS
 ‘They are not God. All these things are God’s creation.’

(D.13) Q: *Marae rapa Dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upai mara encana?*

Maraerapa dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upai mara encana?

marirapa Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upai marainkana?

marira =pa Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upa -i marain =kana
 why =INTERR God make long.ago DEM.PROX.MS all -? thing =PL.MS
 ‘Why did God create all these things long ago?’

(D.14) R: *Ye me era maera.*

Yeme eramaera.

ini iramayra

ini ira -may -ra
 1PL.INCL good -ABS.NOMZ -BEN
 ‘For our wellbeing.’

(D.15) Q: *Mania zenoni Dios yahueque emenua y ennae verano?*

Maniazenoni dios yahueque emenua y ennae verano?

maniasmuni Dios yawiki iminua ini w(1)ranu?

maniasmuni Dios yawiki iminua ini w(1)ranu
 how God make long.ago 1PL.INCL COORD
 ‘Why did God create us long ago as well?’

(D.16) R: *Yenne yqua zenoni Dios semai sey enevaschita zenoni mura Dios, recumessa mai pura canna yenea amuya sucata zenoni: ayquiara tukurari yenyuriti uparichi Euatemairritama cateyacussa zenoni.*

yenne yquazenoni dios semai se yene vaschitazenoni mura dios, re cumessamaipuracanna

yenea amuya sucatazenoni: ayquiara tukurari yene yuriti upa richi euatemai ritamacate yac ussazenoni.

ini ikuasmuni Diossmay s(1), ini safitasmuni mura Dios, ra kumisamaypurakana ini

amuyasukatasmuni, aikiara tuyukari ini yuritiupa rafi, iwatimay ritamakati ususmuni.

ini ikua =smuni Dios =smay s(1), ini safi -ta =smuni
 1PL.INCL know =PURP God =VERID ?, 1PL.INCL be.painful -CAUS =PURP
mura Dios, ra kumisa -may =pura =kana ini amuyasukata
 3SG.MS God, 3SG.MS say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS 1PL.INCL obey
=smuni, aikiara tuyuka =ari ini yuriti =upa rafi,
 =PURP, DEM.PROX.MS land =DIFF.LOC 1PL.INCL remain =CPL NON.ASSERT,
iwati -may ritama =kati usu =smuni
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =ALL go =PURP

‘So that we may know the true God, so that we love Him, so that we obey His commandments, and when we cease to remain on Earth, so that we go to Heaven.’

(D.17) Q: *Aua tipa Dios?*

Auatipa Dios?

awatipa Dios?

awa =*tipa* *Dios*
 person =INTERR God
 ‘Who is God?’

(D.18) R: *Dios Papa, Dios Teagra, Dios Espiritu Santo, ayquiara musa puere ca personacana uyepe titi Dios mura.*

Dios Papa, Dios Teagra, Dios Espiritu Santo, ayquiara musapuerca personacana uyepe titi

Dios mura.

Dios papa, Dios taïra, Dios espiritu santo. aikiara musaïrika personakana wipi titi Dios mura.

Dios papa, Dios taïra, Dios espiritu santo. aikiara musapïrika
 God father, God son.of.man, God spirit holy. DEM.PROX.MS three
persona =kana wipi titi Dios mura
 person =PL.MS one alone God 3SG.MS

‘God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit. These three persons are one God alone.

(D.19) Q: *Ayquiara musa puereca personacana roaya pa musa puereca Dios cana?*

Ayquiara musapuerca personacana roayapa musapuerca dioscana?

aikiara musapïrika personakana, roayapa musapïrika Dioskana?

aikiara musapïrika persona =kana, roaya =pa musapïrika Dios
 DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS, NEG =INTERR three God
 =*kana*
 =PL.MS

‘These three persons, are they not three Gods?’

(D.20) R: *Roaya puereca Dios cana, ayquiara musa puerecana persona cana persona uypetiti Dios mura Santisima Trinidad nanimairashira.*

Roaya puereca Dioscana, ayquiara musapuercana personacana persona uype titi Dios mura Santisima Trinidadnanimai ra shira.

roaya [musa]pïrika Dioskana. aikiara musapïrika personakana persona wipi titi Dios mura. santisima trinidadnanimay ra fira.

roaya [musa]pirika Dios =kana. aikiara musapirika persona =kana
 NEG three God =PL.MS. DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS
persona wipi titi Dios mura. santisima trinidad =nani -may ra fira
 person one alone God 3SG.MS. holy trinity =LIM -? 3SG.MS name
 ‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are one God alone. The Holy Trinity is their name.’

(D.21) Q: *Ayquiara musa puereca persona cana suimaniamai Ahua rahuaca emenua?*

Ayquiara musapuereca personacanasui, maniamai ahua ra huaca emenua?

aikiara musapirika personakanasuy, maniamay awa ra¹ uwaka iminua?

aikiara musapirika persona =kana =suy, maniamay awa ra uwaka
 DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS =ABL, which man 3SG.MS become
iminua
 long.ago
 ‘From these three persons, which became a man long ago?’

(D.22) R: *Dios Taegra Ahua rahuaca emenua.*

Dios taegra ahua ra huaca emenua.

Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua.

Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua
 God son.of.man man 3SG.MS become long.ago
 ‘The Son of God became a man long ago.’

(D.23) Q: *Mania zenoni Dios Taegra Ahua rahuaca emenua?*

Maniazononi dios taegra ahua ra huaca emenua?

maniasmuni Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua?

maniasmuni Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua
 why God son.of.man man 3SG.MS become long.ago
 ‘Why did the Son of God become a man long ago?’

(D.24) R: *Rasachita raschi yame; yenne erac mamaicana sui, ehuepe maitopatata sui verano rusuyepeta zenoni yenne.*

Ra saschita raschi yame; yenne eracmamaicanasui, ehuepema topa tatasui verano rusu yepetazenoni yenne.

ra safita rafi ini, ini irasimamaykanasuy ipipimay tupa tatasuy² w(i)ranu ra usuy(i)p(i)tasmuni ini.

¹The appearance of a person-marker here appears to be ungrammatical (also below).

²Here the order of the words in the neologism *tata tupa* ‘Hell’ is reversed.

ra safi -ta rafi ini, ini ira -sima
 3SG.MS be.painful -CAUS NON.ASSERT 1PL.INCL, 1PL.INCL good -CORE.NEG
-may =kana =suy ipipi -may tupa tata =suy w(i)ranu ra
 -ABS.NOMZ =PL.MS =ABL inside -ABS.NOMZ place fire =ABL COORD 3SG.MS
usuy(i)p(i)ta =sinuni ini
 save =PURP 1PL.INCL
 ‘Him loving us, so that he might save us from our evils as well as from Hell.’

(D.25) Q: *Aua ceueca cuara pe Dios Teagra Ahuara huaca emenua?*

Aua ceuecacuarape dios teagra ahua ra huaca emenua?

awa siwikakwarapi Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua?

awa siwika =kwarapi Dios taira awa ra uwaka iminua
 person womb =INESSIVE God son.of.man man 3SG.MS become long.ago
 ‘In whose womb did the Son of God become a man?’

(D.26) R: *Virgen Santa María ceueca cuarape Ahua rehuaca emenua, Espiritu Santo sui, mura Virgen Santa María ceueca sui rahuariemenua.*

Virgen Santa Maria ceuecacuarape ahua re huaca emenua, Espiritu Santosui, mura Virgen Santa Maria ceuecasui ra huari emenua.

virgen santa maria siwikakwarapi awa ra uwaka iminua. espiritu santosuy mura, virgen santa maria siwikasuy ra uwari iminua.

virgen santa maria siwika =kwarapi awa ra uwaka iminua. espiritu
 virgin holy Mary womb =INESSIVE man 3SG.MS become long.ago. spirit
santo =suy mura, virgen santa maria siwika =suy ra uwari iminua
 holy =ABL 3SG.MS, virgin holy Mary womb =ABL 3SG.MS be.born long.ago
 ‘He became a man in the womb of the virgin Mary long ago. He is from the Holy Spirit and was born of the womb of the virgin Mary long ago.’

(D.27) Q: *Virgen Santa Maria huarita sacapueru veranu muriapaitipa virgen ra yuriti?*

Virgen santa maria huarita sacapueru veranu muriapaitipa virgen ra yuriti?

virgen santa maria uwarita sakapiri w(i)ranu, muriapaitipa virgen ra yuriti?

virgen santa maria uwari -ta sakapiri w(i)ranu, muriapai =tipa virgen
 virgin holy Mary be.born -CAUS CL.ANT COORD, always =INTERR virgin
ra yuriti
 3SG.MS remain

‘And after the virgin Mary gave birth, did she always remain a virgin?’

(D.28) R: *Muriapai Virgen rayuritimura.*

Muriapai virgen ra yuriti mura.

muriapai virgen ra yuriti mura.

muriapai virgen ra yuriti mura
 always virgen 3SG.MS remain 3SG.MS
 ‘She always remained a virgin.’

(D.29) Q: *Dios Teagra Ahua rahuaca raschi emenua mara etipa raschira?*

Dios teagra ahua ra huaca raschi emenua, maraetipa ra schira?

Dios taira awa ra uwaka rafi iminua, maraitipa ra fira?

Dios taira awa ra uwaka rafi iminua, marai =tipa ra
 God son man 3SG.MS become NON.ASSERT long.ago, thing =INTERR 3SG.MS
fira
 name

‘The Son of God becoming a man long ago, what was his name?’

(D.30) R: *Jesu Xto. raschira: muratina aycetui Dios, aycetui Ahua veranu yenne Yara, yenne niumune yepetatara.*

Jesu xto. ra schira: muratina aycetui dios, aycetui ahua, veranu yenne yara, yenne niumuneyepetatara.

hesukristo ra fira. muratina aisituy Dios, aisituy awa wiranu, ini yara ini yumunuy(i)p(i)tatarata.

hesukristo ra fira. mura =tina aisituy Dios, aisituy awa wiranu,
 Jesus Christ 3SG.MS name. 3SG.MS =CERT true God, true man COORD,
ini yara ini yumunuy(i)p(i)ta -tara
 1PL.INCL lord 1PL.INCL redeem -AGT.NOMZ

‘His name is Jesus Christ. He is the true God and a true man, as well as our Redeemer.’

(D.31) Q: *Maria mai Jesu Xto. ni umu nuyepeta emenua yenne?*

Mariamai Jesu Xto. niumunuyepeta emenua yenne?

mariamay hesukristo yumunuy(i)p(i)ta ini?

mariamay hesukristo yumunuy(i)p(i)ta ini
 how Jesus Christ redeem 1PL.INCL

‘How did Jesus Christ redeem us?’

(D.32) R: *Yenne ycuarasussanaraschi, Cruz ari taque tamai raumanuraschi (mura).* (Entre paréntesis, con lápiz: *mura*.)

Yenne ycua ra susana raschi, Cruzari taquetamai ra umanu raschi (*mura*).

iniikua ra susana rafi, krusari takitamay ra umanu rafi iminua (*mura*).

ini =ikua ra susana rafi, krus =ari takita
 1PL.INCL =on.behalf.of 3SG.MS suffer(?) NON.ASSERT, cross =DIFF.LOC nail
-may ra umanu rafi iminua (mura).
 -ABS.NOMZ 3SG.MS die NON.ASSERT long.ago (3SG.MS)
 ‘Suffering³ for us, dying on the cross.’

(D.33) Q: *Mania huassu Jesu Xto.-Dios raschi raumanuemenua?*

Maniahuassu Jesu Xto.-Dios raschi ra umanu emenua?
 maniawasu hesukristo Dios rafi ra umanu iminua?

mania -wasu hesukristo Dios rafi ra umanu iminua
 how -AUG Jesus Christ God NON.ASSERT 3SG.MS die long.ago
 ‘How did Jesus Christ die long ago if he was a God?’

(D.34) R: (Con letras desvaídas: R: *Aguacai ruana pure (?) Roaya.*) R: *Dios caisuara purai raumanua menua.*

Aguacairuanapure (?) Roaya. Dioscaisuara purai ra umanu amenua.
 awakaisuarapura. roaya Dioskaisuara purai ra umanu iminua.

awa -kai -suara =pura. roaya Dios -kai -suara purai ra
 man -? -ADVBLZR =FOC. NEG God -? -ADVBLZR CONTR.FOC 3SG.MS
umanu iminua
 die long.ago
 ‘As a man. He did not die as God long ago.’

(D.35) Q: *Jesu Xto. umanuraschi uyahuere tiparaca quere emenua?*

Jesu Xto. umanu raschi, uyahueretipa ra caquere emenua?
 hesukristo umanu rafi, uyawiritipa ra kakiri iminua?

hesukristo umanu rafi, uyawiri =tipa ra kakiri iminua
 Jesus Christ die NON.ASSERT, again =INTERR 3SG.MS live long.ago
 ‘Jesus Christ having died, did he live again long ago?’

(D.36) R: *Vyahuere racaquere emenua musso puereca coema ari.*

Vyahuere ra caquere emenua mussopuereca coemaari.
 uyawiri ra kakiri iminua musapirika kumari.

uyawiri ra kakiri iminua musapirika kuma =ari
 again 3SG.MS live long.ago three dawn =DIFF.LOC
 ‘He lived again on the third⁴ day long ago.’

³The gloss of ‘suffer’ here is based on a corresponding Quechua catechism in Uriarte’s diaries. No modern cognate is known. However, note that Lemos Barbosa (1970, p. 190) gives *roossanga* for Tupinambá ‘suffer’.

⁴The use of *musapirika* as an ordinal here is likely a calque, as this (and other) numeral(s) only have cardinal functions in the modern languages.

(D.37) Q: *Jesu Cto. uyahuere quererashi emenua macate reusu emenua?*

Jesu Cto. uyahuere quere raschi emenua, macate re usu emenua?

hesukristo uyawiri [ka]kiri rafi iminua, makati ra usu iminua?

hesukristo uyawiri [ka]kiri rafi iminua, makati ra usu iminua
 Jesus Christ again live NON.ASSERT long.ago, where 3SG.MS go long.ago
 ‘If Jesus Christ lived again long ago, where did He go?’

(D.38) R: *Euete mairatama cate raussu emenua.*

euetemai ratamacate ra ussu emenua.

iwatimay ritamakati ra usu iminua.

iwati -may ritama =kati ra usu iminua
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =ALL 3SG.MS go long.ago
 ‘He went to Heaven long ago.’

(D.39) Q: *Era Xtiano cana Dios cumessamai puracana era amuyasu cata taracana era cemamai*

huassu ema, ranu umanuraschi macate rana sahuassuacana ussu?

era xtianocana dios cumessamaipuracana era amuya sucatataracana eracemamaihuassu ema,

ranu umanuraschi, macate rana sahuassuacana ussu? ira kristianokana Dios

kumisamaypurakana ira amuyasukatatarakana irasimamaywasuima, rana umanu rafi, makati

rana sawasuakana usu?

ira kristiano =kana Dios kumisa -may =pura =kana ira
 good Christian =PL.MS God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS good
amuyasukata -tara =kana ira -sima -may -wasu -ima,
 obey -AGT.NOMZ =PL.MS good -CORE.NEG -ABS.NOMZ -AUG -PRIVATIVE,
rana umanu rafi, makati rana sawa -sua =kana usu
 3PL.MS die NON.ASSERT, where 3PL.MS soul -? =PL.MS go
 ‘The good Christians, those who obey God’s commandments well, without evil, when they die, where do their souls go?’⁵

(D.40) R: *Euate mairitama cate muriapai sareguaschi ranacaquere zenoni.*

Euatemai ritamacate muriapai saregua raschi rana caquerezenoni.

iwatimay ritamakati, muriapai sariwa rafi, rana kakirismuni.

iwati- may ritama =kati, muriapai sariwa rafi, rana kakiri
 high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =LOC, always be.happy NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS live
 =smuni
 =PURP

‘To Heaven, so that they may always live being happy.’

⁵Relative clauses are used in the translation of this (and the following) sentence(s) for readability, even though such “clauses” are syntactically nominalizations.

(D.41) Q: *Ayaice xtiano cana* (Con letra desvada: *upai Aucacana*). *Dios cumessamai pura cana roaya amuyasu cataracana era ecmamae huassi yara rana aumanuraschi, macate Dios yumupuricana sahuacana?*

ayaice xtianocana (upai aucacana) Dios cumessamaipuracana roaya amuya sucataracana eraecmamaehuassi yara rana aumanu raschi, macate Dios yumupuri cana sahuacana?
aisi kristianokana (upai aukakana), Dios kumisamaypurakana roaya amuyasukatatarakana irasimamaywasuyara,⁶ rana umanu rafi, makati Dios yumupuri rana sawakana?

aisi kristiano =kana (upa -i auka =kana), Dios kumisa -may =pura
bad Christian =PL.MS (all -? savage =PL.MS), God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC
=kana roaya amuyasukata -tara =kana ira -sima -may -wasu
=PL.MS NEG obey -AGT.NOMZ =PL.MS good -CORE.NEG -ABS.NOMZ -AUG
-yara, rana umanu rafi, makati Dios yumupuri rana sawa =kana
-POSS, 3PL.MS die NON.ASSERT, where God send 3PL.MS soul =PL.MS
'The bad Christians (all the savages), those who do not obey God's commandments, who have great evil, when they die, where does God send their souls?'

(D.42) R: *Euepete maitatopa quarape, muriapai ucairaschi, ranayuritizenoni.*

Euepetemai ta topaquarape, muriapai ucai raschi, rana yuritizenoni.
ipipimay tata tupakwarapi, muriapai ukai rafi, rana yuritismuni.

ipipi -may tata tupa =kwarapi, muriapai ukai rafi, rana
inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place =INESSIVE, always burn NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS
yuriti =sinuni
remain =PURP
'To Hell so that they may remain there always burning.'

(D.43) Q: *Yenne sahuacana roayapa yenne zúcana mucui umanu?*

Yenne sahuacana roayapa yenne zucanamucui umanu?
ini sawakana, roayapa ini sukanamukui umanu?

ini sawa =kana, roaya =pa ini su =kana =mukui umanu
1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS, NEG =INTERR 1PL.INCL body =PL.MS =COM die
'Our souls, do they die with our bodies?'

(D.44) R: *Roaya, miaracana yacatu yenezumucui ranaumanu; yenne Sahuacana muriapaitina ranaca quereari.*

⁶The suffix *-yara* is involved in several derivational processes that yield idiosyncratic meanings, particularly with Spanish loan words. Its various glossings here are intended to reflect such uses. Its principal function in the modern languages is in 'have'-constructions, where it attaches to a noun to derive another noun that denotes a possessor of the referent denoted by the head noun (as is the case here). Michael and O'Hagan (in prep) will treat the function of this form in greater detail.

Roaya, miaracana yacatu yennezumucui rana umanu; yenne Sahuacana muriapaitina rana caquereari.

roaya miarakanayakatu ini sumukui rana umanu. ini sawakana muriapaitina rana kakiriari.

roaya miara =kana =ya =katu ini su =mukui rana umanu.
 NEG monkey =PL.MS =SIM =INTSF 1PL.INCL body =COM 3PL.MS die.
ini sawa =kana muriapai =tina rana kakiri =ari
 1PL.INCL soul =PL.MS always =CERT 3PL.MS live =IMPF
 ‘They do not die with our body like those of monkeys. Our souls live forever.’

(D.45) Q: *Huyahuentipa Yenne yara Jesu Cto. euate mairitama zui anquiquiara tuyucaritama cate rauriari?*

Huyahuentipa Yenne yara Jesu Cto. euatemai ritamazui anquiquiara tuyuca ritamacate ra uriari?

uyawiritipa ini yara hesukristo iwatimay ritamasuy aikiara tuyuka ritamakati ra uriari.

uyawiri =tipa ini yara hesukristo iwati -may ritama =suy
 again =INTERR 1PL.INCL master Jesus Christ high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =ABL
aikiara tuyuka ritama =kati ra uri =ari
 DEM.PROX.MS land village =ALL 3SG.MS come =IMPF
 ‘Will our Lord Jesus Christ come from Heaven to Earth again?’

(D.46) R: *Huyahuere rauriari aiquiara tuyucaritama upa pupe catu.*

Huyahuere ra uriari aiquiara tuyuca ritama upapupecatu.

uyawiri ra uriari aikiara tuyuka ritama upapupikatu.

uyawiri ra uri =ari aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =pupikatu
 again 3SG.MS come =IMPF DEM.PROX.MS land village end =CL.when
 ‘He will come again when the Earth ends.’

(D.47) Q: *Mura guarashi pupe uyahuere tipa yeneca quere usuari?*

Mura guarashipupe uyahueretipa yene caquere usuari?

mura kwarafipupi yawiritipa ini kakiriusuari?

mura kwarafi =pupi uyawiri =tipa ini kakiri =usu =ari
 3SG.MS day =INSTR again =INTERR 1PL.INCL live =ANDATIVE =IMPF
 ‘That day, will we go to live again?’

(D.48) R: *Vyahuere upa yeneca (entre lneas, Ru) caquere usuari.*

Vyahuere upa yene ca /ru/ caquere usuari.

uyawiri upa ini kakiriusuari.

uyawiri upa ini kakiri =usu =ari
 again all 1PL.INCL live =ANDATIVE =IMPF
 ‘Again we will all go to live.’

(D.49) Q: *Maria zenoni mura aquaschi pupe yenne Yara Jesu Cto. uyahuere ruraiari?*

Mariazenoni mura aquaschipupe yenne Yara Jesu Cto. uyahuere ru raiari?
 mariasmuni mura kwarafipupi ini yara hesukristo uyawiri uriari?

mariasnuni mura kwarafi =pupi ini yara hesukristo uyawiri uri
 why 3SG.MS day =INSTR 1PL.INCL master Jesus Christ again come
 =ari
 =IMPF
 ‘Why will our Lord Jesus Christ come again on that day?’

(D.50) R: *Vpacatu yenne sahuacai upai ayaize yene yahue quemai pura cana veranu racumessa zenoni rurari.*

Vpacatu yenne sahuacai upai ayaize yene yahuequemaipuracana veranu ra cumessazenoni rurari.

upakatu ini sawa kai upai aisi ini yawikimaypurakana w(i)ranu ra kumisasnuni ra uriari.

upa =katu ini sawa kai upa -i aisi ini yawiki -may =pura
 all =INTSF 1PL.INCL soul sap all -? bad 1PL.INCL do -ABS.NOMZ =FOC
 =kana w(i)ranu ra kumisa =sinuni ra uri =ari
 =PL.MS COORD 3SG.MS reveal =PURP 3SG.MS come =IMPF
 ‘He will come to reveal all of our secrets and all of our bad deeds.’

(D.51) Q: *Mura quarasschi pupe macate Jesu Cto. erusuari era Xtianocana?*

Mura quarasschipupe macate Jesu Cto. erusuari era xtianocana?
 mura kwarafipupi makati hesukristo irusuari ira kristianokana?

mura kwarafi =pupi, makati hesukristo irusu =ari ira kristiano =kana
 3SG.MS day =INSTR, where Jesus Christ take =IMPF good Christian =PL.MS
 ‘On that day, where will Jesus Christ take the good Christians?’

(D.52) R: *Era xtiano cana purai uyahuere raerusuari euate mairitama cate, rana sahuacana mucui ranazucana mucui, muriapai sararaqaraschiranaca querezenoni; ayquiara tuyucaritama cate Dios cumessamai pura cana rana amuya sucatu sepue.*

Era xtianocanapurai uyahuere ra erusuari euatemai ritamacate, rana sahuacanamucui, rana zucanamucui, muriapai sara ra quaraschi rana caquerezenoni; ayquiara tuyuca ritamacate Dios cumessamaipuracana rana amuya sucata sepue.

ira kristianokana purai, uyawiri ra irusuari iwitimay ritamakati rana sawakanamukui rana sukanamukui, muriapai sara ra[fi] kwarafi rana kakirismuni, aikiara tuyuka ritamakati Dios kumisamaypurakana rana amuyasukata s(i)p(i).⁷

ira kristiano =kana purai, uyawiri ra irusu =ari iwati
 good Christian =PL.MS CONTR.FOC, again 3SG.MS go =IMPF high.up
-may ritama =kati rana sawa =kana =mukui rana su =kana
 -abs.nomz village =ALL 3PL.MS soul =PL.MS COM 3PL.MS body =PL.MS
=mukui, muriapai sara ra[fi] kwarafi rana kakiri =simuni,
 =COM, always await NON.ASSERT day 3PL.MS live =PURP,
aikiara tuyuka ritama =kati Dios kumisa -may =pura =kana
 DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS
rana amuyasukata s(i)p(i)
 3PL.MS obey ?

‘The good Christians he will take again to Heaven with their souls and with their bodies, so that they may live always awaiting [this] day, [because(?)] they obeyed God’s commandments on this Earth.’

(D.53) Q: *Mua quaraschi pupe macate Jesu Cto. yumapuriu suari Ayaize mai cana?*

Mua quaraschipupe macate Jesu Cto. yumapuri usuari Ayaizemaicana?

mura kwarafipupi, makati hesukristo yumupuriusuari aisimaykana?

mura kwarafi =pupi, makati hesukristo yumupuri =usu =ari aisi
 3SG.MS day =INSTR, where Jesus Christ send =ANDATIVE =IMPF bad
-may =kana
 -ABS.NOMZ =PL.MS

‘On that day, where will Jesus Christ send the bad ones?’

(D.54) R: *Vpacatu ayaizemaicana uyazauehuere rayu mupuri usuari epue pemaita tato paraguape rana sahuacana mucui, rana zucana mucui, muri apairana ucairaschi ranayuriti zenoni: ay quierea tuyu carita macate Dios cumessamai puracaca roaya rana amuya su cata yeua.*

Vpacatu ayaizemaicana uyazauehuere ra yumupuri usuari epuepemai tata toparaguape rana sahuacanamucui, rana zucanamucui, muriapai rana ucai raschi rana yuritizenoni: ayquierea tuyuca ritamacate dios cumessamaipuracaca roaya rana amuyasucata yeua.

upakatu aisimaykana, uyawiri ra yumpuriusuari ipipimay tata tupakwarapi rana sawakanamukui rana sukanamukui, muriapai rana ukai rafi rana yuritismuni, aikiara tuyuka ritamakati Dios kumisamaypurakana roaya rana amuyasukataikua.

upa =katu aisi -may =kana, uyawiri ra yumpuri =usu =ari
 all =INTSF bad -ABS.NOMZ =PL.MS, again 3SG.MS send =ANDATIVE =IMPF

⁷The form *s(i)pi* must be a clause-linker (see response to following question), though no cognate is known in the modern languages.

ipipi -may tata tupa =kwarapi rana sawa =kana =mukui rana
 inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place =INESSIVE 3PL.MS soul =PL.MS =COM 3PL.MS
su =kana =mukui, muriapai rana ukai rafi rana yuriti
 body =PL.MS =COM, always 3PL.MS burn NON.ASSERT 3PL.MS remain
=smuni, aikiara tuyuka ritama =kati Dios kumisa -may =pura
 =PURP, DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC
=kana roaya rana amuyasukata =ikua
 =PL.MS NEG 3PL.MS obey =CL.REASON

‘He will send all the bad ones again to Hell with their souls and with their bodies so that they may remain there always burning, because they did not obey God’s commandments on this Earth.’

(D.55) Q: *Mare tipa Ahuacana y ahue que ari Eupe maitatopa quarape renausu maca?*

Maretipa Ahuacana yahuequeari Eupemai tata topaquarape rena usumaca?

maritipa awakana yawikiari ipipmay tata tupakwarapi rana usumaka?

mari =tipa awa =kana yawiki =ari ipipi -may tata tupa
 what =INTERR person =PL.MS do =IMPF inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place
=kwarapi rana usu -maka
 =INESSIVE 3PL.MS go -NEG.PURP

‘What should people do in order to not go to Hell?’

(D.56) R: *Roaya Xitiano raschi sapuera Bautismo puepe Ctiano renahuaca ari; rasui, Dios cumussamai paracana sta Iglesia cumussamai paracana veranu rana amuya su cataraschi, roaya rana asuari Epue penai tatatopa quarape.*

Roaya Xitiano rashci, sapuera Bautismopuepe Ctiano rena huacaari; rasui, Dios

cumussamaiparacana sta Iglesia cumussamaiparacana veranu rana amuya sucata raschi,

roaya rana asuari Epuepenai tata topa quarape.

roaya kristiano rafi, sap(i)ra bautismopupi kristiano rana uwakari. rasuy Dios

kumisamaypurakana santa iglesia kumisamaypurakana w(r)ranu rana amuyasukata rafi,

roaya rana usuari ipipmay tata tupakwarapi.

roaya kristiano rafi, sap(i)ra bautismo =pupi kristiano rana uwaka
 NEG Christian NON.ASSERT, first baptism =INSTR Christian 3PL.MS become
=ari. rasuy Dios kumisa -may =pura =kana santa iglesia kumisa
 =IMPF. then God say -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS holy church say
-may =pura =kana w(r)ranu rana amuyasukata rafi, roaya
 -ABS.NOMZ =FOC =PL.MS COORD 3PL.MS obey NON.ASSERT, NEG
rana usu =ari ipipi -may tata tupa =kwarapi
 3PL.MS go =IMPF inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place =INESSIVE

‘Not being Christian, first they become Christian by way of the baptism. Then, obeying God’s commandments as well as the Church’s commandments, they will not go to Hell.’

(D.57) Q: *Christiano cana nuamai hucha ya raraschimeractipa rana ya hueque ari, Epue pemai rana a su maca?*

Christianocana nuamai hucha yara raschi, meraetipa rana yahuequeari, Epuepemai rana asumaca?

kristianokana nuamay utfayara rafi, maraitipa rana yawikiari ipipimay rana usumaka?

kristiano =kana nua -may utfa -yara rafi, macai =tipa
 Christian =PL.MS be.big -ABS.NOMZ sin -POSS NON.ASSERT, thing =INTERR
rana yawiki =ari ipipi -may rana usu -maka
 3PL.MS do =IMPF inside -ABS.NOMZ 3PL.MS go -NEG.PURP
 ‘Christians being great sinners, what should they do in order to not go to Hell?’

(D.58) R: *Upacatu rana y la mucui ranaya me mueraschi ranayo muerata yeua Dios ay ceparana cetaraschi sapiari, upai rana huchcana cana Confessai ari Missa yahuequetara Patiri (Super macus murapuray Dios secuyara tenepetari).*

Upacatu rana ylamucui rana yamemue raschi, rana yomuerata yeua Dios ay cepa rana seta raschi sapiari, upai huchcanacana Confessaiari Missa yahuequetara Patiri (Super macus murapuray Dios secu yara tenepetari).

upakatu rana ñamukui rana yamimia rafi, rana yumirataikua Dios ai s(i)pa, rana sita rafi sapiari, upai rana utfakana rana konfesaya[ra]ri misa yawikitara patiri (super makus mura purai Dios sekuyara t(i)n(i)p(i)tari).

upa =katu rana ña =mukui rana yamimia rafi, rana
 all =INTSF 3PL.MS heart =COM 3PL.MS grieve NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS
yumira -ta =ikua Dios ai s(i)pa, rana sita rafi
 become.angry -CAUS =CL.REASON God ? ?, 3PL.MS want NON.ASSERT
sapiari, upa -i rana utfa =kana rana konfesa -ya[ra] =ari misa yawiki
 believe, all -? 3PL.MS sin =PL.MS 3PL.MS confess -VBLZR =IMPF mass make
-tara patiri (super makus mura purai Dios sekuyara t(i)n(i)p(i)ta
 -AGT.NOMZ priest (? ? 3SG.MS CONTR.FOC God ? forgive
 =ari)
 =IMPF)

‘Grieving with all their heart, because they angered God [?], and wanting to believe, they should confess all of their sins to the celebrant ([?]).

(D.59) Q: *Christiano cana era rana confessa ya raraschi rana sahuiteari veranu Santísimo Sacramento?*

Christianocana era rana confessa yara raschi, rana sahuiteari veranu Santísimo Sacramento?

kristianokana ira rana konfesayara rafi, rana sawitari w(i)ranu santísimo sakramento?

kristiano =kana ira rana konfesa -yara rafi, rana sawiti
 Christian =PL.MS good 3PL.MS confess -VBLZR NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS find

=*ari* *w(1)ranu santisimo sakramento*
 =IMPF COORD holy sacrament
 ‘If Christians have confessed, will they find the Holy Sacrament?’

(D.60) R: *Ranacahuai icari.*

Rana cahuaicari.
 rana sawitiari.

rana sawiti =ari
 3PL.MS find =IMPF
 ‘They will find [it].’

(D.61) Q: *Hua tipa yuriti Santísimo Sacramento o puperi?*

Huatipa yuriti Santísimo Sacramentoo
 awatipa yuriti santísimo sakramentoipipi?

awa =tipa yuriti santísimo sakramento =ipipi
 person =INTERR remain holy sacrament =INESSIVE
 ‘Who is in the Holy Sacrament?’

(D.62) R: *Mura Jesu Cto. Dios Teagra, aycetui, Dios, aycetui Ahua, raSahua mucui razumucui, rasoe mucui verana, maeramani.*

Mura Jesu Cto. Dios Teagra, aycetui Dios, aycetui Ahua, ra Sahuamucui, ra zumucui, ra soemucui verana, maeramani.

mura hesukristo, Dios taira, aisituy Dios, aisituy awa, ra sawamukui ra sumukui ra suimukui
w(1)ranu mairamania.

mura hesukristo, Dios taira, aisituy Dios, aisituy awa, ra sawa
 3SG.MS Jesus Christ, God son.of.man, true God, true man, 3SG.MS soul
 =*mukui ra su =mukui ra sui =mukui w(1)ranu mairamania*
 =COM 3SG.MS body =COM 3SG.MS blood =COM COORD ?
 ‘It is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, true God, true man, with his soul, his body and his blood.’

(D.63) Q: *Meterepe epuessa sui comulgaiara y acatumarae curataraschi, nuamai hucha yaraschi rana sahuaitimia Santsimo Sacramento?*

meterepe epuessasui comulgaiarayacatu marae curata raschi, nuamai hucha ya raschi, rana sahuaitimia santísimo sakramento

mitiripi ipisasuy komulgayarayakatu marai kurata rafi, nuamay utfaya[ra] rafi, rana sawitimia santísimo sakramento?

míticipi ipisa =suy komulga -yara =ya =katu marai kurata
 in.the.middle.of night =ABL receive.communion -NOMZ =SIM =INTSF thing drink
rafi, nua -may utfa -ya[ra] rafi, rana sawiti =mia
 NON.ASSERT, be.big -ABS.NOMZ sin -POSS NON.ASSERT, 3PL.MS find =HYPTH
santisimo sakramento
 holy sacrament

‘If they were like a communicant who drank from midnight [onwards], if they were a great sinner, would they find the Holy Sacrament?’⁸

(D.64) R: *Roayamania ranasahuaitimia.*

roaya mania rana sahuaitimia.

roaya mania rana sawitimia.

roaya mania rana sawiti =mia
 NEG how 3PL.MS find =HYPTH
 ‘There is no way they would find it.’

(D.65) Q: *Nesepiari tipa ay quiera upacatu Dios comessamaicana, aicetui Dios, upai higuatara, roaya vischanisuri, roaya mue tasuri, Dios cumessa Ycua?*

Ne sepiaritipa ayquiera upacatu Dios comessamaicana, aicetui Dios, upai higuatara, roaya vischanisuri, roaya muetasuri, Dios cumessa Ycua?

ni sapiaritipa aikiara upakatu Dios kumisamaykana, aisituy Dios, upai ikuatara, roaya wifanisuri, roaya mitasuri,⁹ Dios kumisaikua?

ni sapiari =tipa aikiara upa =katu Dios kumisa -may
 2SG believe =INTERR DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF God say -ABS.NOMZ
=kana, aisituy Dios, upa -i ikua -tara, roaya wifani
 =PL.MS, true God, all -? know -AGT.NOMZ, NEG be.deceitful
-suri, roaya mita -suri, Dios kumisa =ikua
 -HAB.AGT.NOMZ, NEG be.deceptive -HAB.AGT.NOMZ, God say =CL.REASON
 ‘Do you believe all the words of God, true God, all-knowing, not deceitful, not deceptive, because God said [them]?’

(D.66) R: *Upacatu ta Hiamucuicatu ta sapiari.*

Upacatu ta Hiamucuicatu ta sapiari.

upakatu ta ñamukuikatu ta sapiari.

upa =katu ta ña =mukui =katu ta sapiari
 all =INTSF 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF 1SG.MS believe
 ‘I believe with my all my heart.’

⁸The initial clause and translation of this sentence require further investigation based on comparable Jesuit catechisms of the time period.

⁹In modern Omagua, *wifani* and *mita* appear to be synonymous.

(D.67) Q: *Nesara tipa upacatu ne hia mucui catu Dios ari enehuchacana ratenepe ta ari, neumanuraschi raerusuari ene Sahua Euatema mairitama cate, naraschi?*

Ne saratipa upacatu ne hiamucuiatu Diosari ene huchacana ra tenepetaari, ne umanu raschi, ra erusuari ene Sahua Euatema ritamacate, na raschi?

nɪ saratipa¹⁰ upakatu nɪ ãmukuikatu Diosari¹¹ mɪ utʃakana ra t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)tari, nɪ umanu rafi, ra ɪrusuari mɪ sawa iwatimay ritamakati, narafi?

nɪ sara =tipa upa =katu nɪ ã =mukui =katu Dios =ari
 2SG hope =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG heart =COM =INTSF God =DIFF.LOC
 ini utʃa =kana ra t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta =ari, nɪ umanu rafi, ra
 2SG sin =PL.MS 3SG.MS forgive =IMPF, 2SG die NON.ASSERT, 3SG.MS
 ɪrusu =ari mɪ sawa iwati -may ritama =kati, narafi
 take =IMPF 2SG soul high.up -ABS.NOMZ village =ALL, ?

‘Do you hope with all your heart that God will forgive our sins, and that when you die, that he will take our soul to Heaven?’

(D.68) R: *Muriaytasara ta hia (hua?) mucuiatu.*

muriay ta sara ta hiamucuiatu.

muriay ta sara ta ãmukuikatu.

muriay ta sara ta ã =mukui =katu
 thus 1SG.MS hope 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF
 ‘Thus I hope with all my heart.’

(D.69) Q: *Nesaschita tipa upacatu ne hai mucui catu yenne Papa Dios upacatu mara encana neucua tarischi ra erasemaicatu y cua?*

Ne saschitatipa upacatu ne haimucuiatu yenne Papa Dios upacatu maraencana ne ucuata rischi ra erasemaicatu ycua?

nɪ safitatipa upakatu nɪ ãmukuikatu ini papa dios, upakatu marainkana nɪ ukuata rafi, ra ɪrasmaykatuikua?

nɪ safi -ta =tipa upa =katu nɪ ã =mukui =katu ini
 2SG be.painful -CAUS =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG heart =COM =INTSF 1PL.INCL
 papa dios, upa =katu marain =kana nɪ ukuata rafi, ra ɪra
 father God, all =INTSF thing =PL.MS 2SG pass.by NON.ASSERT, 3SG.MS good
 =sɪmay =katu =ikua
 =VERID =INTSF =CL.REASON

‘Do you love our Father God with all your heart, even though you may pass by [i.e., experience] all things, because He is really truly good?’

¹⁰The use of *sara* ‘await’ as ‘hope’ is likely a calque based on the polysemy of Spanish *esperar* ‘await, hope’.

¹¹The appearance of the diffuse locative here is inexplicable.

(D.70) R: *Upacatu ta hia mucuicatu tasas chitamura.*

Upacatu ta hiamucuicatu ta saschita mura.

upakatu ta ñamukuikatu ta safita mura.

upa =katu ta ña =mukui =katu ta safi -ta mura
 all =INTSF 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF 1SG.MS be.painful -CAUS 3SG.MS
 ‘I love him with all my heart.’

(D.71) Q: *Ne yememua tipa upacatu nehia mucuicatu ne huchacana pupe ne ya muerata y cua yenne yara Dios?*

Ne yememuatipa upacatu ne hiamucuicatu ne huchacanapupe ne yamuerata ycua yenne yara Dios?

ni yamimiatipa upakatu ni ñamukuikatu ni utfakanapupi ni yumirataikua ini yara Dios?

ni yamimia =tipa upa =katu ni ña =mukui =katu ni utfa
 2SG grieve =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG heart =COM =INTSF 2SG sin
 =kana =pupi ni yumira -ta =ikua ini yara Dios
 =PL.MS =INSTR 2SG become.angry -CAUS =CL.REASON 1PL.INCL master God
 ‘Do you grieve with all your heart because you angered our Lord God with your sins?’

(D.72) R: *Upacatu ta hia mucui catu ta ya memue amura.*

Upacatu ta hiamucuicatu ta yamemuea mura.

upakatu ta ñamukuikatu ta yamimia mura.

upa =katu ta ña =mukui =katu ta yamimia mura
 all =INTSF 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF 1SG.MS lament 3SG.MS
 ‘I lament it with all my heart.’

(D.73) Q: *Neceta tipa nesapiari upacatu ne hia mucuicatu?*

Ne cetatipa ne sapiari upacatu ne hiamucuicatu?

ni sitatipa ni sapiari upakatu ni ñamukuikatu?¹²

ni sita =tipa ni sapiari upa =katu ni ña =mukui =katu
 2SG want =INTERR 2SG believe all =INTSF 2SG heart =COM =INTSF
 ‘Do you want to believe with all your heart?’

(D.74) R: *Upacatu ta hia mucui taseta tasapiari.*

Upacatu ta hiamucui ta seta ta sapiari.

upakatu ta ñamukuikatu ta sita ta sapiari.

¹²In modern Omagua, desiderative matrix verbs do not require the iteration of a coreferential subject in the complement clause. It is unclear if such iteration here is grammatical.

upa =katu ta ã =mukui =katu ta sita ta sapiari
 all =INTSF 1SG.MS heart =COM =INTSF 1SG.MS want 1SG.MS believe
 'I want to believe with all my heart.'

Bibliography

- Adelung, J. C. (1813). *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, Volume 3. Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung.
- Bendor-Samuel, D. (1972). *Hierarchical Structures in Guajajara*. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Boudin, M. H. (1978). *Dicionário de tupi moderno: dialeto tembé-ténetéhar do alto do rio Gurupi*. Sao Paulo: Conselho Estadual de Artes e Ciências Humanas.
- Bustamante, C. P. (1945). Necrología, Antonio Graíño Martínez. *Revista de Indias* 6, 535.
- Cabral, A. S. A. C. (1995). *Contact-induced language change in the western Amazon: the non-genetic origin of the Kokama language*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Pittsburgh.
- Cabral, A. S. A. C. (2007). *New observations on the structure of Kokáma/Omágwa*, pp. 365–379. Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ILLA). Leiden: Research School CNWS, Leiden University.
- Cabral, A. S. A. C. (2011). Different Histories, Different Results: The Origin and Development of Two Amazonian Languages. *PAPIA: Revista Brasileira de Estudos Crioulos e Similares* 21(1), 9–22.
- Cabral, A. S. A. C. and A. D. Rodrigues (2003). Evidências de Crioulização Abrupta em Kokama? *PAPIA: Revista Brasileira de Estudos Crioulos e Similares* 13, 180–186.
- Canese, N. K. D. and F. A. Alcaraz (2001). *Gramática guaraní* (2 ed.). Asunción: Instituto Superior de Lenguas.
- Castelnau, F. (1851). *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud : de Rio de Janeiro à Lima, et de Lima au Para*, Volume 5. Paris: Chez P. Bertrand.

- Dahl, O. (1983). Temporal Distance: Remoteness Distinctions in Tense-Aspect Systems. *Linguistics* 21(1), 105–122.
- de Velasco, J. (1941). *Historia Moderna del Reyno de Quito y Crónica de la Provincia de la Compañía de Jesús del mismo Reyno*, Volume 1. Quito: Imprenta de la Caja del Seguro.
- Espinosa, L. (1935). *Los Tupí del Oriente Peruano*. Madrid: Imprenta de Librería y Casa Editorial Hernando (S.A.).
- Faust, N. (1959). Vocabulario Breve del Idioma Cocama (Tupí). *Perú Indígena* 8(18-19), 150–158.
- Faust, N. (1963). El lenguaje de los hombres y mujeres en Cocama. *Perú Indígena* 10(22-23), 115–117.
- Faust, N. (1971). *Cocama Clause Types*, pp. 73–105. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Faust, N. (2008). *Gramática cocama: Lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma cocama* (3 ed.). Serie Lingüística Peruana. Lima: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Gildea, S. (2002). *Pre-Proto-Tupí-Guaraní Main Clause Person-Marking*, pp. 315–326. Belém: Editora Universitária, Universidade Federal do Pará.
- Gilij, F. S. (1965). *Ensayo de historia americana*, Volume 3 of *Biblioteca de la Academia Nacional de la Historia*. Caracas: Fuentes para la Historia Colonial de Venezuela.
- Heine, B., U. Claudi, and F. Hünnemayer (1991). *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hervás Y Panduro, L. (1784). *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinitá, e diversitá*. Cesena: Insegna di Pallade.
- Hervás Y Panduro, L. (1787). *Vocabolario poligloto con prolegomeni sopra piú di cl. lingue*. Cesena: Insegna di Pallade.
- Jensen, C. (1989). *O desenvolvimento histórico da língua wayampí*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.
- Jensen, C. (1990). *Cross-Referencing Changes in Some Tupí-Guaraní Languages*, pp. 117–158. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Jensen, C. (1998). *Comparative Tupí-Guaraní Morphosyntax*, Volume 4, pp. 489–618. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Kakumasu, J. Y. (1986). *Urubu-Kaapor*, Volume 1, pp. 326–403. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lemle, M. (1971). *Internal Classification of the Tupí-Guaraní Linguistic Family*, pp. 107–129. Summer Institute of Linguistics Publications in Linguistics and Related Fields. Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Lemos Barbosa, A. (1956). *Curso de Tupí Antigo*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Sao José.
- Lemos Barbosa, A. (1970). *Pequeno Vocabulário Portugues-Tupí*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Sao José.
- Loukotka, C. (1968). *Classification of South American Indian Languages*. Reference Series. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Marcy, P. (1866). *Voyage a travers l’Amerique du Sud, de l’Ocean Pacifique a l’Ocean Atlantique*. Paris: Librairie de L. Hachette et cie.
- McQuown, N. A. (1955). The Indigenous Languages of Latin America. *American Anthropologist* 57(3), 501–570.
- Mello, A. A. S. (2000). *Estudo histórico da família lingüística tupí-Guaraní: Aspectos fonológicos e lexicais*. Doctoral, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina.
- Myers, T. P. (1992). The Expansion and Collapse of the Omagua. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 20(1-2), 129–147.
- Newsom, L. A. (1996). Between Orellana and Acuña: A Lost Century in the History of the North-West Amazon. *Bulletin de l’Institut Francais d’Études Andines* 25(2), 203–231.
- Oberem, U. (1967). Un grupo indígena desaparecido del oriente ecuatoriano. *Revista de Antropologia* 15/16, 149–170.
- Orton, J. (1875). *The Andes and the Amazons or across the continent of South America* (2 ed.). New York: Harper and Brothers.
- Payne, D. L. (1994). *The Tupí-Guaraní Inverse*, pp. 313–340. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Porro, A. (1981). *Os omagua do alto amazonas: demografia e padroes de povoamento no século XVII*, pp. 207–231. Colecao Museu Paulista, Serie Ensaio. Sao Paulo.
- Reeve, M.-E. (1993). Regional Interaction in the Western Amazon: The Early Colonial Encounter and the Jesuit Years: 1538-1767. *Ethnohistory* 41(1), 106–138.

- Rivet, P. (1910). Les langues guaranies du Haut-Amazone. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 7(1), 149–178.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (1953). Morfologia do verbo tupí. *Letras* 1, 121–152.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (1958). Classification of Tupí-Guaraní. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24(3), 231–234.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (1981). Estrutura da Língua Tupinambá.
- Rodrigues, A. D. (1984). Relações Internas na Família Lingüística Tupí-Guaraní. *Revista de Antropologia* 27, 33–53.
- Schleicher, C. O. (1998). *Comparative and Internal Reconstruction of Proto-Tupí-Guaraní*. Doctoral, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Seki, L. (2000). *Gramática do Kamaiurá: Língua Tupí Guaraní do Alto Xingu*. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.
- Smith, C. S. (1991). *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Stark, T. E. (2010). *Grammaticalization and Polyfunctionality in Omagua*. Undergraduate honors thesis, University of California, Berkeley.
- Suárez, F. G. (1904). *Prehistoria ecuatoriana: Ligeras reflexiones sobre las razas indígenas, que poblaban antiguamente el territorio actual de la República del Ecuador*. Quito: R. Jaramillo.
- Suárez, F. G. (1968). *De Prehistoria y de Arqueología*. Cuenca: Talleres Gráficos de la Universidad de Cuenca.
- Tessmann, G. (1930). *Die Indianer Nordost-Perus: Gründlegende Forschungen für eine Systematische Kulturkunde*. Hamburg: Friederischen, de Gruyter Co.
- Uriarte, M. J. (1952). *Diario de un Misionero de Mainas*, Volume 2. Madrid: Instituto Santo Toribio de Mogrovejo.
- Uriarte, M. J. (1986). *Diario de un Misionero de Maynas*. Iquitos: IIAP-CETA.
- Vacas Galindo, E. Vocabulaire inédit.
- Vallejos Yopán, R. (2004). *Basic clause types in Kokama-Kokamilla*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Oregon.

- Vallejos Yopán, R. (2005). Entre flexión y derivación: Examinando algunos morfemas en Cocama-Cocamilla.
- Vallejos Yopán, R. (2009). The Focus Function(s) of =pura in Kokama-Kokamilla Discourse. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(3), 399–432.
- Vallejos Yopán, R. (2010). *A grammar of Kokama-Kokamilla*. Doctoral, University of Oregon.
- Van Valin, R. D. and R. J. LaPolla (1997). *Syntax: Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- von Martius, C. F. (1867). *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas*, Volume 2. Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer.
- Yu, A. C. L. (2003). Pluractionality in Chechen. *Natural Language Semantics* 11(3), 289–321.