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

List of Tables

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 Içá 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 sɪta umai yapɪsaɾa yawaɾa

        ta   *sɪta*   *umai*   *yapɪsaɾa*   *yawaɾa*
        1SG.MS   want   see   man   dog
        'I want/wanted to see the man's dog.'

(1.2) yapɪsaɾa yawaɾa sɪta umai ta

        yapɪsaɾa   *yawaɾa*   *sɪta*   *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.

---

[1]At 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) ɾa usu ɾa ukakati

ɾa	usu	ɾa	uka	=kati
3SG.MS	go	3SG.MS	house	=ALLATIVE

‘He goes to his house.’

(2.2) *otsó tsóka kotɨ

o-	tsó	ts-	ók	-a	kotɨ
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.

---

[1]Schleicher 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-   *poɾatséj*
 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) *oɾoepják.

 oɾo-   *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.)

---

[2]This 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 wipoɾatséjta.

      a-   *tsó* *wi-*   *poɾatséj* *-ta*
      1SG.ERG- go 1SG.COREF- dance   -SER
      'I went to dance.'
      (Jensen, 1998, p. 530)

(2.9) *otʃɨ otsepják.

      o-   *tʃɨ*   *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-	tʃé (ɾ-)		wi-	itʃé
1PL.EXCL	oɾo-	oré (ɾ-)		oɾo-	oré
1PL.INCL	ja-	jané (ɾ-)		jere-	jané
2SG	eɾe-	né (ɾ-)	oɾo-	e-	ené
2PL	pe-	pé (n-)	opo-	peje-	pe...ẽ
3	o-	i-, ts-, t-		o-	

Third-person absolute markers are morphologically bound (henceforth absolutive prefixes), while absolutive markers for all other persons are not (henceforth absolutive markers). The epenthetic segments *ɾ- 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 tʃɨ

    tʃé   *tʃɨ*
    1SG.ABS   mother
    'my mother'
    (Jensen, 1998, p. 499)

(2.11) *tʃé ɾuɓ

    tʃé   *ɾ-*   *uɓ*
    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 *ɾ- 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 *ɾ- 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]

---

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

[4]Payne (1994) has argued that the ɾ- is an inverse marker.

[5]Jensen 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).

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

Table 2.2: Subclasses of PTG Verb Roots

	Sublcass	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-kéɾ	'he sleeps'
		*tʃé kéɾ	'I sleep'
		*kéɾ	'sleeping'
	1B	*i-poɾatséj	'he dances'
		*tʃé poɾatséj	'I dance'
		*moɾatséj	'dancing'
V-Initial	2A	*ts-ekó	'he is'
		*tʃé ɾ-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,

---

[7]Class 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

---

[8]When 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	oɾo-jo-pín	We plane it	oɾo-jots-éj	We wash him/her/it
1PL.INCL	ja-jo-pín	We plane it	ja-jots-éj	We wash him/her/it
2SG	eɾe-jo-pín	You plane it	eɾe-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 **oɾo-* and **opo-* are underspecified with regard to the number of A. The occurrence of **tʃé* 1SG.ABS and **oɾé* 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-	?	?	oɾo-	opo-	a-i-
	1PL.EXCL	?	oɾo-je-		oɾo-	opo-	oɾo-i-
	1PL.INCL	?		ja-je-			ja-i-
	2SG	tʃé	oɾé	?	eɾe-je-		eɾe-i-
	2PL	tʃé	oɾé	?		pe-je-	pe-i-
	3	tʃé	oɾé	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 ∼ *-Ø, the serial verb suffix *-a ∼ *-áɓo ∼ *-ta, or the oblique-topicalized suffix *-i ∼ *-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 *-Ø "allomorph" for vowel-final roots). This is shown in the Tupinambá sentence in (2.12).[9]

(2.12) kujã osaɾõ omemɨra serekóɓo.

> | *kujã* | *-Ø* | *o-* | *s-* | *aɾõ* | *o-* | *memɨɾ* | *-a* | *s-* |
> |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
> | woman | -NUCL | 3.ERG- | 3.ABS- | care.for | 3.COREF- | child.of.woman | -NUCL | 3.ABS- |
>
> | *eɾekó* | *-ɓo* |
> |---|---|
> | 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 phontactic 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 ∼ *-Ø from the serial verb suffix *-a ∼ *-áɓo ∼ *-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

---

[9]I 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 *-*ábo* 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 imoʔébo

    o-   tsó   i-   moʔé -bo
    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

    kwetsé   i-   ʔár -i
    yesterday 3.ABS-   fall -OBTOP

---

[10]In Schleicher's analysis, this is simply possessive marking on nouns.

[11]Note 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 addtionally 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.

[12]Other 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 (ɾ-)		wi-	itʃé
1PL.EXCL	oɾo-	oré (ɾ-)		oɾo-	oré
1PL.INCL	**ja-**	jané (ɾ-)		jeɾe-	jané
2SG	eɾe-	né (ɾ-)	oɾo-	e-	ené
2PL	pe-	pé (n-)	opo-	peje-	pe...ẽ
3SG	**o-**	**i-, ts-, t-**		o-	

---

[13]Note 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 absolute 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
apuka	'laugh'	*a-*	*puka*	Ø	'I laugh'
apupuɾi	'cook'	*a-*	*pupuɾ*	*-i*	'I cook'
atika	'throw'	*a-*	*tik*	*-a*	'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

---

[14]One 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 *ekûãî* (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	*yapɨta*	'stay'	*ja-*	*pɨtuʔu*	Ø	'We stay'
	yapaɾaʃi	'dance'	*ja-*	*poratséj*	Ø	'We dance'
	yaupaɾa	'flee'	*ja-*	*upaɾ*	*-a*	'We plant'
	yawaʃima	'arrive'	*ja-*	*watʃem*	*-a*	'We arrive'
Transitive	*yatɨma*	'plant'	*ja-*	*tɨm*	*-a*	'We plant'
	yapiʃika	'grab'	*ja-*	*pɨtsɨk*	*-a*	'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-* stems	*yapaɾa*	'be twisted'	*i-*	*apaɾ*	*-a*	'It is twisted'
		yapua	'be round'	*i-*	*apua*	Ø	'It is round'
	ja- stems	*yapɨka*	'sit down'	*ja-*	*apɨk*	*-a*	'We sit down'
		yasuka	'bathe'	*ja-*	*asuk*	*-a*	'We bathe'
Transitive	*ja-* stems	*yasai*	'cover'	*ja-*	*asai*	Ø	'We cover'
		yatɨka	'bite, prick'	*ja-*	*atɨka*	Ø	'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 absolutive prefix. In addition, each subclass employed a unique

---

[15]The 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
ukai	'burn'	*o-*	*kay*	∅	'He/she/it burns'
umanu	'die'	*o-*	*manõ*	∅	'He/she/it dies'
uʃima	'leave'	*o-*	*tʃem*	*-a*	'He/she/it leaves'
upaka	'wake up'	*o-*	*pak*	*-a*	'He/she/it wakes up'
uwaɾi	'fall down'	*o-*	*ʔaɾ*	*-i*	'He/she/it falls down'
uyupɨ	'descend'	*o-*	*jɨp*	*-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

	Sublcass	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- & *∅

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

---

[16]Vowel-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	*yapaɾa*	'be twisted'	*i-*	*apaɾ*	*-a*	'It is twisted'
	yapua	'be round'	*i-*	*apua*	Ø	'He/she/it is round'
C-Initial	*ɪɾuɾu*	'be swollen'	*i-*	*ɾuɾu*	Ø	'He/she/it is swollen'
	iɾawa	'be bitter'	*i-*	*ɾap*	*-a*	'It is bitter'
	ikiana	'be dry'	*i-*	*kan*	*-a*	'He/she/it is dry'
	ikiɾa	'be green'	*i-*	*kiɾ*	*-a*	'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.

---

[17]Some 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		*kwaɾuka*	'urinate'	Ø	*kaɾuk*	*-a*	'urinating'
		kapi	'defecate'	Ø	*kaʔaβ*	*-i*	'defecating'
		kuɾu	'smallpox'	Ø	*koɾoj*	Ø	'roughness'
		sapukui	'summon'	Ø	*tsapukaj*	Ø	'shouting'
		tini	'be white'	Ø	*tin*	*-i*	'whiteness'
		yaʃú	'cry'	Ø	*jatseʔo*	Ø	'crying'
Transitive		*kaɾay*	'scratch'	Ø	*kaɾãy*	Ø	'scratching'
		kwatiaɾa	'write'	Ø	*kwatiaɾ*	*-a*	'drawing'
		susu	'suck'	Ø	*tʃuʔu*	Ø	'biting'
		tuɾuka	'shake out'	Ø	*toɾok*	*-a*	'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.

     ja-   *jo-*   *kutúk*
     1PL.INCL.ERG-   RECIP- pierce

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

POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
ipu	'sound'	*i-*	*pu*	Ø	'It sounds'
ipuku	'be long'	*i-*	*puku*	Ø	'He/she/it is long'
ipuʃi	'be heavy'	*i-*	*potsɨj*	Ø	'He/she/it is heavy'

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

	POK		Proto-Tupí-Guaraní			
	Root	Gloss	Prefix	Root	Suffix	Gloss
Intransitive	*pɪwa*	'be flat'	Ø	*peβ*	-*a*	'be flat'
	pɨtani	'be red'	Ø	*pɨtan*	-*i*	'be red'
Transitive	*piɾuka*	'peel'	Ø	*piɾok*	-*a*	'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   -ɾeme
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
saku	'be hot'	*ts-*	*akub*	Ø	'He/she/it is hot'
saɾɨwa	'be happy'	*ts-*	*oɾib*	*-a*	'He/she/it is happy'
suni	'be black'	*ts-*	*un*	*-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.	*tɨpɨ*	'be deep'	*t-*	*ɨpɨ*	Ø	'depth'
	tɨwɨti	'be smelly'	*t-*	*ewut*	*-i*	'smelliness'
	timisama	'be full'	*t-*	*ɨnɨsema* (Tb.)	?	'fullness'
Active Intr.	*tapiaɾa*	'delay'	*t-*	*apeaɾõ* (Tb.)	Ø	'delaying'
Transitive	*takɨta*	'nail'	*t-*	*akɨtá* (Tb.)	Ø	'nailing'

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

(2.17) inoporamo...

i-   nopo   -ɾamo
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
yukuka	'embrace'	?	*kok*	*-a*	'? embrace(s)'
yumi	'give'	?	*meʔen*	Ø	'? give(s)'
yumiana	'push'	?	*moayan*	*-a*	'? push(es)'
yumukuni	'swallow'	?	*mokon*	*-i*	'? swallow(s)'
yumunu	'send'	?	*mono*	Ø	'? send(s)'
yupı	'braid'	?	*pẽ*	Ø	'? braid(s)'
yumuita	'teach'	?	*moʔé*	Ø	'? teach(es)'

been frozen from main clauses, in which case tey 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

---

[18]A 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	yapɨka	'sit down	i-	apɨk	-a	'He/she/it sits down'
	yasuka	'bathe'	i-	atʃuk	-a	'He/she/it bathes'
	ipama	'stand up'	i-	pam	-a	'He/she/it stands up'
	sasɨma	'shout'	ts-	atsem	-a	'He/she/it shouts'
	samu	'dive'	ts-	amõ (Tb.)	Ø	'He/she/it dives'
Transitive	ɪɾuɾi	'bring'	i-	ɾuɾ	-i	'X brings him/her/it'
	inupa	'hit'	i-	nupã	Ø	'X hits him/her/it'
	sikɨi	'pull'	ts-	ekɨj	Ø	'X pulls him/her/it'
	sɪtuni	'smell'	ts-	etun	-i	'X smells him/her/it'
	sasawa	'cross'	ts-	atsaβ	-a	'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		
	*a-	*ja-	*o-	*i-	*ts-	*t-
Transitive	✓	✓	Ø	✓	✓	✓
Active Intransitive	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stative Intransitive	Ø	Ø	Ø	✓	✓	✓

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 *iɲisema* '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.

---

[19]He 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 *ɾ-, 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

---

[20]Importantly, 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
	a- 1SG.ERG	*o-* 3.ERG	*i-* 3.ABS	*ts-* 3.ABS	*ja-* 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).

---

[21]Note 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 representented. 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'	*etseɓé	'with'
*kotɨ	'to, toward (LOC)'	*oɓaké	'in front of'
*paɓẽ	'with (company)'	***enoné**	'ahead of'
*pé	'to, for'	***upí**	by means of, within an area, according to
*potsé	'lying with'		
*pɨpé	'in'		

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

---

[1] Unlike verbal and nominal roots, no vowel-initial postpositions receive the *i- suffx, 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
*=kati	ALLATIVE, LOCATIVE	*kotɨ	'in, toward' (LOC)
*=suy	ABLATIVE	*tsuwí	'from'
*=ɾupɪ	PROLATIVE	*ɾ- + *upí	EPNTH + 'within an area'
*=supi	DATIVE	*tsupé	'to, for' (DATIVE)
*=pupɪ	INSTRUMENTAL	/p/ + *upí	(?) + 'by means of'
*=ɨpɨpi	INESSIVE	*i- + *pɨpé	3.ABS + 'in'

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

(3.1) kunumi aki, ɾa usu patiɾikati, ɾa kuɯmata.

   kunumi   aki,   ɾa   usu patiɾi =kati,   ɾa   kuɯmata
   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) ɾana yawʃima wipi ɾitamakati.

   ɾana   yawʃima wipi ɾitama =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 uʃimata wawankɨɾakana yukuʃisuy.

   akia   wiha   uʃima   -ta   wawankɨɾa =kana   yukuʃi =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) ɾa usu, ɾa usu ɨpasu sɨmaɾupɪ.

ɾa	usu,	ɾa	usu	ɨpasu	sɨma	=ɾupɪ
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 maʃta tanasupi.

Pepe	*yumi*	*maʃta*	*tana*	=*supi*
Pepe	give	machete	1PL.EXCL.MS	=DATIVE

'Pepe gives the machete to us.'
(AHT, Green:43)

(3.6) ɪnɪ sakɨta yɨpupɪ.

ɪnɪ	*sakɨta*	*yɨ*	=*pupɪ*
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 (=ɨpɨpi), vowel-initial roots prefixed by the epenthetic *ɾ- (=ɾupɪ) and bare consonant-initial roots (=kati, =suy and =supi). =pupɪ is currently unidentified, although it appears (like =ɾupɪ) 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 *pɨpé*, though this root was also retained as an inessive =ɨpɨpi.

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) ...aikiaɾa tuyuk**ari** ini yuɾitiupa ɾaʃi, ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ini ususmuni.

---

[2]I 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
*=aɾi	DIFFUSE LOCATIVE	*aɾ + *-i	'topside' + PART.LOC
*=aɾɨwa	SUPERESSIVE	*aɾ + *ɨ + *-ɓo	'topside' + EPNTH + DIFF.LOC
*=wiɾɨpɪ	SUBESSIVE	*wiɾ + *ɨ + *-pe	'underside' + EPNTH + PUNCT.LOC
*=kakuɾa	ADESSIVE	?	?
*=kwaɾapɪ	INESSIVE, LOCATIVE	*kwaɾ + *-a + *-pe	'hole' + REF + PUNCT.LOC
*=mɨtɨɾɨpɪ	'in the middle of'	*pɨteɾ + *ɨ + *-pe	'middle' (GEN) + EPNTH + PUNCT.LOC
*=mukui	COMMITATIVE	*mokõj	'two'

aikiaɾa   tuyuka =aɾi   ini   yuɾiti =upa   ɾaʃi,   ɨwati
DEM.PROX.MS land   =DIFF.LOC 1PL.INCL remain =CPL   NON.ASSERT, high.up
-may   ɾitama =kati ini   usu   =sɪnuni.
-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) ɪumay amiti wipi mɪsaaɾɨwa pɪwamay.

ɪumay amiti wipi mɪsa =aɾɨwa   pɪwa   -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 ɨaɾawɨɾɨpɪ ipukumay.

amiti wipi awa   ɨaɾa   =wɨɾɨpɪ   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) ɾa yapɨkata muɾa ɾakakuɾa.

ɾa   yapɨka -ta   muɾa   ɾa   =kakuɾa
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 sɪwɪkakwaɾapɪ Dios taɨɾa awa ɾa uwaka imɨnua?

awa	*sɪwɪka*	*=kwaɾapɪ*	*Dios*	*taɨɾa*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*imɨnua*
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 paɾanamɨtɾɪpɪ.[3]

ta	*paɾana*	*=mɨtɾɪpɪ*
1SG.MS	river	=in.the.middle.of

'I am in the middle of the river.'
(ZJO 2010, LHC, Dict.)

(3.13) ini sawakana, ɾoayapa ini sukanamukui umanu?

ini	*sawa*	*=kana,*	*ɾoaya*	*=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 (=*aɾi*, =*aɾiwa*, =*wiɾipɪ*, =*kwaɾapɪ* and =*mɨtɾɪpɪ*) consist of a relational noun, some intervening segment and a locative suffix, either *-*pe* PUNCTUAL.LOC, *-*ɓo* 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 *-*aɾ* 'topside' or *-*wiɾ* '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 *-*aɾ*, *-*wiɾ* and the locative suffixes are not productive.[4]

Two forms (=*kakuɾa* and =*mukui*) do not derive from relational nouns. The source of =*kakuɾa* is currently unidentified; Cabral (1995) has suggested that it derives from a combination of *kaku* 'cheek' and -*ɾa* LOCATIVE, though is unknown what locative she is refering 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

---

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

[4]The 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 be unambiguously an ordinal one, as in (3.14).

(3.14) ʃé mosapɨra

    ʃé   *mosapɨr*   *-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 mokõîa.

    abá   *mokõî*   *-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 *mokõîa*]] [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]

---

[5]The 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
*paɓẽ	'with' (company)	*etsé	'with respect to'
*pé	'to, for'	*etseɓé	'with'
*potsé	'lying with'	*oɓaké	'in front of'

The commitative *paɓẽ was replaced due to the grammaticalization of the numeral 'two' as a commitative (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 *etseɓé. 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 sɨwapi 'front, forehead' (< PTG *siβ 'forehead') and =kati LOCATIVE (< PTG *kotɨ 'in, toward'), as in (3.17).

(3.17) ta uka sɨwapikati

        ta   uka   sɨwapi =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 yatkupɨ 'back' (< PTG *kupe 'back') and =kwaɾa LOCATIVE (< PTG *kwaɾ 'hole'), as in (3.18).[7]

(3.18) ta uka amiti ɨakua yatkupɨkwaɾa.

---

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

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

ta   *uka*   *amiti* *ɨakua* *yatkupɪ* =*kwaɾa*
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 *sapɨta* 'base, stern, buttress root' (cf., Tupinambá as *opɨtá* 'popa, pé de árvore'), and =*aɾi* DIFF.LOC (< PTG *aɾ 'topside' and *-*i* DIFF.LOC), as in (3.19).

(3.19) amiti ɨwɨrana uka sapɨtaɾi

    amiti *ɨwɨɾa* =*na*   *uka*   *sapɨta* =*aɾi*
    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 =*aɾɨwa* and =*wɨɾɨpɪ*, these constructions are best analyzed as synchronically complex because *sapɨta* and *sɨwapi* are productive lexical items, whereas *aɾ* and *wɨɾ* are not. Note that origin of the '*sapɨta*=*aɾi*' construction must have followed the freezing of the TG sequence *aɾ-i 'topside'-DIFF.LOC as a diffuse locative =*aɾi*, as its composition would otherwise be semantically anomolous (i.e., 'at the base's topside'). Given that this construction is reconstructable for POK, it suggests that =*aɾi* DIFF.LOC is an old morpheme, perhaps providing evidence against the retention of PTG *aɾ '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 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. Expositionally, 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.

---

[8]See 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 ʃikwaɾata ɪnɪ tsɪ sɪta nɪikua.

tsɪ	ʃikwaɾata	ɪnɪ	tsɪ	sɪta	nɪ	=ikua
1SG.FS	follow	2SG	1SG.FS	love	2SG	=CL.REASON

'I follow you because I love you.'
(ZJO 2010, LHC)

(4.2) ɪnɪ yatɨma nɪ ku.[1]

ɪnɪ	yatɨma	nɪ	ku
2SG	sow	2SG	farm

'You sow your farm.'
(ZJO 2010, p. 134, LHC & AHC, corrected form)

(4.3) amiti nɪsupi wipi ɨwɨɾawasu?

amiti	nɪ	=supi	wipi	ɨwɨɾawasu
EXST	2SG	=DATIVE	one	spear

'Do you have a spear?'
(ZJO 2010, p. 77, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(4.4) ɾasuy ɪkumɪ tana uɾi kumɪsasɪnuni umawa kumɪsapupɪ nɪsɪnusɪnuni.

ɾasuy	ɪkumɪ	tana	uɾi	kumɪsa	=sɪnuni	umawa	kumɪsa	=pupɪ	nɪ
then	today	1PL.EXCL.MS	come	speak	=PURP	Omagua	language	=INSTR	2SG

sɪnu	=sɪnuni
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) ɾasuy ta uɾi akiakati ɪnɪ kumɪsakasɪnuni.

ɾasuy	ta	uɾi	akiakati	ɪnɪ	kumɪsaka	=sɪnuni
then	1SG.MS	come	here	2SG	talk.to	=PURP

'Then I came here to talk to you.'
(LHC, 06AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.trans)

---

[1]Note the ungrammaticality of *ɪnɪ yatɨma ɪnɪ ku.

Here, the coreferential subject is not realized in the purposive clause. However, when the subject of a *=sɪnuni*-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 *nɪ* 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(ɪ)=	taná / tan(a)=	tsɪmá / tsɪn(a)=
1INCL			ini / in(i)=	ini / in(i)=
2	mɪ / n(ɪ)=	mɪ / n(ɪ)=	ɪpɪ / p(ɪ)=	ɪpɪ / p(ɪ)=
3	muɾa / ɾ(a)=	ai / i=	ɾaná / ɾan(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	uɾi / ɾ(a)=	=uɾa	ay / y(a)=	=ay	ɾana / ɾan(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

---

[2] There 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).

---

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

[4]Cabral (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	epi	epi, pinu
3	uri	uri, ain	rana	rana, inu

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 categoreis (*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 the stress

---

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

[6]Translation: "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 *tsɨná* 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

[7]Women 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 *uɾa* 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 *muɾa* comes from the catechism fragment, as in (4.7).

(4.6) kakɨɾɨ tanu papa, kakɨɾɨ **uɾa**. Dios ikatutanaɾi.

kakɨɾɨ	*tanu*	*papa,*	*kakɨɾɨ*	*uɾa.*	*Dios*	*ikatu*	*-ta*	*n(a)*	*=aɾi.*
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) Diossɪmay ɾa ikuasɪnuni, **muɾa** ɾa ipuʃitasɪnuni...

Dios	*=sɪmay*	*ɾa*	*ikua*	*=sɪnuni,*	*muɾa*	*ɾa*	*ipuʃi*	*-ta*	*=sɪnuni*
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** ɾumay nɪ yumi ɪkumɪ **tanu**supi.

tanu	*ɾumay*	*nɪ*	*yumi*	*ɪkumɪ*	*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 **ɾana** ĩamukui **ɾana** yamɨmɨa ɾaʃi

upa	*=katu*	*ɾana*	*ĩa*	*=mukui*	*ɾana*	*yamɨmɨa*	*ɾaʃi*
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	muɾa / ɾ(a)=	**ai / i=**	ɾanu	**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]/[ɪ]) 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 *muɾa 3SG.MS, *tanu 1PL.EXCL.MS and *ɾanu 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 *muɾa* 3SG.MS, *tanu* 1PL.EXCL.MS and *ɾanu* 3PL.MS. First, I propose that, prior to the 1680's (the time of the Lucero letter), the initial segment of Old Kokama *muɾa* 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* correpsonds to its proclitic form by way of the deletion of #V. Old Kokama 3SG.MS *muɾa*, then, was reduced so that it exhibited the same correspondence to its proclitic form *ɾa*, 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 *muɾa* 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 *ɾa* 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 *uɾa* appears instead of *uɾi* 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 *uɾi* entered the Kokama system subsequent to this period.[8] Recall that Cabral (1995) claims that *uɾa* and *uɾi* are interchangeable as syntactic subjects and objects in Brazilian Kokama, except when both are third-person, in which case *uɾi* must mark the subject and *uɾa* the object. I propose as a hypothesis, then, that *uɾi* entered Kokama in free syntactic variation with *uɾa*, 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 and 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 *ɾanu* 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 *ɾanu* 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

---

[8]Note 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 ($/u/ \rightarrow /a/$), 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 $/u/ \rightarrow /a/$ 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-

---

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

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

[11]Note 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-existant categories are in black.

Table 4.6: PTG Absolutive Prefixes & Free Pronouns

	ABS	Pronouns
1SG	**tʃé** (ɾ-)	**itʃé**
1PL.EXCL	oɾé (ɾ-)	oɾé
1PL.INCL	**jané** (ɾ-)	**jané**
2SG	**né** (ɾ-)	**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

---

[12]This 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: *-*taɾa*, *-*waɾa* & *-*suɾi*

POK had three agent nominalizers, *-*taɾa* AGT, *-*waɾa* HAB.AGT and *-*suɾi* HAB.AGT, the first two of which are of TG origin. The nominalizer *-*taɾa* derives from one of three allomorphs (*-*áɾ* ∼ *-tsáɾ* ∼ *-táɾ*) 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).

---

[1] Nominalization 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
*-áɾ ∼ -tsáɾ ∼ -táɾ	AGENT	*-taɾa	AGENT	✓	✓	✓	✓
*-βóɾ	HAB.AGT	*-waɾa	HAB.AGT	✓	✓	Ø	✓
*-βaʔe	CLAUSAL	*-may	ABSOLUTIVE	✓	Ø	✓	✓
*-a ∼ -áβo ∼ -ta	EVENT	*-wa	EVENT	Ø	✓	Ø	✓
*-tsʷáɾ	ADVERBIAL	*-suaɾa	ADVERBIAL	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
n/a	n/a	*-pan	ABUNDANTIVE	✓	✓	Ø	✓
*-pɨɾ	PATIENT	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
*-ɨwáɾ	ORIGIN	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
*embɨ-	PATIENT	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
*-áβ ∼ -tsáβ ∼ -táβ	CIRCUMSTANTIAL	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
*-tsʷéɾ	PROCLIVITIVE	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Ø	Ø	*-suɾi	HAB.AGT	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ø	Ø	*-n	ABSOLUTIVE	✓	✓	Ø	✓
Ø	Ø	*-ta	INSTRUMENTAL	✓	✓	Ø	✓

(5.1) *oɾé ɾepjákáɾ

    oɾé   *ɾ-*   *epják* *-áɾ*
    1PL.EXCL.ABS   EPNTH-   see   -AGT.NOMZ
    'The one who see us' [Lit. 'Our seer']
    (Jensen, 1998, p. 540)

(5.2) *ijukátsáɾ

    i-   *juká* *-tsáɾ*
    3.ABS-   kill   -AGT.NOMZ
    'His killer'
    (ibid.)

(5.3) *ipwájtáɾ

    i-   *pwáj* *-táɾ*
    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, *-taɾa* 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 umaitaɾa kamatataɾana.

yapá	*ini*	*usu*	*umai*	*-taɾa*	*kamata*	*-taɾa*	*=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) yawaɾa tsamɨmɨɾa kaɾutataɾa yapanauy.

yawaɾa	*tsa=*	*mɨmɨɾa*	*kaɾuta*	*-taɾa*	*yapana*	*=uy*
dog	1PL.FS	son.of.woman	bite	-REL.A	run	=PAS1

'The dog that bit my son escaped.'

(5.6) nana eɾuɾataɾa napitsaɾa muna tsatukiniuy.

nana	*eɾuɾa*	*-taɾa*	*napitsaɾa*	*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 *-taɾa*-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 *-*taɾa*, 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.

---

[2]However, 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.

[3]As 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 *-*taɾa* AGT.NOMZ and *-*suɾi* HAB.AGT.NOMZ are attested in Old Omagua, as in (5.7).[4]

(5.7) nɪ sapiaɾitipa aikiaɾa upakatu dios kumɪsamaykana, aisituy dios, upai ikua**tara**, ɾoaya
       wiʃani**suɾi**, ɾoaya mɪta**suɾi**, dios kumɪsaikua?

>   *nɪ   sapiaɾi   =tipa   aikiaɾa   upa   =katu   dios   kumɪsa   -may*
>   2SG   believe   =INTERR   DEM.PROX.DM   all   =INTSF   God   say   -ABS.NOMZ
>   *=kana,   aisituy   dios,   upa   -i   ikua   -taɾa,   ɾoaya   wiʃani*
>   =PL.MS,   true   God,   all   -?   know   -AGT.NOMZ,   NEG   be.deceiving
>   *-suɾi,   ɾoaya   mɪta   -suɾi,   dios   kumɪsa   =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 *-*suɾi* (above), not known to be TG, POK possessed an additional habitual agent
nominalizer *-*waɾa*, from PTG *-*βoɾ* 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) ikuatawaɾataka uɾiaɾi.

>   *ikua   -ta   -waɾa   =taka   uɾi   -aɾi*
>   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 -*waɾa* with -*tsuɾin* in the
following way.

> With -*waɾa*, 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 -*tsuɾin* the
> result is someone expert in doing something and who likes to do it.
> (Vallejos Yopán, 2004, p. 30)

---

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

[5]In addition, *-*waɾa* functions endocentrically. It may attach to nouns to derive a variety of meanings, as in
Omagua *manipiaɾawaɾa* 'fisherman' (Sp. *anzuelero*), from *manipiaɾa* 'fishhook'. It appears to have retained this
polyfunctionality from its TG source, as the Tupinambá cognate -*ɓoɾ* 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 *-*βoɾ*, the cognate of -*waɾa*, is only attested in Tupinambá and Old Guaraní (Schleicher, 1998, p. 148), which severely limits candidate lexifier languages.

5.2 Absolutive Nominalizers: **-may* & **-n*

POK exhibited two absolutive nominalizers *-*may* and *-*n*, which derived a noun refering 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) tʃunanimaymukui ta usu ukakati.

tʃunani	*-may*	*=mukui*	*ta*	*usu*	*uka*	*=kati*
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 nɪsupi upa nɪ piatamay.

tana	*yumi*	*nɪ*	*=supi*	*upa*	*nɪ*	*piata*	*-may*
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 ipuɾakasaɾi carretera ɪpɪ piatamay.

tana	*ipuɾaka*	*=saɾi*	*carretera*	*ɪpɪ*	*piata*	*-may*
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)

---

[6]There 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 jux-
taposed noun, also yielding functionally relative clauses. This is shown by the grammaticality and
ungrammaticality of (5.12) & (5.13), respectively.

(5.12) yapɪsaɾa yapanamay usu kamatataɾa.

> *yapɪsaɾa   yapana   -may   usu   kamata   -taɾa*
> man   run   -ABS.NOMZ go   work   -PURP
>
> 'The man who ran is going in order to work.'
> (TES 2010)

(5.13) *yapanamay ɪu panaɾakana.

> *yapana   -may   ɪu   panaɾa   =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-*may*]$_{NP}$	P	[NP TR.V-*may*]$_{CPLX.NP}$	P
[STAT.INTR.V-*may*]$_{NP}$	S	[NP STAT.INTR.V-*may*]$_{CPLX.NP}$	S
ACT.INTR.V-*may*	Ø	[NP ACT.INTR.V-*may*]$_{CPLX.NP}$	S

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

(5.14) *ikatúɓaʔé.

> *i-   katú   -ɓaʔé*
> 3.ABS   be.good -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
>
> 'He one that is good.'
> (Jensen, 1998, p. 542)

(5.15) *otsóɓaʔé.

    o-   tsó -ɓaʔé
    3.ERG- go   -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
    'The one who goes.'
    (ibid.)

(5.16) oisuʔúɓaʔé. (Tupinambá)

    o-   i-   suʔú -ɓaʔé
    3.ERG- 3.ABS- bite -CLAUSAL.NOMZ
    'The one that bit him.'
    (ibid.)

Note that, as a clausal nominalizer, PTG *-ɓaʔé* 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 refering 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

---

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

*-*ɓaʔé* to nominalize P, the distrbution 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 *-*ɓaʔé* attached to a fully formed VP, how did POK *-*may* come to derive nouns refering 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 *-*ɓaʔé*, 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 ikaɾan awa.

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

(5.21) tana eɾutsuka ɾana yumin kaɾamina.

    tana   *eɾutsu* *-ka*   *ɾana*   *yumi* *-n*   *kaɾamina*
    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

---

[8]This 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 uɾi ɾitama nuásúy.

> | *taná* | *uɾi* | *ɾitama* | *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: **-tsʷáɾ* ADVERBIAL.NOMZ (§5.3.1); **-a* ∼ *-áβo* ∼ *-ta* EVENT.NOMZ (§5.3.2); *-pan* ABUNDAN-TIVE.NOMZ (§5.3.3); and *-ta* INSTRUMENTAL.NOMZ (§5.3.4).

5.3.1   **-tsʷáɾ* ADVERBIAL.NOMZ

The PTG adverbial nominalizer **-tsʷáɾ* 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) Cuiabápewat

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

(5.24) pópeswáɾa

> | *pó* | *-pe* | *-swaɾ* | *-a* |
> |---|---|---|---|
> | hand | -LOC | -ADV.NOMZ? | -REF |
>
> 'That which is in the hand'
> (ibid.)

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

(5.25) ɾoaya dioskaisuaɾa puɾai ɾa umanu ɨmɨnua.

ɾoaya	dios	-kai	-suaɾa	puɾai	ɾa	umanu	ɨmɨnua
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), *-suaɾa* attaches to a noun. It is thus inaccurate to describe *-suaɾa* 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 similative. However, a separate similative =*ya* is attested in Old Omagua, which also attaches to nouns, as in (5.26).[10] The similative is productive in Kokama, though it does not appear to be so in Omagua.

(5.26) ɾoaya miaɾakana**ya**katu ini sumukui ɾana umanu.

ɾoaya	miaɾa	=kana	=ya	=katu	ini	su	=mukui	ɾana	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 similative, 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 similative.[11] This is shown by the pair of English examples below, the first of which would in theory contain *-suaɾa*, 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 *-*suaɾa* 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.

---

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

[10]In response to, 'Our souls, don't they die with our bodies?'

[11]Omagua has innovative constructions that appear to be sensitive to this semantic distinction (i.e., *ɪntɪɾu* 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

    ay   *inu=*   *umi* *tsuni*   *-wa*
    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

---

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

[13]Vallejos 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	*yamɨma-pan*	be.sad-ABUND	penoso	someone grieving
	yumɨɾa-pan	be.furious-ABUND	rabioso	a crazy-person
	akɨtʃa-pan	be.scared-ABUND	miedoso	coward
NOUN	*itaki-pan*	stone-ABUND	pedregal	quarry
	miɾitɨ-pan	aguaje-ABUND	aguajal	aguaje farm
	panaɾa-pan	banana-ABUND	bananal	banana farm

Table 5.4: Omagua Nouns Derived with -*pa*

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

Tupinambá cognate -*poɾ*, 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.

---

[14]Other cognates are Tenetehára -*pôr* (Boudin, 1978); Kamaiurá -*pot* (Seki, 2000); and possibly Paraguayan Guaraní -*pɨ* ∼ -*mbɨ* (Canese and Alcaraz, 2001).

[15]*yupɨta* 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
yupɪ-ta	braid-INSTR.NOMZ	Sp. *trenzador*

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 espitemic 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 adquately 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 Ø 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	Ø	*=*suɾi*	✓	✓	Ø	✓
			=*ikwá*	Ø	✓	Ø	Ø
			*=*uí*	✓	✓	Ø	✓
	FUTURE	*-*potaɾ*	=*usu*	✓	✓	Ø	Ø
			=*saɾi*	✓	Ø	Ø	Ø
			=*á*	Ø	✓	Ø	Ø
Desid. Modality	DESIDERATIVE	*-*potaɾ*	*seta*	✓	✓	✓	✓
			putaɾi	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
Sentential Mod.	FRUSTRATIVE	-ɓiã	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Temp. Aspect	IMPERFECTIVE	Ø	*=*aɾi*	✓	✓	✓	✓
	COMPLETIVE	*-*paɓ*	*=*upa*	✓	✓	✓	✓
Pluractionality	ITERATIVE	?	-*kapa*	✓	Ø	Ø	Ø
			*-*ka*	Ø	✓	Ø	✓
	DISTRIBUTIVE	[monosyll. redup.]	*-*ka*	Ø	✓	Ø	?
	FREQUENTATIVE	[bisyll. redup.]	?	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Espistemic Mod.	CERTAINTY	Ø	*=*tina*	✓	✓	✓	✓
	UNCERTAINTY	Ø	*=*taku*	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
	HYPOTHETICAL	Ø	*=*mia*	✓	✓	✓	✓

---

[1]For 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 *putaɾi '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 sɨta yatɨma sandiana ta pɨɾɨpɨtasɨnuni.

ta	*sɨta*	*yatɨma*	*sandia*	*=na*	*ta*	*pɨɾɨpɨ*	*-ta*	*=sɨnuni*
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 *putaɾi has fallen out. POK *putaɾi derives from PTG *potaɾ '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) ɾasɨmay kumɨsamaypupɨ ɾa ni **putaɾi**maypupɨ puɾai.

ɾa	*=sɨmay*	*kumɨsa*	*-may*	*=pupɨ*	*ɾa*	*ni*	*putaɾi*	*-may*
3SG.MS	=INTSF	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=INSTR	3SG.MS	NEG	want	-ABS.NOMZ

=pupɨ	*puɾai.*
=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 ɨmɨnua ɾa ukua**suɾi** upai makati. ɾa usu**suɾi** ɨpasunakati umanutataɾa iwasuna.

ta	*amui*	*ɨmɨnua*	*ɾa*	*ukua*	*=suɾi*	*upai*	*makati.*	*ɾa*
1SG.MS	grandfather	long.ago	3SG.MS	go.about	=DIST.PST	all	where.	3SG.MS

usu	*=suɾi*	*ɨpasu*	*=na*	*=kati*	*umanu*	*-ta*	*-taɾa*	*iwasu*	*=na*
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	=*suɾi*	=*tsuɾi(ay)*
	MEDIAL	Ø	=*ikwá*
	PROXIMAL	=*í*	=*uy*
FUTURE	PROXIMAL	=*saɾi*	=*utsu*
	DISTAL		=*á*

'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) tsɪ usu**í** kawakati. tsɪ usu**í** ɨwɨɾakana ɪɾuɾataɾa, ta uka upatamiɾa.

tsɪ   usu   =í   kawa =kati.   tsɪ   usu   =í   ɨwɨɾa =kana
1SG.FS go   =PROX.PST jungle =ALLATIVE. 1SG.FS go   =PROX.PST tree   =PL.MS
ɪɾuɾa   -taɾa,   ta   uka   upa   -ta   -miɾa
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) uɾi**saɾi** carro nuamayna ɾana ɪɾususɪmuni awana, pero ɾo tana umay mañapkatu ɾana

ipuɾaka**saɾi**.

uɾi   =saɾi   carro   nua   -may   =na   ɾana   ɪɾusu   =sɪnuni   awa
come   =FUT   car   be.big   -ABS.NOMZ   =PL.FS   3PL.FS   take   =PURP   person
=na,   pero   ɾo   tana   umay   mañapkatu   ɾana   ipuɾaka   =saɾi
=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

---

[2]When pronominal objects and tense enclitics coöccur, 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, =*saɾi*, 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 musapɨka patiɾi.

   amua   wata   uɾi   =usu   musapɨka   patiɾi
   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 *ikwaʃi* 'yesterday', as in (6.8).

(6.8) ikwaʃi tsɪ yasukusu.

   ikwaʃi   tsɪ   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.

---

[3]Vallejos Yopán (2004) suggests that the Kokama medial past =*ikwá* grammaticalized from *ikwatʃi* '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 =*aɾi*, and a complex sequence =*usuaɾi* (a combination of the andative and imperfective).[5] These are shown in (6.9)[6] & (6.10), respectively.

(6.9) ini sawakana muɾiapai tina ɾana kakɨɾi**aɾi**.

ini	*sawa*	=*kana*	*muɾiapai*	*tina*	*ɾana*	*kakɨɾi*	=*aɾi.*
1PL.INCL	soul	=PL.MS	always	CERT	3PL.MS	live	=IMPF

‘Our souls will live forever.’
(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(6.10) muɾa kwaɾaʃipupɪ uyawɨɾitipa ini kakɨɾi**usuaɾi**?

muɾa	*kwaɾaʃi*	=*pupɪ*	*uyawɨɾi*	=*tipa*	*ini*	*kakɨɾi*	=*usu*	=*aɾi*
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 =*aɾi*, 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 =*aɾi* is evidenced by data from Espinosa (1935), where constructions with =*utsu* are interchangeable with those with =*aɾi*. That is, one actually sees the full =*aɾi* being interpreted functionally as a future.[8]

(6.11) ɾana juka ɾutsu

ɾana	*juka*	*ɾa*	=*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) ɾana juka ɾaɾi

ɾana	*juka*	*ɾa*	=*aɾi*
3PL.MS	DEM.DIST.MS	3SG.MS	=FUT

‘They will be.’ [Lit. ‘Them, that [one] they will be.’]
(ibid.)

---

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

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

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

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

[8]Segmentation 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 =*saɾi* FUT is a reduction of Old Omagua =*usuaɾi*, 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 *usaɾi*. 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 =*aɾi* 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	=*suɾi*
	PROXIMAL	=*uí*

I reconstruct =*suɾi* and not =*suɾiay* (see Table 6.2) for the distal past because modern =*tsuɾiay* 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 langauge-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 **potaɾ* 'want' (recall Old Omagua *putaɾi*). Tupinambá, the oldest recorded TG language, has only a desiderative based on this form, as in (6.13).[11]

(6.13) eɾekaɾupotaɾ.

> *eɾe-*   *kaɾu*   *-potaɾ*
> 2SG.ERG-   eat   -DESID
> 'You want to eat.'
> (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 148)

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

(6.14) oho taɾ katu

---

[9]Translation: 'Omagua uses the same ending, with the distinction that the acent 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*.'

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

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

> o-   ho   taɾ   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) apɨtata.

> a-   pɨta   -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 *potaɾ is not attested in Old Omagua, modern Omagua, or Kokama. However, both modern languages exhibit a purposive *-taɾa*, as in (6.17) from Omagua and (6.18) from Kokama. I consider this form and function reconstructable for POK.

(6.17) ɾasuy ta uɾí akiasɪɾupi ta usu umaitaɾa ɾana yumisaɾikia.

> ɾasuy   ta   uɾi   =í   akiasɪɾupi   ta   usu   umai   -taɾa   ɾana
> then   1SG.MS   come   =DIST.PST   around.here   1SG.MS   go   see   -PURP   3PL.MS
> yumisaɾikia
> play
> 'Then I came here [and then] I went to see them play.'
> (LHC, 09AUG10.OMG.LHC.AHC.1.trans)

(6.18) apu uɾiuy aɾutsu yumitaɾa

> | *apu* | *uɾi* | *=uy* | *aɾutsu* | *yumi* | *-taɾa* |
> |-------|-------|-------|----------|--------|---------|
> | chief | come | =PST | rice | give | -PURP |
>
> 'The chief came to give rice.'
> (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 619)

In *-taɾa* purposive clauses, the ellipsed nominative argument is coreferential with the absolutive argument of the main clause.[12] I propose that POK *-taɾa* 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 *=aɾi* IMPERFECTIVE and *=upa* COMPLETIVE. The former was illustrated in §6.1. The latter is illustrated in (6.19), from Old Omagua.[13]

(6.19) ...aikiaɾa tuyukaɾi ini yuɾiti**upa** ɾaʃi, ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ini ususmuni.

> | *aikiaɾa* | *tuyuka* | *=aɾi* | *ini* | *yuɾiti* | *=upa* | *ɾaʃi,* | *ɨwati* |
> |-----------|----------|--------|-------|----------|--------|--------|---------|
> | DEM.PROX.MS | land | =DIFF.LOC | 1PL.INCL | remain | =CPL | NON.ASSERT, | high.up |
> | *-may* | *ɾitama* | *=kati* | *ini* | *usu* | *=sɨnuni.* | | |
> | =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 *-paƀ* 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

---

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

[13]As part of a response to, 'Why did God create us?'

[14]Jensen (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 *=*aɾi* IMPF) fit into a larger class of aspectual markers that have grammaticalized from full verbs, including *=*usu* (above) and *=*yuɾiti* DURATIVE.

POK *=*aɾi* IMPF also resulted from a language-internal grammaticalization process, namely from *=*aɾi* 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 =*aɾi*) 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 =*pupɪ*, which derives manner adverbial clauses in Omagua.

(6.21) ta usu uwatapupɪ.

ta   *usu* *uwata* =*pupɪ*
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 kamataɾi.

---

the POK completive *=*upa* is also attributable to the presence of POK *upa* 'all'. That is, the amibiguity 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.

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

> *ta   kamata   =aɾi*
> 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 wɨɾpe seków.

> *ʃe   pó   wɨɾ   -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 wɨɾbo seków.

> *ʃe   pó   wɨɾ   -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 *=aɾi 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

---

[16]I 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-ɾ.

    o-   *pó-póɾ.*
    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) oɾotsóɾotsó.

    oɾo-   *tsó-ɾo-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

---

[17]This 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
ipama	'stand up'	*ipa-pa-ma*	'stand up for a while'
yapaɾaɾi	'sink'	*yapa-pa-ɾaɾi*	'sink very deep'
kakɨɾɨ	'live'	*kakɨ-kɨ-ɾɨ*	'live in various places'
ɨyɨ	'grill'	*ɨyɨ-yɨ-ka*	'grill something well done'
itika	'throw/leave'	*iti-ti-ka(-ka)*	'divorce'

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

Root	Gloss	Reduplicated Stem	Gloss
tʃikaɾi	'look for'	*tʃika-tʃika-ɾi*	'keep on looking for'
tsapuki	'call'	*tsapu-tsapu-ki*	'keep on calling'
paɾiatsu	'suffer'	*paɾia-paɾia-tsu*	'constant suffering'
tsakamɨka	'cross'	*tsaka-tsaka-mɨka*	'intertwine, interweave'
mitʃiku	'wrinkle'	*mitʃi-mitʃi-kuka*	'wrinkle, fold'
kupetake	'limp'	*kupe-kupe-taka*	'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 *sikɨi* 'pull' and *sikɨkɨi* 'pull from one side and another' ∼ 'stretch'. Another speaker, AHT, remembered only the reduplicated stems of some roots, as in *sasɨsɨma* 'shout' for *sasɨma*, and *ɨsɨsɨy* 'be.scared' for *ɨsɨy*. These forms exhibit the internal reduplication of the second CV, as in Kokama.

---

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

Table 6.6: Other Reduplication Patterns in Kokama

Root	Gloss	Reduplicated Stem	Gloss
yuti	'stay'	*yut-yuti ∼ yututi*	'stay for a long time'
maynani	'take care of'	*may-maynani*	'protect'
aɾɨwa	'be on top'	*aɾ-aɾɨwa-ka*	'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 mɨmɨɾaɾakatsuɾi, wepe napitsaɾa.

    tsa   *mɨmɨɾa*   *-ɾa*   *-ka*   *=tsuɾi,*   *wepe* *napitsaɾa*
    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) ɾaepetsui ta eɾa tɨkɨtakauɾa ikiakatika.

    ɾaepetsui   *ta*   *eɾa*   *tɨkɨta* *-ka*   *=uɾa*   *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)

---

[19]However, 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) ɾaepetsui tana tsatsawaka ikian puyo.

ɾaepetsui	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 yɨatipuɾa ini tsɨkika ajamia.

ajan	y=	ɨati	=puɾa	ini	tsɨki	-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) yapɨsaɾa mutʃakapa ɾa wainú.

yapɨsaɾa	mutʃa	-kapa	ɾa	wainú
man	kiss	-ITER	3SG.MS	woman

'The man gives a lot of kisses to his wife.'
(TES 2010)

(6.33) amana uwaɾikapa.

amana	uwaɾi	-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 yatsuɾiay.

tsa=	papa	=tin	mutsanaka	ya	=tsuɾi	=ay
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) muɾatina aisɪtui Dios, aisɪtui awa w(ɪ)ɾanu, ini yaɾa, ini yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)tataɾa.

muɾa	=tina	aisɪtui	Dios,	aisɪtui	awa	w(ɪ)ɾanu,	ini	yaɾa,	ini
3SG.MS	=CERT	true	God,	true	person	COORD,	1PL.INCL	Lord,	1PL.INCL

yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta	-taɾa
redeem	-AGT.NOMZ

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

(6.36) ini sawakana, muɾiapaitina ɾana kakɪɾɪaɾi.

---

ini   sawa =kana, muɾiapai =tina   ɾana   kakɨɾɨ =aɾi
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 ɾaná ukayɨma.

tina   ɾaná   ukayɨma
OPT 3PL.MS   lose
'May they lose!'
(CSS 2010 E2, p. 64, LHC & AHC, Sp. given)

(6.38) tina nɪ usu ɪɾaya viajekwaɾa.

tina   nɪ   usu ɪɾaya viaje   =kwaɾa
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 ɾamainaniuɾa. (Kokama)

ti   ɾa=   mainani   =uɾa
OPT 3SG.MS   take.care.of =3SG.MS.OBJ
'May he take care of her.'[23]
(Espinosa, 1935, p. 75)

(6.40) ti ɾa mayana muɾa. (Omagua)

ti   ɾa   mayana   muɾa
OPT 3SG.MS   take.care.of 3SG.MS
'May he take care of her.'
(Espinosa, 1935, p. 75)

---

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

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

[23]Original translation: 'Que la cuide.'

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

(6.41) mɪ nuamay ɾitama, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ɾa uɾi tanu in.

ɪnɪ	nua	-may	ɾitama,	t(ɪ)n(ɪ)	ɾa	uɾi	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(ɪ)n(ɪ)*, 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) eɾesó**te**mo**ne** koɾi.

eɾe-	só	=te	=mo	=ne	koɾi
2SG.ERG-	go	=FOC	=NON.ASSERT	=DEONTIC	today

'You are the one who should have gone today.'
(Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 331)

---

[24]Vowels 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.

[25]Glosses 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) koɾi**temone** eɾesó .

    koɾi   *=te*   *=mo*   *=ne*   *eɾe-*   *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 ɨwɨɾa ikananɾi.

    ay   *=taka*   *yamimi* *ɨwɨɾa* *ikana* *-n*   *=ɾi*
    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 tɨma ɾa ɨwamatsuɾiay.

    mukuika *wata* *=taka*   *tɨma* *ɾa*   *ɨwama*   *=tsuɾi*   *=ay*
    two   year   =UNCERT NEG   3SG.MS collapse =DIST.PST =already
    'Maybe during two years it didn't collapse.'
    (ibid.)

(6.46) ikuntaka ɾa tʃikuaɾata iniutsu.

    ikun   *=taka*   *ɾa*   *tʃikuaɾa* *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 wiɾtuɾio tseta eɾutsu ini, ɾaepe ini utsu.

> | *maka* | *=taka* | *wiɾtuɾio* | *tseta* | *eɾutsu* | *ini,* | *ɾaepe* | *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 ɾana usu, niawa amiti.

> | *makati* | *ina* | *usu?* | *makati* | *=taku* | *ɾana* | *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 utʃayaɾa ɾaʃi, ɾana sawitimia Santísimo Sacramento?

> | *nua* | *-may* | *utʃayaɾa* | *ɾaʃi,* | *ɾana* | *sawiti* | *=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 uɾimia, amiti uka ɾaʃi.

---

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

[27] More 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*   *uɾi*   *=mia,*   *amiti*   *uka*   *ɾaʃi*
        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) tɨma tʃɨpɨyaɾaɾa utsutaka, nieɾuɾa ɾamia.

        tɨma   *tʃɨpɨ*   *-yaɾa*   *-ɾa*   *utsu*   *=taka,*   *ni=*   *eɾuɾa*   *ɾa*   *=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 kamatamia.

        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) ɾoaya mania ɾana sawitimia.

        ɾoaya   *mania*   *ɾana*   *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' ɓiã.[28]

        a-   *s-*   *ausuɓ*   *ɓiã*
        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 *ɓiã*, 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.

---

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

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

[30]The 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
$n(a)$-...-i $\sim$ ni-...-i	*ni*	OBLIQUE	✓	✓	✓	✓
	$nati$	CORE	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
$e\Omega im$	*$-sima$*	CORE	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
	$-ima$	PRIVATIVE	?	✓	✓	✓
	$tima$	CLAUSAL	Ø	✓	Ø	Ø
$ɾuã$	*$ɾoaya$*	CLAUSAL	✓	Ø	✓	✓
eme	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø

---

[1]Here 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 *eʔim*; 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 ɾoa sɪta usu

     wainú   *=kana*   *ɾoa*   *sɪta*   *usu*
     woman   PL.MS   NEG   want go
     'The women don't want to go.'
     (CSS 2010 E2, p. 8, LHC, Sp. given)

(7.2) ɾo ɾa yauʃima

     ɾo   *ɾa*   *yauʃima*
     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.

---

[2]The Omagua negator shows the following phonetic realizations: [ɾua], [ɾu], [ɾoa] and [ɾo]. 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) ɾaepe ipiɾa tɨma wataɾi

    ɾaepe   ipiɾa   tɨma   wataɾi
    there.MS fish   NEG   lack

    'There, fish does not lack.'
    (Vallejos Yopán, 2010, p. 531)

(7.4) tɨma ɾatseta eyun

    tɨma ɾa=   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) tɨma maɾi epe eyutsu

    tɨma maɾi 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

---

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

[4]Recall 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-   paje   -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)-...ɾua(-i) ~ ni-...ɾua(-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 ʃe sɨi.

> nda   ʃe   sɨ   -i.
> NEG   1SG.ABS   mother   -NEG
>
> 'I don't have a mother.'
> (Lemos Barbosa, 1956, p. 144)

(7.9) nda ʃe sɨ ɾuã.

> nda   ʃe   sɨ   ɾuã
> 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** maɾai aikiaɾa Dios muɾa.

> nati   maɾai   aikiaɾa   Dios   muɾa.
> CORE.NEG   thing   DEM.PROX.MS   God   3SG.MS
>
> 'None of these things is God.' [Lit. 'God is no thing.']
> (Suárez, 1968)

---

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

[6]I maintain the author's segmentations here.

[7]In 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 maɾai* was a lexicalized construction in Old Omagua. However, *maɾai* 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) ɾasɪmay kumɪsamaypupɪ ɾa **ni** putaɾimaypupɪ puɾai.

ɾa	=sɪmay	kumɪsa	-may	=pupɪ	ɾa	ni	putaɾi	=may
3SG.MS	=VERID	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=INSTR	3SG.MS	OBL.NEG	want	-ABS.NOMZ

=pupɪ	puɾai
=INSTR	CONTR.FOC

'With his words, and not with his desires.'
Uriarte (1952, 1986)

*ni is the only negator found in both daughter langeges. 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 *ɾua ∼ ɾoa* and *tɨma*. 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 ɾua usu ipiɾa ʃikiaɾitaɾa ni Pepe usu ipiɾa ʃikiaɾitaɾa.

Julio	ɾua	usu	ipiɾa	ʃikiaɾi	-taɾa	ni	Pepe	usu	ipiɾa	ʃikiaɾi	-taɾa.
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) ɾo tsɪ ɪu panaɾa ni supia.

---

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

[9]In response to, 'With what did God make all these things?'

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

ɾo	tsɪ	ɪu	panaɾa	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) ɾo tsɪ amiasuka puɾaɾa tsɪ miʃu ni makatisɪɾupɪ.

ɾo	tsɪ	amiasuka	puɾaɾa	tsɪ	miʃu	ni	makatisɪɾupɪ
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 yapiʃikia suɾui

ni	awa	yapiʃikia	suɾui
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) wapuɾu katupenpuɾa aki tipiʃkaka ni awa emetepuka.

wapuɾu	katupe	-n	=puɾa	aki	tipiʃka	=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 *tɨma*, the clausal negator, which suggests that this function is an overgeneralization within a particular idiolect.

---

[11]Spanish: **No podía encontrar mi gato ni donde.'*
[12]Spanish: **Ni persona agarró zúngaro.* However: *Ni una persona agarró zúngaro.*

(7.17) ni tapɨatua akɨtʃa

> *ni   tapɨa   =tua   akɨtʃa*
> 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) paɾana tsɨmaɾi inu upaka ni tuntatʃiɾuyaɾa.

> *paɾana   tsɨma   =aɾi   inu   upaka   ni   tuntatʃiɾu -yaɾa*
> 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 *ɾua* ∼ *ɾoa* and *tɨma* 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 sɨta yapɾaʃi ɾo akiamukui.

> *ta   sɨta   yapɾaʃi ɾo   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)

---

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

7.3   PTG *-$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$

Between Old Omagua and the modern languages, three forms derive from PTG *$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$.

Table 7.2: POK Negators Derived from *$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$

PTG	Form	Function	OMG	KK	OOMG	POK
*$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$	-$s\dot{\imath}ma$	CORE	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
	-$\dot{\imath}ma$	PRIVATIVE	?	✓	✓	✓
	$t\dot{\imath}ma$	CLAUSAL	Ø	✓	Ø	Ø

In PTG, *$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$ 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 *$e\mathit{?}\dot{\imath}m$ 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) mojaɡ̃areʔema

  mojaɡ̃   -aɾ   -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 -$s\dot{\imath}ma$ CORE.NEG and -$\dot{\imath}ma$ PRIVATIVE, as in (7.21).

(7.21) ɪɾa kɾistianokana, Dios kumɪsamaypuɾakana ɪɾa amuyasukatataɾakana,

  ɪɾa**sɪma**maywasu**ɪma**, ɾana umanu ɾaʃi, makati ɾana sawasuakana usu?

  ɪɾa   kɾistiano   =kana,   Dios kumɪsa -may   =puɾa =kana   ɪɾa
  good   Christian   =PL.MS, God   say   -ABS.NOMZ   =FOC   =PL.MS good
  amuyasukata -taɾa   =kana,   ɪɾa   -sɪma   -may   -wasu -ɪma,
  obey   -AGT.NOMZ   =PL.MS, good -CORE.NEG   -ABS.NOMZ -AUG   -PRIV,
  ɾana   umanu ɾaʃi,   makati ɾana   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 *-sɨma* 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 *-ɨma*, nor has one been attested in Omagua. However, Espinosa (1935) gives the following examples from Kokama & Omagua, respectively (my glosses, his translations).

(7.22) suiɨma uɾa.

sui	*-ɨma*	*uɾa*
tail	-PRIV	3SG.MS

     'He is without a tail.'
     (Espinosa, 1935, p. 72)

(7.23) suiɨmamay muɾa.[14]

sui	*-ɨma*	*-may*	*muɾa*
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 *tɨma* appears to derive from PTG **-eʔɨm*. However, unlike *-sɨma* and *-ɨma*, which retained their original syntactic position following the syntactic element over which they have scope, *tɨma* precedes its negated predicate (cf., (7.3) & (7.4)). Additionally, *tɨma* 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 *tɨma* 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 *tɨma* 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, **ɾoaya*. However, **ɾoaya* 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 *tɨma* CLAUSAL.NEG and *-sɨma* CORE.NEG are mysterious, as both appear to have a TG person prefix frozen to them (i.e.,

---

[14]The 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 *eʔɨm; rather, full pronouns were used. For the time being, I cannot explain their form.

7.4   PTG *ɾuã̃

PTG *ɾuã̃ 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 *ɾuã̃ 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 *ɾuwã̃ ∼ ɾuwã̃j* occurs in insolation following the stem when it negates an oblique (i.e., not a predicate), as in (7.24). Note that *ɾuwã̃j* appears to combine *ɾuã̃ and the suffixal portion *-i of *n(a)-...-i ∼ ni-...-i. I maintain her segmentation and glossing.

(7.24)   tesaoɾɨ katu pɨpe ɾuwã̃j.

   t-   esa -oɾɨ   katu pɨpe   ɾuwã̃j
   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 tʃeremimbota ɾupi ɾuwã̃j.

   na   tʃe   ɾ-   emi-   mbota ɾ-   upi ɾuwã̃j
   NEG   1SG.ABS   EPNTH- PAT.NOMZ-   want   EPNTH- by   NEG
   'It wasn't by my own will.'
   (Jensen, 1998, p. 548)

In Tupinambá *ɾuã̃ and *-i appear to never coöccur. *ɾuã̃* 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 ɾuã̃ iʃé.

---

[15]In light of this, it would be nice to explain presence of *tɨma* 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   ɾuã   iʃé
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 *ɾuã only as an adverbial nominalizer. I would like to propose that PTG
*ɾuã 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 coöccurred with the circumfixal negator. This is the situation
for Old Guaraní.[16] In Tupinambá the final -i would have been dropped in this coöccurrence. Recall
that non-verbal clauses negated by the circumfixal negator received a 'having' reading, so in this
analysis *ɾuã, when it coöccurs 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 *ɾuã: Old Omagua ɾoaya CLAUSAL.NEG and modern Omagua ɾua
∼ ɾoa CLAUSAL.NEG. Example (7.27) illustrates the former.[17]

(7.27) ini sawakana, **roaya**pa ini sukanamukui umanu?

ini   sawa =kana,   ɾoaya =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)

ɾoaya is attested as late as the 1850's (Marcoy, 1866). However, modern Omagua exhibits only
ɾua ∼ ɾoa. The former appears to derive from the coöccurrence of *ɾuã 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 ɾua ∼ ɾoa is a subsequent reduction, even
though it is identical to an inheritable PTG form.

Like Kokama tɨma, ɾoaya 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 *ɾuã coöccurred
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, eʔɨm 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 ɾoaya more closely resembles Old Guaraní ɾuwãj

---

[16]...except that suffixal -i occurred with ɾuwã even when the prefixal portion was not realized.
[17]See 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 prohibitve follows a verb with an imperative second-person prefix, as in the following pair from Tupinambá.

(7.28) eɾasó

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

(7.29) eɾasóumé

    e-   *ɾasó*   *-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 ukɨɾɨ

    inami   *ukɨɾɨ*
    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.

---

[18]For example, PTG **maɾã* & POK **maɾai* 'thing'.

[19]Note 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 (*ɾuã and *eʔɨm), 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 *ɾuã. POK maintained two forms derived from the PTG *eʔɨm, (*-sɨma CORE.NEG and *-ɨma 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
*-watʃú ~ -utʃú	AUGMENTATIVE	*-wasu	AUGMENTATIVE	✓	Ø	✓	✓
*-katú	INTENSIFIER	*=katu	INTENSIFIER	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
*-eté	INTENSIFIER	*-eté	INTENSIFIER	Ø	Ø	✓	✓
*-atsɨ	INTENSIFIER	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
*-ʔi	DIMINUTIVE	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
Ø	Ø	*-kɨɾa	DIMINUTIVE	✓	✓	Ø	✓
Ø	Ø	*=semay	VERIDICAL	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ø	Ø	*-tʃasu	AFFECTIVE	Ø	✓	Ø	?

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

8.1 Diminutive *-kɨɾa & Augmentative *-wasu

The modern languages share the non-TG diminutive -kɨɾa, 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) tsɪ wipi yawaɾakɨɾa tsɪ maɾay.

> *tsɪ*   *wipi* *yawaɾa* *-kɨɾa* *tsɪ*   *maɾay*
> 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 **-watʃú ∼ -utʃú*. 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) ɪɾa kɾistianokana Dios kumɪsamaypuɾakana ɪɾa amuyasukatataɾakana ɪɾasɨmamay**wasu**ɨma,
       ɾana umanu ɾaʃi, makati ɾana sawasuakana usu?

> *ɪɾa*   *kɾistiano*   *=kana*   *Dios*   *kumɪsa* *-may*   *=puɾa*   *=kana*   *ɪɾa*
> good   Christian   =PL.MS   God   say   -ABS.NOMZ   =FOC   =PL.MS   good
> *amuyasukata*   *-taɾa*   *=kana*   *ɪɾa*   *-sɨma*   *-may*   *-wasu*   *-ɨma,*
> obey   -AGT.NOMZ   =PL.MS   good   -CORE.NEG   -ABS.NOMZ   -AUG   -PRIVATIVE,
> *ɾana*   *umanu*   *ɾaʃi,*   *makati*   *ɾana*   *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 commitative *=mukui*, an argument for its status as a clitic.

(8.3) upakatu ta ĩamukuikatu ta sapiaɾi.

> *upa*   *=katu*   *ta*   *ĩa*   *=mukui*   *=katu*   *ta*   *sapiaɾi*
> 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) kakɨrɨ tanu papa, kakɨrɨ uɾa. Dios **ikatu**tanaɾi.

kakɨrɨ	tanu	papa,	kakɨrɨ	uɾa.	Dios	ikatu	-ta	n(a)=	=aɾi
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 =*sɪmay* 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) ɾa**sɪmay** kumɨsamaypupɨ ɾa ni putaɾimaypupɨ puɾai.

ɾa	=sɪmay	kumɨsa	-may	=pupɨ	ɾa	ni	putaɾi	-may
3SG.MS	=INTSF	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=INSTR	3SG.MS	NEG	WANT	-ABS.NOMZ

=pupɨ	puɾai
=INSTR	CONTR.FOC

'With his true words and not with his desire(s).'
(Uriarte, 1952, 1986)

(8.6) Dios taɨra**sɪmay** awa uwaka ɨmɨnua.

    Dios   taɨra   =sɪmay   awa   uwaka   ɨmɨnua
    God   son   =INTSF   man   become   long.ago
    'The true Son of God became a man long ago.'
    (Suárez, 1968)

(8.7) aikiaɾa musapɾɨka peɾsonakana wipi**sɪmay** Dios muɾa.

    aikiaɾa   musapɾɨka   peɾsona =kana   wipi   =sɪmay Dios muɾa
    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 ɪɾa 'good'.

(8.8) nɪ saʃitatipa upakatu nɪ ĩamukuikatu ini papa Dios, upakatu maɾainkana nɪ ukuata ɾaʃi, ɾa

    ɪɾa**sɪmay**katuikua?

    nɪ   saʃi   -ta   =tipa   upa   =katu   nɪ   ĩa   =mukui =katu   ini
    2SG be.painful   -CAUS =INTERR all   =INTSF 2SG   heart   =COM   =INTSF 1PL.INCL
    papa   dios, upa =katu   maɾain =kana   nɪ   ukuata ɾaʃi,   ɾa   ɪɾa
    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?'
    (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) uwaɾikatseme na yapitʃikaay.

    uwaɾika -tseme na   yapitʃika =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).

---

[1]Vallejos 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
anantseme	not yet	KK & KLL
aytsemeka	it is true	KK & KLL
aytseme	(be) a little bit	KLL
ukuatseme	(be) a lot	KLL
aytsewanan	(be) a little bit	KK
aytseme	(be) enough	KK
aytsemenan	(be) too much	KK

In modern Omagua, the cognate =*sɪmay* maintains the veridical reading from the 18th century religious texts, as in *yapɪsaɾasɪmay* '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 ʃitasɪmay yanɨkɨy.

    ta   yuwama   kamata ʃita   =sɪmay   yanɨkɨy
    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 =*sɪmay* 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 *aisɪmay* 'truth' (cf., Kokama *aystemeka* in Table 8.2), the form of which appears to be composed of two morphemes, *aisɪ* 'true' ∼ 'be true' (see below) and -*may* ABS.NOMZ. Interestingly, no form *aisɪ* 'be true' exists in the modern languages. However, a related adjectival form *aisɪtui* 'true' appears in Old Omagua.

(8.11) muɾa Jesukɾisto, Dios taɨra, aisɪtui Dios, aisɪtui awa...[2]

    muɾa   Jesukɾisto, Dios taɨra,   aisɪtui Dios, aisɪtui 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)

---

[2]In response to, 'Who is in the Holy Sacrament?'

It is unknown if there was productive Old Omagua suffix -*tui*. However, the related stems *aisɪtui* and *aisɪmay* suggest that there was, and that at one time there existed an adjective *aisɪ* 'true'.[3] Thus as late as the writing of the religious texts both the adjective and the reduction of the nominalized adjective (the veridical =*sɪmay*) 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 *aisɪmay* (OMG) and *aytsemeka* (KK).[4]

8.3 Affective =*tʃasu*

Modern Kokama exhibits an additional evaluative not attested in Omagua or known to be TG, the affective =*tʃasu*, 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 ayumatʃasu yumayaɾi ta.

ta	*ayuma*	=*tʃasu*	*yumayaɾi*	*ta*
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.

---

[3]I specifically use the term adjective to reflect the fact that there is a small class of functionally adjectival words in Old Omagua (*ɪɾa* 'good', *ayaisɪ* 'bad' and *aisɪtui* '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.

[4]Note 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 <ɨ>, 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 currenly 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

---

[1]The 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.

[2]Cabral 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.

[3]Translation (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

---

[4]The 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 solamenete las preguntas: además tiene dos catecismos 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 difcil, 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.']

[5]However, 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) ɨwati(may) ɾitama

> *ɨwati*   *-may*   *ɾitama*
> high.up   -ABS.NOMZ   village
> 'Heaven'

(A.3) tuyuka ɾitama

> *tuyuka*   *ɾitama*
> land   village
> 'Earth'

---

[6]In 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 redcator who did not speak Omagua.

[7]Translation (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 ɾitama

    nua   *-may*   *ɾitama*
    be.big   -ABS.NOMZ   village
    'Kingdom'

(A.5) ɨpɨpɪmay tata tupa

    ɨpɨpɪ   *-may*   *tata*   *tupa*
    inside   -ABS.NOMZ   fire   place
    'Hell'

(A.6) misa yawɨkɨtaɾa patiɾi

    misa   *yawɨkɨ*   *-taɾa*   *patiɾi*
    mass   make   -AGT.NOMZ   priest
    'celebrant'[8]

---

[8]The 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, ɨwati ɾitamakati yuɾitimukui...[1]

tanu	*papa*	*ɨwati*	*ɾitama*	*=kati*	*yuɾiti*	*=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

...mɪ ʃiɾa, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ɾa mutʃa[2] muɾa.

ɪnɪ	*ʃiɾa,*	*t(ɪ)n(ɪ)*	*ɾa*	*mutʃa*	*muɾa*
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

mɪ nuamay ɾitama, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ɾa tanu in.[3]

ɪnɪ	*nua*	*-may*	*ɾitama,*	*t(ɪ)n(ɪ)*	*ɾa*	*uɾi*	*tanu*	*in*
2SG	be.big	-ABS.NOMZ	village,	JUSS	3SG.MS	come	1PL.EXCL.MS	?

'Your Kingdom, may it come to us.'

---

[1] The 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 =*pupɪ* attaches directly to the verb. Both are translated by Spanish *con*.

[2] Literally, 'kiss'.

[3] The 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

ɪnɪ putaɾi, t(ɪ)n(ɪ) ɾa yawɨkɨ muɾa, maiɾamania ɨwatimay ɾitamakati...

ɪnɪ	*putaɾi,*	*t(ɪ)n(ɪ)*	*ɾa*	*yawɨkɨ*	*muɾa,*	*maiɾamania*	*ɨwati*	*-may*
2SG	desire,	JUSS	3SG.MS	do	3SG.MS,	CL.EXACT.SIM	high.up	-ABS.NOMZ

ɾitama	*=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

...maiɾai w(ɪ)ɾanu aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati w(ɪ)ɾanu.

maiɾai	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*	*aikiaɾa*	*tuyuka*	*ɾitama*	*=kati*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*
?	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 ɪumay nɪ yumi ɪkumɪ tanusupi.

tanu	*ɪu*	*-may*	*nɪ*	*yumi*	*ɪkumɪ*	*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*

tenepata tanu tanu eraecmamaicana

t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta tanu tanu ɪɾasɨmamaykana...[4]

t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta	*tanu*	*tanu*	*ɪɾa*	*-sɨma*	*-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 sawayaɾakana.

---

[4]Ditransitive 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*.

maiɾamania	*tanu*	*t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta*	*tanu*	*sawayaɾa*	*=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 ucucuimaca eraecmamai

inami nɪ iʃaɾi tanu ukukuimaka ɪrasɨmamay.

inami	*nɪ*	*iʃaɾi*	*tanu*	*ukukui*	*-maka*	*ɪɾa*	*-sɨma*
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

aisɪ maɾaisuy nɪ yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta tanu

aisɪ	*maɾai*	*=suy*	*nɪ*	*yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta*	*tanu*
bad	thing	=ABL	2SG	save	1PL.EXCL.MS

'Save us from the bad thing.'

---

[5]Note 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 ɪpɪ tasupi, amititipa Dios?

ikua	*-ta*	*ɪpɪ*	*ta*	*=supi,*	*amiti*	*=tipa*	*Dios*
know	-CAUS	2SG	1SG.MS	=DATIVE,	EXST	=INTERR	God

      'Tell me, does God exist?'

(C.2) R: *Amiti muɾa.*

      Amiti muɾa.

      amiti muɾa.

amiti	*muɾa*
EXST	3SG.MS

      'He exists.'

(C.3) Q: *Maraitipa Dios muɾa?*

      Maraitipa Dios muɾa?

      maɾaitipa Dios muɾa?

maɾai	*=tipa*	*Dios*	*muɾa*
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.

ɨwatimay ɾitama, aikiaɾa[1] tuyuka ɾitama, upakatu maɾainkana, yawɨkɨtaɾa, wakutataɾa, ini yaɾasɨmay[2] wɪɾanu,[3] muriay Dios muɾa.

ɨwati	-may	ɾitama,	aikiaɾa	tuyuka	ɾitama,	upa	=katu	maɾain
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village,	DEM.PROX.MS	land	village,	all	=INTSF	thing

=kana,	yawɨkɨ	-taɾa,	wakuta	-taɾa,	ini	yaɾa	=sɪmay
=PL.MS,	make	-AGT.NOMZ,	carry.in.arm	-AGT.NOMZ,	1PL.INCL	master	=VERID

wɪɾanu,	muɾiay	Dios	muɾa
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?

maɾipupɪtipa Dios yawɨkɨ upakatu maɾainkana?

maɾi	=pupɪ	=tipa	Dios	yawɨkɨ	upa	=katu	maɾain	=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 puɾai.*

Ra cumesiapupe purai.

ɾa kumɪsapupɪ puɾai.

ɾa	kumɪsa	=pupɪ	puɾai
3SG.MS	word	=INSTR	CONTR.FOC

'With his words.'

---

[1]Cabral (1995, p. 374) segments this form as *aikia* + *ɾa* 'this' + LOC. However, a locative meaning does not make sense in the quesiton '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 prenominal modifiers in POK or the modern languages, nor is there any known locative *ɾa*. The form is *aikiaɾa* in all attestations in all religious texts, even when a locative meaning is not construable.

[2]Cabral (1995, p. 374) segments this as *sɪ* + *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 *=sɪmay* 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).

[3]The etymology of *wɪɾanu* 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 *weɾan*, 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 yuɾiti?

makati	*=tipa*		*Dios*	*yuɾiti*
where	=INTERR		God	remain

'Where is God?'

(C.8) R: *Eguatemai ritama cate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamacate, muriapai, Vayuriti veranu.*

Eguatemai ritamacate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamacate, muriapai, va yuriti veranu.

ɨwatimay ɾitamakati, aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati, muɾiapay ɾa yuɾiti w(ɪ)ɾanu.

ɨwati	*-may*		*ɾitama*	*=kati,*	*aikiaɾa*		*tuyuka*	*ɾitama*	*=kati,*	*muɾiapay*
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ		village	=LOC,	DEM.PROX.MS		land	village	=LOC,	always

ɾa	*yuɾiti*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*
3SG.MS	remain	COORD

'He is always in Heaven as well as on Earth.'

(C.9) Q: *Aguerepa Dios amiti?*

Aguerepa Dios amiti?

awɨɾɨpa Dios amiti?

awɨɾɨ	*=pa*		*Dios*	*amiti*
how.many	=INTERR		God	EXST

'How many Gods are there?'

(C.10) R: *Uyepe titi.*

Uyepe 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?

kwaɾaʃi, yasɨ, sɨsukana, wɨɾakana, ɨwɨɾakana w(ɪ)ɾanu, to maɾitipa aikiaɾakana Dios muɾa?

kwaɾaʃi,	yasɨ,	sɪsu	=kana,	wiɾa	=kana,	ɨwiɾa	=kana	w(ɪ)ɾanu,	to	maɾi
sun	moon	star	=PL.MS	bird	=PL.MS	tree	=PL.MS	COORD,	?	what

=tipa	aikiaɾa	=kana	Dios	muɾa
=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 aiquiara Dios mura, Dios yagueque mai puracana, puravanu.*

Nati marai aiquiara Dios mura, Dios yaguequemaipuracana puravanu.

nati[4] maɾai aikiaɾa Dios muɾa. Dios yawɨkɨmaypuɾakana puɾavanu.[5]

nati	maɾai	aikiaɾa	Dios	muɾa.	Dios	yawɨkɨ	-may	=puɾa	=kana
NEG	thing	DEM.PROX.MS	God	3SG.MS.	God	make	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC	=PL.MS

puɾavanu
?

'None of these is God. They are God's creations.'

(C.13) Q: *Mareiqua tipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aiquiara maraincama?*

Mareiquatipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aiquiara maraincama?

maɾikuatipa Dios yawɨkɨ upakatu aikiaɾa maɾainkana?[6]

---

[4]Cabral (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 *tɨma maɾi* 'nothing' (literally, NEG 'thing'). In modern Omagua the word for 'thing' is still *maɾai* (as it is here, unlike Kokama *maɾi*), 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 *tɨma maɾi* (cf., §7.2).

[5]Cabral (1995, p. 377) suggests that *puɾavanu* here is *pura awa nu* EMPH 'person' PLUR. While the function (and possible segmentation) of this form is unknown, this story is unlikely: =*puɾa* 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 =*puɾa* =*kana* =*puɾa*). 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 *puɾai* and *w(ɪ)ɾanu*.

[6]Cabral (1995, p. 378) proposes to segment *maɾainkana* 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 **maɾai*; thus the /i/ of *in* actually belongs to the root. This form derives from the PTG word **marã* 'thing'. I propose that the apperance 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 *maɾain* 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.)

maɾikua	*=tipa*	*Dios*	*yawɨkɨ*	*upa*	*=katu*	*aikiaɾa*	*maɾain*	*=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 ɪɾasɪnuni.

awa	*ɪɾa*	*=sɪnuni*
man	good	=PURP

'So that man is good.'

(C.15) Q: *Mareiqua tipa Dios yagueque, varanu mura agoa?*

Mareiquatipa Dios yagueque, varanu mura agoa?

maɾikuatipa Dios yawɨkɨ w(ɪ)ɾanu muɾa awa?

maɾikua	*=tipa*	*Dios*	*yawɨkɨ*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*	*muɾa*	*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.

Diossɪmay ɾa ikuasɪnuni, muɾa ɾa ipuʃitasɪnuni, ɾa kumɪsapuɾakana ɾa sɪnusɪnuni, umanumaypuɾa ɾa yawaʃimasɪnuni ɨwatimay ɾitamakati.

Dios	*=sɪmay*	*ɾa*	*ikua*	*=sɪnuni,*	*muɾa*	*ɾa*	*ipuʃi*	*-ta*	*=sɪnuni,*
God	=VERID	3SG.MS	know	=PURP	3SG.MS	3SG.MS	be.heavy	-CAUS	=PURP,
ɾa	*kumɪsa*	*=puɾa*	*=kana*	*ɾa*	*sɪnu*	*=sɪnuni,*	*umanu*	*-may*	*=puɾa*
3SG.MS	word	=FOC	=PL.MS	3SG.MS	hear	=PURP,	die	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC
ɾa	*yawaʃima*	*=sɪnuni*	*ɨwati*	*-may*	*ɾitama*	*=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 taɨra, Dios espiɾitu santo. aikiaɾa musapɨɾika peɾsonakana wipi titi Dios.

Dios	*papa,*	*Dios*	*taɨra,*	*Dios*	*espiɾitu*	*santo.*	*aikiaɾa*	*musapɨɾika*
God	father,	God	son.of.man,	God	spirit	holy.	DEM.PROX.MS	three

peɾsona	*=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?

aikiaɾa musapɨɾika peɾsonakana, roayatipa[7] musapɨɾika Dios?

aikiaɾa	*musapɨɾika*	*peɾsona*	*=kana,*	*roaya*	*=tipa*	*musapɨɾika*	*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 muɾa musapɨɾika Dios. aikiaɾa musapɨɾika peɾsonakana wipisɪmay Dios muɾa.

santisima tɾinidadnani ɾa ʃiɾa.

roaya	*muɾa*	*musapɨɾika*	*Dios.*	*aikiaɾa*	*musapɨɾika*	*peɾsona*	*=kana*	*wipi*
NEG	3SG.MS	three	God.	DEM.PROX.MS	three	person	=PL.MS	one

=sɪmay	*Dios*	*muɾa.*	*santisima*	*tɾinidad*	*=nani*	*ɾa*	*ʃiɾa*
=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.'

---

[7]Cabral (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 *muɾa* 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 ahuaguaca emenua?*

Aiquiara muesapuereca Personacanazui, manismaitipa ahua guaca emenua?

aikiaɾa musapɨɾɨka personakanasuy, maniamaytipa awa uwaka ɨmɨnua?

aikiaɾa	*musapɨɾɨka*	*peɾsona*	*=kana*	*=suy,*	*maniamay*	*=tipa*	*awa*
DEM.PROX.MS	three	person	=PL.MS	=ABL,	which	=INTERR	man

uwaka	*ɨmɨnua*
become	long.ago

'From these three persons, which became a man long ago?'

(C.22) R: *Dios Taegra semai, Ahuaguaca emenua.*

Dios Taegrasemai, Ahua guaca emenua.

Dios taɨɾasɨmay awa uwaka ɨmɨnua.

Dios	*taɨɾa*	*=sɨmay*	*awa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua*
God	son.of.man	=VERID	man	become	long.ago

'The Son of God became man long ago.'

(C.23) Q: *Mareicua tipa Dios Teagra Ahuaguaca emenua?*

Mareicuatipa Dios Teagra Ahua agua emenua?

maɾikuatipa Dios taɨɾa awa uwaka ɨmɨnua?

maɾikua	*=tipa*	*Dios*	*taɨɾa*	*awa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua*
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 ɾa saʃita ɾaʃi, ini ɪɾasɨmamaykanasuy ini ɾa usuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)tasɪnuni, ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ini ɾa yawaʃimatasɪnuni w(ɪ)ɾanu.

ini	*ɾa*	*saʃi*	*-ta*	*ɾaʃi,*	*ini*	*ɪɾa*	*-sɨma*
1PL.INCL	3SG.MS	be.painful	-CAUS	NON.ASSERT,	1PL.INCL	good	-CORE.NEG

-may	*=kana*	*=suy*	*ini*	*ɾa*	*usuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta*	*=sɪnuni,*	*ɨwati*
-ABS.NOMZ	=PL.MS	=ABL	1PL.INCL	3SG.MS	save	=PURP,	high.up

-may	*ɾitama*	*=kati*	*ini*	*ɾa*	*yawaʃima*	*-ta*	*=sɪnuni*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*
-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: *Taeɣra cana pecumessa tasupe amititipa Dios?*

taegracana pe cumessa tasupe, amititipa dios?

taiɾakana, pɪ kumɪsa tasupi, amititipa Dios?

taiɾa	*=kana,*	*pɪ*	*kumɪsa*	*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 muɾa.*

Amiti muɾa.

amiti muɾa.

amiti	*muɾa*
EXST	3SG.MS

'He exists.'

(D.3) Q: *Maɾae tipa Dios?*

Maraetipa Dios?

maɾaitipa Dios?

maɾai	*=tipa*	*Dios*
thing	=INTERR	God

'What is God?'

(D.4) R: *Euate mairrisama, ay quiara tuyre carritama upacatu mara encana Yahuequetara, Yara huassu Dios muɾa.*

euatemai risama, ayquiara tuyreca ritama upacatu maraencana yahuequetara, yarahuassu dios mura.

ɨwatimay ɾitama, aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitama, upakatu maɾainkana, yawɨkɨtaɾa yaɾawasu Dios muɾa.

ɨwati	*-may*	*ɾitama,*	*aikiaɾa*	*tuyuka*	*ɾitama,*	*upa*	*=katu*	*maɾain*
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village,	DEM.PROX.MS	land	village,	all	=INTSF	thing
=kana,	*yawɨkɨ*	*-taɾa*	*yaɾa*	*-wasu*	*Dios*	*muɾa*		
=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?*

maraepupe dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upacatu maraencana?

maɾaipupɪ Dios yawɨkɨ ɨmɨnua aikiaɾa upakatu maɾainkana?

maɾai	*=pupɪ*	*Dios*	*yawɨkɨ*	*ɨmɨnua*	*aikiaɾa*	*upa*	*=katu*	*maɾain*	*=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.

ɾasɪmay kumɪsamaypupɪ ɾa ni putaɾimaypupɪ puɾai.

ɾa	*=sɪmay*	*kumɪsa*	*-may*	*=pupɪ*	*ɾa*	*ni*	*putaɾi*	*-may*
3SG.MS	=VERID	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=INSTR	3SG.MS	NEG	want	-ABS.NOMZ
=pupɪ	*puɾai*							
=INSTR	CONTR.FOC							

'With His true words and not with His desires.'

(D.7) Q: *Macate Dios yuriti?*

macate dios yuriti?

makati Dios yuɾiti?

makati	*Dios*	*yuɾiti*
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.

ɨwatimay ɾitamakati, aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati, upakatu makati Dios yuɾiti muɾa.

ɨwati	*-may*	*ritama*	*=kati,*	*aikiara*	*tuyuka*	*ritama*	*=kati,*	*upa*
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village	=LOC,	DEM.PROX.MS	land	village	=LOC,	all

=katu	*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?

awɨrɨka Dios amiti?

awɨrɨka	*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, yasɨ, sɨsukana, wɨrakana, miarakana, ɨwɨrakana, roayatipa Dios?

kwarafi,	*yasɨ,*	*sɨsu*	*=kana,*	*wɨra*	*=kana,*	*miara*	*=kana,*	*ɨwɨra*	*=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, maraencana dios yahuequemaipura purai mura.

roaya Dios mura. aikiara upakatu marainkana Dios yawɨkɨmaypura purai mura.

roaya	*Dios*	*mura.*	*aikiara*	*upa*	*=katu*	*marain*	*=kana*	*Dios*	*yawɨkɨ*
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 maraencana?

maɾirapa Dios yawɨkɨ ɨmɨnua aikiaɾa upai maɾainkana?

maɾiɾa	=pa	Dios	yawɨkɨ	ɨmɨnua	aikiaɾa	upa	-i	maɾain	=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 ɪɾamayɾa

ini	ɪɾa	-may	-ɾa
1PL.INCL	good	-ABS.NOMZ	-BEN

'For our wellbeing.'

(D.15) Q: *Mania zenoni Dios yahueque emenua y ennae verano?*

Maniazenoni dios yahueque emenua yennae verano?

maniasmuni Dios yawɨkɨ ɨmɨnua ini w(ɪ)ɾanu?

maniasmuni	Dios	yawɨkɨ	ɨmɨnua	ini	w(ɪ)ɾanu
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 yeneyuriti 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 Diossɪmay s(ɪ), ini saʃitasmuni muɾa Dios, ɾa kumɪsamaypuɾakana ini amuyasukatasmuni, aikiaɾa tuyukaɾi ini yuɾitiupa ɾaʃi, ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ususmuni.

ini	ikua	=smuni	Dios	=sɪmay	s(ɪ),	ini	saʃi	-ta	=smuni
1PL.INCL	know	=PURP	God	=VERID	?,	1PL.INCL	be.painful	-CAUS	=PURP
muɾa	Dios,	ɾa	kumɪsa	-may	=puɾa	=kana	ini	amuyasukata	
3SG.MS	God,	3SG.MS	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC	=PL.MS	1PL.INCL	obey	
=smuni,	aikiaɾa	tuyuka	=aɾi	ini	yuɾiti	=upa	ɾaʃi,		
=PURP,	DEM.PROX.MS	land	=DIFF.LOC	1PL.INCL	remain	=CPL	NON.ASSERT,		
ɨwati	-may	ɾitama	=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 Espritu Santo, ayquiara musa puere ca personacana uyepe titi Dios muɾa.*

Dios Papa, Dios Teagra, Dios Espiritu Santo, ayquiara musapuereca personacana uyepe titi Dios muɾa.

Dios papa, Dios taɨɾa, Dios espiɾitu santo. aikiaɾa musaɨɾika peɾsonakana wipi titi Dios muɾa.

Dios	*papa,*	*Dios*	*taɨɾa,*	*Dios*	*espiɾitu*	*santo.*	*aikiaɾa*	*musapiɾika*
God	father,	God	son.of.man,	God	spirit	holy.	DEM.PROX.MS	three

peɾsona	*=kana*	*wipi*	*titi*	*Dios*	*muɾa*
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 musapuereca personacana roayapa musapuereca dioscana?

aikiaɾa musapiɾika peɾsonakana, ɾoayapa musapiɾika Dioskana?

aikiaɾa	*musapiɾika*	*peɾsona*	*=kana,*	*ɾoaya*	*=pa*	*musapiɾika*	*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 muɾa Santsima Trinidad nanimairashira.*

Roaya puereca Dioscana, ayquiara musapuerecana personacana persona uype titi Dios muɾa Santisima Trinidadnanimai ɾa shira.

ɾoaya [musa]piɾika Dioskana. aikiaɾa musapiɾika peɾsonakana peɾsona wipi titi Dios muɾa. santisima trinidadnanimay ɾa ʃiɾa.

ɾoaya	*[musa]pɨɾɨka*	*Dios*	*=kana.*	*aikiaɾa*	*musapɨɾɨka*	*peɾsona*	*=kana*
NEG	three	God	=PL.MS.	DEM.PROX.MS	three	person	=PL.MS

peɾsona	*wipi*	*titi*	*Dios*	*muɾa.*	*santisima*	*trinidad*	*=nani*	*-may*	*ɾa*	*ʃiɾa*
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?

aikiaɾa musapɨɾɨka peɾsonakanasuy, maniamay awa ɾa[1] uwaka ɨmɨnua?

aikiaɾa	*musapɨɾɨka*	*peɾsona*	*=kana*	*=suy,*	*maniamay*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*
DEM.PROX.MS	three	person	=PL.MS	=ABL,	which	man	3SG.MS	become

ɨmɨnua
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 taɨra awa ɾa uwaka ɨmɨnua.

Dios	*taɨra*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua*
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?*

Maniazenoni dios taegra ahua ra huaca emenua?

maniasmuni Dios taɨra awa ɾa uwaka ɨmɨnua?

maniasmuni	*Dios*	*taɨra*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua*
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: *Rasaschita raschi yame; yenne erac mamaicana sui, ehuepe maitopatata sui verano rusuyepeta zenoni yenne.*

Ra saschita raschi yame; yenne eracmamaicanasui, ehuepemai topa tatasui verano rusu yepetazenoni yenne.

ɾa saʃita ɾaʃi ini, ini ɯɾasɨmamaykanasuy ɨpɨpɨmay tupa tatasuy[2] w(ɪ)ɾanu ɾa usuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)tasmuni ini.

---

[1]The appearance of a person-marker here appears to be ungrammatical (also below).

[2]Here the order of the words in the neologism *tata tupa* 'Hell' is reversed.

ɾa	*saʃi*	*-ta*	*ɾaʃi*	*ini,*	*ini*	*ɪɾa*	*-sɨma*
3SG.MS	be.painful	-CAUS	NON.ASSERT	1PL.INCL,	1PL.INCL	good	-CORE.NEG

-may	*=kana*	*=suy*	*ɨpɨpɪ*	*-may*	*tupa*	*tata*	*=suy*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*	*ɾa*
-ABS.NOMZ	=PL.MS	=ABL	inside	-ABS.NOMZ	place	fire	=ABL	COORD	3SG.MS

usuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta	*=sɪnuni*	*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 sɪwɪkakwaɾapɪ Dios taɨra awa ɾa uwaka ɨmɨnua?

awa	*sɪwɪka*	*=kwaɾapɪ*	*Dios*	*taɨɾa*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua*
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, Espíritu 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.

viɾgen santa maɾia sɪwɪkakwaɾapɪ awa ɾa uwaka ɨmɨnua. espiɾitu santosuy muɾa, viɾgen santa maɾia sɪwɪkasuy ɾa uwaɾi ɨmɨnua.

viɾgen	*santa*	*maɾia*	*sɪwɪka*	*=kwaɾapɪ*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*ɨmɨnua.*	*espiɾitu*
virgin	holy	Mary	womb	=INESSIVE	man	3SG.MS	become	long.ago.	spirit

santo	*=suy*	*muɾa,*	*viɾgen*	*santa*	*maɾia*	*sɪwɪka*	*=suy*	*ɾa*	*uwaɾi*	*ɨmɨnua*
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 sacapuere veranu muri apai tipa Virgen rayuriti?*

Virgen santa maria huarita sacapuere veranu muriapaitipa virgen ra yuriti?

viɾgen santa maria uwaɾita sakapɨɾɨ w(ɪ)ɾanu, muɾiapaitipa viɾgen ɾa yuɾiti?

viɾgen	*santa*	*maɾia*	*uwaɾi*	*-ta*	*sakapɨɾɨ*	*w(ɪ)ɾanu,*	*muɾiapai*	*=tipa*	*viɾgen*
virgin	holy	Mary	be.born	-CAUS	CL.ANT	COORD,	always	=INTERR	virgin

ɾa	*yuɾiti*
3SG.MS	remain

'And after the virgin Mary gave birth, did she always remain a virgin?'

(D.28) R: *Muri apai Virgen rayuritimura.*

Muriapai virgen ra yuriti mura.

muɾiapai viɾgen ɾa yuɾiti muɾa.

muɾiapai	*viɾgen*	*ɾa*	*yuɾiti*	*muɾa*
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 taɨɾa awa ɾa uwaka ɾaʃi ɨmɨnua, maɾaitipa ɾa ʃiɾa?

Dios	*taɨɾa*	*awa*	*ɾa*	*uwaka*	*ɾaʃi*	*ɨmɨnua,*	*maɾai*	*=tipa*	*ɾa*
God	son	man	3SG.MS	become	NON.ASSERT	long.ago,	thing	=INTERR	3SG.MS

ʃiɾa	
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.

hesukɾisto ɾa ʃiɾa. muɾatina aisɪtuy Dios, aisɪtuy awa wɪɾanu, ini yaɾa ini yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)tataɾa.

hesukɾisto	*ɾa*	*ʃiɾa.*	*muɾa*	*=tina*	*aisɪtuy*	*Dios,*	*aisɪtuy*	*awa*	*wɪɾanu,*
Jesus Christ	3SG.MS	name.	3SG.MS	=CERT	true	God,	true	man	COORD,

ini	*yaɾa*	*ini*	*yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta*	*-taɾa*
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?

maɾiamay hesukɾisto yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta ini?

maɾiamay	*hesukɾisto*	*yumunuy(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta*	*ini*
how	Jesus Christ	redeem	1PL.INCL

'How did Jesus Christ redeem us?'

(D.32) R: *Yenne ycuarasussanaraschi, Cruz ari taque tamai raumanuraschi (muɾa).* (Entre paréntesis, con lápiz: *muɾa*.)

Yenne ycua ra susana raschi, Cruzari taquetamai ra umanu raschi (mura).

iniikua ɾa susana ɾaʃi, kɾusaɾi takɨtamay ɾa umanu ɾaʃi ɨmɨnua (muɾa).

ini	*=ikua*	*ɾa*	*susana*	*ɾaʃi,*	*kɾus*	*=aɾi*	*takɨta*
1PL.INCL	=on.behalf.of	3SG.MS	suffer(?)	NON.ASSERT,	cross	=DIFF.LOC	nail

-may	*ɾa*	*umanu*	*ɾaʃi*	*ɨmɨnua*	*(muɾa).*
-ABS.NOMZ	3SG.MS	die	NON.ASSERT	long.ago	(3SG.MS)

'Suffering[3] 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 hesukɾisto Dios ɾaʃi ɾa umanu ɨmɨnua?

mania	*-wasu*	*hesukɾisto*	*Dios*	*ɾaʃi*	*ɾa*	*umanu*	*ɨmɨnua*
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.

awakaisuaɾapuɾa. ɾoaya Dioskaisuaɾa puɾai ɾa umanu ɨmɨnua.

awa	*-kai*	*-suaɾa*	*=puɾa.*	*ɾoaya*	*Dios*	*-kai*	*-suaɾa*	*puɾai*	*ɾa*
man	-?	-ADVBLZR	=FOC.	NEG	God	-?	-ADVBLZR	CONTR.FOC	3SG.MS

umanu	*ɨmɨnua*
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?

hesukɾisto umanu ɾaʃi, uyawɨɾitipa ɾa kakɨɾi ɨmɨnua?

hesukɾisto	*umanu*	*ɾaʃi,*	*uyawɨɾi*	*=tipa*	*ɾa*	*kakɨɾi*	*ɨmɨnua*
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.

uyawɨɾi ɾa kakɨɾi ɨmɨnua musapɨɾika kuɾmaɾi.

uyawɨɾi	*ɾa*	*kakɨɾi*	*ɨmɨnua*	*musapɨɾika*	*kuɾma*	*=aɾi*
again	3SG.MS	live	long.ago	three	dawn	=DIFF.LOC

'He lived again on the third[4] day long ago.'

---

[3]The 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'.

[4]The use of *musapɨɾika* 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 quereraschi emenua macate reusuemenua?*

Jesu Cto. uyahuere quere raschi emenua, macate re usu emenua?

hesukɾisto uyawɨɾɨ [ka]kɨɾɨ ɾaʃi imɨnua, makati ɾa usu imɨnua?

hesukɾisto	*uyawɨɾɨ*	*[ka]kɨɾɨ*	*ɾaʃi*	*imɨnua,*	*makati*	*ɾa*	*usu*	*imɨnua*
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.

ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ɾa usu imɨnua.

ɨwati	*-may*	*ɾitama*	*=kati*	*ɾa*	*usu*	*imɨnua*
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 sucatatararcana eracemamaihuassu ema, ranu umanuraschi, macate rana sahuassuacana ussu? ɨɾa kɾistianokana Dios kumɨsamaypuɾakana ɨɾa amuyasukatatataɾakana ɨɾasɨmamaywasuɨma, ɾana umanu ɾaʃi, makati ɾana sawasuakana usu?

ɨɾa	*kɾistiano*	*=kana*	*Dios*	*kumɨsa*	*-may*	*=puɾa*	*=kana*	*ɨɾa*
good	Christian	=PL.MS	God	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC	=PL.MS	good

amuyasukata	*-taɾa*	*=kana*	*ɨɾa*	*-sɨma*	*-may*	*-wasu*	*-ima,*
obey	-AGT.NOMZ	=PL.MS	good	-CORE.NEG	-ABS.NOMZ	-AUG	-PRIVATIVE,

ɾana	*umanu*	*ɾaʃi,*	*makati*	*ɾana*	*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 sareguaraschi ranacaquere zenoni.*

Euatemai ritamacate muriapai saregua raschi rana caquerezenoni.

ɨwatimay ɾitamakati, muɾiapai saɾɨwa ɾaʃi, ɾana kakɨɾɨsmuni.

ɨwati-	*may*	*ɾitama*	*=kati,*	*muɾiapai*	*saɾɨwa*	*ɾaʃi,*	*ɾana*	*kakɨɾɨ*
high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village	=LOC,	always	be.happy	NON.ASSERT,	3PL.MS	live

=sɨnuni
=PURP

'To Heaven, so that they may always live being happy.'

---

[5]Relative clauses are used in the translation of this (and the following) sentence(s) for readability, even though such "clauses" are syntactically nominalizations.

Roaya, miaracana yacatu yennezumucui rana umanu; yenne Sahuacana muriapaitina rana caquereari.

ɾoaya miaɾakanayakatu ini sumukui ɾana umanu. ini sawakana muɾiapaitina ɾana kakɨɾɨari.

ɾoaya	*miaɾa*	*=kana*	*=ya*	*=katu*	*ini*	*su*	*=mukui*	*ɾana*	*umanu.*
NEG	monkey	=PL.MS	=SIM	=INTSF	1PL.INCL	body	=COM	3PL.MS	die.
ini		*sawa*	*=kana*	*muɾiapai*	*=tina*	*ɾana*	*kakɨɾɨ*	*=aɾi*	
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?

uyawɨɾitipa ini yaɾa hesukɾisto ɨwatimay ɾitamasuy aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati ɾa uɾiari.

uyawɨɾɨ	*=tipa*	*ini*	*yaɾa*	*hesukɾisto*	*ɨwati*	*-may*	*ɾitama*	*=suy*
again	=INTERR	1PL.INCL	master	Jesus Christ	high.up	-ABS.NOMZ	village	=ABL
aikiaɾa		*tuyuka*	*ɾitama*	*=kati*	*ɾa*	*uɾi*	*=aɾi*	
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.

uyawɨɾɨ ɾa uɾiari aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitama upapupɨkatu.

uyawɨɾɨ	*ɾa*	*uɾi*	*=aɾi*	*aikiaɾa*	*tuyuka*	*ɾitama*	*upa*	*=pupɨkatu*
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?

muɾa kwaɾaʃipupɨ uyawɨɾitipa ini kakɨɾɨusuaɾi?

muɾa	*kwaɾaʃi*	*=pupɨ*	*uyawɨɾɨ*	*=tipa*	*ini*	*kakɨɾɨ*	*=usu*	*=aɾi*
3SG.MS	day	=INSTR	again	=INTERR	1PL.INCL	live	=ANDATIVE	=IMPF

'That day, will we go to live again?'

(D.48) R: *Vyahuere upa yenneca* (entre lneas, *Ru*) *caquere usuari.*

Vyahuere upa yene ca /ru/ caquere usuari.

uyawɨɾɨ upa ini kakɨɾɨusuaɾi.

uyawɨrɨ	*upa*	*ini*	*kakɨrɨ*	*=usu*	*=aɾi*
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?

maɾiasɪnuni muɾa kwaɾaʃipupɪ ini yaɾa hesukɾisto uyawɨrɨ uɾiari?

maɾiasɪnuni	*muɾa*	*kwaɾaʃi*	*=pupɪ*	*ini*	*yaɾa*	*hesukɾisto*	*uyawɨrɨ*	*uɾi*
why		3SG.MS	day	=INSTR	1PL.INCL	master	Jesus Christ	again	come
=aɾi							
=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 aisɪ ini yawɨkɨmaypuɾakana w(ɪ)ɾanu ɾa kumɪsasɪnuni ɾa uɾiaɾi.

upa	*=katu*	*ini*	*sawa*	*kai*	*upa*	*-i*	*aisɪ*	*ini*	*yawɨkɨ*	*-may*	*=puɾa*
all	=INTSF	1PL.INCL	soul	sap	all	-?	bad	1PL.INCL	do	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC
=kana	*w(ɪ)ɾanu*	*ɾa*	*kumɪsa*	*=sɪnuni*	*ɾa*	*uɾi*	*=aɾi*			
=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?

muɾa kwaɾaʃipupɪ makati hesukɾisto ɪrusuari ɪra kɾistianokana?

muɾa	*kwaɾaʃi*	*=pupɪ,*	*makati*	*hesukɾisto*	*ɪrusu*	*=aɾi*	*ɪra*	*kɾistiano*	*=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 sararaquaraschiranaca 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.

ɪɾa kristianokana puɾai, uyawɨɾɨ ɾa ɪɾusuaɾi ɨwatimay ɾitamakati ɾana sawakanamukui ɾana sukanamukui, muɾiapai saɾa ɾa[ʃi] kwaɾaʃi ɾana kakɨɾismuni, aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati Dios kumɪsamaypuɾakana ɾana amuyasukata s(ɪ)p(ɨ).[7]

ɪɾa	kɾistiano	=kana	puɾai,	uyawɨɾɨ	ɾa	ɪɾusu	=aɾi	ɨwati
good	Christian	=PL.MS	CONTR.FOC,	again	3SG.MS	go	=IMPF	high.up

-may	ɾitama	=kati	ɾana	sawa	=kana	=mukui	ɾana	su	=kana
-ABS.NOMZ	village	=ALL	3PL.MS	soul	=PL.MS	COM	3PL.MS	body	=PL.MS

=mukui,	muɾiapai	saɾa	ɾa[ʃi]	kwaɾaʃi	ɾana	kakɨɾɨ	=sɪnuni,
=COM,	always	await	NON.ASSERT	day	3PL.MS	live	=PURP,

aikiaɾa	tuyuka	ɾitama	=kati	Dios	kumɪsa	-may	=puɾa	=kana
DEM.PROX.MS	land	village	=LOC	God	say	-ABS.NOMZ	=FOC	=PL.MS

ɾana	amuyasukata	s(ɪ)p(ɨ)
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?

muɾa kwaɾaʃipupɪ, makati hesukristo yumupuriusuari aisɪmaykana?

muɾa	kwaɾaʃi	=pupɪ,	makati	hesukristo	yumupuri	=usu	=aɾi	aisɪ
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 tuya 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 tuyaca ritamacate dios cumessamaipuracaca roaya rana amuyasucata yeua.

upakatu aisɪmaykana, uyawɨɾɨ ɾa yumpuɾiusuaɾi ɨpɨpɪmay tata tupakwaɾapɪ ɾana sawakanamukui ɾana sukanamukui, muɾiapai ɾana ukai ɾaʃi ɾana yuritismuni, aikiaɾa tuyuka ɾitamakati Dios kumɪsamaypuɾakana ɾoaya ɾana amuyasukataikua.

upa	=katu	aisɪ	-may	=kana,	uyawɨɾɨ	ɾa	yumpuɾi	=usu	=aɾi
all	=INTSF	bad	-ABS.NOMZ	=PL.MS,	again	3SG.MS	send	=ANDATIVE	=IMPF

---

[7]The form *s(ɪ)pɨ* must be a clause-linker (see response to following question), though no cognate is known in the modern languages.

ɨpɨpɪ   -may   tata tupa =kwaɾapɪ ɾana   sawa =kana   =mukui ɾana
inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place =INESSIVE 3PL.MS soul =PL.MS =COM   3PL.MS

su   =kana   =mukui, muɾiapai ɾana   ukai   ɾaʃi   ɾana   yuɾiti
body =PL.MS =COM,   always   3PL.MS burn NON.ASSERT 3PL.MS remain

=sɪnuni, aikiaɾa   tuyuka ɾitama =kati Dios kumɪsa -may   =puɾa
=PURP,   DEM.PROX.MS land   village =LOC God   say   -ABS.NOMZ =FOC

=kana   ɾoaya ɾana   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 maitatatopa quarape renausu maca?*

Maretipa Ahuacana yahuequeari Eupemai tata topaquarape rena usumaca?

maɾitipa awakana yawɨkɨari ɨpɨpɪmay tata tupakwaɾapɪ ɾana usumaka?

maɾi =tipa   awa   =kana   yawɨkɨ =aɾi   ɨpɨpɪ   -may   tata tupa
what =INTERR person =PL.MS do   =IMPF inside -ABS.NOMZ fire place

=kwaɾapɪ   ɾana   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.

ɾoaya kɾistiano ɾaʃi, sap(ɨ)ɾa bautismopupɪ kɾistiano ɾana uwakaɾi. ɾasuy Dios kumɪsamaypuɾakana santa iglesia kumɪsamaypuɾakana w(ɪ)ɾanu ɾana amuyasukata ɾaʃi, ɾoaya ɾana usuaɾi ɨpɨpɪmay tata tupakwaɾapɪ.

ɾoaya kɾistiano ɾaʃi,   sap(ɨ)ɾa bautismo =pupɪ   kɾistiano ɾana   uwaka
NEG   Christian NON.ASSERT, first   baptism   =INSTR Christian 3PL.MS become

=aɾi.   ɾasuy Dios kumɪsa -may   =puɾa =kana   santa iglesia kumɪsa
=IMPF. then   God   say   -ABS.NOMZ =FOC   =PL.MS holy   church say

-may   =puɾa =kana   w(ɪ)ɾanu ɾana   amuyasukata ɾaʃi,   ɾoaya
-ABS.NOMZ =FOC   =PL.MS COORD   3PL.MS obey   NON.ASSERT, NEG

ɾana   usu =aɾi   ɨpɨpɪ   -may   tata tupa   =kwaɾapɪ
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 raraschimeraetipa rana ya hueque ari, Epue pemai rana a su maca?*

Christianocana nuamai hucha yara raschi, meraetipa rana yahuequeari, Epuepemai rana asumaca?

kristianokana nuamay utʃayaɾa ɾaʃi, maɾaitipa ɾana yawɨkɨaɾi ɨpɨpɪmay ɾana usumaka?

kɾistiano	=kana	nua	-may	utʃa	-yaɾa	ɾaʃi,		maɾai	=tipa
Christian	=PL.MS	be.big	-ABS.NOMZ	sin	-POSS	NON.ASSERT,		thing	=INTERR
ɾana	yawɨkɨ	=aɾi	ɨpɨpɪ	-may		ɾana	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 yahue quetara 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 ɾana ĩamukui ɾana yamɨmɨa ɾaʃi, ɾana yumɨrataikua Dios ai s(ɪ)pa, ɾana sɪta ɾaʃi sapiaɾi, upai ɾana utʃakana ɾana konfesaya[ɾa]ɾi misa yawɨkɨtaɾa patiɾi (super makus muɾa puɾai Dios sekuyaɾa t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)taɾi).

upa	=katu	ɾana	ĩa	=mukui	ɾana	yamɨmɨa	ɾaʃi,		ɾana	
all	=INTSF	3PL.MS	heart	=COM	3PL.MS	grieve	NON.ASSERT,		3PL.MS	
yumɨra		-ta	=ikua		Dios	ai	s(ɪ)pa,	ɾana	sɪta	ɾaʃi
become.angry		-CAUS	=CL.REASON		God	?	?,	3PL.MS	want	NON.ASSERT
sapiaɾi,	upa	-i	ɾana	utʃa	=kana	ɾana	konfesa	-ya[ɾa]	=aɾi	misa	yawɨkɨ
believe,	all	-?	3PL.MS	sin	=PL.MS	3PL.MS	confess	-VBLZR	=IMPF	mass	make
-taɾa		patiɾi	(super	makus	muɾa	puɾai		Dios	sekuyaɾa	t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta
-AGT.NOMZ		priest	(?	?	3SG.MS	CONTR.FOC		God	?	forgive
=aɾi)										
=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 Santisimo Sacramento?

kristianokana ɪra ɾana konfesayaɾa ɾaʃi, ɾana sawitiaɾi w(ɪ)ɾanu santisimo sakɾamento?

kɾistiano	=kana	ɪra	ɾana	konfesa	-yaɾa	ɾaʃi,		ɾana	sawiti
Christian	=PL.MS	good	3PL.MS	confess	-VBLZR	NON.ASSERT,		3PL.MS	find

=aɾi   w(ɪ)ɾanu   santisimo   sakɾamento
=IMPF   COORD   holy   sacrament
'If Christians have confessed, will they find the Holy Sacrament?'

(D.60) R: *Ranacahuai icari.*

Rana cahuaiicari.

ɾana sawitiaɾi.

ɾana   sawiti   =aɾi
3PL.MS   find   =IMPF
'They will find [it].'

(D.61) Q: *Hua tipa yuriti Santísimo Sacramento o puperi?*

Huatipa yuriti Santisimo Sacramentoopuperi?

awatipa yuɾiti santisimo sakɾamentoɨpɨpɪ?

awa   =tipa   yuɾiti   santisimo   sakɾamento   =ɨpɨpɪ
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.

muɾa hesukɾisto, Dios taɨɾa, aisɪtuy Dios, aisɪtuy awa, ɾa sawamukui ɾa sumukui ɾa suɨmukui w(ɪ)ɾanu mairamania.

muɾa   hesukɾisto,   Dios   taɨɾa,   aisɪtuy   Dios,   aisɪtuy   awa,   ɾa   sawa
3SG.MS   Jesus Christ,   God   son.of.man,   true   God,   true   man,   3SG.MS   soul
=mukui   ɾa   su   =mukui   ɾa   suɨ   =mukui   w(ɪ)ɾanu   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 sould, 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 santisimo sacramento

mɨtɨɾɨpɪ ɨpɨsasuy komulgayaɾayakatu maɾai kuɾata ɾaʃi, nuamay utʃaya[ɾa] ɾaʃi, ɾana sawitimia santisimo sakɾamento?

mɨtɨɾɨpɪ	*ɨpɨsa*	*=suy*	*komulga*	*-yaɾa*	*=ya*	*=katu*	*maɾai*	*kuɾata*
in.the.middle.of	night	=ABL	receive.communion	-NOMZ	=SIM	=INTSF	thing	drink

ɾaʃi,	*nua*	*-may*	*utʃa*	*-ya[ɾa]*	*ɾaʃi,*	*ɾana*	*sawiti*	*=mia*
NON.ASSERT,	be.big	-ABS.NOMZ	sin	-POSS	NON.ASSERT,	3PL.MS	find	=HYPTH

santisimo	*sakɾamento*
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.

ɾoaya mania ɾana sawitimia.

ɾoaya	*mania*	*ɾana*	*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?

nɪ sapiaɾitipa aikiaɾa upakatu Dios kumɪsamaykana, aisɪtuy Dios, upai ikuataɾa, ɾoaya wiʃanisuɾi, ɾoaya mɨtasuɾi,[9] Dios kumɪsaikua?

nɪ	*sapiaɾi*	*=tipa*	*aikiaɾa*	*upa*	*=katu*	*Dios*	*kumɪsa*	*-may*
2SG	believe	=INTERR	DEM.PROX.MS	all	=INTSF	God	say	-ABS.NOMZ

=kana,	*aisɪtuy*	*Dios,*	*upa*	*-i*	*ikua*	*-taɾa,*	*ɾoaya*	*wiʃani*
=PL.MS,	true	God,	all	-?	know	-AGT.NOMZ,	NEG	be.deceitful

-suɾi,	*ɾoaya*	*mɨta*	*-suɾi,*	*Dios*	*kumɪsa*	*=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: *Upcatu ta Hia mucuicatu tasapiari.*

Upacatu ta Hiamucuicatu ta sapiari.

upakatu ta ĩamukuikatu ta sapiaɾi.

upa	*=katu*	*ta*	*ĩa*	*=mukui*	*=katu*	*ta*	*sapiaɾi*
all	=INTSF	1SG.MS	heart	=COM	=INTSF	1SG.MS	believe

'I believe with my all my heart.'

---

[8]The initial clause and translation of this sentence require further investigation based on comparable Jesuit catechisms of the time period.

[9]In modern Omagua, *wiʃani* and *mɨta* appear to be synonymous.

(D.67) Q: *Nesara tipa upacatu ne hia mucui catu Dios ari enehuchacana ratenepe ta ari,*

neumanuraschi raerusuari ene Sahua Euate mairitama cate, naraschi?

Ne saratipa upacatu ne hiamucuicatu Diosari ene huchacana ra tenepetaari, ne umanu raschi,

ra erusuari ene Sahua Euatemai ritamacate, na raschi?

nɪ saɾatipa[10] upakatu nɪ ĩamukuikatu Diosaɾi[11] mɪ utʃakana ɾa t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)taɾi, nɪ umanu ɾaʃi,

ɾa ɪɾusuaɾi mɪ sawa ɨwatimay ɾitamakati, naɾaʃi?

nɪ	saɾa	=tipa	upa	=katu	nɪ	ĩa	=mukui	=katu	Dios	=aɾi
2SG	hope	=INTERR	all	=INTSF	2SG	heart	=COM	=INTSF	God	=DIFF.LOC
ini	utʃa	=kana	ɾa	t(ɪ)n(ɪ)p(ɪ)ta	=aɾi,	nɪ	umanu	ɾaʃi,		ɾa
2SG	sin	=PL.MS	3SG.MS	forgive	=IMPF,	2SG	die	NON.ASSERT,		3SG.MS
ɪɾusu	=aɾi	mɪ	sawa	ɨwati	-may	ɾitama	=kati,	naɾaʃi		
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?) mucuicatu.*

muɾiay ta saɾa ta hiamucuicatu.

muɾiay ta saɾa ta ĩamukuikatu.

muɾiay	ta	saɾa	ta	ĩa	=mukui	=katu
thus	1SG.MS	hope	1SG.MS	heart	=COM	=INTSF

'Thus I hope with all my heart.'

(D.69) Q: *Nesaschita tipa upcatu ne hai mucui catu yenne Papa Dios upacatu mara encana neucua*

tarischi ra erasemaicatu y cua?

Ne saschitatipa upcatu ne haimucuicatu yenne Papa Dios upacatu maraencana ne ucuata

rischi ra erasemaicatu ycua?

nɪ saʃitatipa upakatu nɪ ĩamukuikatu ini papa dios, upakatu maɾainkana nɪ ukuata ɾaʃi, ɾa

ɪɾasɪmaykatuikua?

nɪ	saʃi	-ta	=tipa	upa	=katu	nɪ	ĩa	=mukui	=katu	ini
2SG	be.painful	-CAUS	=INTERR	all	=INTSF	2SG	heart	=COM	=INTSF	1PL.INCL
papa	dios,	upa	=katu	maɾain	=kana	nɪ	ukuata	ɾaʃi,		ɾa	ɪɾa
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?'

---

[10]The use of *saɾa* 'await' as 'hope' is likely a calque based on the polysemy of Spanish *esperar* 'await, hope'.

[11]The 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 ĩamukuikatu ta saʃita muɾa.

upa	=katu	ta	ĩa	=mukui	=katu	ta	saʃi	-ta	muɾa
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?

nɪ yamɨmɨatipa upakatu nɪ ĩamukuikatu nɪ utʃakanapupɪ nɪ yumɨrataikua ini yaɾa Dios?

nɪ	yamɨmɨa	=tipa	upa	=katu	nɪ	ĩa	=mukui	=katu	nɪ	utʃa
2SG	grieve	=INTERR	all	=INTSF	2SG	heart	=COM	=INTSF	2SG	sin

=kana	=pupɪ	nɪ	yumɨra	-ta	=ikua	ini	yaɾa	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 ĩamukuikatu ta yamɨmɨa muɾa.

upa	=katu	ta	ĩa	=mukui	=katu	ta	yamɨmɨa	muɾa
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 upcatu ne hiamucuicatu?

nɪ sɪtatipa nɪ sapiaɾi upakatu nɪ ĩamukuikatu?[12]

nɪ	sɪta	=tipa	nɪ	sapiaɾi	upa	=katu	nɪ	ĩa	=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 ĩamukuikatu ta sɪta ta sapiaɾi.

---

[12] In 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	$\tilde{\tilde{i}}a$	=mukui	=katu	ta	sɪta	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 Ciencias 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 Crioules e Similares 21*(1), 9–22.

Cabral, A. S. A. C. and A. D. Rodrigues (2003). Evidencias de Crioulizaçao Abrupta em Kokama? *PAPIA: Revista Brasileira de Estudos Crioules 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.

Marcoy, 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 Ensaios. 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). Relaçoes 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.