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Morphemes and Abbreviations

Here we provide glosses and definitions of grammatical morphemes encountered in this work. For simplicity, we include only grammatical morphemes that appear in Old Omagua. All glosses of morphemes that appear in our occasional exemplification of modern Omagua also happen to be represented here, although the form of the morpheme itself may be somewhat different. Table 1 is organized alphabetically by gloss, and Table 2 by morpheme.

Table 1: Morphemes and Abbreviations by Gloss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG.MS</td>
<td>First singular masculine speech</td>
<td>taa/ta=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.EXCL.MS</td>
<td>First plural exclusive masculine speech</td>
<td>tanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>First plural inclusive</td>
<td>yenelyene=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>Second singular</td>
<td>ene/ne=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>Second plural</td>
<td>epe/pe=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.MS</td>
<td>Third singular masculine speech</td>
<td>mutara=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL.MS</td>
<td>Third plural masculine speech</td>
<td>tanu ~ rana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>=sui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Andative</td>
<td>=usu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>Allative</td>
<td>=kate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>Applicative</td>
<td>=supe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>Augmentative</td>
<td>=wasu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>Causative</td>
<td>-ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
<td>=tina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Cessative</td>
<td>=upa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
<td>=mukui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COORD</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>weranu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORE.NEG</td>
<td>Core negator</td>
<td>-sima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM.PROX.MS(,PRO)</td>
<td>Proximal demonstrative masculine speech</td>
<td>aikiara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
<td>=kiita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXST</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>amiti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC:CONTR</td>
<td>Contrastive focus</td>
<td>purai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC:EXCL</td>
<td>Exclusive focus</td>
<td>=nani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC:VER</td>
<td>Verum focus</td>
<td>=semai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>=supe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>Imperfective aspect</td>
<td>=ari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>Inessive</td>
<td>=ipipe, =k’arape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>=pupe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: Morphemes and Abbreviations by Morpheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akia</td>
<td>DEM.PROX.MS(.PRO)</td>
<td>Proximal demonstrative (pro-form) masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amiti</td>
<td>EXST</td>
<td>Existential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ari</td>
<td>IMPF</td>
<td>Imperfective aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ename</td>
<td>PROH</td>
<td>Prohibitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ene</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>Second singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epe</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>Second plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ikua</td>
<td>REAS</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ima</td>
<td>PRIV</td>
<td>Privative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ipipe</td>
<td>INESS</td>
<td>Inessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kana</td>
<td>PL.MS</td>
<td>Plural masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kate</td>
<td>ALL, LOC</td>
<td>Allative, Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kate</td>
<td>TEMP.OVRLP</td>
<td>Temporal overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=katekatu</td>
<td>TEMP.POST</td>
<td>Temporal posteriority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=katu</td>
<td>INTSF</td>
<td>Intensifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=kia</td>
<td>DIM</td>
<td>Diminutive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=k ara⁵pe</td>
<td>INESS, LOC</td>
<td>Inessive, Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symbol</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=mai</td>
<td>NOMZ:INACT</td>
<td>Inactive nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=mia</td>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Irrealis mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=mukui</td>
<td>COM</td>
<td>Comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=nani</td>
<td>FOC:EXCL</td>
<td>Limitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=maka</td>
<td>NEG.PURP</td>
<td>Negative purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mata</td>
<td>3SG.MS</td>
<td>Third singular masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ne=</td>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>Second singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=pa</td>
<td>INTERR</td>
<td>Interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pe=</td>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>Second plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=pupe</td>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>Instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=pupekatu</td>
<td>TEMP.OVRLP</td>
<td>Temporal overlap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=puta</td>
<td>NOM.PST</td>
<td>Nominal past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra=</td>
<td>3SG.MS</td>
<td>Third singular masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ra</td>
<td>NOM.PURP</td>
<td>Nominal purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranu ~ rana</td>
<td>3PL.MS</td>
<td>Third plural masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=rafi</td>
<td>NASS</td>
<td>Non-assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roaya</td>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=sakapiri</td>
<td>TEMP.POST</td>
<td>Temporal posteriority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=semai</td>
<td>FOC:VER</td>
<td>Veridical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=senuni</td>
<td>PURP</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=sepi</td>
<td>REAS</td>
<td>Reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-simaa</td>
<td>CORE.NEG</td>
<td>Core negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=sui</td>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=supe</td>
<td>APPL</td>
<td>Applicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=supe</td>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-suri</td>
<td>NOMZ:SUBJ</td>
<td>Subject nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taal/ta=</td>
<td>1SG.MS</td>
<td>First singular masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanu</td>
<td>1PL.EXCL.MS</td>
<td>First plural exclusive masculine speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tata</td>
<td>NOMZ:ACT</td>
<td>Active nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tene</td>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>Optative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=tina</td>
<td>CERT</td>
<td>Certainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=upa</td>
<td>CESS</td>
<td>Cessative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=usu</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>Andative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=wasu</td>
<td>AUG</td>
<td>Augmentative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weraun</td>
<td>COORD</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=wiripe</td>
<td>SUBESS</td>
<td>Subessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=ya</td>
<td>SIM</td>
<td>Similative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=yata</td>
<td>NOMZ:POSS</td>
<td>Possessive nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yene/yene=</td>
<td>1PL.INCL</td>
<td>First plural inclusive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1: Indigenous Groups of Maynas, 1638-1768 (Grohs 1974)
Figure 2: Early Locations of the Omagua, Kokama, Kokamilla, Yurimagua and Aisuari
Chapter 1

Introduction

Ecclesiastical texts written in indigenous South American languages are among the oldest sources of data on these languages, allowing us insight into their grammars and lexicons as they existed centuries before modern documentation and description began to be carried out. The data provided by such ecclesiastical texts, which run the gamut from prayers to catechisms, is especially valuable in cases where the historical development of the language is a focus of research, as is the case for Omagua, the language treated here. Omagua, like its closely related sister language Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a), has long puzzled linguists, as it exhibits numerous Tupí-Guaraní traits, but is also relatively grammatically and lexically divergent from other Tupí-Guaraní languages. This has led to a provocative hypothesis, advanced by Cabral (1995, 2007, 2011) and Cabral & Rodrigues (2003), that Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla are in fact creole languages that developed in the Jesuit reducciones (mission settlements) of the Gobierno de Maynas during the late 17th and early 18th centuries, although more recent work has shown that in fact these languages must be of a pre-Columbian origin (Michael 2014a). Regardless, it is clear that Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla are of significant comparative interest from the wider Tupí-Guaraní perspective, due to how they differ from other Tupí-Guaraní languages.

Ecclesiastical texts like those studied in this volume are also valuable historical documents that, together with contemporary descriptions of missionary linguistic and evangelical practices, provide us the opportunity to better understand how colonial-era missionaries – in the Omagua case, Jesuits – engaged with indigenous languages. Ecclesiastical texts served as crucial tools to mitigate the difficulties posed by the tremendous linguistic diversity of Amazonia, and formed part of a sophisticated linguistic policy that combined descriptive linguistic research, the maintenance of archives of linguistic materials, and a broader effort to promote Quechua as a lengua general in the Amazonian lowlands. A close examination of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts, and descriptions of how similar texts were developed, also reveals that ecclesiastical texts were communally created objects, with different missionaries successively modifying the texts.

The purpose of the present work is to compile for the first time all four known ecclesiastical texts produced in Old Omagua, the 17th- and 18th-century predecessor to modern Omagua, and to provide a linguistically informed analysis of these texts. The goal in doing so is to render these texts suitable for further linguistic analysis, especially for comparative analysis aimed at clarifying

1The colonial-era Gobierno de Maynas corresponds roughly to the present-day Region of Loreto in Peru.
2Old Omagua is sufficiently different from modern Omagua, especially in terms of the preservation of Tupí-Guaraní morphology, that a distinct name is useful to distinguish it from the modern language.
the relationship of Omagua to other Tupí-Guaraní languages.

The texts analyzed in this work consist of: 1) a version of the Lord’s Prayer (Pater Noster); 2) a short fragment of one catechism; 3) a complete version of a second catechism; and 4) a Profession of Faith. The texts were produced by Jesuit missionaries in the 17th or 18th centuries as part of the broader missionary effort of the Society of Jesus in the Government of Maynas (Province of Quito, Viceroyalty of Peru), which lasted from 1638 to 1767, when King Charles III expelled the Jesuits from Spain and all territories. Together, these works constitute one of the more extensive records of a western Amazonian language from this period. In addition, we include an analysis of brief fragments of Omagua present in the diary of Manuel Uriarte, a Jesuit missionary who worked among the Omagua.

The Omagua ecclesiastical texts discussed in this work have come down to us in different ways, which we discuss in the chapters devoted to each text.

At the time of Europeans’ arrival in South America, the Omagua people were one of the most numerous and powerful groups in Amazonia, occupying an extensive territory along the Amazon River, from somewhat below the mouth of the Napo, in present-day Peru, to the mouth of the Putumayo/Iça, in present-day Brazil, as well as occupying two regions in the upper Napo basin (where they were known as the Omaguayeté), one on the Coca River, and another in and around the mouth of the Curaray (Grohs (1974:21-27); Métreaux (1927:36-41); Newsom (1996:206-208, 218-220); Oberem (1967/1968)). The Omagua are first thought to have encountered Europeans in 1538, when the expedition of Diego Nunes carried out exploration of the Huallaga, Marañón and Amazon basins (Myers (1992:129), citing Hemming (1978:185); Stocks (1978:102)). The earliest surviving description of Omagua society was written Gaspar de Carvajal ([1542]1934) (b. c1500 Trujillo, Spain – d. 1584 Lima), a Dominican priest attached to the expedition of Francisco de Orellana (b. 1511 Trujillo, Spain), which travelled down the Napo and Amazon rivers.

Colonial era estimates of the total Omagua population dating from 1542 to 1649 range from roughly 6,000 to 100,000 (see Myers (1992:137-139) for a summary), but since several 16th- and 17th-century epidemics ravaged the Omagua, some estimates of pre-contact populations reach 2,000,000 (Myers 1992:148-149). The Omagua appear to have exerted significant politico-economic
influence throughout the part of Amazonia in which they lived, and exhibited large-scale social organization. Omagua society collapsed in the 1690s, however, under intense pressure from Portuguese slave raids, which resulted in the capture of many thousands of Omaguas and led the majority of the remainder to flee upriver (Anonymous [1731]1922). By the 1720s, the surviving Omagua lived mainly in a small number of mission settlements in Peru and Brazil, and by the early 20th century, ethnographers such as Günter Tessmann (1930:47-66) were proclaiming the imminent extinction of the Omagua. As of the writing of the present work, the authors are aware of fewer than ten speakers of Omagua, living in San Joaquín de Omaguas, Peru, and in the nearby urban center of Iquitos. The youngest of these speakers was born in 1936.

Interactions between Christian missionaries and the development of Omagua ecclesiastical materials date to the 1621 expedition to the Omaguayeté settlements of the Aguarico River, a tributary of the upper Napo River, by the Jesuits Simón de Rojas and Humberto Coronado, and a lay priest, Pedro Limón (Newsom 1996). During this visit they prepared an Omagua catechism with the aid of a bilingual Quechua-Omagua translator (Maroni [1738]1988:214-217), but the Jesuits did not maintain a stable presence among the Omaguayeté, and following increasing tensions and violence involving the Omaguas and representatives of the colonial government, the Omaguayeté abandoned the Aguarico area and resettled on the Tiputini River, another tributary of the Napo located further downriver, and further from the centers of Spanish colonial power. The ultimate fate of the Rojas and Coronado catechism remains unknown.

A lengthy hiatus in Jesuit missionary activity among the Omagua followed the flight of the Omaguayeté, and was broken only in 1685 when Samuel Fritz arrived in the Omagua settlements along the Amazon proper. As described in detail in Chapter 9, Fritz was successful in creating numerous reucciones (mission settlements) and within a few years had developed his own Omagua catechism. Fritz’s work inaugurated a period lasting until the Jesuit expulsion in 1767 of intensive work on developing and rewriting a variety of Omagua ecclesiastical texts, the known exemplars of which are analyzed in this volume, as well as a number of grammars and dictionaries, which unfortunately remain lost.

The analysis of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts presented here forms part of larger project, based at the University of California, Berkeley and led by Lev Michael, to document and describe Omagua, and to better understand its linguistic history. The analysis of the texts given in this work is based on several seasons of fieldwork with Omagua speakers and a detailed analysis of Omagua grammar. Our analysis of the Old Omagua texts has also benefited from the parallel Tupí-Guaraní Comparative Project (Michael et al. 2015), which has facilitated the identification of morphemes and constructions in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts for which counterparts can be found in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, despite their absence from modern Omagua. And not least, our analysis of these texts has been informed by the ongoing

10 Nevertheless, as late as the middle 1950s, Girard (1958:163-185) was able to record significant ethnographic information on the Omagua of Peru. 
11 A Franciscan expedition departing from Quito and led by the Franciscan priest Laureano de la Cruz spent 17 months among the Omagua living on the Amazon River proper between 1647 and 1649, but this expedition did not engage in missionary activities or the preparation of Omagua ecclesiastical texts (de la Cruz [1653]1900; Myers (1992:133)). 
12 These include two months of fieldwork by Edinson Huamancayo Curi in 2004, one month of fieldwork by Brianna Grohman in 2006, two months of fieldwork in 2010 by Zachary O’Hagan, Clare Sandy, Tammy Stark, and Vivian Wauters, two months of fieldwork in 2011 by Zachary O’Hagan and Clare Sandy, and one month of fieldwork in 2013 by Zachary O’Hagan.
A Linguistic Analysis of Old Omagua Ecclesiastical Texts


The present work continues in Chapter 2 with a grammatical sketch of Old Omagua. The purpose of the sketch is two-fold: first, to allow readers to critically evaluate our analysis of the ecclesiastical texts and the translations we provide; and second, to facilitate the comparison of Old Omagua to modern Omagua. In Chapter 3 we present the representational conventions we follow in our analysis of the Jesuit ecclesiastical texts, and provide a discussion of certain recurrent characteristics of the Jesuit texts, such as calques. In Chapters 4–7 we present our analysis of each of the ecclesiastical texts. At the beginning of each chapter we provide a bibliographical history of the relevant text, summarizing its publication history prior to appearing in this work, and commenting on salient features of each of previously published versions. Each text is presented in a multilinear format that preserves the orthography original to the published sources from which we have drawn them, which in each of the subsequent lines is transliterated into a phonemic representation, segmented, glossed, translated and annotated. Chapter 8 presents a small additional body of Omagua text produced by a Jesuit: the passages written in Omagua as they appear in the personal diaries of Manuel Uriarte, a Spanish Jesuit who carried out missionary work among the Omagua from 1756 to 1764. Chapter 9 examines the role of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts in the missionary practices of the Jesuits who worked with the Omaguas, and clarifies the processes by which the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts were developed. Chapter 10 presents our conclusions.
Chapter 2

Grammatical Sketch of Old Omagua

In this chapter, we provide a sketch of Old Omagua grammar, so that the reader can understand and critically evaluate our analysis of the ecclesiastical texts presented in Chapters 4-8. Our description of Old Omagua relies on our analysis of modern Omagua grammar (Michael et al. in prep) and on the comparative study of other Tupí-Guaraní languages, as well as, of course, the data present in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical materials themselves. If we make no comment to the contrary in the description below, it can be assumed that a given form is identical in both phonological shape and grammatical function in the modern language. However, certain forms attested in Old Omagua are not attested in modern Omagua, and we discuss these on a case-by-case basis. In some instances, our analysis of these Old Omagua forms is informed by cognate morphemes in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, in which case relevant comparative Tupí-Guaraní data is presented. Unless citations indicate otherwise, example sentences given in the following description are drawn from the Omagua ecclesiastical texts, in which case they can be located with the relevant example number in Chapters 4-8. For the sake of space, we have reduced each example in Chapter 2 to show only our phonemic representation, morphological segmentation, and free translation, which corresponds to our TARGET translation (see §3.1).

The only extant descriptions of Old Omagua grammar of which we are aware are very short sketches in Veigl (1788, 1789) and von Humboldt (2011). Both works are of interest as historical documents, but are of somewhat limited use from a modern perspective. Written in the Latin grammatical tradition, it is not always clear to what degree Latin grammatical categories correspond to those appropriate for Omagua. We make reference to these sketches only at those points at which we feel they shed light on our own analyses.

Our description begins in §2.1 with a description of the Old Omagua phonological inventory.

---

13The Austrian Jesuit Franz Xavier Veigl (b. 1723 Graz – d. 1798 Klagenfurt, Austria) (Jouanen 1943:749) was Superior of the Maynas missions from 1762 until 1766 (ibid.:722), during which time he was resident at Santiago de la Laguna, the headquarters of the Jesuit mission, and may have been exposed to the Omagua of a small group of families resident there (see footnote 32 and §9.1). Veigl’s account of the Maynas missions, originally written in Latin, was first published in German translation in 1785 (Veigl [1785]), without the Old Omagua grammar sketch. A second edition was reissued in 1798 (Veigl [1798]), also lacking the sketch. The first Spanish publication, which is a translation of the 1798 German edition, was not released until 2006 (Veigl [1798]2006).

14Humboldt’s work, dating from the early 19th century, was based on an 18th-century grammar of Omagua written in Italian by Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (see §4.1.1).

15The Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts provide no insight into the prosodic system of the language (e.g., via diacritics), and so we do not include a description of it here. We refer the reader to Sandy & O’Hagan (submitted) for further...
We then present a discussion of Old Omagua morphology in \(\S 2.2.1\) beginning with a discussion of person-markers, which surface both on verbs and nouns. Following this we turn to specifically nominal morphology in \(\S 2.2.2\), and specifically verbal morphology in \(\S 2.2.3\). We provide an overview of Old Omagua syntax in \(\S 2.3\).

### 2.1 Phonological Inventory

Old Omagua exhibited thirteen phonemic consonants, as in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Alveo-Palatal</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stop</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k(\text{w})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>ts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glide</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j &lt;\text{y}&gt;\text{[16]}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inventory in Table 2.1 is identical to that of the modern language. Note that /ts/ is not attested in the Jesuit texts, and it occurs in the modern language in a single feminine genderlect form: \(tst=\ 1\text{Sg.FS}\) (see Table 2.2). We assume it existed in Old Omagua, and attribute its absence in the ecclesiastical texts to the fact that they were written in the masculine genderlect. Also not attested in the Jesuit texts is /t\(\text{f}\)/, which in the modern language occurs mainly in Quechua, Spanish, and Kokama-Kokamilla loans, and a small number of words of unknown, non-TG, origin, such as t\(\text{finani}\) ‘be quiet’.

Old Omagua exhibited five phonemic vowels, as in Figure 2.1. The vowel inventory is identical to that of the modern language, with the exception that modern Omagua \(i\) corresponds to Old Omagua \(*e\), the outcome of an unconditioned sound change whereby Proto-Omagua-Kokama \(*e\)

---

\(\text{[16]}\) We will use the grapheme \(<\text{y}>\) in our phonemic representations of the Omagua palatal glide. We refer the reader to Sandy & O’Hagan (submitted) for argumentation for the phonemic status of glides.
raised to $i$ (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012). We do not believe, however, that this change had yet occurred in Old Omagua, because reflexes of Proto-Omagua-Kokama *e are consistently written as $<e>$ in the ecclesiastical texts. It is possible, of course, that this change had already occurred by the time the Jesuit texts were produced, and that the Jesuit authors simply did not have the orthographic means to represent this phoneme. However, if that were the case, we would expect inconsistencies in the Jesuits’ orthographic representation resulting from confusion between $i$ and $i$, with instances of phonemic $i$ being written as $<i>$. However, the vowel corresponding to modern $i$ is always represented orthographically as $<e>$ in the ecclesiastical texts, leading us to conclude that raising to $i$ had not yet occurred at this stage of Old Omagua.17

2.2 Morphology

2.2.1 Person-Marking

Omagua verbal arguments can be expressed by referential noun phrases, free pronouns, and phonologically dependent pronominal proclitics. These proclitics also express possessors in possessive constructions. Due to their importance and the fact that they are neither properly nominal nor verbal morphology, we discuss these markers prior to discussing nominal or verbal morphology more narrowly defined.

We begin our discussion by presenting the modern Omagua person-marking system, given in §2.2.1.1. We do so in part because the Old Omagua person-marking system appears to be essentially the same as the modern one, with minor differences in the form of some markers. All markers present in the Jesuit texts are attested today, but only a subset of the person-markers found in the modern language are attested in the texts. This is due to the fact that: 1) although Omagua exhibits a masculine and feminine genderlect distinction in certain parts of the person-marking system, the ecclesiastical texts are written exclusively in the masculine genderlect; and 2) Omagua has recently innovated certain new person-markers with particular syntactic and information-structural distributions (not discussed here). And in §2.2.1.2 we discuss vowel hiatus resolution patterns found in modern Omagua that inform our transliteration of person markers in the original texts.

2.2.1.1 Paradigms

Omagua expresses the person and number of verbal arguments via free pronouns and pronominal proclitics, whose forms are related. Omagua free pronouns may express the arguments of both verbal and non-verbal predicates, but pronominal proclitics only express the arguments of verbal predicates (see below). In this function they must have a rightward phonological host: when the proclitic is a subject, the host is the verb root; when it is an object, the host is a VP-enclitic18. Referential noun phrases and coreferential pronominal proclitics do not typically co-occur, although they may in certain information-structurally marked contexts. Proclitics additionally function as the possessors of nouns and as the complements of postpositions, in which case the nominal or

---

17Old Omagua also exhibited a series of diphthongs of falling sonority, which are also present synchronically: $ai$, $ui$, and $ai$. The diphthong $ii$, attested in the modern language, is not attested in the Jesuit texts, presumably because the small class of words in which it occurs do not appear in the ecclesiastical texts.

18When not expressed as enclitics, first- and second-person objects surface as free pronouns, while third-person objects either surface as free NPs or have no surface expression.
postpositional head serves as the phonological host. Whether an argument is realized as a free
pronoun or a pronominal proclitic is determined by a complex set of interacting factors, including
the presence of verbal enclitics, word order, and information structure, which we do not discuss
further here.

Omagua person-markers distinguish three persons in the singular and plural, and exhibit a
clusivity contrast in the first person plural. First and third person forms are sensitive to the gender
of the speaker (as opposed to the referent), forming part of a broader genderlect system in the
language. Table 2.2 presents the Omagua person-markers, with free pronouns shown to the
left of the slashes and proclitics to their right; parenthetical vowels are deleted in fast speech when
they appear before vowel-initial roots.

Table 2.2: Modern Omagua Free Pronouns and Pronominal Proclitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th></th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MASC. SPEECH</td>
<td>FEM. SPEECH</td>
<td>MASC. SPEECH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>taa / t(a)=</td>
<td>tsn / ts(t)=</td>
<td>taná / tan(a)=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>in / i(t)=</td>
<td></td>
<td>yini / yin(i)=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mura / r(a)=</td>
<td></td>
<td>iná / in(a)=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1SG, free pronoun and pronominal proclitic differ in vowel quantity, due to a broader
bimoraic minimum word requirement on free nouns and pronouns. In the 1PL and 3PL, free
pronouns and proclitics are distinguished via stress placement, where the former receive a final
stress that is otherwise atypical within Omagua prosody. In the 2SG, 2PL, and 3SG the distinction is a segmental one. In the 1INCL, neither length, stress or form
distinguish the free pronoun from proclitic; such distinctions may only be made based on whether
yini(=) forms a prosodic word with its host, that is, whether it is assigned its own stress or falls
within the domain of stress assignment of the verbal stem. Two alternants are attested for the third-
person feminine-speech proclitic (i= and r=): the former occurs with consonant-initial roots, the
latter with vowel-initial roots.

Since the Jesuit texts are written entirely in the masculine genderlect, there are no attestations

---

19 Genderlect systems are reported for Tupí-Guaraní languages, as well as in Tupian languages outside of the Tupí-
Guaraní subgroup. In Kayabí (Tupí-Guaraní), third-person singular object pronouns and prefixes are sensitive to
both the gender of the speaker and of the referent; in the plural they are sensitive only to the gender of the speaker
(Dobson 1988:28). A similar system is found in Awti (Tupian), where 1SG, 3SG, and 3PL independent pronouns
are sensitive to the gender of the speaker (Drude 2002:179). In Tupinambá (Tupí-Guaraní), modal particles have
been reported to exhibit genderlect differences (Lemos Barbosa 1956:374-375), although independent pronouns and
person cross-referencing prefixes do not.

20 Stress patterns indicate that the ‘long’ vowels in question are in fact doubled monomoraic vowels, and not a single
bimoraic vowel. In particular, the penultimate stress pattern targets the second monomoraic vowel for stress, and
not the putative long vowel in its entirety (e.g., kiu [ku:] ’swidden’ versus kuuna [ku:na] ’swiddens (FS)’). The
morphology that would be necessary to prove that ‘long’ vowels in pronouns have the same structure is not available
for pronouns, but since we assume the surface length of free pronouns is motivated by the same phonological
constraint as that which affects nouns, we assume that pronominal long vowels are likewise doubled monomoraic
vowels.
of feminine genderlect person-markers in them. However, given that the genderlect system is also found in modern Kokama-Kokamilla and hence, we infer, reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, we assume that the genderlect system was present in Old Omagua. Because the ecclesiastical texts do not indicate stress, we cannot know if 1PL.EXCL and 3PL Old Omagua pronominal and proclitic person markers are distinguished by position of primary stress, as the modern markers are. Finally, note that the Lord’s Prayer exhibits 1PL.EXCL.MS *tanu*, as opposed to modern *tana*. The forms attested in the Jesuit texts are given in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Old Omagua Person-markers in Jesuit Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SINGULAR</th>
<th>PLURAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>taa / t(a)=</td>
<td>tanu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1INCL</td>
<td>yene / yen(e)=</td>
<td>epe / pe=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ene / ne=</td>
<td>epe / pe=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mura / r(a)=</td>
<td>rana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1.2 Vowel Hiatus Resolution

Two postlexical phonological processes optionally occur at boundaries between a pronominal proclitic (which are all vowel-final) and a vowel-initial root. In slow speech, both vowels are pronounced, but in fast speech, the final vowel of the proclitic either deletes or coalesces with the vowel to its right, depending on the quality of the root-initial vowel, and on the person, number, and genderlect of the pronoun. When roots begin with *i*, both the proclitic-final and root-initial vowels are realized, even in fast speech. When the root begins with *i, t, u* or *a*, the final vowel of the proclitic deletes, with the exception 1SG.MS *ta=*, which coalesces with the root-initial vowel. These patterns are summarized for masculine speech proclitics and vowel-initial verb roots in Table 2.4; these processes operate identically with nominal roots. When the proclitic is in the feminine genderlect, the proclitic-final vowel uniformly deletes. We note that these phonological processes have guided our transliteration of the Jesuit texts, as in some cases the texts reflect processes of vowel coalescence and deletion.

2.2.2 Nominal Morphology

Nominal morphology in both Old Omagua and the modern language consists exclusively of clitics, with the exception of two endocentric nominalizers. We analyze the Omagua noun phrase as exhibiting a number of fixed positions that are occupied by functionally distinct clitics. One prenominal position is filled by the pronominal proclitics that encode the person and number of a possessor (§2.2.1). Postnominal positions include ones for an endocentric nominalizer, augmentative or diminutive marker (§2.2.2.2), a nominal past tense marker (§2.2.2.3), plural markers (§2.2.2.1), oblique-licensing postpositions (§2.3.3), and an intensifier =*katu*, as is illustrated in Table 2.5.
Table 2.4: Vowel Coalescence and Deletion Patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular Marker</th>
<th>Verb Realization</th>
<th>Plural Marker</th>
<th>Verb Realization</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ta=</td>
<td>aki [taki]</td>
<td>aki [tanaki]</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ikua [tekua]</td>
<td>ikua [taniku]</td>
<td>know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trwa [tirwa]</td>
<td>trwa [tanjirwa]</td>
<td>return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usu [tosu]</td>
<td>usu [tanusu]</td>
<td>go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni=</td>
<td>aki [naki]</td>
<td>aki [pak]</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ikua [nikua]</td>
<td>ikua [raniku]</td>
<td>know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trwa [nirwa]</td>
<td>trwa [ranirwa]</td>
<td>return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usu [nusu]</td>
<td>usu [pusu]</td>
<td>go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ra=</td>
<td>aki [raki]</td>
<td>aki [runaki]</td>
<td>enter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ikua [rikua]</td>
<td>ikua [runiku]</td>
<td>know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>trwa [rirwa]</td>
<td>trwa [ranirwa]</td>
<td>return</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>usu [rusu]</td>
<td>usu [ranusu]</td>
<td>go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Modern Omagua Noun Phrase Template

| POSS= NOUN -NOMZ =AUG/DIM =TENSE =NUM =OBL =INTSF |

2.2.2.1 Number

Plural nominal number is expressed by the noun phrase enclitic =kana PL.MS, as in (2.1).

(2.1) kwara=fi, yasi, sesukana, wirakana, iwatakana weranu, to maritapa aikiarakana Dios mura?

kwara=fi yasi sesu=kana wira=kana iwata=kana weranu to mari=tipa
sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS forest =PL.MS COORD what =INTERR
aikiara =kana Dios mura
DEM.PROX.MS.PRO =PL.MS God 3SG.MS

‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the forests, which of these is God?’
(example (5.6a))

In modern Omagua, plural marking is optional when numerals occur in the noun phrase. In the ecclesiastical texts, however, plural marking, with one exception, is found even when numerals are present, as in (2.2).²¹

(2.2) aikiara musapirika personakana sui, maniamaitapa awa uwaka iminua?

²¹The exception involves plural marking on the Spanish loan word Dios ‘God’.
Of these three people, which became man?
(example (5.11a))

Plural-marking is also an area of the grammar that exhibits a genderlect distinction, with =kana being the masculine genderlect form, and =na being the feminine one. As noted in §2.2.1.1, however, the Old Omagua texts are written entirely in the masculine genderlect.

2.2.2.2 Augmentative & Diminutive

Old Omagua exhibited both augmentative and a diminutive morphemes, which are retained in the modern language without any change to their form. Both are noun phrase clitics in modern Omagua, and we assume that the same held for Old Omagua.

The augmentative =wasu expresses that the referent denoted by the noun is of greater-than-normal size or that one or more of its attributes is of greater-than-normal intensity, effectiveness, or scope. This sense is exemplified in (2.3), where the augmentative attaches to the noun yara ‘master’ in reference to God.

(2.3) iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkana, yawikitara yara =wasu Dios mura.

The augmentative is also attested in a different context, where it attaches to mania ‘how’, and appears to indicate that the information presupposed by the question runs counter to expectations (2.4). The attachment of the augmentative =wasu to an interrogative word is not attested in the modern language, but is in Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a:505).

(2.4) mania =wasu jesucristo Dios rafsi raumanu iminua?

The diminutive =kira expresses either positive affect on the part of the speaker toward the referent, that the referent denoted is smaller than normal, or both. It is attested once in the Old Omagua texts, where it appears to exclusively encode positive affect (2.5).

In Kokama-Kokamilla, =kira and a second morpheme, =tfasu, encode both size-based and affective semantics (Vallejos 2010a:239-241, 244-248).
(2.5) patirikira usu?

\[\text{patiri} = \text{kira usu}\]

priest =DIM go

‘Is the priest going?’

(example (8.10))

Cognates of \textit{=wasu} are attested in other Tupí-Guaraní languages (cf. Tapiete -\textit{wasu} \cite{González2005} 104 and Tupinambá -\textit{wasu} \sim -\textit{usu} \cite{LemosBarbosa1956}). The diminutive, however, appears to be an innovation in Proto-Omagua-Kokama: we do not find cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní language and Jensen (1998:508) has reconstructed a Proto-Tupí-Guaraní diminutive *-\textit{tí}. Proto-Omagua-Kokama *\textit{kira} is probably grammaticalized from what in Omagua is \textit{ikira} ‘be unripe, young’, as in \textit{ikiramai} ‘infant’.

2.2.2.3 Nominal Past Tense =\textit{puRA}

The nominal enclitic \textit{=puRA} expresses nominal past tense, glossable in English as the adjective ‘former’. The nominal past tense marker occurs between the augmentative or diminutive and plural markers, as shown in (2.6). In all but one example in the Old Omagua texts, (5.8b), \textit{=puRA} attaches to the inactive nominalizer \textit{=mai}, as in (2.6).

(2.6) Diosyawikimaipurakana purai ranu.

\[\text{Dios} \text{yawiki} = \text{mai} \quad = \text{puRA} \quad = \text{kana} \quad \text{puRA} \quad \text{ranu}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{God} & \text{ make} \\
= & \text{NOMZ:INACT} \quad = \text{NOM.PST} \quad = \text{PL.MS \ FOC:CONTR} \quad \text{3PL.MS}
\end{align*}

‘They are God’s creations.’

(example (5.6b))

With the exception of a small number frozen forms, \textit{=puRA} is not productive in modern Omagua.\footnote{For example, see \textit{paramapura} ‘oxbow lake’ (regional Spanish \textit{tipishca}), which denotes a branch of a river that is no longer connected to the main river itself (from \textit{parama} ‘river’).} Nevertheless, given its appearance in Old Omagua, we argue that it was productive in Proto-Omagua-Kokama, especially given cognates with similar function in many Tupí-Guaraní languages, e.g., Tupinambá -\textit{p}w\textit{er} \cite{LemosBarbosa1956} 100-104).

Modern Omagua additionally exhibits a clitic \textit{=puRA} that marks narrative peaks, which appears to be related to the nominal past tense marker. Vallejos Yopán (2009, 2010a:679-713) describes a presumably cognate Kokama-Kokamilla morpheme \textit{=puRA} with information-structural functions. The functional and distributional differences between Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla \textit{=puRA} are important topics for future research (see also §2.3.9.1).

2.2.2.4 Nominal Future Tense =\textit{RA}

The nominal enclitic =\textit{RA} expresses nominal future tense, as shown in (2.7).\footnote{For additional commentary on this example, see §2.3.7.4} Given the existence of cognate nominal future tense morphemes such as Tupinambá and Kamaiurá -\textit{ram} (see \cite{LemosBarbosa1956} 101-102; Seki 2000:187), this function is presumably reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama.
(2.7)  ene putari, tene rayawiki mura mairamania iwatimai ritamakatemairai weranu, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate weranu.

\[
\text{ene putari tene ra=} \text{yawiki mura mairamania iwatimai aikiara ruyuka ritamakate weranu.}
\]

2SG desire(?) OPT 3SG.MS= do 3SG.MS exactly.(as) be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT ritamai =kate =mai =ra =i weranu aikiara tuyuka ritamai village =LOC =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.FUT =? COORD DEM.PROX.MS land village =kate weranu =LOC COORD

‘...thy will be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven.’
(example (4.3))

This morpheme is attested only once in the ecclesiastic texts with a nominal future tense function, and is absent from modern Kokama-Kokamilla. This morpheme survives in both modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla, however, as a purposive marker that attaches to nouns as in (2.8), a response to the question ‘Why did God create all these things?’ Since this function is found in both daughter languages, it is presumably reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama.

(2.8)  yeneeramaira.

\[
yene= \text{era mai=a}
\]

1PL.INCL= good =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PURP

‘For our well-being.’
(example (6.7b))

2.2.2.5 Possession

Nominal possession is expressed via NP-NP apposition, with the order possessor possessum, or by means of a pronominal possessor proclitic. 25

(2.9)  Dios taira awara uwaka iminua.

\[
\text{Dios taira awara ra=}uwaka iminua
\]

God son.MALE.ego man =NOM.PURP transform long.ago

‘The son of God became man.’
(example (6.11b))

2.2.3 Verbal Morphology

The Omagua verb phrase exhibits a number of distinct positions, occupied by functionally distinct sets of suffixes and clitics. Although the verbal domain exhibits a large number of enclitics, like the nominal one, verbs exhibit somewhat more affixal morphology than nouns. A leftmost preverbal

25NP-NP apposition may also yield a predicative interpretation (see §2.3.10), and if a free pronoun precedes a noun, it is obligatorily interpreted as a predicative relationship.

26Note that =ra marks the noun that denotes the resulting state of the subject of uwaka ‘transform’.
position is filled by free pronouns or nouns that encode the person and number of an argument. This position is followed by a morphologically independent negator, and then an additional position that is filled by pronominal proclitics. Typically only one preverbal argument position is filled, although doubling may occur with information-structurally marked interpretations.

A series of suffixal positions follow the verb, and these may be filled by activizer, causative, iterative, reciprocal, attenuative, completive, distributive, and progressive morphemes [Michael et al. in prep]. With the exception of the causative and progressive, the remaining suffixes are unattested in the ecclesiastical texts and we do not discuss them further in this sketch. In addition, there is evidence that the progressive marker had a distribution in Old Omagua (and in Proto-Omagua-Kokama) different than that in the modern language.

Following the set of verbal suffixes comes a position that may be filled by pronominal proclitics that encode the person and number of an argument. This is followed by a set of enclitics that encode direction/position, tense, modality, and function as clause-linkers. An additional argument position appears to the right of all enclitics, which may be filled by free pronouns or nouns. Doubling of morphemes in these two postverbal argument positions does not occur, as it does for those in the two preverbal positions.

These positions and the functions of the morphemes that occupy them are summarized in Table 2.6. Dots indicate that additional positions exist between the morphemes that bracket those dots, but which are outside the scope of this work. Note that we assume such morphemes to have existed in Old Omagua, as they are also attested in Kokama-Kokamilla.

Table 2.6: Modern Omagua Verb Phrase Template

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERS</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>PERS=</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>-CAUS</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>-PROG</th>
<th>PERS=</th>
<th>=DIR</th>
<th>=TNS</th>
<th>=MOD</th>
<th>PERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Lastly, it is important to note that it is clear the Old Omagua imperfective marker =a ri was a clitic that appeared to the right of clitics encoding direction. Since the 18th century, the morpheme has become an affix -a ri that appears in the rightmost suffixal position, and experienced some semantic shift (see §2.2.3.1.2).

2.2.3.1 Tense-Aspect-Mood

2.2.3.1.1 Tense Modern Omagua exhibits a four-way tense distinction encoded by the set of optional verbal enclitics given in Table 2.7 [27] The Old Omagua texts, however, reveal no morphology exclusively dedicated to encoding tense. Instead, future temporal reference is conveyed with the imperfective =ari (§2.2.3.1.2) [28], and past temporal reference is conveyed with an independent

---

[27] Vowels enclosed in parentheses are obligatorily deleted when they directly attach to a verb stem. The vowel u surfaces only when the tense enclitic serves as the phonological host to a pronominal proclitic, in which case the vowel of the proclitic either deletes or coalesces with the vowel of the tense enclitic, following the patterns in Table 2.4 (e.g., tu = usari → [tosari]; n = usari → [nusari]; r = usari → [rusari]).

[28] The fact that aspectual markers may receive tense-like temporal interpretations 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.
temporal adverb *imina* ‘long ago’. Neither of these strategies for expressing temporal reference is attested in modern Omagua.

Table 2.7: Modern Omagua Tense Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DISTAL</th>
<th>PROXIMAL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=suri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUTURE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>=usu</td>
<td>=usu <em>(sari)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The future tense morphemes in Table 2.7 only grammaticalized since the Jesuit period, and unsurprisingly do not appear in the ecclesiastical texts. The proximal future =usu has only recently grammaticalized from an andative, and the distal future =usu *(sari)* grammaticalized from a sequence of the andative and imperfective (=usu=ari) \(^{29}\).

More surprisingly, both past tense morphemes are also unattested in the ecclesiastical texts. Both reconstruct to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, however, and the absence of =suri PST.DIST is particularly striking, given that the events in question (the life and deeds of Christ) occurred in the remote past. Instead of past tense morphology, past temporal reference is expressed with the adverb *imina* ‘long ago’, as in (2.10).

(2.10) maniasenuni Dios taira awara *imina*?

`mania =senuni Dios taira awa -ra uwaka imina`

what.action =PURP God son.MALE.EGO man =NOM.PURP transform long.ago

‘Why did the son of God become man?’

(example 6.12a)

We note that the distribution of *imina* in the ecclesiastical texts is unlike its modern distribution. In modern Omagua, *imina* appears sentence-initially (as do all other temporal adverbs), often in conjunction with =suri PST.DIST, and appears only in the opening clauses of a given discourse in order to set temporal reference, as in (2.11). Typically, both *imina* and =suri are subsequently dropped.

(2.11) **MODERN O MAGUA**

*imina* ranakakiri=suri ikati. isui, ranasu= upa. rana= su kakiritara ikitukati.

`imina rana= kakiri =suri ikati`

long.ago 3PL.MS= live =PST.DIST there.FS\(^{30}\)

`isui rana= usu= upa`

then.FS 3PL.MS= depart all

`rana= usu kakiri -tara ikitu =kati`

3PL.MS= go live -PURP Iquitos =LOC

\(^{29}\)Note that =ari follows =usu in Old Omagua, although today -ari is a suffix that precedes =usu (see §2.2.3).
Long ago they lived there. Then they all left. They went to live in Iquitos.

In the ecclesiastical texts, however, it appears sentence-finally and, tellingly, nearly always in contexts in which a Jesuit author would have used past tense in, say, Spanish. We suspect that the pervasive sentence-final use of iníu is, if not fully ungrammatical, highly unnatural Omagua. In fact, there is evidence from Veigl’s (1788:199) sketch of Old Omagua, in which he calls <emenua> a “pluperfect” marker, that the Jesuits interpreted iníu within a Latinate grammatical framework, and subsequently overgeneralized its distribution to include any case in which they wished to express past tense.

2.2.3.1.2 Imperfective =ari The verbal enclitic =ari encodes imperfective aspect, although in both modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla it is a verbal affix that encodes progressive aspect (see Table 2.6). We analyze it as a clitic in Old Omagua because it occurs outside of morphemes that have been analyzed as clitics in both modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla, e.g., iníu (Vallejos 2010a:402-409, 470-482). Moreover, early attestations of Kokama indicate that the Proto-Omagua-Kokama form was also a clitic *=ari that encoded imperfective aspect. This follows from the fact that Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=ari grammaticalized from a diffuse locative *=ari (O’Hagan 2011:89-90), which is cognate to phonologically independent postpositions in Proto-Tupí-Guaraní (Jensen 1998:514).

In Old Omagua (both in the ecclesiastical texts and in the passages from the diaries of Manuel Uriarte (Ch. 8)) =ari is recruited to encode future tense as well as deontic modality. We analyze these functions as pragmatic extensions of a marker of an open aspectual class (as opposed to a marker of a closed aspectual class such as a perfective). The future tense function is illustrated in (2.12) & (2.13), and the deontic function in (2.14).

(2.12) maniasenuni mura kʷa[ra]jpupe yeneyara jesucristo uyawiri rauriari?

(2.1) OLD KOKAMA
kakiri tanupapa, kakiri ura, Dios ikatuta nari.

kakiri tanu= papa kakiri ura Dios ikatu -ta na= =ari
live 1PL.EXCL.MS= father live 3SG.MS God be.good -CAUS 2SG= =IMPF

‘May our father live, may he live, and God will make you well.’

(Maroni ([1738]1988:224, gloss and translation ours), originally excerpted in Rodríguez (1684)).

The original reads Caquire tanu papa, caquire vra Dios icatotonare and is translated by Lucero as ‘Quédate con Dios hombre esforzado, Dios te guarde y te dé mucha vida’ (ibid.). Kokamas who Lucero had induced to live at Santa María de Ucayali were fleeing a smallpox epidemic that began in June 1680, and advising Lucero that he do the same.
mania =senuni mura k\textsuperscript{w}ataf\textsuperscript{i} =pupe yene= yara jesucristo uyawiri
what.action =PURP 3SG.MS day =INSTR 1PL.INCL= master Jesus.Christ again
ra= uri =ari
3SG.MS= come =IMPF

‘Why will our Lord Jesus Christ come again on that day?’
(example (6.25a))

(2.13) uyawiri upa yenekakiriusari.

uyawiri upa yene= kakiri =usu =ari
again all 1PL.INCL= live =AND =IMPF

‘Again we will all go to live.’
(example (6.24b))

(2.14) maritipa awakana yawikiari ipipemai tata tupak\textsuperscript{w}arape ranauseumaka?

mari =tipa awa =kana yawiki =ari ipipe =mai tata tupa
what =INTERR person =PL.MS do =IMPF be.inside =NOMZ:INACT fire place
=k\textsuperscript{w}arape rana= usu =maka
=INESS 3PL.MS= go =NEG.PURP

‘What should people do in order to not go to Hell?’
(example (6.28a))

Interestingly, Kokama-Kokamilla exhibits a verbal future tense enclitic =\textacute, which appears to have grammaticalized from the Proto-Omagua-Kokama imperfective *=ari. It is one of a small number of monosyllabic grammatical morphemes in Kokama-Kokamilla that attract final stress, a pattern that is otherwise atypical within Kokama-Kokamilla and Omagua prosody (Sandy & O’Hagan [submitted]; Vallejos (2010a:119-124)). All other members of this class of morphemes historically exhibited an additional syllable that explains their synchronically aberrant stress pattern (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012).

The grammaticalization trajectory described above is problematic in that it entails that Old Kokama-Kokamilla *=ari grammaticalized as a future, retaining its distribution as a verbal enclitic, but further grammaticalized to become a verbal affix encoding progressive aspect, as it did in Omagua (see above). However, two points of evidence suggest that this is indeed the origin of Kokama-Kokamilla =\textacute. On the one hand, Espinosa Pérez (1935:47) lists a form <ari> as an alternant to the additional Kokama-Kokamilla future =utsu, which presumably corresponds to the =\textacute documented by Vallejos. Furthermore, modern Omagua future =(<u)siari grammaticalized from =usu=ari (see (2.13), which suggests that the grammaticalization of Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=ari into a future is a recent occurrence in both languages (see footnote [31]), perhaps occurring under mutual influence between speakers of the two languages, though involving different forms.

32In the later missionary period, Kokamas and Omaguas lived in some of the same mission settlements. This is reported for San Joaquin de Omaguas from the mid-18th century (Uriarte [1776]1986); Sarayacu (Ucayali river), a Franciscan site, in the early 19th century (Lehnertz [1974]:271); and Lagunas (Huallaga river), the headquarters of the Jesuit missions until 1768 (Yuyarima Tapuchima, p.c.). Trade existed between residents of San Joaquin de Omaguas and groups of the upper Ucayali as late as 1828 (Maw [1829]:185), although it is unknown whether the latter were Sarayacu residents. These facts make the possibility for contact-induced changes quite likely.
2.2.3.1.3 \textit{upa} ‘come to an end, run out’ The verb \textit{upa} is a minor verb (see Aikhenvald (2006)) in a serial verb construction that encodes the cessation of the event denoted by the predicate (2.15). We discuss it here because of the aspectual reading it imparts on the construction in which it participates. It is homophonous with the universal quantifier.

\begin{equation}
yeneikuasenuni Diossemai se, yenesasitasenuni mura Dios, rakumesamaipurakana yeneamyuyasukasenuni, aikara tuyuari yeneyuritiupara[i], iwatimai ritamakate yeneususenununi.
\end{equation}

\begin{verbatim}
yene= ikua =senuni Dios =semai se yene= safita =senuni mura Dios ra= kumesa =mai =pua =kana yene= amuyasukata =senuni 3SG.MS= say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS 1PL.INCL= observe =PURP aikiara tuyuka =ari yene= yuriti =upa =rafi ivati DEM.PROX.MS land =LOC.DIFF 1PL.INCL= be.in.place =CESS =NASS be.high.up =mai ritama =kate yene= usu =senuni =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL 1PL.INCL= go =PURP
\end{verbatim}

‘So that we may truly know God, so that we may love him, so that we may observe his commandments, and ceasing to remain on Earth, so that we may go to Heaven.’ (example (6.8b))

The class of minor verbs in the modern language includes the verbs of motion \textit{usu} ‘go’, \textit{uri} ‘come’, and \textit{ukua} ‘go about’, as well as the posture verb \textit{yuriti} ‘be in a place’. The use of \textit{usu} in a serial verb construction is attested in Old Omagua (see §2.2.3.1.1)\footnote{See Michael et al. (in prep) for a more detailed analysis of modern Omagua serial verbs.}

2.2.3.1.4 \textbf{Irrealis} =\textit{mia} In modern Omagua, the verbal enclitic =\textit{mia} appears in a number of construction types, all of which may be considered notionally irrealis (Michael 2014b). It encodes deontic modality, appears in the apodosis of counterfactual conditionals, and may indicate that a given state of affairs is hypothetical in nature. It is the only morpheme that occurs in the final clitic position in Table 2.6. Only the counterfactual use is attested in Old Omagua, as in (2.16)\footnote{In the ecclesiastical texts deontic modality is encoded via the imperfective VP-enclitic =\textit{ari} (see §2.2.3.1.2).}

\begin{equation}
mitiriipe ipisasui comulgayarayakatu marai kuratara[i], nuamai ut[aya][ra]rafi, ranasaitimia santísimo sacramentǒ?
\end{equation}

\begin{verbatim}
mitiriipe ipisa =sui comulga =yara =ya =katu marai kurata in.middle.of.night =ABL receive.communion =NOMZ:POSS =SIM =INTSF thing drink =rafi nua =mai utfa =yara =rafi rana= sawaiti =mia =NASS be.big =NOMZ:INACT sin =NOMZ:POSS=NASS 3PL.MS= encounter =IRR santísimo sacramentǒ
\end{verbatim}

Holy Sacrament

‘Drinking in the middle of the night like a communicant, but being a great sinner, would they receive the Holy Sacrament?’ (example (6.32a))
This morpheme can be reconstructed to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, and is cognate to Tupí-Guaraní frustratives (e.g., Tupinambá βiβã and Wayampí mijã (Jensen 1998:538-539)). Although we cannot reconstruct a frustrative meaning for Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=mia, frustrative meanings do fall within in the broader category of irrealis meanings, since they express a form of event non-realization, and it is possible the Proto-Tupí-Guaraní morpheme did in fact have broader irrealis semantics, in which case the Proto-Omagua-Kokama morpheme simply reflects the older semantics of this form. In any event, treating Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=mia as a retention from Tupí-Guaraní is at odds with (Cabral 1995:271) who suggests that Kokama *=mia is a borrowing of some reflex of Proto-Arawak *-mi (Payne 1993). Although the question deserves further study, we feel that a Tupí-Guaraní origin for this morpheme is more likely for two reasons: first, the phonological form of Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=mia is readily explained by assuming it is cognate to, e.g., Tupinambá βiβã, while the final a poses a puzzle if we assume that it derives from a borrowed reflex of Proto-Arawak *-mi; and second, no other Proto-Omagua-Kokama grammatical morphemes have been definitively shown to be of Arawak origin, casting some doubt that the Tupí-Guaraní precursor to Proto-Omagua-Kokama ever experienced sufficiently intense contact with an Arawak language to borrow the frustrative.

2.2.3.1.5 Certainty =tina The ecclesiastical texts exhibit a second-position clitic =tina that expresses certainty on the part of the speaker with regard to the truth value of a proposition. This morpheme forms part of a set of second-position clitics that encoded epistemic modality in Proto-Omagua-Kokama. They attach to the right edge of the leftmost element in the verb phrase, either the morpheme occupying the person or negation positions in Table 2.6, or a sentence-initial adverb when one is present. In general, the use of epistemic markers is uncommon in natural and elicited speech among the remaining Omagua speakers, possibly due to language attrition, and our description of =tina thus relies heavily on Vallejos’ description of cognate =tin in Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a:487-490).

The examples in (2.17) and (2.18) represent the only attestations of =tina in the ecclesiastical texts. In the former, the first constituent is the independent pronoun muR3SG.MS; in the latter it is the adverb muRiapai ‘uninterruptedly’.

(2.17) muratina aisetui Dios aisetui awa weranu, yeneyara yeneyumunyepetatara.

35Jensen (1998) does not reconstruct a PTG frustrative, but reconstructions of forms with reflexes in Tupinambá that are very similar to the frustrative (e.g., the PTG and Tupinambá clausal nominalizer (*baγãγ) suggest that a PTG frustrative would be very similar in form to Tupinambá βiβã.

36Others include Omagua =taku and Kokama-Kokamilla =taka (Vallejos 2010a:496-498), a dubitative marker, as well as the Kokama-Kokamilla ‘speculative’ and ‘reportative’ markers =raγ and =iaγ (Vallejos 2010a:492-496). The latter two morphemes are likely reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama given cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní cognates (e.g., Tupinambá raγã (Lemos Barbosa 1956:367-368)), but reflexes of these forms are not attested in modern Omagua. None of the above forms are attested in the ecclesiastical texts.

37Note that the position of =tina in (2.18) requires comment, since it does not seem to be in second position. We argue, however, that the constituent yenesawakana ‘our souls’ is extra-clausal, and that thus =tina is in second position. Our conclusion is based on two facts: 1) that the adverb muriapai otherwise appears only clause-initially in the ecclesiastical texts, suggesting that the element that appears before it is extra-clausal; and 2) the presence of the resumptive pronoun rana= 3PL.MS in the clause. Omagua exhibits a contrastive topic construction that involving an extra-clausal NP and a coreferential resumptive pronoun (Sandy & O’Hagan 2012), and since it is plausible that sawakana ‘souls’ is indeed a contrastive topic, it follows that it is likely extra-clausal (see 6.20-6.21 for discourse context).
2.2.3.2 Derivational Morphology

In this section we examine the Omagua causative -ta (§2.2.3.2.1), the applicative =supe (§2.2.3.2.2) and a series of nominalizers (§§2.2.3.2.3-2.2.3.2.5).

2.2.3.2.1 Causative -ta

The causative verbal suffix -ta is only attested on intransitive stems in Old Omagua, and derives a transitive verb in those cases, with the erstwhile subject is demoted to object position, as in (2.19).

(2.19) yene rasafitarasti, yeneerasimamaikanasui yene rausuepetasenuni, iwatimai ritamakati yene rayawasimatatatenun yeanana.

yene ra= safitata-ta yene= eta -simata=mai=kana
1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= love =NASS 1PL.INCL= good -CORE.NEG =NOMZ:INACT =PL.MS =ABL 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= escape -CAUS =PURP be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village
=kati yene ra= yawasima-ta =senuni weranu
=LOC 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= arrive -CAUS =PURP COORD

‘Since he loves us, in order to save us from our evils and take us to Heaven.’
(example (5.12b))

In modern Omagua, transitive verbs may also be derived with -ta, with the erstwhile subject being demoted to object position, and the erstwhile object optionally realized as an oblique argument licensed by the instrumental =pupt, as in (2.20).

(2.20) MODERN OMAGUA
tayapifikata mi ifipupu...

ta= yapisita-tp mi ifipu=pupt
1SG.MS= grab -CAUS 2SG liana =INSTR

‘I made you [jaguar] grab the liana...’
(MCT:C5.S3)
2.2.3.2.2 Applicative =supe  The applicative =supe is attested only once in Old Omagua, and is not attested in modern Omagua. It attaches to a stative intransitive verb root and licenses a direct object with a goal thematic role, as in (2.21).

(2.21) ename ukairasupe Andrés. taumanu[sa]kapiri, erusu padre ukakate.


‘Don’t be stingy with Andrés. After I die, take him to the Father’s house.’

(example (8.6))

The applicative is homophonous with the Old Omagua postposition =supe (also attested as =supi in modern Omagua), which attaches to an NP and licenses an oblique argument functioning as a goal. An unproductive cognate -tsupe is attested with certain intransitive verb roots in Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a:380-383), where it ‘introduces a benefactive-like participant as the object of the clause’ (ibid.:380).

2.2.3.2.3 Clausal Nominalizers  Old Omagua exhibits three nominalizers: the active nominalizer -tara, the inactive nominalizer =mai, and the subject nominalizer =suri, which differ in the verbal argument positions they eliminate in the nominalization process. We begin by focusing on the first two nominalizers, which target arguments based on an ergative-absolutive alignment: -tara derives nouns that correspond to A or S arguments of the verb, whereas =mai derives nouns that correspond to S_p or P arguments. Derived nouns corresponding to A, S_p, and P are illustrated in (2.22).

(2.22) ayaise cristianokana (upai aucakana), Dios kumesa=mai purakana roaya amuyasukatatara=kana erasimana=maiwasuyara, ranaumanarafi, makati Dios yumupuri ranasawakana?


‘The wicked Christians (every savage), those who do not observe God’s commandments, those with great evil, when they die, where does God send their souls?’

(example (6.21a))

38Note that there are no attestations in Old Omagua of a derived noun corresponding to S_A, although such nominalizations are amply attested in the modern language.
Verb stems nominalized with -tara and =mai may take exclusively nominal morphology such as the plural =kana PL.MS (§2.2.2.1) and nominal past =puta NOM.PST (§2.2.2.3). Verbs derived with these nominalizers retain some verbal properties, such as being negated by the clausal negator roaya, as in (2.22), which intervenes between kumesamaipuraka and amuyasukatatarakanaka, which could otherwise be analyzed as an NP-NP compound with the meaning ‘commandment followers’. The negator roaya does not break up nominal compounds in such a manner way, suggesting that the first element in the putative compound is not entirely nominal in nature. Similar facts point to the verbal nature of forms derived with =mai, as in (2.23) & (2.24), from modern Omagua, where the adverbial elements (ikwafi ‘yesterday’ and iantika ‘at the prow’) fall between the nominalized verb and its associated nominal element.

(2.23) **MODERN OMAGUA**

mi umai yukú yapisara ikwafi yaujimai?

\[mï \text{uman yuku } \text{yapisara ikwafi } \text{yaujima }=\text{mai}\]

2SG see DEM.DIST FS man yesterday arrive =NOMZ:INACT

‘Have you seen the man that arrived yesterday?’

(ZJO 2011, E-2, p. 21, AmHT, Sp. given)

(2.24) **MODERN OMAGUA**

Entonces wipi awa iantiraka yapikama...  

\[\text{entonces wipi awa iantira }=\text{kwara }\text{yapika }=\text{mai}\]

then one man prow =LOC sit.down =NOMZ:INACT

‘Then the man sitting at the prow [said]...’

(MCT:C2.S4)

Verbs derived with -tara or =mai do exhibit reduced verbal properties, however, most notably the loss of person markers, as in (2.25), from modern Omagua.39

(2.25) **MODERN OMAGUA**

Hasta medio cuerpo rayatima firimakwara, uri cielosuimai.

\[\text{hasta medio cuerpo }a=\text{ yatima }\text{Fitir }=\text{mai }=\text{kwara }\text{uri }\text{cielo}\]

up.to half body 3SG MS= be.buried be.muddy =NOMZ:INACT =INESS come sky =sui =mai  
=ABL =NOMZ:INACT

39In one attested example, person is encoded via a pronominal proclitic, as in (2.1).

(2.1) **MODERN OMAGUA**

ranarisara upa ranakakiri ritamakwaramai.

\[\text{ranai }\text{parisara upa }\text{ranai }=\text{kakiri ritama }=\text{kwara }=\text{mai}\]

3PL.MS= invite all 3PL.MS= live village =LOC =NOMZ:INACT

‘They used to invite all those who lived in the village.’

(LHC:2011.06.29.1)
‘He was buried in the mud halfway up his body, the one who had come from the sky.’
(MCT:C4.S1)

We see in (2.26) that the nominalized verb retains its P arguments, however.

(2.26) iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkanamukui, yawiki tara, wakutatara, yeneyarasemai weranu, muria Dios mura.

1 watimai =mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu marain be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all =INTSF thing =kana =mukui yawiki -tara wakuta -tara yene= yara =PL.MS =COM make -NOMZ:ACT carry.in.arm -NOMZ:ACT 1PL.INCL= master =semai weranu muria -i Dios mura =FOC:VER COORD thus -? God 3SG.MS

‘The Creator of Heaven, Earth and all things, the protector, and our true Lord as well, thus is God.’
(example (5.2b))

Evidence for the clitic status of =mai comes from the fact that it attaches to the entire verb phrase, as in (2.1). It occurs outside of postpositions, which we analyze synchronically as phonologically bound nominal enclitics, given that they follow the nominal plural enclitics =kana and =na, analyzed as such because of their scopal properties and distribution within the noun phrase (see Michael et al. (in prep)).40 Furthermore, the position of =mai may vary within the noun phrase with respect to the plural enclitics and spatial postpositions, depending on scope, as can be seen in (2.25) above.41

The third clausal nominalizer, -suri, targets the syntactic subject position. It is attested twice in the ecclesiastical texts, on wifani ‘be dishonest’ and mita ‘deceive’, as in (2.27).42 This example also provides evidence for the quasi-verbal status of forms derived with -suri, since it appears modified by the negator roaya, which otherwise only appears with predicates.

(2.27) nesapiaritipa aikiara, upakatu Dios kumesamaikana, aisetui Dios, upai ikuatara, roaya wifanisuri, roaya mitasuri, Dios kumesaikuna?

ne= sapiari =tipa aikiara upa =katu Dios kumesa =mai 2SG= obey =INTERR DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF God say =NOMZ:INACT =kana aise -tui Dios upai ikuia -tara roaya wifani -suri roaya =PL.MS true -? God every know -NOMZ:ACT NEG be.dishonest -NOMZ:SUBJ NEG mita -suri Dios kumesa =ikuia deceive -NOMZ:SUBJ God say =REAS

---

40 The appearance of =mai outside of postpositions, although not attested in the Jesuit texts, is also attested in von Humboldt’s work [2011], in the form <uni huerepe-mai>, which we transliterate and segment as uni=wicipe=mai ‘water=SUBESS=NOMZ:INACT’ and translate as ‘that which is under the water’. This is line with Humboldt’s German translation ‘was unter dem Wasser ist’.

41 See Table 2.5 for a schema of nominal morphology.

42 An additional attestation is found in Uriarte’s diaries, on yawapa‘flee’ (see 8.4).
‘Do you obey all the words of God, true God, all-knowing, not deceitful, because God says them?’
(example (6.33a))

[Vallejos (2010a:232-233) characterizes Kokama-Kokamilla as a ‘proficient-agent nominalizer’; however, in Omagua, -suri may attach to predicates whose arguments receive no thematic agent role, as with the pair aikua ‘be sick’ and aikuasuri ‘sickly person’. Because of these facts, we analyze -suri as a subject, and not agent, nominalizer. In addition, nouns derived with -suri denote entities that carry out the event denoted by the root in a habitual fashion, rather than proficiently, and also tend to carry pejorative semantics.

2.2.3.2.4 Container Nominalizer -si Rusu Omagua exhibits a ‘container nominalizer’, so-called because it is historically related to Proto-Omagua-Kokama ‘container’,43 which has come to mean ‘shirt, clothes’ in modern Omagua. As evident in Table 2.8, stems formed with -si Rusu include ones where the container sense is fairly literal, as in unisi Rusu ‘water jug’, and ones that are increasingly abstract, such as maraisi Rusu ‘church’, exemplified in 2.28, from Uriarte’s diary, and kaisi Rusu ‘mischievous boy’ (cf. kai ‘capuchin sp.’).

Table 2.8: Modern Omagua -si Rusu Stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kai</td>
<td>white monkey sp.</td>
<td>kaisi</td>
<td>mischievous boy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maria</td>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>maraisi</td>
<td>church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nami</td>
<td>ear</td>
<td>namisii</td>
<td>earring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pita</td>
<td>foot</td>
<td>pitasi</td>
<td>sock, footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pua</td>
<td>hand</td>
<td>puasi</td>
<td>ring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stima</td>
<td>thigh</td>
<td>stimasii</td>
<td>pants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tpuita</td>
<td>excrement</td>
<td>tpuitasi</td>
<td>entrails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uni</td>
<td>water</td>
<td>unsii</td>
<td>water jug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yiwa</td>
<td>arm</td>
<td>yiwasi</td>
<td>sleeve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2.28) karayoa, mariasi Rusukate!

karayoa mari -si Rusu =kate
Portuguese Mary -NOMZ:CONT =ALL

‘Portuguese, to the church!’44
(example (8.1))

43 Cognates of this form in other TG language are plentiful, including, among many others, Sirionó iisu ‘basket’ [Priest & Priest 1985], and Tapirapé and Parakanã iuo ‘basket’ [Praça 2007; da Silva 2003].
44 In modern Omagua ‘church’ is most often realized as [marisii] or [mari siisii], and speakers are not aware of a relation to Maria. However, this form is attested (as <Maria zhiru>) in von Humboldt’s early 19th century sketch of Omagua (von Humboldt 2011:430), and as such must date to at least the 18th century.
The more abstract associations between entities and their metaphorical ‘containers’ evident in the forms for ‘church’ and ‘mischievous boy’ are prevalent in deverbal nouns formed with -\textit{firu}, exemplified in Table 2.9. Nominalizations indicate that the trait expressed by the verb root is characteristic of the person to which the nominalized verb refers.

Table 2.9: Modern Omagua Verbs Nominalized with -\textit{firu}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Root</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aiskapa</td>
<td>be ugly</td>
<td>aiskapafiru</td>
<td>very ugly person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ikua</td>
<td>know</td>
<td>ikuafiru</td>
<td>wise person, school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mapiri</td>
<td>be lazy</td>
<td>mapirifiru</td>
<td>lazybones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payu</td>
<td>hex</td>
<td>payufiru</td>
<td>witch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sasisma</td>
<td>shout. REDUP</td>
<td>sasismafiru</td>
<td>(Sp. gritón)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukaira</td>
<td>be stingy</td>
<td>ukairafiru</td>
<td>stingy person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.3.2.5 Possessive Nominalizer =\textit{yara} The possessive nominalizer =\textit{yara} is an enclitic that derives a noun construed as the possessor of the nominal head, as in (2.29).

(2.29) cristianokana nuamai utfa\textit{yara}rafi...

\textit{cristiano} =kana nua =mai utfa =\textit{yara} =rafı
\text{Christian} =PL.MS be.big =NOMZ:INACT sin =NOMZ:POSS =NASS

‘Christians, being great sinners...’
(example (6.29a))

In Old Omagua, =\textit{yara} attaches to two Spanish verb roots con\textit{fesar} ‘confess’ and com\textit{ulgar} ‘receive communion’. On the former it behaves as a verbalizer, and in that single instance we have glossed it as such. On the latter, however, it derives an agent noun (‘one who receives communion’), and in this instance we preserve the NOMZ:POSS gloss, although we note that in modern Omagua =\textit{yara} does not attach to Spanish loan verbs.

2.3 Syntax

In this section we present an overview of Omagua syntax, including information structure. As before, much of our description here is based on our analysis of modern Omagua, and unless otherwise noted, the descriptions that follow are true for both modern and Old Omagua. Some phenomena we discuss in this section are attested only in Old Omagua. Topics discussed include nominal modification (§2.3.2), adpositional phrases (§2.3.3), negation (§2.3.4), interrogative formation (§2.3.6), noun phrase coordination (2.3.7), clause-linking (§2.3.8), focus (§2.3.9), and non-verbal predication (§2.3.10).

\textsuperscript{45}See also \textit{yara} ‘owner, master’.
2.3.1 Basic Clause Structure

Information-structurally unmarked constituent order in Omagua exhibits active-stative alignment: AVP, S_V, and VS_P, as shown for modern Omagua in (2.30) \(^\text{46}\).

(2.30) a. ...nyasaismuni kaikana. AVP

\[ n1= yasai =smuni kai =kana \]
2SG= trap =PURP capuchin.sp. =PL.MS

‘...so that you [can] trap the monkeys.’
(MCT:C2.S1)

b. isiwasu yapana kawaru. S_A V

\[ isiwasu yapana kawa =ru \]
dereer run forest =PROL

‘The deer ran off into the forest.’
(LHC:2011.07.01.1)

c. awi yamaři raná. VS_P

\[ awi yamaři raná \]
already be.hungry 3PL.MS

‘They were hungry.’
(MCT:C3.S1)

Arguments can be expressed by nouns, free pronouns, or phonologically bound pronominal proclitics (see §2.2.1), but pronominal proclitics must have a rightward phonological host. Omagua verbs are maximally bivalent, and any additional arguments (including indirect objects) must be licensed by phonologically bound NP enclitic postpositions (see §2.3.3).

Contrastive topic subjects encoded via nouns appear at the left edge of the clause, in which case they are followed by an intonation break and doubled by a pronominal proclitic phonologically bound to the verb. Focus is typically marked \textit{in situ} via intonation, but see §2.3.9. Highly topical third-person objects may be null, while subjects are obligatory. The realization of an argument as a referential noun, free pronoun, pronominal proclitic or, in the case of third-person objects, null, is governed by a givenness hierarchy (Gundel et al. 1993), which we will not treat here (see Sandy & O’Hagan (2012) and Michael et al. (in prep)). Adverbs tend to occur clause-initially.

2.3.2 Nominal Modification

In Old Omagua, nouns could be modified by three types of elements (which could be combined): 1) pronominal elements that include demonstratives (§2.3.2.1); 2) other nouns (§2.3.2.2); and 3) nominalized stative verbs (§2.3.2.3).

\(^{46}\)A = subject of transitive verb; S_A = single argument of active intransitive verb; S_P = single argument of inactive intransitive verb; P = object of transitive verb.
2.3.2.1 Demonstratives and Quantifiers

The ecclesiastical texts exemplify only a small number of demonstratives and quantifiers in comparison to the full range of such elements in modern Omagua and Proto-Omagua-Kokama, presumably because these texts exhibit a restricted range of deictic reference, and because the texts are written exclusively with masculine genderlect forms, such that no feminine genderlect demonstratives are attested. Below we summarize demonstratives and quantifiers in modern Omagua, and then discuss those forms attested in the ecclesiastical texts, before turning our attention to a small set of diachronic issues concerning the evolution of these forms from Proto-Omagua-Kokama.

Table 2.10 lists the demonstratives found in modern Omagua. Demonstratives may serve as arguments by themselves, in which capacity they may also take nominal morphology (see §2.2.2). They may also function as determiners, in which case any nominal morphology attaches to the noun itself, and not to the demonstrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROX</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>FS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akia</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yu</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the forms in Table 2.10, only aikiara, corresponding to modern akia, is attested. This demonstrative is shown as an argument with plural marking in (2.31).

(2.31) kʷaraʃi, yasi, sesukena, wirakanə, iwatakana weranu, to maritipa aikiarakanə Dios mura?

kʷaraʃi yasi sesu=kana wira=kana iwata=kana weranu to mari =tipa
sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS forest =PL.MS COORD ? what =INTERR
aikiara =kana Dios mura
DEM.PROX.MS.PRO =PL.MS God 3SG.MS

‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the forests, which of these is God?’

(Example (5.6a))

Table 2.11 summarizes non-numeral quantifiers in modern Omagua. The order of modifiers in modern Omagua is summarized in Table 2.12. Note that quantifiers (Table 2.11) and numerals

47 The syntactic distribution of demonstrative pronouns varies significantly between Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla. In the latter (at least with proximal demonstratives), both nominalized and non-nominalized demonstratives may modify nouns, but the latter appear to encode only spatial deixis, whereas the former appear to encode levels of discourse givenness (“discourse deixis”). Only nominalized demonstratives may take nominal morphology and stand alone as arguments (see Vallejos 2010a:215-222 for more explanation).

48 See footnote 134 for a discussion of the unexpected form of Old Omagua aikiara.

49 Native Omagua numerals range from ‘one’ to ‘four’, with ‘five’ and higher borrowed from Quechua. They may function as pre-nominal modifiers or stand alone as arguments, and in the latter case the suffix -tai may encode a definite group (cf. English ‘two of them’ versus ‘the two of them’). In the ecclesiastical texts the numerals uyepe ‘one’ (modern Omagua wipi) and musapirika ‘three’ are attested.
do not co-occur. The ordering of modifiers is a point of variation between the two catechism texts, which we discuss as part of §9.4.

Table 2.11: Modern Omagua Non-numeral Quantifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Omagua</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>upa</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upai</td>
<td>every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upaimai</td>
<td>every kind of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amua</td>
<td>(an)other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nimakatimai</td>
<td>no, any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awirika</td>
<td>some, few (count)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mimikatu</td>
<td>some, little (mass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fita</td>
<td>much, many</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.12: Order of Modern Omagua Nominal Modifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUANT</th>
<th>DEM</th>
<th>NUM</th>
<th>POSS=</th>
<th>NOUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The quantifiers *upa, upai, and amua* are attested in Old Omagua. The fact that *upa ‘all’ and upai ‘every’ are widespread in the ecclesiastical texts, in combination with Kokama-Kokamilla facts, leads us to reconstruct *upa ‘all’ and *upai ‘every’.

2.3.2.2 Noun-Noun Modification

Nouns may be modified by other nouns, in which case the head follows the modifier (2.32).

(2.32) uyawiri rauriari aikia tuyuka ritama upapupekatu.

uyawiri ra= uri =ari aikia tuyuka ritama upa =pupekatu again 3SG.MS= come =IMPF DEM.PROX.MS land village end =TEMP.OVRLP

‘He will come again when the Earth ends.’

(example (6.23b))
A frequent use of noun-noun modification in modern Omagua is in the derivation of male and female terms for animal names that either lack a gender distinction or are specific to the opposite gender, e.g., yapisara ‘man’, atawari ‘hen’, but yapisara atawari ‘rooster’.

### 2.3.2.3 Modification via Nominalization of Stative Verb

Nouns may be modified by a nominalized stative verb, as shown in (2.33). In the Old Omagua texts, nominalized stative verbs typically precede their head, although in modern Omagua the distribution is the opposite.

(2.33) iwatimai ritamakate rausu iminua.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{iwati} & =\text{mai} \\
\text{ritama} & =\text{kate} = \text{usu iminua} \\
\text{be.high.up} & =\text{NOMZ:INACT} \\
\text{village} & =\text{ALL} \ 3\text{SG.MS} = \text{go long.ago}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He went to Heaven.’

(Example (6.19b))

Lastly, two Old Omagua roots function as adjectives, i.e., they modify nouns without derivation, in which function they are only attested prenominally. These are era ‘good’ and ayaise ‘wicked’ (recruited by Jesuit authors to convey notions of ‘bad’ and ‘evil’ (see footnote 124)), the former shown in (2.34). In modern Omagua, the reflexes of these forms,  \(\text{ira} \) and \(\text{aisi} \), are stative verbs that must be nominalized in order to modify a noun.

(2.34) upakatu yenesawakai upai ayaise yene= kemesa senuni ari.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upa} & =\text{katu} = \text{yene=} \\
\text{sawa} & =\text{kai} \  \text{upai} \  \text{ayaise} \  \text{yene=} \  \text{yawiki} = \text{mai} \\
\text{all} & =\text{INTSF} \  \text{1PL.INCL= soul} =? \\
\text{every wicked} & =\text{1PL.INCL=} \text{do} \  =\text{NOMZ:INACT} \\
\text{=puta} & =\text{kana} \  \text{wananu ra=} \\
\text{=kumesa} & =\text{senuni} \  \text{ra=} \  \text{uri} = \text{ari} \\
\text{=NOM.PST} \  \text{=PL.MS COORD} \  \text{3SG.MS=} \  \text{say} \\
\text{=PURP} \  \text{3SG.MS=} \  \text{come} =\text{IMPF}
\end{align*}
\]

‘He will come to judge all of our souls and all of our wicked deeds.’

(Example (6.25b))

### 2.3.3 Adpositional Phrases

In Old and modern Omagua, oblique arguments must be licensed by one of a set of postpositional enclitics, which attach to the argument. Modern Omagua postpositions are shown in Table 2.13. Forms additionally attested in Old Omagua are given in the rightmost column.\(^{54}\)

### 2.3.4 Negation

Old Omagua exhibits four negation morphemes. Following Van Valin & LaPolla (1997:45-46), we distinguish three of these as a clausal negator \(\text{roaya} \), a core negator -\(\text{sima} \), a derivational negator \(\text{=ima} \), which functions as a privative\(^{55}\) and a prohibitive, \(\text{ename} \). These are discussed in §§2.3.4.1-2.3.4.4.


\(^{55}\) Clausal negation is additionally known as propositional negation, and core negation as narrow scope or internal negation (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997:45).
2.3.4.1 Clausal Negator roaya

The clausal negator is shown in (2.35), where it negates the entire proposition.

(2.35) ene yumiawaraŋi ta, roaya [uya]wiri tayumiratari ene.

\[
\text{ene } yumiawiraŋa =rafi } \hspace{1cm} \text{ta } \hspace{1cm} \text{roaya uyawiri ta=} \hspace{1cm} \text{yumira -ta } =ari } \hspace{1cm} \text{ene}
\]

\[
\text{2SG help } \hspace{1.5cm} \text{=NASS 1SG.M.S NEG again 1SG.MS=} \hspace{0.5cm} \text{get.angry -CAUS =IMPF 2SG}
\]

‘If you help me, I will not anger you again.’
(example (7.4))

The form of the clausal negator found in the ecclesiastical texts is somewhat unexpected given its from in modern Omagua, rua, and the corresponding form reconstructed to Proto-Tupí-Guaraní, *rua (Jensen 1998:547). The difference in the quality of the first vowel may be explicable as an assimilatory effect, but the additional final syllable presents a greater challenge. We propose that roaya was at one point a morphologically complex negation element consisting of what Jensen (1998:545-549) considers an ‘adverbial negator’ *rua and the standard negation suffix *-i, which elsewhere co-occurs with a prefix *n(a)- ~ *ni- to negate verbal predicates (see O’Hagan (2011:112-114)). On this view, Old Omagua roaya (presumably underlyingly /ruaya/) reduced to rua in modern Omagua, which must have happened relatively recently, since roaya is recorded as

---

56Modern rua frequently surfaces phonetically as either [raa] or [ro].
late as the 1840s by the French explorer Paul Marcoy in São Paulo de Olivença (Amazon River), Brazil (Marcoy 1875).

2.3.4.2 Privative = *ima*

The enclitic = *ima* is a denominal privative that derives a stative predicate denoting the absence or lack of the entity or quality denoted by the nominal root to which it attaches (2.36). We analyze it as a clitic because it follows other morphemes analyzed as clitics (e.g., = *mai*) and because in modern Omagua it forms a phonological word with morphological material to its left.

(2.36) era kristianokana Dios kumesamaipurakana era amuyasukatatarakana erasimaiwasu

```plaintext
(2.36)
era kristiano =kana Dios kumesa =mai =pura =kana era
good Christian =PL.MS God say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS good
amuyasukata -tara =kana era -simai =mai =wasu =ima
observe -NOMZ:ACT =PL.MS good -CORE.NEG =NOMZ:INACT =AUG =PRIV
rana= umanu =rafi makati rana= sawa -sua =kana usu
3PL.MS= die =NASS where 3PL.MS= soul -? =PL.MS go
```

‘The good Christians, those who observe what God said, those without great evil, when they die, where do their souls go?

(example (6.20a))

2.3.4.3 Core Negator - *simai*

The core negator - *simai* is not attested in either modern Omagua or Kokama, and only appears with a single property-denoting root, *era* ‘good’, in the ecclesiastical texts, from which it derives the negative stem *erasima* ‘evil’, as in (2.37). Its similarity in form and meaning to the privative is noteworthy, but due to the rarity with which it is attested, it is not possible at this stage to clarify the relationship between these two morphemes.

(2.37) yene rasafitarafi, yeneerasimamaikanasui yene rausuepetasenuni, iwotimai ritamakati yene rayawaşimatasenuni weranu.

```plaintext
(2.37)
yene ra= safita =rafi yene= era -simai =mai =kana
1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= love =NASS 1PL.INCL= good -CORE.NEG =NOMZ:INACT =PL.MS
= sui yene ra= usuepe -ta =senuni iwati =mai ritama
= ABL 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= escape -CAUS =PURP be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village
=kati yene ra= yawaşima -ta =senuni weranu
= LOC 1PL.INCL 3SG.MS= arrive -CAUS =PURP COORD
```

‘Since he loves us, in order to save us from our evils and take us to Heaven.’

(example (5.12b))
2.3.4.4 **Prohibitive *ename***

The Old Omagua prohibitive marker *ename* is a sentence-initial particle that is attested three times in this corpus, once in the Lord’s Prayer, and twice in the Uriarte diaries. We give a modern example of the prohibitive construction in (2.38), which shows that the verbal subject is expressed in modern Omagua prohibitives, as in the clausal negation and optative constructions, which similarly involve sentence-initial particles. Note that in modern Omagua both vowels *e* have raised to *i*, representing an irregular correspondence *e:i*.

(2.38) inami mi sasima.

\[\text{inami mi sasima} \]

PROH 2SG shout

‘Don’t shout.’

(MCT:C6.S1)

Strikingly both prohibitive examples in Uriarte’s diaries ((8.4) & (8.6)) lack subject person-marking. It is not clear if the lack of person-marking in these examples accurately represents Old Omagua prohibitive constructions, however, since it is also attested in the Lord’s Prayer, with person-marking (4.6).

2.3.5 **Optative *tene***

The Old Omagua optative *tene* is a sentence-initial particle, like the negator *roaya* and the prohibitive *ename*. It is attested only in the Lord’s Prayer, as in (2.39).

(2.39) tene rayawiki mura.

\[\text{tene ra=} \ yawiki mura\]

OPT 3SG.MS= do 3SG.MS

‘...[thy will] be done.’

(example (4.3))

Modern Omagua exhibits an optative with the same syntactic description as the Old Omagua morpheme, but the form of this sentence-initial particle is *tina*, which would not result from regular sound changes to the attested Old Omagua form. More puzzlingly, a morpheme with the form *=tina* appears both in the ecclesiastical texts and modern Kokama, and it is clearly a second-position epistemic modal clitic in both cases (see §2.2.3.1.5). We are not in a position to account for either sound changes that produced modern Omagua *tina* from Old Omagua *tene*, or a reanalysis of a second-position epistemic modal clitic as a sentence-initial optative particle.

2.3.6 **Interrogatives**

2.3.6.1 **Polar Interrogatives**

Old Omagua polar interrogative sentences are distinguished from declarative sentences in bearing one of two second-position interrogative clitics: *=tipa* or *=pa*[^37]. In most sentences, the interrogative

[^37]: These clitics also occur on interrogative pronouns in the Jesuit texts (see §2.3.6.2 and §9.4).
clitics encliticize to a sentence-initial verb, as in (2.40), but in negative interrogative sentences, and in interrogative sentences bearing an initial adverb, the clitics appear encliticized to the negation particle or adverb, as in (2.41) and (2.42), respectively.

(2.40)  neyamimiatipa upakatu niyamukuikatu neu[akanapupe neyumirataiku yaneyara Dios?

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{neyamimia} = \text{tipa} \\
\text{upakatu} = \text{katu} \\
\text{niyamukuikatu} = \text{katu} \\
\text{neyumirataiku} = \text{ut} \\
\text{Dios} = \text{kana}
\end{array}
\]

‘Do you grieve with all your heart because you have angered our Lord God with your sins?’ (example (6.36a))

(2.41)  aikiara musapirika personakana, roayatipa musapirika Dios?

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{aikiara} \\
\text{musapirika} \\
\text{personakana} \\
\text{roaya} = \text{tipa} \\
\text{musapirika} = \text{kana} \\
\text{Dios} = \text{tipa} \\
\text{three} = \text{PL} \\
\text{God} = \text{MS}
\end{array}
\]

‘These three persons, are they not three Gods?’ (example (5.10a))

(2.42)  uyawiritipa yaneyara jesucristo iwati mai ritama rauriaratuyuka.

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{uyawiri} = \text{tipa} \\
\text{yaneyara} = \text{yara} \\
\text{jesucristo} = \text{mai} \\
\text{iwati} = \text{ritama} \\
\text{rauriaratuyuka} = \text{kate} \\
\text{master} = \text{MS} \\
\text{village} = \text{ALL} \\
\text{come} = \text{IMPF}
\end{array}
\]

‘Will our Lord Jesus Christ come from Heaven to Earth again?’ (example (6.23a))

We should note a variety of distributional facts concerning these two interrogative enclitics. The interrogative clitic =pa is significantly less frequent than =tipa, occurring only four times in all of the Jesuit texts, and can be replaced by =tipa on all the hosts on which it is attested, namely, interrogative pronouns and the clausal negation particle. Interestingly, while both interrogative clitics are attested in Old Omagua, modern Omagua only exhibits =pa, whereas Kokama-Kokamilla only exhibits =tipa. We reconstruct both *=tipa and *=pa to Proto-Omagua-Kokama based on the attestation of both clitics in Old Omagua, and on data from other Tupí-Guaraní languages, especially Tupinambá, which exhibited two interrogative markers, pe and tepe. Cabral (1995:209-213) distinguished the latter from the former, apparently an unmarked interrogative marker, as a marker of rhetorical questions. We suspect that the two markers are distinguished by knowledge asymmetries between speaker and interlocutor, although further comparative work is needed across the Tupí-Guaraní family to evaluate this hypothesis.

2.3.6.2 Content Interrogative

Old Omagua content interogatives exhibit fronted interrogative pronouns, listed in Table 2.14 that bear one of the two interrogative second position clitics, =tipa or =pa. In the Catechism Fragment,
interrogative clitics appear on all interrogative words, whereas in the Full Catechism they are occasionally omitted, including in cases of questions that otherwise correspond identically to those in the Catechism Fragment (e.g., (5.4a) versus (6.4a)). See §9.4 for a more in-depth discussion of this variation.

Table 2.14: Old Omagua Interrogative Pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mania</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mariamai</td>
<td>how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>awiri(ka)</td>
<td>how many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marai</td>
<td>what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makati</td>
<td>where</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maniamai</td>
<td>which</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ava</td>
<td>who</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maraira</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maraikua</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maniasenuni</td>
<td>why</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Postpositional nominal enclitics front with their associated interrogative pronouns, and in such cases, interrogative clitics follow the postpositions, as in (2.43). Reflexes of all forms except mariamai ‘how’ and maniasenuni ‘why’ are attested in modern Omagua, although maniamai ‘which’, in Old Omagua, has come to mean ‘what type of’.

(2.43) maripupetipa Dios yawiki upakatu marainkana?

\[
\text{mari } =\text{pupe } =\text{tipa } \quad \text{Dios } \text{yawiki } \text{upa } =\text{katu } \quad \text{marain } =\text{kana}
\]

what =INSTR =INTERR God make all =INTSF thing =PL.MS

‘With what did God make all things?’

(example (5.3a))

Note the compositionality of the Old Omagua words for ‘why’, which are based on marai ‘what’ and mania ‘how’, the latter of which in its function in “why-words” we gloss as ‘what action’. Proto-Omagua-Kokama words for ‘why’ can be reconstructed as in Table 2.15 with a quadripartite distinction based on the word class of the questioned constituent and whether or not it is the purpose or cause of an event in question. The ‘Response’ column indicates the morpheme that attaches to the relevant constituent in the response.

58 In the Catechism Fragment, awiri appears with =pa (5.5a), whereas in the Full Catechism, awirika appears without additional morphology (6.5a). Only the latter is attested in modern Omagua.
59 In examples (5.3a), (5.6a), and (6.28a), marai ‘what’ is realized as mari, which is intriguing for two reasons. First, the modern language exhibits only mari for ‘what’, while marai fulfills two separate functions, one as a noun glossable as ‘possession’ or ‘thing’, and another as a possessive predicate (e.g., ‘the book is mine’). Second, mari is the form that would be expected in Kokama due to widespread monophthongization processes (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012), but not in Omagua. This may mean that the influence of Kokama on Omagua began at quite an early stage, which may be unsurprising, given that Uriarte ([1776]1986) reports Kokama families in San Joaquín de Omaguas as early as the 1750s.
Table 2.15: Proto-Omagua-Kokama Words for ‘why’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POK</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Questioning</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*maraira</td>
<td>=ra</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>‘in order for what thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maraikua</td>
<td>=ikua</td>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>‘because of what thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maniasenuni</td>
<td>=senuni</td>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>‘in order for what action’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*maniaikua</td>
<td>=ikua</td>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>‘because of what action’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinctions between these forms have nearly collapsed in both modern languages, with maniasenuni having fallen out of modern Omagua entirely, and neither maniasenuni or maniaikua attested in Kokama-Kokamilla. However, some distinctions are preserved in Old Omagua. Namely, answers to questions with maraira are nominal and marked by =ra, and answers to questions with maniasenuni are verbal and marked by the purposive =senuni. The form maraikua is attested in the Catechism Fragment only, and receives a response with a verb marked by =senuni. This appears to indicate that the former quadripartite distinction was either already being lost at the time of the writing of the Jesuit texts, or not fully commanded by the author. The fact that maniaikua is not attested in Old Omagua, but is so synchronically, is likely due to happenstance.

2.3.7 Noun-Phrase Coordination

2.3.7.1 Coordination with weanu

Old Omagua coordinated two or more noun phrases using the particle weanu COORD, which follows the last of a series of coordinated NPs, as in (2.44).

(2.44) kwaRasi, yasi, sesukana, wirakana, iwatakana weanu, to maritapa aikiarakan Dios mura?

kwaRas’i yasi sesu=kana wira=kana iwrata=kana weanu to mari =tipa sun moon star =PL.IMS bird =PL.IMS forest =PL.IMS COORD ? what =INTERR aikitra =kana Dios mura DEM.PROX.IMS.PRO =PL.IMS God 3SG.IMS

‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the forests, which of these is God?’
(example (5.6a))

This particle can also functions adverbially with the meaning ‘also’, as in (2.45), where the previous question in the catechism was ‘Why did God make all these things?’

(2.45) maraikuatipa Dios yawiki weanu mura awa?

marai =ikua =tipa Dios yawiki weanu mura awa what =REAS =INTERR God create COORD 3SG.IMS man

Note that translation of weanu as ‘also’ dates back at least to Hervás y Panduro [1787a:98].
‘Why did God also make man?’
(example (5.8a))

The coordinator *weranu* has vanished from modern Omagua and Kokama, but is reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, as it exhibits cognates across Tupí-Guarani.

### 2.3.7.2 Coordination with Comitative =*mukui*

In both modern and Old Omagua, the comitative postposition =*mukui* may, like *weranu* did in Old Omagua, encliticize to the last of a series of coordinated nouns, as in (2.46), the sole attestation of this strategy in the ecclesiastical texts. Note that in modern Omagua, however, nominal coordination is most typically achieved via unmarked juxtaposition, and in Old Omagua, with the use of *weranu*.

(2.46) *iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu maraikanan* =*mukui*, *yawikitara, wakutatara, yeneyarasemai* =*weranu*, *muriai Dios mura*.

---

Evidence from other Tupí-Guaraní suggest that coordinator =*weranu* derived from the fusion of two distinct clitics involved in coordination constructions. Kamaiurá, for example, exhibits =*we* and =*ran*, where =*we* has the same distribution as Old Omagua =*weranu*, coordinating NPs with a sense of ‘and also’, as in (2.1). The form =*ran*, on the other hand, coordinates verb phrases, and likewise appears following the coordinated elements.

(2.1) *ije akwahap sapaĩ galvao manuewawe*.  

ije a- kwahap sapaĩ -a galvao manue -a =*we*  
1SG.PRON 1SG.ERG- know Sapaĩ -REF Galvao Manuel -REF =COORD  

‘I know Sapaĩ, Galvão and also Manuel.’  
(Seki [2000] 248)

(2.2) *aka upotat akepotaran*.  

a- katu-potat a- ke -potat =*ran*  
1SG.ERG- eat -DESID 1SG.ERG sleep -DESID =COORD  

‘I want to eat and sleep.’  
(Seki [2000] 239)

Significantly, =*we* and =*ran* co-occur when one of the coordinated NPs is realized post-verbally (i.e., in non-canonical position), an apparent focus strategy, as in (2.3). Note, however, that the function of *weranu* in Old Omagua is not restricted to this limited syntactic environment, and in coordinating both NPs and VPs exhibits hybrid syntactic characteristics of both Kamaiurá =*we* and =*ran*. Note that glosses in these examples have been modified from the original for purposes of clarity.

(2.3) *ojomonopawawa rak mørerekwaraw* =*weranu*.  

o- jo- mono -paw =awa rak mørerekwat -a =*we* =*ran*  
3.ERG- RECIP- send -CPL =PL ? chief -REF =COORD =COORD  

‘They all went, and the chief too.’  
(Seki [2000] 248)
iwati =mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu marain
be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all =INTSF thing
=kana =mukui yawiki -tara wakuta -tara yene= yara
=PL.MS =COM make -NOMZ:ACT carry.in.arm -NOMZ:ACT 1PL.INCL= master
=semai weranu muria -i Dios mura
=FOC:VER COORD thus -? God 3SG.MS

‘The Creator of Heaven, Earth and all things, the protector, and our true Lord as well, thus
is God.’
(example (5.2b))

2.3.7.3 Similative =ya

Similarity between nominal referents is expressed in Old Omagua by the nominal enclitic =ya,
which appears following the plural marker =kana, if present, as in (2.47).

(2.47) roaya miarakayakatu yenesuumukui ranaumanu.

roaya miara =kana =ya =katu yene= suu =mukui rana= umanu
NEG monkey =PL.MS =SIM =INTSF 1PL.INCL= body =COM 3PL.MS= die

‘They [our souls] do not die with our bodies like animals.’
(example (6.22b))

Old Omagua =ya is cognate to Kokama-Kokamilla =yá, as in (2.48). It is unclear whether Old
Omagua =ya bore lexical stress as the Kokama-Kokamilla form does.

(2.48) MODERN KOKAMA-KOKAMILLA
ipirawayá ya tsapuyuru.

awa =yá ya tsapuyuru
person =CMP 3SG.FS whistle

‘He [the dolphin] whistles like a person.’
(Vallejos 2010a:291)

This similative morpheme has disappeared from modern Omagua, which employs two differ-
ent strategies to express similarity. In the first, the nominal enclitic =sana attaches to the noun
functioning as the standard of comparison, as in (2.49).

(2.49) MODERN OMAGUA
maniaikua nryumisarika yapisarasana?

62 The final stress is attributable to a former final n, reported by Cabral (1995:350) for Brazilian Kokama, in which the
particles ya and yan differ along genderlect lines, with the latter uttered by male speakers. A closed final syllable
of this sort would attract stress. Cabral does not discuss the stress patterns associated with these forms, however, and
Vallejos (2010a) does not report a gender distinction for this morpheme.
63 CMP = completive
64 The morpheme =sana appears to have grammaticalized from a noun meaning ‘shadow, reflection’, which is no
longer found in Omagua, but is attested in modern Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a:444). The Kokama similative
construction does not, however, employ a morpheme cognate to Omagua =sana.
In the second strategy, the morphologically free element \textit{mtrru} appears between the two constituents being compared, as in (2.50). The two strategies may also co-occur, as in (2.51).

\textbf{(2.50) Modern Omagua}

\texttt{mifu} sasisima \texttt{mtrru} yawarawasu.

\texttt{mifu} sasisima \texttt{mtrru} yawarawasu
\textit{cat} howl.REDUP\textit{SIM} jaguar

‘The cat howls like a jaguar.’

\textbf{(2.51) Modern Omagua}

\texttt{nipuraka} jaula \texttt{mtrru} gallinerosananani...

\texttt{nipuraka} jaula \texttt{mtrru} gallinerosananani
\textit{2SG= make} cage \textit{SIM} hen.house=SIM =LIM

‘You should make a cage just like a hen house...’

(MCT:C2.S1)

\subsection{2.3.7.4 Exact Similative \textit{mairamania}}

This section addresses the function of \textit{mairamania}, a form that has proven difficult to analyze because it is not attested in either modern Omagua or Kokama, and because its function and distribution vary slightly across its three attestations in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts. We tentatively analyze it as a manner similative that participates in constructions that compare events or states of affairs (as expressed by clauses or postpositional phrases) and indicate exact identity between the comparata. The most straightforward example of this function is given in (2.52), where \textit{mairamania} occurs between two VPs.

\textbf{(2.52) tenepeta tanu tanuerasimamaikana \textit{mairamania} tanu tenepeta tanusawayarakana}

\texttt{tenepeta} \texttt{tanu=} \texttt{era \textendash sima =mai =kana}
\texttt{forgive} \texttt{1PL.EXCL.MS} \texttt{1PL.EXCL.MS=} \textit{good} \textit{-CORE.NEG =}NOMZ:INACT \texttt{=PL.MS}
\texttt{mairamania} \texttt{tanu} \texttt{tenepeta} \texttt{tanu=} \texttt{sawayara =kana}
\texttt{exactly.(as) 1PL.EXCL.MS forgive} \texttt{1PL.EXCL.MS=} \textit{enemy} \texttt{=PL.MS}

‘Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.’

(example (4.5))

\footnote{Modern Omagua exhibits a small number of frozen reduplicated verb stems that reflect a formerly productive pattern of reduplication of the first non-initial CV [O’Hagan 2011:91-93].}
A similar function is exemplified in (2.53), but here *mairamania* precedes the two comparata, which are postpositional phrases, and are also coordinated with *weranu* (see §2.3.7.1). Note that his example is exceptional, in being the only case in which both comparata are marked with *weranu*.

(2.53) ene putari, tene rayawiki mura **mairamania** iwatimai ritamakatemairai weranu, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate weranu.

```
ene putari tene ra= yawiki mura mairamania iwati =mai
2SG desire(?) OPT 3SG.MS= do 3SG.MS exactly(as) be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT
ritama =kate =mai =ra =i weranu aikiara tuyuka ritama
village =LOC =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.FUT =? COORD DEM.PROX.MS land village
=kate weranu
=LOC COORD
```

CLOSE: ‘Your desire, may he do it exactly like both that which will be in the high village and in this land village.’

TARGET: ‘...thy will be done, on Earth as it is in Heaven.’

(example (4.3))

The functional contribution of *mairamania* in this example seems to be that of expressing exact identity between the comparata, with the function of coordination fulfilled by the two instances of *weranu*, which we take to yield a meaning of ‘both in X and in Y’. In short, *mairamania* appears to have a more adverbial function in this case.

A similar function and distribution can be seen in (2.54), in which *mairamania* again is not involved in coordination. Here *weranu* coordinates the three oblique noun phrases *rasawamukui*, *rasuumukui*, and *rasuimukui*.

(2.54) mura jesucristo, Dios taira, aisetui Dios, aisetui awa, rasawamukui rasuumukui rasuimukui weranu **mairamania**.

```
mura jesucristo Dios taira aise -tui Dios aise -tui awa ra= sawa
3SG.MS Jesus.Christ God son.MALE.EGO true -? God true -? man 3SG.MS= soul
=mukui ra= suu =mukui ra= sui =mukui weranu mairamania
=COM 3SG.MS= body =COM 3SG.MS= blood =COM COORD exactly(as)
```

‘It is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, true God, true man, with his soul, his body and his blood exactly.’

(example (6.31b))

In this example, as is true to a lesser degree for (2.52) and (2.53), the theological significance of exact identity is extremely important, since the catechist is emphasizing that the bread and wine of the sacrament are identical to the body and blood of Christ. Because *mairamania* coordinates constituents in only one of its three attestations, we have opted to gloss it as ‘exactly (as)’, where the parenthetical ‘as’ is relevant in those instances when it functions as a coordinator. Otherwise ‘exactly’ is meant to capture its adverbial use.

66 Here we include both close and target translations for extra clarity.
2.3.8 Clause-Linking

Old Omagua exhibited a series of enclitics that function as clause-linkers, a subset of which we discuss here. These are the purpose clause markers =senuni and =maka (§2.3.8.1); the non-assertive marker =ra$ti$ (§2.3.8.2); the temporal clause-linkers =sakapiri ‘after’, =pupekatu ‘when’, and =kate ‘while’ (§2.3.8.3); and the reason clause-linkers =ikua and =sep$1$ ‘because (of)’ (§2.3.8.4). These enclitic clause-linkers fall into one of two classes: 1) those that attach directly to the verb, outside all other verbal affixes and clitics; and 2) those that alternate between attaching at this same position, when objects are realized as an independent pronoun or noun, and, when objects are realized as pronominal proclitics, attaching to right of that clitic, which appears following the verb.

2.3.8.1 Purposive Markers

Two purpose clause markers are attested in Old Omagua, a marker of positive purpose =senuni (§2.3.8.1.1), and a marker of negative purpose =maka (§2.3.8.1.2). In modern Omagua =senuni is one of three positive purposive markers, including -tara and -mira, whose distribution depends on coreference restrictions between main clause arguments and omitted supporting clause (in the sense of Dixon (2009)) arguments, and semantic criteria, as discussed by Vallejos (2014) for Kokama-Kokamilla.

2.3.8.1.1 Positive Purpose =senuni  The purpose clause marker =senuni is a verb-final enclitic that appears in a supporting clause that describes an event that serves as the purpose for the realization of the event described by the main (focal) clause (2.55).

(2.55) iwatimai ritamakate, muriapai sariwara$fi$ ranakakirisenuni.

iwati =mai ritama =kate muriapai sariwa =ra$ti$ rana=
be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL uninterruptedly be.happy =NASS 3PL.MS=
kakiri =senuni
live =PURP

‘To Heaven, so that they may live forever happy.’
(example (6.20b))

This marker is frequent in the ecclesiastical texts, while the modern Omagua purpose clause markers -tara and -mira are strikingly absent. Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=tsenuni, of which Old Omagua =senuni is a reflex, grammaticalized from a morphologically independent postposition meaning ‘ahead of’ (Jensen 1998:514).

2.3.8.1.2 Negative Purpose =maka  In =maka purposive constructions, a focal clause denotes an action that is carried out in order that the event denoted in the supporting clause, which bears the verb-final enclitic =maka, not be realized, as in (2.56).

(2.56) maritipa awakana yawikiari ipipemai tata tupak$w$arape ranausumaka?

$^67$See O’Hagan (2014) for a reconstruction of some of these markers.
mari =tipa  awa =kana  yawiki =ari  ipipe =mai  tata tupa
what =INTERR  person =PL.MS  do =IMPF  be.inside =NOMZ:INACT  fire  place
=k3  arape  rana=  usu =maka
=INESS  3PL.MS=  go  =NEG.PURP

‘What should people do in order to not go to Hell?’
(example (6.28a))

In (2.57), the function of the negative purposive is handily glossed by English ‘lest’.

(2.57) ename  nei= fari  tanu  ukukui =maka  era -sima
PROH  2SG= abandon  1PL.EXCL.MS  fall.from.height =NEG.PURP  good  -CORE.NEG
=mai
=NOMZ:INACT

CLOSE: ‘Don’t abandon [us] lest we fall [into] evil.’

TARGET: ‘Lead us not into temptation.’
(example (4.6))

The negative purpose clause marker =maka is not attested in modern Omagua, although Kokama
exhibits an apparently cognate ‘postponed prohibitive’, which is not a clause-linker, and is ana-
lyzed as a verbal suffix (Vallejos 2010a:564-566). We have not located cognates to these mor-
phemes in any other Tupí-Guaraní languages. Note that the Omagua negative purposive construc-
tion employs the purposive marker =sina

2.3.8.2  Non-assertive Marker =rafi

The verbal enclitic =rafi indicates that the event denoted by the clause in which it appears is in
some general sense not asserted, as in conditional clauses, and certain reason and temporal clause-
linking constructions. Translations of such clauses in English include a variety of clause-linking
markers, such as if, when, since, etc., reflecting the fact that English generally distinguishes types
of non-assertedness more finely. In modern Omagua, =rafi most commonly appears in the prota-
sis of conditional sentences, but in the ecclesiastical texts, there are no cases of incontrovertibly
conditional sentences, and =rafi instead appears in clauses like that in (2.58).

(2.58)  ene  era  dias  ta[sal]fita=rafi,  ipipemai  tata  tupa  taakisiarafi  weranu,  tayamimia
upakatu  taut[akanapu]  teyamirataikua  ene  era  dias.
ene  era  dias  ta=  safita=rafi  ipipe  =mai  tata tupa  ta=
2SG  good  God  1SG.MS=  love  =NASS  be.inside  =NOMZ:INACT  fire  place  1SG.MS=
akisi=rafi  weranu  ta=  yamimia  upa=katu  ta=  utfa=kana  =pupe
fear  =NASS  COORD  1SG.MS=  grieve  all  =INTSF  1SG.MS=  sin  =PL.MS  =INSTR
ta=  yuimia  -ta  =iku=ene  era  dias
1SG.MS= get.angry  -CAUS  =REAS  2SG  good  God

68 Here we maintain the close and target translations for better clarity.
69 Note that polyfunctional non-assertive markers of this type are common in lowland Amazonian languages, e.g., see
Iquito -sa-kari (Lai (2009:67-68), Michael (2009:155-156)).
‘Loving you good God, and fearing Hell, I grieve because I have angered you, good God, with all of my sins.’

2.3.8.3 Temporal Relations

The Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts exhibit three clause-linking markers that express temporal relations between clauses. Two of these markers express the temporal overlap relations: =pupekatu ‘when’, used when the two events are construed as points in time (§2.3.8.3.2); and =kate ‘while’, used when the two events are construed as periods in time (§2.3.8.3.3). The remaining marker, =sakapiri, expresses temporal posteriority (§2.3.8.3.1).

2.3.8.3.1 Temporal Posteriority =sakapiri ‘after’

Temporal posteriority relations in biclausal sentences are expressed with the verbal enclitic =sakapiri, which attaches to the verb of the temporally anterior clause. It is attested twice in Old Omagua, once in the Full Catechism and once in Manuel Uriarte’s diaries, given in (2.59). Note that we consider this morpheme to be a verbal enclitic based on its distribution in modern Omagua, since the probative evidence of a VP with an object is absent in the two instances in which =sakapiri occurs in the ecclesiastical texts.

(2.59) taumanusakapiri, erušu padre ukakate.

\text{ta=} \text{1SG.MS} = \text{umanu} = \text{sakapiri} \quad \text{erušu padre uka} = \text{kate}

\text{=TEMP.POST} \quad \text{take} \quad \text{father house} = \text{ALL}

‘After I die, take him [my son] to the Father’s house.’

(Example (8.6))

This clause linker grammaticalized from the Proto-Omagua-Kokama postposition *=tsakapiri ‘behind’, with this spatial function still attested in modern Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010b:29), which exhibits a different strategy for encoding temporal posteriority. The spatial function is also clearly attested elsewhere in the Tupí-Guaraní family, e.g., Tupinambá *akip"eri (Lemos Barbosa 1970).

2.3.8.3.2 Temporal Overlap: Point =pupekatu ‘when’

The verbal enclitic =pupekatu expresses temporal coincidence between the events denoted by two clauses, where those events are construed as point-like in time. It is attested only once in the ecclesiastical texts (2.60), and is not described by Veigl (1788). As was the case with =sakapiri, our evidence for this syntactic distribution comes from modern Omagua, and we have no reason to believe that the same distribution did not hold for Old Omagua as well.

(2.60) uyawiri raúriari aikiara tuyuka ritama upa=pupekatu.

\text{uyawiri} \quad \text{ra=} \quad \text{3SG.MS} = \text{uri} = \text{ari} \quad \text{aikiara} \quad \text{tuyuka ritama} \quad \text{upa}

\text{again} \quad \text{=IMPF} \quad \text{DEM.PROX.MS} \quad \text{land} \quad \text{village} \quad \text{come.to.end}

\text{=pupekatu}

\text{=TEMP.OVRLP}

‘He will come again when the Earth ends.’

(Example (6.23b))
This morpheme appears to derive historically from two distinct morphemes, the instrumental \(=\text{pupe}\) and the intensifier \(=\text{katu}\), and is reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama as \(*=\text{pupekatu}\) (cf. Kokama-Kokamilla -\(\text{puka}\) \cite{Vallejos2010a}642-644).

### 2.3.8.3.3 Temporal Overlap: Period \(=\text{kate}\) ‘while’

The enclitic \(=\text{kate}\), which is related to the homophonous allative postposition, expresses the temporal overlap between the events of two clauses, when those events may be construed as periods of time. In this construction, \(=\text{kate}\) attaches to the predicate of the supporting clause. The construction is not attested in the ecclesiastical texts, but is found in Veigl’s sketch of Omagua \((2.61)\).

\[(2.61)\]
\begin{enumerate}
    \item ta \textit{cumessa cate} \\
    \item tacumessacate \\
    \item takumesakate
\end{enumerate}

\(ta=\) \textit{kumesa}=\textit{kate}\hfill
\begin{align*}
    \text{1SG.MS}=\text{speak} & =\text{TEMP.OVRLP} \hfill \\
    \text{LATIN}: \text{‘dum loquor’} & \sim \text{‘in loquendo ego’} \\
    \text{ENGLISH}: \text{‘while I speak’} & \sim \text{‘with me speaking’} \hfill
\end{align*}

\(\text{(Veigl1788:199)}\)

In modern Omagua, durative temporal overlap is expressed by \(=\text{katikatu}\), as in \((2.62)\).

\[(2.62)\] \textbf{Modern Omagua}

\begin{align*}
    \text{yapituka }\text{mi} & \text{ tanakamatausukatikatu}. \hfill \\
    \text{yapituka }\text{mi} & \text{ tana=} \text{ kama} =\text{usu} =\text{katikatu} \hfill \\
    \text{rest} & \text{ 2SG 1PL.EXCL.MS= work} =\text{AND} =\text{TEMP.OVRLP} \hfill
\end{align*}

‘You rest while we go work.’

Modern \(=\text{katikatu}\) may additionally encode the temporal anteriority of a period of time up to relevant temporal reference point (as in English ‘until’). In this construction \(=\text{katikatu}\) appears in the clause containing the predicate that denotes a point in time, as in \((2.63)\).

\[(2.63)\] \textbf{Modern Omagua}

\begin{align*}
    \text{tanaayukaka tana} & =\text{ukiri}\text{katikatu}. \hfill \\
    \text{tana=} & \text{ ayuka} -\text{ka} \text{ tana=} \text{ uk}\text{\textsuperscript{w}}\text{ari} =\text{katikatu} \hfill \\
    \text{1PL.EXCL.MS=} & \text{hit} -\text{RECIP} \text{ 1PL.EXCL.MS=} \text{be.tired} =\text{TEMP.SUCC} \hfill
\end{align*}

‘We fought until we got tired.’

\textsuperscript{70}Latin translations are those in Veigl’s original work; English translations are our own.

\textsuperscript{71}Espinosa Pérez \cite{EspinosaPerez1935} gives a morpheme of the form \(<\text{katikjati}\>>\) as having this function. However, the redundancy of grammatical morphemes (in this case \(=\text{kati ALL}\)) that this form seems to entail is not attested in Old or modern Omagua, suggesting that Espinosa Pérez may have been in error. (The representation \(<\text{kj}\>>\) reflects a postlexical phonological process whereby \(k\) palatalizes between \(i\) and \(a\).)
Both *=kate and *=katekatu can be reconstructed to Proto-Omagua-Kokama (O’Hagan 2014), where the former exhibits the same function as Old Omagua =kate and the latter encodes the temporal succession characteristic of modern =katikatu. Thus it is evident either that the distinction between the two morphemes has collapsed since the writing of the ecclesiastical texts, or that the apparent collapse is the result of language attrition.

2.3.8.4 Reason Markers

Old Omagua exhibited two reason markers: =ikua ‘because (of)’ (§2.3.8.4.1); and =sep1 ‘because (of)’ (§2.3.8.4.2). Only the former is attested in modern Omagua.

2.3.8.4.1 =ikua ‘because (of)’ The verbal enclitic =ikua appears in the supporting clause of a biclausal sentence and expresses the reason for which the event of the main clause is realized (2.64). It grammaticalized from Proto-Omagua-Kokama *=ikua ‘know’.

(2.64) neyamimimi=tipa upa=katu ne= âyam=katu ne= utsa=kana 2SG= grief =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG= heart =COM =INTSF 2SG= sin =PL.MS =pupe ne= yumita -ta =ikua yene= yara Dios =INSTR 2SG= get.angry -CAUS =REAS 1PL.INCL= master God

‘Do you grieve with all your heart because you have angered our Lord God with your sins?’ (example (6.36a))

When =ikua occurs, it is always the rightmost element in its phonological word, coming outside of derivational morphology (2.64) as well as other enclitics (2.65).

(2.65) nesa=fitatipu upakatu niyamukuikatu yene=papa dios, upakatu marainkana nekuatarafi, raerasemaikatuiikua?

ne= safita=tipa upa=katu ne= âyam=katu yene= papa dios 2SG= love =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG= heart =COM =INTSF 1PL.INCL= father God upa=katu marain=kana ne= ukuata=räfî ra= era =semai =katu all =INTSF thing =PL.MS 2SG= pass.by =NASS 3SG.MS= good =FOC;VER =INTSF =ikua =REAS

‘Do you love our father God with all your heart, even though anything may happen to you, because he is really truly good?’ (example (6.35a))

Beyond its clause linking function, =ikua may also attach to nouns, pronouns, and interrogative words to license oblique arguments that are construed as the reason for the events denoted by the remainder of the clause. It is attested once in the ecclesiastical texts with this function, attaching to yene= 1PL.INCL, as in (2.66). In modern Omagua it commonly attaches marai ‘what’, yielding the interrogative word maraiikua ‘why’ (see §2.3.6.2).
(2.66) yeneikua rasusanaraşi, cruzari takitamai raumanuraşi iminua (mura).

\[
yene= =ikua \text{ ra}= \text{ susana}=\text{rafi} \text{ cruz}=\text{ari} \text{ takita}=\text{mai}
\]

1PL.INCL= =REAS 3SG.MS= suffer =NASS cross =LOC.DIFF nail =NOMZ:INACT

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ra}= \text{ umanu}=\text{rafi} \text{ iminua} \text{ mura}. \\
3SG.MS= \text{ die} \quad \text{ =NASS long.ago} \quad 3SG.MS
\end{align*}
\]

‘Suffering for us, dying nailed to the cross.’
(example (6.16b))

2.3.8.4.2 =sepi ‘because (of)’ The enclitic =sepi is attested twice in the ecclesiastical texts, but is not found in modern Omagua. It appears in the supporting clause of a biclausal sentence and expresses the reason for which the event of the main clause is realized (2.67), and is indistinguishable in both position and meaning from =ikua.\(^\text{2}\)

(2.67) era cristianokana purai, uyawiri raerusuari iwatimai ritamakate
ranasawakanamukui ranasuukanamukui, muriapai sariwaraşi ranakakirisenuni,
aikiaɾa tuyuka ritamakate Dios kumesamaipurakana ranaamuyasukatasepi.

\[
era \text{ cristiano}=\text{kana} \text{ purai} \quad \text{uyawiri} \text{ ra}=\text{erusu}=\text{ari} \text{ iwati}
good Christian =PL.MS FOC:CONTR again 3SG.MS= go =IMPF be.high.up
=mai \text{ ritama}=\text{kate} \text{ rana}= \text{ sawa}=\text{kana} \quad \text{ =mukui} \text{ rana}= \text{ suu}=\text{kana}
=COM uninterrupted be.happy =NASS 3PL.MS= soul =PL.MS =COM 3PL.MS= body =PL.MS
=\text{mukui muriapai} \quad \text{sariwa}=\text{rafi} \text{ rana}= \text{ kakiri}=\text{senuni aikiara} \text{ tuyuka}
=\text{COM} \text{ uninterrupted be.high.up} =\text{NASS} 3PL.MS= \text{ live} =\text{PURP DEM.PROX.MS land}
\text{ritama}=\text{kate} \text{ Dios} \text{ kumesa}=\text{mai} =\text{pura} =\text{kana} \text{ rana}= \text{ amuyasukata}
village =LOC God say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS 3PL.MS= observe
=sepi
=REAS
\]

‘He will take the good Christians to Heaven with their souls and with their bodies, so that they may live forever happy, due to the fact that they observed God’s commandments on this Earth.’
(example (6.26b))

Like =ikua, =sepi may also attach to a nominal element and license an oblique argument, which is construed as the reason for which the events denoted by the remainder of the clause are realized, as in (2.68).

(2.68) upai tautakana era taconfesayarari. utfakanasepi patiri wanakarimai ta amuyasukatari.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upai} \text{ ta}= & \quad \text{utfa}=\text{kana} \text{ era} \text{ ta}= \text{ confesa}=\text{yara}=\text{ari} \\
\text{every} \quad 1SG.MS= \text{ sin} =\text{PL.MS} \text{ good} \quad 1SG.MS= \text{ confess} =\text{NOMZ:POSS} =\text{IMPF}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{utfa}=\text{kana} =\text{sepi} \text{ patiri} \text{ wanakari} =\text{mai} \text{ ta}= \text{ amuyasukata}=\text{ari}
\quad \text{sin} =\text{PL.MS} =\text{REAS priest order.about} =\text{NOMZ:INACT} \quad 1SG.MS= \text{ observe} =\text{IMPF}
\]

\(^2\) See the parallel response in (6.27b).
‘I will properly confess every sin. Because of my sins I will observe the priest’s instructions.’
(example (7.5))

It appears likely that $=sepi$ grammaticalized from the Proto-Omagua-Kokama word for ‘compensation’.$^{73}$ The Kokama-Kokamilla cognate $tfipi$ (Vallejos Yopán & Amías Murayari 2015:53) does not function as a clause-linker (Vallejos 2010a), which suggests that this grammaticalization process occurred following the divergence of Omagua and Kokama.

### 2.3.9 Focus Markers

Old Omagua exhibited three focus operators with different distributions and scopal properties: the syntactically independent contrastive focus element $purai$ (§2.3.9.1); the exclusive focus enclitic $=nani$ (§2.3.9.2); and the verum focus second-position clitic $=semai$ (§2.3.9.3).

#### 2.3.9.1 Contrastive Focus $purai$

The contrastive focus particle $purai$ directly follows the constituent over which it has scope, occurring outside of all affixal and clitic morphology. In (2.69) the $purai$-marked constituent is contrasted with the non-$purai$-marked constituent previously stated. Here $purai$ intervenes between the nominal predicate and its argument $ranu$, providing further evidence that $purai$ directly follows the constituent over which it has scope.

(2.69) nati marai aikiara Dios mura. Dios yawikimaipurakana $purai$ ranu.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{nati} & \text{marai aikiara Dios mura} \\
\text{NEG.INDEF DEM.PROX.MS.PRO God 3SG.MS} \\
\text{Dios yawikima} =\text{mai} =\text{pura} =\text{kana purai ranu} \\
\text{God make =NOMZ:INACT=NOM.PST=PL.MS FOC:CONTR 3PL.MS} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘God is none of these things. They are God’s creations.’
(example (5.6b))$^{74}$

The constituent over which $purai$ has scope may also be a sentence-initial adverbial (2.70).

(2.70) awakaisuara$purai[i]$,$^{75}$ roaya Dioskaisuara $purai$ raumanu iminau.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{awa} =\text{kai} =\text{suara purai} \\
\text{man} =? =\text{ADVBLZR FOC:CONTR} \\
\text{roaya Dios} =\text{kai} =\text{suara purai ra= uamanu iminau} \\
\text{NEG God =? =ADVBLZR FOC:CONTR 3SG.MS= die long.ago} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘As a man. He did not die as God.’
(example (6.17b))

$^{73}$The modern Omagua reflex $spi$ has come to mean ‘value, price’, as concerns the transaction of money.
$^{74}$See also footnote [141].
$^{75}$See footnote [179].
Note in 2.69 that purai also occurs in conjunction with the nominal past =pura, which it resembles in form. In other cases, as in 2.71, grammatical factors may conspire such that =pura and purai appear adjacent to one another.

(2.71) roaya Dios mura. aikiara upakatu marainkana Dios yawikimai purai purai mura.

roaya Dios mura
NEG God 3SG.MS

aikiara upa =katu marain =kana Dios yawiki =mai =pura
DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF thing =PL.MS God make =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST

purai mura
FOC:CONTR 3SG.MS

‘They are not God. All these things are God’s creation.’
(example 6.66)

Interesting from a diachronic perspective is that purai is not attested in modern Omagua, and that modern Omagua =pura no longer productively encodes past tense on nouns, but rather marks narrative peaks (Michael et al., in prep). This suggests to us that two distinct forms =pura and purai collapsed, perhaps because of a reanalysis of their functions in contexts such as 2.71, in which they occur adjacent to one another, and that the function of purai came, in a sense, to replace that of =pura. Nominal tense may already have been well on its way to being lost at this point in Omagua history, since only a single instance of the reflex of the Proto-Omagua-Kokama nominal future =ra is attested with that function in Old Omagua (see §2.2.2.4), it having otherwise already grammaticalized as a purpose clause marker (O’Hagan 2012). The prior nominal tense functions can be inferred, however, by comparison with cognates across the Tupí-Guaraní family (see §2.2.2.3).

2.3.9.2 Exclusive Focus =nani

The exclusive focus enclitic =nani attaches to nominal elements. It is attested twice in the ecclesiastical texts, once in each of two parallel passages from the Catechism Fragment and the Full Catechism. The former is shown in 2.72.

(2.72) roaya mura musapirika Dios. aikiara musapirika personakana uyepe semai Dios mura. santísima trinidad =nani rafira.

roaya mura musapirika Dios
NEG 3SG.MS three God

aikiara musapirika persona =kana uyepe =semai Dios mura
DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one =FOC:VER God 3SG.MS

santísima trinidad =nani =ra= fira
Holy Trinity =FOC:EXCL 3SG.MS= name

76See also Vallejos (2010a:170) for description of the Kokama-Kokamilla cognate =nan, and Vallejos (2009:419-421) for description of the interaction of =nan and left dislocation.
‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are truly one God. The Holy Trinity is its name.’
(example (5.10b))

2.3.9.3 Verum Focus =semai

Verum focus – encoded via the second-position clitic =semai – focuses, or highlights, the truth value of a proposition. One construal of verum focus is that the relevant truth value obtains to a higher or greater degree than might be expected, and thus clauses containing =semai often translated with adverbs such as very or truly.\(^7\) This morpheme survives in modern Omagua, although its Kokama-Kokamilla cognate, the emphatic marker -tseme, receives only a brief description in Vallejos (2010a:269), and appears to be found on a number of frozen stems only (O’Hagan 2011:121). Two attestations of =semai are illustrated in (2.73) and (2.74). Note that in (2.74) the complex noun phrase Dios taira ‘God’s son’ is treated as a single constituent with respect to to the distribution of =semai.

(2.73) tayara jesucristo, aisetui dios, aisetui awa, enesemai tasapiai ene kumesamaikanari.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ta=} & \quad \text{yara jesucristo aise} - \text{tui dios} aise - \text{tui awa ene} = \text{semai} \quad \text{ta=} \\
\text{1SG.MS=} & \quad \text{master} \text{Jesus.Christ true} - ? \quad \text{God true} - ? \quad \text{man 2SG=} \text{FOC:VER 1SG.MS=} \\
\text{sapiari ene} & \quad \text{kumesa} = \text{mai} \quad = \text{kana} = \text{ari} \\
\text{believe 2SG say} & \quad = \text{NOMZ:INACT =PL.MS =LOC.DIFF} \\
\text{‘My Lord Jesus Christ, true God, true man, I truly believe in you and your words.’} \\
\text{(example (7.1))}
\end{align*}
\]

(2.74) Dios tairasemai awa uwaka iminua.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dios} & \quad \text{taira} = \text{semai} \quad \text{awa} \quad \text{uwaka} \quad \text{iminua} \\
\text{God} \quad \text{son.MALE.EGO} = \text{FOC:VER man transform long.ago} \\
\text{‘The son of God truly became man.’} \\
\text{(example (5.11b))}
\end{align*}
\]

2.3.10 Non-Verbal Predication

Like the modern language, Old Omagua exhibited non-verbal predicates that lack a copular verb. The most common order of constituents in these constructions was argument-predicate, as in (2.75), also a common order in the modern language.

(2.75) Dios papa, Dios taira, Dios espíritu santo.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Dios papa} & \quad \text{Dios taira} \quad \text{Dios espíritu santo} \\
\text{God father God} \quad \text{son.MALE.EGO God Holy Spirit}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^7\)Note that translations of clauses containing the certainty marker =tina (§2.3.1.5) do not contain degree adverbs of this type, since it is the speaker’s certainty regarding the truth value of a proposition, and not the truth value itself, that is being asserted.
CLOSE: ‘God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit.’
(example (5.9a))

This order is also attested when the argument is a free pronoun (2.76). Note that additional material may intervene between the argument and predicate.

(2.76) muratina aisetui Dios aisetui awa weranu, yeneyara yeneyumunyepetatara.

mur =tina aise -tui Dios aise -tui awa weranu yene = yara yene = 3SG.MS =CERT true -? God true -? man COORD 1PL.INCL= lord 1PL.INCL= yumunuyepeta -tara
redeem -NOMZ:ACT

‘He is the true God and a true man, as well as our redeemer.’
(example (6.15b))

When the subject is especially heavy, a different construction obtains, where the heavy subject appears in sentence-initial position, and a coreferential resumptive pronoun, mu 3SG.MS, appears following the predicate, as exemplified in (2.77).

(2.77) {iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkanamukui, yawikitara, wakutatara, yeneyarasemai weranu]SUBJ, murai Dios mura.

iwati =mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu marain be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all =INTSF thing =kana =mukui yawiki -tara wakuta -tara yene = yara =PL.MS =COM make -NOMZ:ACT carry.in.arm -NOMZ:ACT 1PL.INCL= master =semai weranu muria -i Dios mura
=FOC:VER COORD thus -? God 3SG.MS

‘The Creator of Heaven, Earth and all things, the protector, and our true Lord as well, thus is God.’
(example (5.2b))

A similar pattern appears in the question in (2.78), drawn from the Catechism Fragment, which yielded the response given in (2.77), suggesting that resumptive pronoun in (2.77) may be a consequence of fronting the heavy subject to some position to the left of the typical subject position.

Note that this ordering preference is a common source of VS-P order in the modern language, and is attested once in the ecclesiastical texts, in (2.1).

(2.1) [Dios yawikimaipurakana]PRED purai ranu.

Dios yawiki =mai =pura =kana purai tanu
God make =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS FOC:CONTR 3PL.MS

‘They are God’s creations.’
(example 5.6b)

Note that there are examples, such as (5.9a), of interrogative constructions that do not exhibit resumption. It is not clear if such resumption is optional or such variation reflects a lack of mastery of this construction on the part of the Jesuit authors.
In modern Omagua, left-dislocation of this type is associated with a contrastive topic construction, although we cannot be sure the bracketed constituent in (2.77) is a contrastive topic. Note, in any case, that in the Full Catechism counterpart to (2.77), *mu* 3SG.MS is absent, although the structure of the two responses is otherwise identical, suggesting that resumption may be optional in such cases (or alternatively, that one of these examples reflects an error by the Jesuit author).

(2.78)  *maraitipa Dios mura?*

  *ma* =*tipa*     *Dios mura*
  what =INTERR God 3SG.MS

  ‘What is God?’

(example (5.2a))

Finally, we note that even declarative non-verbal clauses exhibit optionality in resumption in the ecclesiastical texts. In (2.79) from the Catechism Fragment, structurally parallel to (2.77), we see no resumptive pronoun following *Dios*, although the equivalent sentence from the Full Catechism, (6.9b), exhibits one.

(2.79)  *[aikiara musapirika personakana]SUBJ uyepe titi Dios.*

  *aikiara*     *musapirika persona* =*kana*  *uyepe titi*     *Dios*
  DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one be.alone God

  ‘These three persons are one God alone.’

(example (5.9a))

---

80 See §9.4 for a systematic comparison of the two catechism texts, which includes a discussion of the differing treatment of parallel non-verbal clauses.
Chapter 3

Text Conventions

This chapter provides information on the conventions employed in our representation of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts. We begin in §3.1 by describing the general multilinear format in which we present sentences of the texts. In §3.2 we discuss the related issues of the orthographic choices employed in each text to represent Old Omagua phonemes, and how we deduce phonemic representations on the basis of the orthographic representations.

3.1 Multilinear Text Format

In our analysis and presentation of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts, portions of text are given in a numbered multilinear format. The goal of this format is to allow the reader to follow the entire process of interpretation and analysis from the original text, through its resegmentation, conversion to a phonemic representation, its morphological segmentation, and ultimately, its translation. We feel that this multilinear format is necessary to render this process maximally transparent and open to verification.

The first issue to address is the segmentation of the original text into portions that bear example numbers. In general, we divide the original text into sentences for purposes of numbering and interlinearization. The major exception to this general principle are the catechism texts, which were organized into question-response pairs in the original documents. For these texts, each example number corresponds to a question-response pair, where the question and response are distinguished by lowercase letters, and the lettered format described in (3.1) below corresponds to lowercase Roman numerals. Returning to the issue of sentence breaks in the non-catechistic texts, it is important to note that in some cases, the question of where sentence breaks lie is itself an analytical decision open to question. This is especially the case for the Profession of Faith (Chapter 7), where the original text is largely devoid of punctuation. In this case we provide the original text, so that our sentence breaks can be evaluated. In most other cases, sentence breaks in our representation correspond to sentence breaks in the original text. Whenever this is not the case we make note of the fact.

Our multilinear format consists of up to eight lines, as exemplified in (3.1), taken from (4.4) in the Lord’s Prayer (see §4.2).

(3.1) a. *Tanu eocmai neyume icume tanu supe*
    
b. *tanu eocmai neyume icume tanusupe*
c. tanueumai neyume ikume tanusupe.

\[
\text{tanu= eu =mai ne= yume ikume tanu=} =\text{supe}
\]

1PL.EXCL.MS= eat =NOMZ:INACT 2SG= give today 1PL.EXCL.MS= =GOAL

CLOSE: ‘You give us our food today.’

TARGET: ‘Give us this day our daily bread.’

The first line, (3.1a), reproduces the text from the published source from which it was extracted without any alteration (except, possibly, the insertion of a sentence break, as discussed above). It should be noted that this line, although it faithfully reproduces the text in the published source, no doubt contains significant errors in comparison to the original manuscripts (to which we do not have access). These errors are likely due to the fact that at least one step in the process of reproducing the manuscripts involved individuals who had little or no knowledge of Omagua. The result was misinterpretations on the part of the individuals involved of the handwriting in earlier manuscripts, and widespread errors in identifying word boundaries. There is a particular tendency, for example, to confuse the graphemes <a> and <u>; <e> and <c>; <n> and <r>; and <ss> and <fs>. We discuss the issues involved in the interpretation.

The second line, (3.1b), consists of a grouping of the graphemes given in (3.1a) such that they form coherent grammatical words, without in any way changing the graphemes. This often involves combining sets of graphemes that are grouped as distinct “words” in (3.1a), and in some cases splitting up such “words”. This rearrangement is most striking in the Full Catechism, where it is common for roots to be split up as separate words. This suggests to us large-scale misinterpretation of the manuscript handwriting on the part of a copyist who did not speak Omagua, in the centuries preceding publication (see footnote 81).

The third line, (3.1c), represents our informed interpretation and phonemic rendering of the actual words in the original manuscript. In most cases, this interpretation and rendering is straightforward, since Omagua phonology has changed little since the 17th century, and the relationship between the words in (3.1b) and the intended ones is clear, even when scribal errors have crept into the published texts. Our phonemic representations in this line are thus usually identical to that of the corresponding forms in the modern language. When we find it necessary to insert segments in this line in order to arrive at an intelligible morpheme, we enclose the segments in parentheses, and when we find it necessary to excise letters for the same reason, we enclose them in square brackets.

The fourth line, following (3.1c), is a morphological segmentation of the previous line, while the fifth line consists of a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss of the preceding line. If the example includes more than one sentence, each sentence will begin on a new line here.

The sixth through eighth lines consist of three translations of the preceding Omagua text, labeled CLOSE, TARGET, and SPANISH. The CLOSE translation is our relatively literal, but possibly awkward, translation of the preceding Omagua text. The TARGET translation consists of our interpretation of the Jesuit authors’ intended meaning of the Omagua prose in the example, based on our understanding of the intended theological message and symbolism. The most notable contrast between these two lines involves Jesuit neologisms (see §9.3.1) and calques (see §9.3.2), which are translated literally in the close translation line, but with standard Christian terms in the target.

81Note that in some cases, there is more than one published version of a given text, and there are inconsistencies between the various versions. In the case of the three versions of the Uriarte catechism (see §6.1), there is no variation between Uriarte ([1776]1952:229-232) and Uriarte ([1776]1986:614-617), but there is variation between the text in these publications and Espinosa Pérez (1935:155-163).
translation. In cases where only a close translation line is given, we consider it to be equivalent to a target translation.

The **Spanish** translation is given only in cases in which the published source provides a translation of some sort. In the case of the Full Catechism, these Spanish translations correspond to those given for a very similar Quechua catechism that appears alongside the Omagua catechism in the appendix to Uriarte’s diaries (Uriarte ([1776]1952a:215-220,[1776]1986:602-607)). In the case of the fragments of Omagua found in Uriarte’s diary, the Spanish translation consists of the translation he provides in text. We include these translations because they are the closest approximation to an ‘original’ translation available, even though they are typically only partially faithful to the Omagua.

### 3.2 Orthographic Representations

In this section we discuss three issues relevant to the phonemic representation of forms in the Old Omagua texts: orthographic conventions employed by the original Jesuit authors; common scribal errors made by copyists involved in the reproduction of the texts; and certain diachronic issues relevant to phonemic representations.

The orthographic conventions employed by the Jesuits who contributed to each of the texts are given in Table 3.1 for the most part, the phonemic interpretation of these orthographic conventions is relatively straightforward, assuming Hispanophone orthographic conventions in the use of graphemes (or sequences thereof) such as `<c>`, `<gu>`, `<hu>`, `<qu>`, and `<z>`. Perhaps the most obvious non-Hispanophone conventions are the use `<k>` for /k/ and `<sch>` for /ʃ/, presumably attributable to the prominent role of German-speaking Jesuits in the Omagua ecclesiastical text tradition (see §9.1).

The phonemic representation of Old Omagua forms is relatively straightforward with regard to consonants, with the notable exception of /ʃ/ and /tʃ/. Recall that modern Omagua exhibits a phoneme /tʃ/, but only in a very small set of forms that are mostly attributable to borrowing (see §2.1). Furthermore, Proto-Omagua-Kokama exhibited *tʃ, the source of Old Omagua and modern Omagua /ʃ/. Incidentally, none of the synchronic forms exhibiting /tʃ/ are attested in Old Omagua, but a different set of forms exhibits the sequence `<ch>`. In some cases we analyze this sequence as corresponding to an Old Omagua phoneme /tʃ/, which was marginal at that time as it is now, while in other cases we consider `<ch>` to be yet another orthographic strategy for representing Old Omagua /ʃ/, which yields the overlap of `<ch>` in multiple rows in Table 3.1. We take this line of approach because, on the one hand, it is clear that the forms in which we posit /tʃ/ are loan words from Quechua (see below), while on the other hand it is otherwise obvious that the lenition process that yielded Omagua /ʃ/ from Proto-Omagua-Kokama *tʃ (as well as /s/ from *ts) had already occurred by the time period in which these texts were written. All forms exhibiting orthographic `<ch>` are given in Table 3.2 with the number of tokens, their phonemic representation in Old Omagua and modern Omagua, their gloss, and an indication of the texts in which they appear. Forms above the dashed line contain old Omagua /tʃ/, while those below it contain /ʃ/.

---

82 Cells are grayed out if the segment in question is not attested in a particular text.
83 See below for a discussion of the single token in which `<ch>` corresponds to /s/.
84 **LORD** = Lord’s Prayer; **FRAG** = Catechism Fragment; **FULL** = Full Catechism; **PROF** = Profession of Faith.
85 See regional Spanish *yarina*. 
The Old Omagua word *mutSa* ‘kiss’ and *utSa* ‘fault’ are loan words from Quechua, in which language they also exhibit the medial affricate */tʃ/ (Taylor 2006:65, 98). They appear to have been introduced into Omagua by the Jesuits themselves, in order to convey the Christian notions of adoration (i.e., of Christ) and sin, as they exhibit the same extended religious uses in at least some dialects of Quechua (ibid.). Note that in modern Omagua, the affricate in both forms has lenited to */ʃ/; the sense ‘adore’ does not survive, although the sense ‘sin’ does. The remaining Old Omagua words, which we claim exhibit the alveo-palatal fricative */ʃ/, occur only once with an orthographic representation <ch>, and, with the exception of <chipate> and <mariachicu>, which are each attested only once, occur elsewhere with expected representations of */ʃ/ (see Table 3.1). Lastly, there is one instance of a <ch>:/s/ correspondence in the diaries of Manuel Uriarte (see (8.6) and footnotes therein), in the form <chupi>, which corresponds to the applicative =*supe*. We do not attribute much significance to this correspondence, since it is attested only once.

In general, the greatest challenges for assigning phonemic representations of Omagua words

---

Table 3.1: Phoneme-Orthography Correspondences in Old Omagua Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Lord’s Prayer Fragment</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Diaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>c, k</td>
<td>c, qu</td>
<td>c, k, qu</td>
<td>c, qu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kʰ</td>
<td>gu</td>
<td>qu, cu, co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n, nn</td>
<td>n, nn</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s, ss, c</td>
<td>s, ss, c, s</td>
<td>s, c, z</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>sch, sc</td>
<td>sch, ch</td>
<td>sch, ssch, sh, ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tf</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>gu, hu, v</td>
<td>hu, u, v, gu</td>
<td>hu, u, v, gu, u, v, b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>i, e</td>
<td>b, y</td>
<td>i, y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e, i</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e, i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e, ue</td>
<td>e, ue</td>
<td>e, ue</td>
<td>e, ue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>u, o</td>
<td>u, o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai, ae</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai, ae, ay</td>
<td>ai, ae, ay, ai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ui</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>ui</td>
<td>ui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>aeg</td>
<td>aeg</td>
<td></td>
<td>ag</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

86 See footnote 104
87 The form <quasrachi> is conspicuous here, in that the <s> that would otherwise form the sequence <sch>, an expected representation of */ʃ/, appears to be “metathesized”. We assume this token to have been improperly copied.
Table 3.2: Old Omagua Forms Containing <ch>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Tokens</th>
<th>Old Omagua</th>
<th>Modern Omagua</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mucha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mutʃa</td>
<td>muʃa</td>
<td>‘kiss’</td>
<td>LORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hucha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>utʃa</td>
<td>uʃa</td>
<td>‘fault, sin’</td>
<td>FULL, PROF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chira</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>jira</td>
<td>jira</td>
<td>‘name’</td>
<td>FRAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quasrachi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kʷaraʃi</td>
<td>kʷaraʃi</td>
<td>‘day’</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>richi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>=raʃi</td>
<td>=raʃi</td>
<td>NASS</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maria chicu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>mariaʃiru</td>
<td>mariaʃiru</td>
<td>‘church’</td>
<td>DIARY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chipate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>jipate</td>
<td>jipati</td>
<td>‘palm sp.’</td>
<td>DIARY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

are found in the orthographic conventions for representing vowels, in particular the high central vowel /i/. The high central vowel is generally represented as <e>, although a less common variant, <ue>, also surfaces, particularly following the bilabial stop /p/. With this representational choice this phoneme is thus always conflated with other vowels, and we must rely on our knowledge of the corresponding form in modern Omagua to infer the appropriate phonemic representation in forms that exhibit orthographic <e> in the Omagua texts. Additionally, the rounded back vowel /u/ is variably represented as either <u> or <o>, presumably due to the fact that the single rounded back vowel in the language occupied a position between cardinal /u/ and /o/, leading to variation in how the Jesuit authors perceived and represented the segment.

A different challenge for accurate phonemic representation arises from what we assume to be errors introduced in the process of copying the texts. Given the nature of these errors, we believe that the texts were copied at least once by someone who had no knowledge of Omagua. The result were scribal errors that are easily explained if we assume that the copyist was simply attempting to interpret and reproduce handwritten characters based on their shape, without being able to rely on wider knowledge of the Omagua lexicon or Omagua phonotactics. Thus, for example, it is evident that handwritten <r> was occasionally misinterpreted as <v> or <n>, where both of the latter resemble <r> (see Table 3.3).

88 For the Lord’s Prayer and Catechism Fragment, the copying event was likely only that of typesetting the texts for publication, since, although there are numerous unexpected graphemes in the forms of these texts, word breaks are more faithfully reproduced. However, in the Full Catechism and Profession of Faith, which come to us bundled in the appendices to Manuel Uriarte’s diaries (see §6.1), word breaks are quite surprising. We consider it most likely that these word breaks are due to a copyist with no knowledge of Omagua reproducing another handwritten manuscript in the time between when the text was last edited and when it was typeset for publication.

89 In Table 3.3 empty cells indicate that there are no attested scribal errors with respect to the particular segment in question. Grayed-out cells indicate that the respective phoneme is not attested in that text.

90 We assume this sequence and that in the immediately lower cell to be misinterpretations of <qu>.

91 We assume this to be a misrepresentation of <c>, which in all other texts corresponds to /s/.

92 This sequence almost certainly corresponds to <ss>, given calligraphic practices of the period in which the first of a sequence of two <s>s was written as what essentially resembles a cursive <f>.

93 We assume this and its counterpart in the immediately lower cell to be a misrepresentation of <e>, which corresponds to both /e/ and /i/ (see below).
Table 3.3: Scribal Errors in the Copying of Old Omagua Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phoneme</th>
<th>Lord’s Prayer</th>
<th>Fragment</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Diaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>t, h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>s, i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td>gu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kw</td>
<td></td>
<td>gu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>m, z</td>
<td>m, r</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>v, r</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td>v, x, n</td>
<td>c, n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>go</td>
<td>bu</td>
<td>ga, n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td>ie, d</td>
<td>e, u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a, c</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td>ua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>v, a, re</td>
<td>a, n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>e, s</td>
<td>e, u, i, o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>e, u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ui</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>eag</td>
<td>eag</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The final issue we consider with relation to the phonemic representation of forms in the Old Omagua texts is the role of sound change. As indicated in §3.1, there are few systematic differences between the phonemic representation of Old Omagua forms and modern Omagua ones. A notable exception to this generalization involves Old Omagua orthographic <e>. Most instances of <e> correspond to modern Omagua /i/, which is a reflex of Proto-Omagua-Kokama *e, also corresponding to Kokama-Kokamilla /e/ (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012). In light of this, <e> is most typically represented as /e/ in our analysis in the line of phonemic representation (see (3.1c)). More infrequently, however (i.e., only in the Lord’s Prayer and Catechism Fragment), <e> corresponds to modern /i/, particularly in unstressed position, and crucially also to Kokama-Kokamilla /i/. In these instances, Old Omagua data becomes crucial for reconstructing the proper Proto-Omagua-Kokama segment, since we would otherwise reconstruct *i in such forms. In the majority of these instances, comparative data from elsewhere in the Tupí-Guaraní family has shed light on this particular issue, in that Old Omagua words that exhibit <e> but correspond to both modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla /i/ typically correspond to /e/ in other languages of the family. In these cases we represent <e> again as /e/ in our phonemic representation, and note that this yields an additional correspondence set between Old Omagua and modern Omagua (really between Proto-
Omagua-Kokama and both daughter languages) e:i.

Conversely, and even less frequently, <i> corresponds to modern /i/, which clearly came from Old Omagua /e/. This latter correspondence, which is the least well attested, suggests to us that the /e/ phoneme in some words may have already been raising to /i/ at this time, resulting in alternations on the part of Jesuits in representing /e/ as both <e> and <i>. Support for this conclusion comes from the fact that the same root in the same text is occasionally represented with <e> and occasionally with <i>. Where correspondences between the Proto-Omagua-Kokama and Old Omagua front vowels /i/ and /e/ and the modern Omagua front vowels /i/ and /i/ are not straightforward, we discuss them on a case-by-case basis in footnotes to the texts themselves.\footnote{See footnote 113 for more details.} Lastly, note that yet other instantiations of <e>, as discussed above, correspond to modern /i/ (and crucially, to *i), making our knowledge of the phonemic representations of these forms in modern Omagua all the more essential to their proper representation in Old Omagua.
Chapter 4

Lord’s Prayer

4.1 Bibliographic History and Previous Linguistic Study

4.1.1 Hervás y Panduro (1787a)

The Omagua translation of the Lord’s Prayer that we discuss in this chapter was first published in 1787 by Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (b. 1735 Horcajo de Santiago, Spain – d. 1809 Rome) in his Saggio pratico delle lingue, which constitute volumes 5 and 6 of his 21-volume Idea dell’universo. The two volumes in question include the Catalogo delle lingue conosciute (Hervás y Panduro 1784) – translated into Spanish as Hervás y Panduro (1800) – and the Vocabolario poligloto (Hervás y Panduro 1787b), which attempt to enumerate, classify, and to a very limited degree, describe all human languages on which he was able to obtain information. Although Hervás y Panduro was a Jesuit, he himself never visited the Americas, instead obtaining linguistic materials on the indigenous languages spoken there from his colleagues who found refuge in Italy following the suppression of the Jesuits and their expulsion from the Americas. The manner in which he obtained the Omagua Lord’s Prayer that he published is suggested by the following description that he provided of his work:

Yo pues he procurado leer, y aún comprar (sin temor de la incomodidad a que me exponía la estrechez de mis limitadísimas facultades) libros gramaticales de cuantas lenguas he tenido noticia. Ésta me hizo conocer, que de poco número de ellas había libros impresos, y que por tanto debía yo suplir la falta de éstos, consultando a los que hablaban o entendían los muchísimos lenguajes de que nada se ha impreso. Para esta consulta me han ofrecido mis circunstancias presentes la ocasión más ventajosa de hasta ahora ha habido en el mundo, y que difícilmente se logrará otra vez en los siglos venideros. Esta ocasión ha sido y es la de hallarme en Italia en medio de muchedumbre de jesuitas sabios, antes dispersos por casi toda la faz terrestre para anunciar el santo Evangelio, aún a las naciones más remotas y bárbaras, y ahora compañeros míos envueltos en la misma desgracia, que arrancándonos del seno de la patria, nos ha arrojado a las playas de Italia.

En ésta, rodeado yo de celosos y sabios misioneros de casi todas las naciones conocidas del mundo, he podido fácilmente consultar, a unos de palabra, y a otros por escrito,

\[95\] For more biographical details, see Caballero (1868).
I, then, have attempted to read and even purchase (without fear of the inconvenience to which the narrowness of my very limited means exposed me), grammars of as many languages as I have heard of. This made me aware of the fact that only a small number of these were books in print, and as such that I should supplement these by consulting those individuals who spoke or understood the many languages on which nothing has been printed. For this my present circumstances have provided the most advantageous position that there has in the world been up until now, and that will again only be realized with great difficulty in the coming centuries. This position has been and is that of finding myself in Italy amid crowds of wise Jesuits, previously dispersed across nearly the entire face of the Earth to spread the holy gospel, even to the most remote and barbarous of nations, and now companions of mine embroiled in the same disgrace which, tearing us away from the breast of our homeland, has cast us out to the beaches of Italy.

In this [undertaking], surrounded by ardent and wise missionaries from nearly all the nations known in the world, I have been able to easily consult, some by word of mouth, and others by letter, requesting from each one the words that from the language of the nation of their mission I place in my multilingual vocabulary and in other volumes, and some indication of their grammar. With the guidance of several of said missionaries I have formed grammars, and yet others have assisted me in forming them. These manuscripts, and the many letters with which the missionaries responded to my questions and doubts about the languages and nations that speak them, form an indispensable part of my small multilingual library: and in this work I cite the names of the principal missionaries who have provided me the information I put in it regarding the barbarous languages that they understand, and regarding the nations of which they were missionaries or with whom they confined themselves.

Despite Hervás y Panduro’s proclaimed intent in the above-cited passage to indicate the source of indigenous language texts in the *Saggio pratico delle lingue*, he fails to do so for the Omagua Lord’s Prayer (Hervás y Panduro 1787a:98-99). It is likely that Hervás y Panduro obtained the Omagua Lord’s Prayer from Joaquín Camaño Bazán (b. 1737 La Rioja – d. 1820 Valencia), an Argentine Jesuit with whom he corresponded intensely regarding South American languages, but that Camaño Bazán was not the ultimate source of the text. This correspondence, part of which is preserved in the Vatican Archives, reveals that Camaño Bazán provided Hervás y Panduro with considerable lexical and grammatical data on Omagua (Clark 1937, Fúrlong Cárdiff 1955:48-87, 138-182). However, he had no direct experience with Omagua, since his missionary activities
were confined to the Gran Chaco of modern-day Bolivia, Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil, a region in which Omagua was not spoken. It is clear from his correspondence with Hervás y Panduro, however, that Camaño Bazán had accumulated information on a wide range of South American languages, and it is likely that he obtained the Omagua Lord’s Prayer as part of this process, subsequently passing it on to Hervás y Panduro. From whom Camaño Bazán obtained the text is unclear, although it should be noted that following the expulsion, he lived in northern Italy, in Faenza (Purlong Cárdiff [1955: 14-15]), a region in which many Jesuits who had worked in the Americas lived upon their return to Europe. We suppose that one of the former Jesuit missionaries in the region gave Camaño Bazán the text.

Hervás y Panduro published the text in a two-column format, in which short sequences of Omagua words were followed by a word-by-word translation into Italian. We reproduce the text in a manner faithful to its 1787 format in §4.2. It should be noted that the word-by-word translation exhibits a literalism that permits us to see that the translator of the text had a reasonable understanding of Omagua morphology. Likewise, neologism for introduced Christian concepts, such as *wati ritama* ‘Heaven’ (lit. ‘high village’) are translated literally, suggesting that the translation was carried out by someone with non-trivial knowledge of Omagua. Note that we base our analysis in §4.2 of this text on Hervás y Panduro’s 1787 version, and not the derivative Adelung (1813) version or the Rivet (1910) version, which is based on Adelung (1813).

### 4.1.2 Adelung (1813)

The next version of the Omagua Lord’s Prayer was published in 1813 by the German philologist Johann Christoph Adelung (b. 1732 Spantekow, Prussia – d. 1806 Dresden), as part of his *Mithridates, oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, a work which, much like those of Hervás y Panduro, sought to classify most of the languages of the world. Unlike Hervás y Panduro, Adelung utilizes the Lord’s Prayer, which he obtained in approximately 500 languages, as the central text with which to analyze the grammars of these languages, augmenting them with additional lexical and grammatical material at his disposal (e.g., from Hervás y Panduro’s works). Adelung indicates that he obtained the Omagua text from Hervás y Panduro (1787a: 98-99). Adelung preserved Hervás y Panduro’s orthographic representation and word breaks, but translated Hervás y Panduro’s Italian word-by-word translation of the Omagua into German. In addition to speculative commentary regarding the origin of the Omagua people and ethnonym, Adelung provides the first grammatical analysis of this text (1813: 609-611), making use of comparative lexical data published in Hervás y Panduro (1787b: 161-219) and Gilii (1782). It is clear from Adelung’s presentation of Omagua grammar (Adelung 1813: 606-607) that he had access to Hervás y Panduro’s unpublished grammar sketch of Omagua (see footnote 98).

---

99 Other cities in the area which were favored by Jesuits included Ravenna, where Uriarte lived (Bayle [1952] 1986: 82), and Forlì and Cesena, where Hervás y Panduro lived at different points (Caballero 1868).

100 Most volumes of this work were edited and published by Johann Severin Vater following Adelung’s death.

101 Filippo Salvatore Gilii (b. 1721 Legogne – d. 1789 Rome), an Italian Jesuit who carried out missionary work in the Orinoco basin, also obtained Omagua lexical data from Joaquín Camaño Bazán (see Gilii [1965] 297-300, a Spanish translation and republication of his original work carried out by Antonio Tovar).
4.1.3 Rivet (1910)

The next and most recent publication of the Omagua Lord’s Prayer – prior to our own – was by Rivet (1910), as part of his descriptive and comparative treatise on Kokama and Omagua. Rivet obtained the text for the Lord’s Prayer from Adelung (1813:608-609), but made significant orthographic modifications to the text to bring it more closely in line with the then developing standards for the representation of linguistic data. As would be expected, Rivet provides a linguistically much more sophisticated treatment of the text, including morphemic segmentations and glosses in French for nearly all morphemes. Given the limited resources that Rivet had access to, his morphological segments are impressively accurate, although there are certain morpheme boundaries that he failed to identify.

4.2 Text of the Lord’s Prayer

In the two columns below we give the Pater Noster as it appears originally in Hervás y Panduro (1787a). In (4.2)-(4.7) we present this text in the format outlined in §3.1.

15. Homagua, od Omagua dialetto Guaranì nel regno del Quito.

Tanu Papa .. nostro Padre,
Ehuatirami cate yuri timcui .. città-alta in sei:
En sciira tenera muchamura .. tuo nome che-sia felice:
Ene nuamai ritama .. tua grande città
teneruri tanu in .. venga noi in:
Ene putari tenera .. tua volontà che-sia
yahuckemura .. adempiuta
maeramania .. siccome
ehuetemai ritama cate .. alta città
maerai veranu .. così anche

aikiara tuyuca .. questa bassa
ritama cate .. città in
veranu .. ancora.
Tanu eocmai .. nostro cibo
neyume .. dà-a-noi
icume .. oggi
tanu supe .. noi per:
Tenepatatanu .. perdona-ci
tanu eraecmamaicana .. nostri fat-
ti-cattivi
maeramanía .. così-come
tanu tenepeta .. noi perdoniamo
tanu sahuayaracana .. nostri nemici:
Ename neischari .. non lasciare
tanu ucucui .. noi cadere
maca .. accio-non
eraecmamai .. peccati-in:
Ayaisimarae sui .. avversità dalle
nimunuy epetatanu .. libera-ci

(4.1) a. Tanu papa ehuatirami cate yuri timcui, ene sciira tenera muchamura
b. tanupapa ehuati ramicate yuritimcui, ene sciira tene ramucha mura
c. tanupapa, iwati ritamakate yuritimukui, ene fira, tene ramutja mura.
A Linguistic Analysis of Old Omagua Ecclesiastical Texts

1. **Our father, being high up in the village, your name, may he kiss it.**

   TARGET: ‘Our father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be thy name.’

2. **Your big village, may it come [to] us.**

   TARGET: ‘Thy kingdom come...’

(4.2) a. **Ene nuamai ritama teneruri tanu in**

b. ene nuamai ritama tene ruri tanuin

c. ene nuamai ritama, tene ra uri tanuin.

(4.3) a. **Ene putari tenera yahuckemura maeramania ehuatemai ritama cate, maerai veranu aikiara tuyuca ritama cate veranu.**

b. ene putari tene rayahucke mura maera mania ehuatemai ritamacate maerai veranu, aikiara tuyuca ritamakate veranu.

c. ene putari, tene rayawiki mura mairamania iwatimai ritamakatemairai veranu, aikiara tuyuka ritumakate veranu.

---

**Notes:***

102 The postposition =*kate* exemplifies one of a restricted set of *e:i* correspondences between Old and modern Omagua that runs counter to the more common *e:i* correspondence (see footnote 113).

103 The comitative =*mukui* in this context would be ungrammatical in modern Omagua, and may be a calque on the part of the author. Modern Omagu manner adverbial constructions employ the instrumental postposition =*pupita*.

104 We translate *muta* based on the meaning of its modern Omagua reflex *mu* =*s* ‘kiss’, and translate it as ‘hallow’ in the target translation. We will not treat this form in our discussion of Jesuit calques (9.3.3) because the contemporary meaning of this form is unclear, given that it is a Quechua loan (Taylor 2006:65).

105 Omagua exhibits no morphological or syntactic passive. In the Omagua Lord’s Prayer, constructions intended to translate passives in the corresponding Spanish sentences involve active verbs with third person non-referential pronominal subjects, as is the case here.

106 The form *in* does not have any known reflexes in modern Omagua, nor have we been able to identify cognates in modern Kokama-Kokamilla (Espínosas Pérez 1989; Vallejos Yopán & Amías Murayari 2015) or other Tupí-Guaraní languages. A postposition would be expected in this position, however, in order to license the oblique argument *tanu* = 1PL.EXCL.MS. We suspect that this form is a scribal error in representing the postposition that actually appeared in this position in an earlier version of the manuscript.

107 There are two things unexpected about the second-person independent pronoun *ene* here. First, in the modern language, only pronominal proclitics may function as nominal possessors (i.e., we expect *ne =*). Second, when a proclitic possessor is present, a modifier consisting of a nominalized stative verb (cf. *nuamai ‘big’) must occur postnominally. Thus we expect the order *ne = ritama nuamai*.

108 It is unusual for heteromorphemic vowel hiatus to be represented as “resolved” in the ecclesiastical texts. This form derives from an underlying *ra = uri* in which the vowel of the pronominal proclitic has been elided following expected vowel hiatus resolution strategies (see §2.2.1.2).

109 There are two things unexpected about the second-person independent pronoun *ene* here. First, in the modern language, only pronominal proclitics may function as nominal possessors (i.e., we expect *ne =*). Second, when a proclitic possessor is present, a modifier consisting of a nominalized stative verb (cf. *nuamai ‘big’) must occur postnominally. Thus we expect the order *ne = ritama nuamai*.

110 The postposition =*kate* exemplifies one of a restricted set of *e:i* correspondences between Old and modern Omagua that runs counter to the more common *e:i* correspondence (see footnote 113).
110 The form *yawi has been glossed as either ‘do’ or ‘make’ at different points in these ecclesiastical texts, depending on which gloss is more appropriate to the discourse context. In modern Omagua, the word ipuraka has come to fill the role of *yawi; ipuraka is cognate to Kakama-Kakamilla ipurakai ‘hunt’, which is reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kakama, and has cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, e.g. Tupinambá porakar ‘hunt/fish for’ (Lemos Barosa [1951] 128).

111 Typically *wetani COORD appears once following a sequence of coordinated elements (see §2.3.7.1). We suggest that its appearance here following each of the coordinated elements yields a reading of ‘both X and Y’, although this is the only attestation of such a construction in these texts, and this construction is not attested in modern Omagua.

112 No reflex of *putari is attested in modern Omagua, nor is a cognate attested in modern Kakama-Kakamilla (Espinosa Pérez 1989, Vallejos Yopán & Amías Murayari 2015). Cognates are widely attested in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, however, and Mello (2000:190) reconstructs the Proto-Tupí-Guaraní verb *potar ‘want’. Our gloss here reflects this etymology, as well as the standard phrasing of the Lord’s Prayer (i.e., ‘thy will be done’). Note that this forms bears no nominalizing morphology, which would be expected if *putari were a verb, leading us to suspect that its appearance here is the result of a calque.

113 This sentence exhibits two irregular correspondences between Old and modern Omagua: e:i (*yume ‘give’ & *supe GOAL); and i:1 (*ikume ‘today’ (modern Omagua ikumi)). Proto-Omagua-Kakama exhibited *e and *i; *e generally raised to i in Omagua, while generally remaining e in Kakama-Kakamilla (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012). The e:i correspondence appears in only a small number of forms, and only word-initially or word-finally. However, the vowels in the Old Omagua forms in question are what would clarify the reconstructed Proto-Tupí-Guaraní forms: *meley (Mello 2000:179) & *tsupé (Jensen 1998:514), which makes these attested forms essential for reconstructing the correct vowel for Proto-Omagua-Kakama (e.g., *yume ‘give’).

The i:1 correspondence is only attested in this single form, and we currently know of no cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages that would clarify the Proto-Omagua-Kakama form. It should be noted that modern Kakama-Kakamilla exhibits the cognate ikume, suggesting that Proto-Omagua-Kakama form was *ikume, and that the modern Omagua exhibits an irregular lowering process for this particular form.
b. tenepata tanu tanueraecmamaicanana mairamania tanu tenepeta tanusawayaracana

c. tenepeta tanu tanueraecmamaicanana 

\[
\text{tenepeta tanu tanu= era -\text{\scriptsize{sim}}a =\text{\scriptsize{mai}} =\text{\scriptsize{kana}}}
\]

forgive\[\text{\tiny{1.0}}\] 1\text{\scriptsize{pl.excl.ms}} 1\text{\scriptsize{pl.excl.ms}}= good -\text{\scriptsize{core.neg}} =\text{\scriptsize{nomoz.inact}} =\text{\scriptsize{pl.ms}}

\[
\text{mairamania tanu tenepeta tanu= sawaya=\text{\tiny{1.0}} =\text{\scriptsize{kana}}}
\]

\[
\text{\text{\scriptsize{exactly.(as) 1pl.excl.ms forgive 1pl.excl.ms= enemy =pl.ms}}}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Forgive us our evils as we forgive our enemies.’

TARGET: ‘Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.’

(4.6) a. \textit{Ename neischari tanu ucucui maca eraecmamai}

b. ename neischari tanu ucucuimaca eraecmamai

c. ename ne\text{\scriptsize{i}}[17]ari tanu ukukuimaka erasimamai.

\[
\text{ename\text{\scriptsize{17}}ne= \text{\scriptsize{ifari tanu}} \text{\scriptsize{ukukui\text{\scriptsize{18}}} =\text{\scriptsize{maka}}\text{\scriptsize{19}}} era}
\]

\[
\text{PROH 2\text{\scriptsize{sg}}= abandon 1\text{\scriptsize{pl.excl.ms fall.from.height =neg.purp good}}}
\]

\[
\text{-\text{\scriptsize{sim}}a =\text{\scriptsize{mai}}}
\]

\[
\text{-\text{\scriptsize{core.neg}} =\text{\scriptsize{nomoz.inact}}}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Don’t abandon [us] lest we fall [into\text{\scriptsize{120}} evil.’

TARGET: ‘Lead us not into temptation.’

(4.7) a. \textit{Ayaisimarae sui nimunuy epetatanu}

b. ayaisi maraesui nimunuyepeta tanu

c. ayaise\text{\scriptsize{121}} maraisu\text{\scriptsize{122}} neyumunuyepeta tanu

\[
\text{ayaise marai =sui ne= yumunuyepeta\text{\scriptsize{123}} tanu}
\]

\[
\text{wicked\text{\scriptsize{124}} thing =\text{\scriptsize{abl ne}= yu\text{\scriptsize{125}}munuyepeta =pl.ms}}
\]

CLOSE: ‘You save us from the wicked thing.’

TARGET: ‘Deliver us from evil.’

\[\text{\tiny{14}}\text{Modern Omagua exhibits no ditransitive constructions whatsoever; recipient arguments require postpositions to license them. We hypothesize that the appearance of tenepeta ‘forgive’ with two arguments, neither of which is licensed by a postposition, is the result of a calque of the Spanish construction \textit{Perdónanos nuestros pecados} or the German construction \textit{Vergib uns unsere Schuld} ‘Forgive us our sins’, depending on the native language of the author of the Omagua Lord’s Prayer.}\]

\[\text{\tiny{15}}\text{The Old Omagua form \textit{sawyara} ‘enemy’ is unattested in modern Omagua, but is cognate to Tupinambá \textit{of}kajar ‘enemy, brother-in-law (male ego)’ (\textsc{Lemos Barbosa} [1951] 114).}\]

\[\text{\tiny{16}}\text{The form \textit{tenepeta} is not attested in modern Omagua, nor have we been able to locate cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages. However, it occurs in contexts in which it must clearly mean ‘forgive’, and we gloss it as such throughout the rest of this work.}\]

\[\text{\tiny{17}}\text{The modern Omagua prohibitive is \textit{inami}, and the form given throughout these texts, namely \textit{ename}, represents an irregular correspondence between Old and modern Omagua \textit{ei} (see footnote\text{\scriptsize{\tiny{113}}}).}\]

\[\text{\tiny{18}}\text{In this sentence, either \textit{\textit{ifari} ‘abandon’ is missing an object or \textit{ukukui ‘fall from height’ is missing a subject, although it is unclear from the context which is the case.}\}

\[\text{\tiny{19}}\text{See also \textsection\text{\scriptsize{2.3.8.1.2}}.}\]

\[\text{\tiny{20}}\text{This sentence lacks a postposition to license \textit{erasima} as an oblique argument to \textit{ukukui ‘fall from height’}.}\]

\[\text{\tiny{21}}\text{Although this form is written in the original orthography with a final \textless\textit{i}>, we change it to \textit{e} here for two reasons:}\]
first, in the Full Catechism, it appears with a final <e> (e.g., see (6.21a)); and second, we would expect the Old Omagua form to end in e, based on the synchronic form aist (see footnote 113).

122 The representation of Old Omagua marai in the ecclesiastical texts varies between <marae> and <marai>. We represent it phonemically as /marai/ (namely with the diphthong /ai/ and not /ae/) because of its modern Omagua reflex marai and its Kokama-Kokamilla cognate mari. The final vowel in the latter form is the result of widespread monophthongization (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012), and suggests that the second vowel of the Proto-Omagua-Kokama diphthong was *i. Interestingly, the orthographic representations of this form (and forms derived from it) are in complementary distribution across the texts here: <marae> appears in the Lord’s Prayer and Full Catechism to the exclusion of <marai>; and <marai> appears in the Catechism Fragment and in the passages from Uriarte’s diaries, to the exclusion of <marae>.

123 See footnote 174.

124 Except for this instance, we translate Old Omagua ayaise as ‘wicked’ in both CLOSE and TARGET translation lines, which is in line with the meaning of its modern Omagua reflex aist (see footnote 121). With the exception of its appearance here, in these texts it modifies nouns denoting persons, particularly in order to convey the idea of ‘bad Christians’ (as opposed to ‘good Christians’). We take the extension of ‘wicked’ to ‘evil’ to be a result of Jesuit authors’ searching for an antonym to era ‘good’ (see §9.3.3), which does not exist in Omagua (at least in modern Omagua). Why erasimamai ‘evil’ is not employed here is unclear, since elsewhere it used to translate ‘evil’ into Old Omagua (e.g., see (6.12b)).
Chapter 5

Catechism Fragment

5.1 Bibliographic History and Previous Linguistic Study

5.1.1 González Suárez (1904)

The Catechism Fragment that we analyze in this chapter was first published in 1904 by Federico González Suárez (b. 1844 Quito – d. 1917 Quito), then Bishop of Ibarra, as an appendix to his Prehistoria ecuatoriana, which sought to clarify the pre-Columbian history of the region that would later become the nation of Ecuador. Other appendices to this work include ecclesiastical texts and wordlists in Quechua and a number of other lowland languages (González Suárez 1904:43-75). González Suárez simply presents the texts, without word-by-word translations or other linguistic treatment.

Regarding the provenance of the manuscript on which the Catechism Fragment is based, González Suárez remarks:

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 jesuita del siglo décimo octavo: creemos, sin peligro ninguno de equivocarnos, que fue del Padre De Franciscis, siciliano, que estaba en Mainas, cuando los jesuitas 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 le servirá a Ud.: es cosa vieja, y parece que sólo a Ud. le servirá”.

(González Suárez 1904:75, emphasis ours)

125Ibarra was an Ecuadorian diocese within the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Archdiocese of Quito.
126González Suárez was Archbishop of Quito from 1905. For biographical details, see Saville (1918).
127Translation (ours):

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 Maynas when the Jesuits were expelled from the missions by order of Charles III in 1767, since from that Father
The Jesuit missionary mentioned in this passage is Ignacio Maria Franciscis (b. 1705 Palermo – d. 1777 Palermo), and although González Suárez is likely correct in identifying Franciscis as the source of the manuscripts, it is highly unlikely that he was the author of the Omagua Catechism Fragment.

Regarding the content of the manuscripts, González Suárez (1904:75) continues:

El manuscrito contiene toda la doctrina cristiana en el idioma de los Icaguates y de los Yameos: en el idioma de los Omaguas no tiene las oraciones, sino solamente las preguntas: además tiene dos 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.

Crucially, it should be noted that the original manuscript apparently contained a complete Omagua catechism and not only the fragment printed in González Suárez (1904), and reproduced in Chapter 5, as indicated by the following footnote:

En nuestro manuscrito no hay más que las preguntas y las respuestas de la doctrina en la lengua omagua: faltan enteramente las oraciones; por esto transcribimos sólo doce preguntas. (González Suárez 1904:66)

The fate and current location of the original manuscript is unknown to us. Note that the text that we analyze in §5.2 is the original González Suárez (1904) version, and not the Rivet (1910) version, which was based on the González Suárez version, or the Cabral (1995) version, which was based on the Rivet (1910) version.

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”.

Jouanen (1943:732). De Velasco ([1789]1981:518) gives Viterbo as the place of death, and he is likely correct, since Uriarte ([1776]1986:290) also indicates that Franciscis was residing in Viterbo when Uriarte was writing the second part of his diaries, no earlier than February 1773 (Uriarte [1776]1986 187).

Translation (ours):

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

Translation (ours):

In our manuscript there are not more than the questions and answers to the doctrine in Omagua: the prayers are lacking entirely; because of that we transcribe only twelve questions.

128 Jouanen [1943] 732. De Velasco ([1789]1981) 518 gives Viterbo as the place of death, and he is likely correct, since Uriarte ([1776]1986) 290 also indicates that Franciscis was residing in Viterbo when Uriarte was writing the second part of his diaries, no earlier than February 1773 (Uriarte [1776]1986 187).

129 Translation (ours):

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

130 Translation (ours):

In our manuscript there are not more than the questions and answers to the doctrine in Omagua: the prayers are lacking entirely; because of that we transcribe only twelve questions.
5.1.2 Rivet (1910)

The Catechism Fragment was analyzed and republished in Rivet (1910), in conjunction with the Omagua Lord’s Prayer, as discussed in §4.1. As with his treatment of the Omagua Lord’s Prayer, Rivet provides mostly accurate morphemic segmentations and French glosses, additionally altering the graphemic representation to avoid orthographic choices inherited from the original Spanish orthography. For this latter reason, González Suárez’s version remains essential for obtaining an accurate version of the orthography in the original manuscript.

5.1.3 Cabral (1995)

Cabral’s (1995:372-383) re-analysis of the Catechism Fragment represents the first modern treatment of this text, and indeed, the only modern treatment of any of the four Omagua ecclesiastical texts other than our own. Cabral took Rivet’s (1910) text as the starting point for developing a phonemic representation of the text, in much the same spirit as the phonemic re-interpretation we carry out in the present work. Cabral’s analysis benefited from her field-based research on Brazilian Kokama grammar, and she provides both morphemic segmentations and morpheme glosses for the texts, as well as free translations.

Since Cabral’s re-analysis is the only other modern treatment of an Omagua ecclesiastical text, we annotate the text presented below in some detail at those points where our analysis diverges significantly from hers. In many cases, the divergences we remark on probably arise from the fact that Cabral was relying on her analysis of modern Brazilian Kokama to parse the Old Omagua text. Although modern Kokama and modern Omagua are closely related languages, they are not identical, and the difference between modern Brazilian Kokama and Old Omagua is even greater. Cabral also attempted to push the morphological segmentation as far as possible (see footnote 135), in some cases yielding segmentations that are, with the benefits of hindsight afforded by further work on the Kokama-Kokamilla of Peru (Vallejos 2004, 2005, 2006, 2009, 2010a-b, 2014), Omagua (Michael et al. in prep), and Proto-Omagua-Kokama (O’Hagan 2011, 2014, O’Hagan & Wauters 2012, O’Hagan et al. 2013, Wauters & O’Hagan 2011), clearly incorrect. It is important to point out, however, that despite these points, Cabral’s analysis of this text constitutes a major improvement over Rivet’s (1910) analysis.

5.2 Text of Catechism Fragment

(5.1) a. i. *Icuata epe ta zupe, amititipa Dios?*

ii. Icuata epe tazupe, amititipa Dios?

iii. *ikuata epe tasupe, amititipa Dios?*

\[
\text{ikua } -\text{ta}^{131} \text{ epe ta=} =\text{supe amiti } =\text{tipa Dios}
\]

\[
\text{know } -\text{CAUS 2PL 1SG.MS=} =\text{GOAL EXST } =\text{INTERR God}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Teach me, does God exist?’

b. i. *Amiti mura.*

ii. Amiti mura.

iii. amiti mura.
**amiti mura**  
**EXST 3SG.MS**  
CLOSE: ‘He exists.’

(5.2)  
(a)  
(i) *Maraitipa Dios mura?*  
(ii) Maraitipa Dios mura?  
(iii) maraitipa Dios mura?  
\[ marai =tipa \quad Dios mura \]  
what =INTERR God 3SG.MS  
CLOSE: ‘What is God?’

(b)  
(i) *Eguate mai ritama, aiquiara tuyuca ritama, upacatu maraincama mucui, yague-quetara, guacutatara: yenenara semai viranu, muriai Dios mura.*  
(ii) Eguate mai ritama, aiquiara tuyuca ritama, upacatu maraincama mucui, yague-quetara, guacutatara: yenenara semai viranu, muriai Dios mura.  
(iii) iwati mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu  
\[ be.	ext{high.up} =\text{NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all} =\text{INTSF} \]  
\[ marai =kana =\text{mukui yawiki -tara} \]  
\[ wakuta -tara \]  
\[ \text{thing} =\text{PL.MS} =\text{COM make -NOMZ:ACT carry.in.arm -NOMZ:ACT} \]  
yene= yara =semai weranu Dios mura  
\[ 1\text{PL.INCL} =\text{master =FOC:VER} \]  
\[ \text{COORD thus} - \text{God 3SG.MS} \]  
CLOSE: ‘He who makes the high village, this land village and all things, he who holds [us] in his arm, as well as our true master, thus is God.’  
TARGET: ‘The Creator of Heaven, Earth and all things, the protector, and our true Lord as well, thus is God.’

---

131 The use of *ikuata* here is unexpected. First, in modern Omagua, *ikuata* is best glossed as ‘tell’, and its use presupposes that the recipient of the information related by the communicative action in question is unaware of the state of affairs thereby related. This makes little sense in the context of a priest receiving answers to catechistic questions. Rather, we would expect *kumesa* ‘say’ to be used, as it is in the Full Catechism (see (6.14)). Second, the argument structure that *ikuata* exhibits here is incorrect for the modern language, and we strongly suspect it to be incorrect for Old Omagua. In particular, the recipient of the information should be treated as the direct object, not an oblique argument. The sentence given here appears to extend the syntax of *kumesa*, for which a recipient would be encoded with =supe (since the verb does not have a core recipient argument), to *ikuata*. That the goal argument in *ikuata* should be encoded as a direct object follows from the fact that it is the causativized form of *ikua* ‘know’.

132 When *marai* ‘thing’ is followed by =kana PL.MS in the ecclesiastical texts, an <n> appears between these two morphemes. We take this to be evidence that Old Omagua retained traces of the nasality that was historically associated with the final vowels of these words, as attested in cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages such as Tupinambá *mará* ‘thing’ (Lemos Barbosa 1951:83). In modern Omagua, nasality never surfaces in this word. We represent the form in question as *marai* in the interlinearization.

133 The etymology of *weranu* has confounded many authors, beginning with Adelung (1813:609-610). Hervás y Pan-duro (1787a), Adelung (1813), and Rivet (1910) translate it as ‘also’, but no author gives any obvious reason for doing so. Cabral (1995:374) does not provide a gloss for this form. However, as we discuss in §2.3.7.1 *weranu* has clear Tupí-Guaraní cognates that justify it being glossed as ‘also’. 
(5.3)  

a.  

i.  *Marepue tipa, Dios yagueque upacatu maraincama?*  
   Marepupetipa, Dios yagueque upacatu maraincama?  
   maripupetipa Dios yawiki upakatu marainkana?  
   
   \[ \text{mar}^{137} = \text{pupe} = \text{tipa} \quad \text{Dios yawiki upa} = \text{katu} \quad \text{marain} = \text{kana} \]  
   what =INSTR =INTERR God make all =INTSF thing =PL.MS  
   CLOSE: ‘With what did God make all things?’  

b.  

i.  *Ra cumesia pupe purai.*  
   Racumesiapupe purai.  
   rakumesapupe purai.  
   
   \[ \text{ra=} = \text{kumesa} = \text{pupe} = \text{purai} \]  
   3SG.MS= word=INSTR FOC:CONTR  
   CLOSE: ‘With his words.’

---

134 Our analysis of this form differs from [Cabrál (1995:374)], who segments it as *aikia + ra* ‘this’ + LOC. Cabrál’s analysis is untenable for a number of reasons. First, there is no known locative *ra* in Omagua (according to our own work on the language) or in Kokama-Kokamilla (Cabrál herself does not describe one, nor does [Vallejos (2010a:279-318)]). Second, morphemes with spatial semantics in Omagua are NP-enclitics, and as such, do not attach to prenominal elements such as demonstratives (as it does according to Cabral’s analysis), but rather to the right edge of the entire NP (most typically the noun). Third, the demonstrative is invariably *aikia* in the ecclesiastical texts, even when there is no location expressed anywhere in the sentence, as is the case here. We reconstruct the masculine speech proximal demonstrative to Proto-Omagua-Kokama as *aikia* ([cf. Omagua *akia* and Kokama-Kokamilla *ikia* (Vallejos 2010a:214)]). We currently cannot account for the presence of a final *ra* in the Old Omagua form, and have found no obvious cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages (e.g., see [Jensen (1998:550-552)]).

135 Here our analysis differs significantly from [Cabrál (1995:374)], who segments *=semai as se + mai* ‘sweet’ + REL ‘sweet, who is sweet’. While this is a possible segmentation of this sequence of phonemes (i.e., Omagua *s* ‘be sweet’ and *=mai NOMZ:INACT*), we argue that the form that appears here is actually the monomorphemic verum focus marker *=semai*. There are several pieces of evidence that support this conclusion. First, *=semai is cognate to the morpheme -sene, found in the varieties Kokama-Kokamilla spoken in Peru, which [Vallejos (2010a:269)] describes as an emphatic marker. Second *=semai is attested in these texts appearing on elements in which a construal of “sweetness” is implausible, such as numerals (see (5.10b)). Finally, in modern Omagua, *s* ‘be sweet’ may only be used literally, i.e., to predicate a property of edible items, and is not used metaphorically as a term of positive evaluation or praise, as Cabral in effect claims with her translation.

136 The modern Omagua reflex of this word is *mutia*, and we cannot currently account for the presence of the final *i* in the Old Omagua form. Note that in its one other attestation in these texts, it is also *mutiai* (see (6.34b)). [Cabrál (1995:375)] segments this form as *mari + ay, 3 + ‘Compl’. However, this analysis is untenable given that: 1) there is no pronoun *mari* in either Omagua or Kokama-Kokamilla (Cabrál herself does not describe one (1995:329)), nor does [Vallejos (2010a:201)]; and 2) the Omagua cognate to *ay* is actually *avi*, and moreover, it appears only clause-initially, and not in second position, as Cabrál’s analysis here would have it.

137 In the ecclesiastical texts the form *matai ‘what’* is considerably more common than *mari ‘what’*, but here we find an example of the latter form. The appearance of *mari* is intriguing in light of the fact that, in modern Omagua, *mari* is best glossed as ‘what’, while *matai* is best glossed as ‘thing’. However, it is clear from the ecclesiastical texts, and via reconstruction, that that Proto-Omagua-Kokama *matai* was polysemous, and could mean either ‘what’ or ‘thing’. That it appears as *mari* here, and in modern Omagua for that matter, is unexpected, given that the monophthongization processes necessary to yield *mari* from *matai*, with the exception of this form, are known to have occurred only in Kokama-Kokamilla, and not in Omagua. The presence of the reduced form here might be a sign of early Kokama-Kokamilla influence on Omagua.

138 Here as well as in modern Omagua, *kumesa* may function as a verb meaning ‘say’, or as a zero-derived noun meaning ‘word, language’ (e.g., *umawa kumesa* ‘the Omagua language’).
(5.4) a. i. **Macate tipa Dios Juriti?**
   ii. Macatetipa Dios Juriti?
   iii. makatetipa Dios yuriti?
   makate =tipa Dios yuriti
   where =INTERR God be.in.place
   CLOSE: ‘Where is God?’

   b. i. **Eguatemai ritama cate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamicate, muriapai, Vayuriti veranu.**
   ii. Eguatemai ritamicate, aiquiara tuyuca ritamicate, muriapai, vayuriti veranu.
   iii. iwatimai ritamakate, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate, muriapai rayuriti weranu.
   iwatimai =mai ritama =kate aikiara tuyuka ritama =kate
   be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =LOC DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC
   muriapai ra= yuriti weranu
   uninterrupted 3SG.MS= be.in.place COORD
   CLOSE: ‘In the high village, and at the same time in this land village he is.’
   TARGET: ‘He is always in Heaven as well as on Earth.’

(5.5) a. i. **Aguerepa Dios amiti?**
   ii. Aguerepa Dios amiti?
   iii. awipipa Dios amiti?
   awiri =pa Dios amiti
   how.many =INTERR God EXST
   CLOSE: ‘How many Gods are there?’

   b. i. **Uyepe titi.**
   ii. Uyepe titi.
   iii. uyepe[139] titi.
   uyepe titi
   one be.alone
   CLOSE: ‘Only one.’

(5.6) a. i. **Guaraschi, Yasie, Sesuscana, Hueracana, eguatacana veranu, tomaritipa aiquiracana Dios mura?**
   ii. Guaraschi, Yasie, Sesuscana, Hueracana, eguatacana veranu, to maritipa aiquiracana Dios mura?
   iii. kwa =raji, yasi, sesukana, wirakana, iwatakanan weranu, to maritipa aiquirakana Dios mura?
   kwara =raji sesu =kana wira =kana iwata =kana weranu to mari
   sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS forest =PL.MS COORD
   what =tipa aikiara =kana Dios mura
   =INTERR DEM.PROX.MS.PRO =PL.MS God 3SG.MS

[139]In modern Omagua the word for ‘one’ is wipi. However, we consider the orthographic representation here to be faithful to the proper phonemic representation of the time, given cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, e.g., Tupinambá ojepé ‘one’ (Lemos Barbosa 1951:116).
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CLOSE: ‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds and the forests, which of these is God?’

b. i. **Nati marai aiquiara Dios mura, Dios yagueque mai puracana, puravanu.**


iii. nati marai aikiara Dios mura. Dios yawikimaipurakana purai ranu.

*nati marai  aikiara  Dios mura*

NEG.INDEF DEM.PROX.MS.PRO God 3SG.MS

*Dios yawiki =mai =puia =kana purai ranu*

God make =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS FOC:CONTR 3PL.MS

CLOSE: ‘God is none of these. They are what God made.’

TARGET: ‘God is none of these things. They are God’s creations.’

(5.7) a. i. **Mareiqua tipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aiquiara maraincama?**

ii. Mareiquatipa Dios yaguepe jupacatu aiquiara maraincama?

iii. maraikuatipa Dios yawiki^142^ upakatu aikiara marainkama^143^

---

140 There is no grammatical morpheme or lexical item in modern Omagua that would elucidate the function of *<to>* here, and we have been unable to locate plausibly related cognate morphemes in other Tupi-Guaraní languages. However, we entertain the possibility that the original orthographic sequence *<tomari>* here is related to the original orthographic sequence *<ti marai>* in the following response (i.e., where the first *<i>* in the latter is a copyist error and the variation between *marai* and *marai* is attested elsewhere in the ecclesiastical texts). If this reasoning is on the right track, then it is the entire sequence *<tomari>* that must mean ‘which’, and the initial sequence *<na>* that must function as a negator of some sort in the response. While modern Omagua does show a negative indefinite pronoun ‘no(ne)’ (see *nimakatimai*) that consists of a negator *ni* plus ‘which’, words for ‘what’ *marai* and ‘which’ *makatimai* show no trace of any initial sequence resembling either *<to>* or *<ti>*.

141 Our analysis here differs from that of Cabral (1995:377), who suggests that *<puravanu>* is actually *pura awa nu EMPH ‘person’ PLUR. However, this analysis is untenable for a number of reasons. First, in both modern Omagua and modern Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos Yepán 2009:400-402, 2010a:679-709), *=puia* appears to the right of the nominal root it occurs with, and to the left of any plural enclitics; under Cabral’s analysis, however, it appears to the left of the nominal root. And second, *=mu* is specifically the feminine genderlect form of the plural, which poses a problem, since the ecclesiastical texts are otherwise written entirely in the masculine genderlect. We suggest that the orthographic sequence *<puravanu>* results from a scribal error in copying the forms *puistai ranu*; we suggest that the final *i* of *puistai* was lost in the copying of the original manuscript, and that the original handwritten *<r>* was misinterpreted as *<v>*; an extremely common occurrence throughout the texts. Perhaps the most convincing evidence in favor our interpretation of *puia* as a truncated form of *puistai* is that fact in the parallel clause in the Full Catechism (see (6.6b), the corresponding form is given as *<purai>*. If the interpretation of *<puravanu>* as *puistai ranu* is granted, we find that the free form *purai* occurs in its expected syntactic position (see §2.3.9.1), and that *ranu* encodes the correct number for the argument in the non-verbal predicate, namely third-person plural (see §2.3.10). Under the interpretation here, the form of the 3PL.MS pronoun found in the Catechism Fragment differs from that found in the Full Catechism (i.e., *ranu*). However, this is not as problematic as it may seem, as we reconstruct the Proto-Omagua-Kokama 3PL.MS pronoun to be *u-final (*ranu)*, along with the 1PL.EXCL.MS pronoun (*tanu*) (O’Hagan et al. 2013). The latter form is in fact attested in the Omagua Lord’s Prayer. Thus it appears that different ecclesiastical texts used different forms of the 3PL.MS pronoun, perhaps due to Omagua-internal dialectal diversity, or due to ongoing language change in the time between the preparation of the two versions of the catechism.

142 We replace the original orthographic *<p>* with *k* here, given that the word must clearly be *yawiki*, based on its translation and its orthographic representations elsewhere in the Catechism Fragment and the parallel question in the Full Catechism (see (6.7a)).

143 Even though Cabral (1995:375) previously segments the same sequence as *marain kana* ‘thing’ PLUR, as we do,
maraik =ikua =tipa Dios yawiki upa =katu aikiara marain =kana what =REAS =INTERR God make all =INTSF DEM.PROX.MS thing =PL.MS
CLOSE: ‘Why did God make all these things?’

b. i. Agoa era zenoni.
   ii. Awa erazenoni.
   iii. awa erasenuni.

   awa era =senuni
man good =PURP
CLOSE: ‘So that man is good.’
TARGET: ‘For the well-being of man.’

(5.8) a. i. Mareiqua tipa Dios yagueque, varanu mura agoa?
   ii. Mareiquatipa Dios yagueque varanu mura agoa?
   iii. maraikuatipa Dios yagueque wera mura awa?

   marai =ikua =tipa Dios yawiki wera mura awa
what =REAS =INTERR God create COORD 3SG.MS man
CLOSE: ‘Why did God also make man?’

b. i. Dios semai raicua zenoni, mura va ipuschita zenoni, racumesse puracana, va zenu zenoni; umanumaipura rayanaschina zenoni eguatemai, vitamacate.
   ii. Diossemai raicuazenoni, mura vaipuschitazenoni, racumessepuracana vazenuzenoni; umanumaipura rayanaschinazenoni eguatemai vitamacate.
   iii. Diossemai raikuasenuni, mura rasafitasenuni, rakumesapurakana rasenusenuni, umanumaipura rayawajimasenuni iwaimai ritamakate.

   Dios =semai ra= ikua =senuni mura ra= safita =senuni
God =FOC:VER 3SG.MS= know =PURP 3SG.MS 3SG.MS= love =PURP
ra= kumesa =pura ra= kana ra= senu =senuni umanu
3SG.MS= word =NOM.PST =PL.MS 3SG.MS= hear =PURP die
=mai =pura ra= yawajima =senuni iwati
=NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST 3SG.MS= arrive =PURP be.high.up
=mai =ritama =kate
=NOMZ:INACT village =LOC

Here [Cabral, 1995:378] segments marainkana as mara in kana ‘thing’ LOC PLUR. However, the i of marain is clearly part of the root, and the presence of the n has previously been accounted for (see footnote 132). Moreover, as we have discussed elsewhere (see footnote [108]), there is no independent evidence a locative in in Omagua or Kokama-Kokamilla [Vallejos 2010a:279-318].

144Note that in the parallel clause in the Full Catechism (see (6.7b)), the Omagua sentence is more faithful to the expected theological message (i.e., that God made the things of the world for the good of man, not so that man would be good). The author of the parallel clause in the Full Catechism appears to have been more aware of the relatively subtle semantic difference between the construction that uses the purposive =senuni (as appears here), and the construction that involves the absolutive nominalizer =mai and nominal purposive =ri (as appears in the parallel sentence in the Full Catechism).
CLOSE: ‘So that he may truly know God, so that he may love him, so that he may hear his words, so that the dead may arrive in the high village.’

TARGET: ‘So that he may truly know God, so that he may love him, so that he may hear his words, so that the dead may arrive in Heaven.’

(5.9)  

a. i. *Ahua tipa Dios?*  
   ii. Ahuatipa Dios?  
   iii. awatipa Dios?  
      
   *awa =tipa Dios*  
   *who =INTERR God*  

CLOSE: ‘Who is God?’


iii. Dios papa, Dios taira, Dios espíritu santo. aikiara musapirika personakana uyepe titi Dios.

*Dios papa Dios taira Dios espíritu santo*  
*God father God son.MALE.EGO God Holy Spirit*  

*aikiara musapirika persona =kana uyepe Dios*  
*DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one be.alone God*  

CLOSE: ‘God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit. These three persons are one God alone.’

(5.10)  

a. i. *Aiquiara musa puereca Persona cana, roaya tipa musa puereca Dios?*  
   ii. Aiquiara musapuereca Personacana, roayatipa musapuereca Dios?  
   iii. aikiara musapirika personakana, roayatipa musapirika Dios?  
      
   *aikiara musapirika persona =kana roay =tipa musapirika Dios*  
   *DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS NEG =INTERR three God*  

CLOSE: ‘These three persons, are they not three Gods?’

b. i. *Roaya mura musa puereca Dios: adquiara musa puereca Persona cana, uyepe semai Dios mura, Santisima Trinidad nanirachira.*  

---

145 Here *mura* 3SG.MS and *awa* ‘man’ are coreferential; this is a grammatical construction in Omagua.

146 Our re-interpretation of orthographic `<ipuschita>` as *sa>fita* ‘love’ is fairly radical, but plausible. Note that *ipufita*, although a grammatical Omagua verb (meaning ‘make heavy’, from *ipufi* ‘be heavy’ and -*ta CAUS*), is nowhere in these texts, or in modern Omagua, attested to mean ‘love’ (and moreover, ‘make heavy’ would be nonsensical in the given context). Also note that *sa>fita* is widely attested in these texts and in modern Omagua as ‘love’, and appears in the parallel clause in the Full Catechism (see (6.8b)), where the orthographic representation `<vaschita>` is much less controversially construable as *sa>fita*. We also believe that it is relatively easy for a handwritten `<s>` in the manuscript to have been interpreted as a short `<i>` and a `<p>` with a relatively short tail.

147 For an explanation of our phonemic representation of this form, see footnote 139.
ii. Roaya mura musapuereca Dios: adquiara musapuereca Personacana, uyepesemai Dios mura, Santisima Trinidadnani rachira.

iii. Roaya mura musapuika Dios. aikia musapurika personakana uyepesemai Dios mura. santisima trinidadnani rafira.

Roaya musapuika Dias
NEG 3SG.MS three God

ai kiria musapirika persona =kana uyepe = semai Dios mura
DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one = FOC:VER God 3SG.MS

santisima trinidad =nani ra = fira
Holy Trinity = FOC:EXCL 3SG.MS = name

CLOSE: ‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are truly one God. The Holy Trinity is its name.’

5.11 a. i. Aiquiara muesa puereca Persona cana zui manis mai tipa ahuaguaca emenua?

ii. Aiquiara muesapuereca Personacanazui, manismaitipa ahua guaca emenua?

iii. aikia musapurika personakanasui, maniamaitipa awa uwaka long.ago?

Aiquiara musapirika persona =kana = sui maniamai tipa awa uwaka transform long.ago

CLOSE: ‘Of these three people, which transformed into a man long ago?’

TARGET: ‘Of these three people, which became man?’

b. i. Dios Taegra semai, Ahuaguaca emenua.

ii. Dios Taegrasemai, Ahua guaca emenua.

iii. Dios tairasemai awa uwaka inimua.

Dios taira = semai awa uwaka inimua
God son.MALE.EGO = FOC:VER man transform long.ago

Our analysis here differs from Cabral (1995:380), who segments roaya as roa ya NEG + 3. However, Cabral’s segmentation is untenable for a number of reasons. Although the negative morpheme roa is indeed attested in modern Omagua, Cabral identifies the other element she segments off as the Kokama-Kokamilla 3SG.FS pronoun ya= (see Vallejos (2010a:201)), which is not found in modern Omagua (see Table 2.2). Moreover, this is a feminine genderlect form; but recall that the ecclesiastical materials are written in the masculine genderlect (see footnote 141), making the identification of <ya> with the Kokama-Kokamilla feminine genderlect pronoun form doubly problematic. A second difficulty with Cabral’s analysis is posed by the position of <ya>: pronominal proclitics in Omagua never attach to the interrogative enclitic =tipa, as they attach only to nominal, verbal, and postpositional hosts. Finally, analyzing <ya> as a pronoun of any type in this sentence is problematic for syntactic reasons, since that the verbal argument is already expressed by mura, the 3SG.MS pronoun (note that this forces Cabral to gloss mura as EMPH). The <ya> sequence nevertheless remains perplexing: see §2.3.4.1 for additional discussion of roaya. See also Cabral (1995:381) for additional problematic segmentations involving a supposed 3SG.FS ya=.

Here the placement of = semai is unexpected, as it breaks up the numeral uyepe from kumesamai, thus not appearing in second position relative to the initial entire noun phrase, as seen elsewhere in these texts. We suspect this to be an error on the part of the Jesuit author in question.
CLOSE: ‘The son of God truly transformed into man long ago.’
TARGET: ‘The son of God truly became man.’

(5.12) a. i. Mareicua tipa Dios Teagra Ahuaguaca emenua?
ii. Mareicuatipa Dios Teagra Ahua guaca emenua?
iii. maraikuatipa Dios taira awa uwaka iminua?

CLOSE: ‘Why did the son of God transform into a man long ago?’
TARGET: ‘Why did the son of God become man?’

b. i. Yenne va zaschita raschi, yenne eracema mai caza zui; yenne rusui epeta zenoni, eguatemai ritamacati; yenne rayavaschimata zenoni veranu.
ii. Yenne vazaschitaraschi, yenneeracemamaicazazui yenne rusuiepetazenoni, eguatemai ritamacati yenne rayavaschimatazenoni veranu.
iii. yene rasafitarasi, yeneerasmamaikanasui yene rausupetazenuni, iwataimai ritakakate yene rayawasimatasenuni weranu.

CLOSE: ‘Since he loves us, in order to save us from our evils and make us arrive in the high village.’
TARGET: ‘Since he loves us, in order to save us from our evils and take us to Heaven.’

150 Complements of uwaka ‘transform’ must take =ta NOM.PURP, as does the corresponding complement in the parallel clause in the Full Catechism (see (6.11a)).
151 See footnote 150.
152 The use of ‘since’ is meant to translate the non-assertive marker =nafi NASS, and to indicate that the proposition ‘he loves us’ is presupposed, or non-asserted.
Chapter 6

Full Catechism

6.1 Bibliographic History and Previous Linguistic Study

6.1.1 Espinosa Pérez (1935)

The complete Omagua catechism presented here was first published in 1935 by Lucas Espinosa Pérez (b. 1895 Villabasta, Spain – d. 1975 Guecho, Spain), as part of his historical, ethnographic, and linguistic treatise on the Kokamas and Omaguas of Peru, Los tupí del oriente peruano. Espinosa Pérez was a Augustinian missionary who began missionary work in northern Peruvian Amazonia in 1920, working closely with the Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla communities of the Huallaga, Ucayali, Marañón, Amazon, Itaya, and Nanay river basins, and eventually becoming a fluent speaker of both languages.

Espinosa first obtained the text through Constantino Bayle (b. 1882 Zarza de Granadilla, Spain – d. 1953 Madrid), a Spanish Jesuit who was preparing for publication the manuscript of the diaries of Manuel Joaquín Uriarte (b. 1720 Zurbano, Spain – d. 1802 Vitoria, Spain), a Spanish Jesuit missionary who worked in the Maynas missions prior to the Jesuit expulsion. Bayle sought Espinosa’s help in transliterating a set of ecclesiastical texts in lowland Amazonian languages that accompanied the diaries, one of which was the complete catechism in Omagua that we analyze here (see §6.1.2).

It is clear that Espinosa’s version of the catechism represents a significant, but not entirely

153 Uriarte’s exact date of death is elusive. Bayle ([1952]1986:57) claims that a margin note in the volume containing Uriarte’s original 1720 baptismal record indicates that he died “sobre el año 1802” (“around the year 1802”). Jouanen (1943:747) gives 1800, but indicates that he is uncertain. Various authors have simply chosen a date (e.g., Cipolletti [2001:241], Downes [2005:156], Negro Tua [2007:106]).

154 Within the appendices to Uriarte’s diaries, Quechua texts far outnumber texts in any other indigenous languages (Omagua (Tupí-Guaraní), Tikuna (isolate, see footnote 247) and Yameo (Peba-Yaguan, extinct)), and include (with Spanish titles): El “pater noster”; El ave maría; El credo; La salve regina; Los mandamientos de la ley de Dios; Los mandamientos de la santa madre iglesia son cinco; Los siete sacramentos de la santa iglesia; La confesión general que se dice después del rezo; Acto de contrición que dice el padre y repiten todos, acabada la misa, los domingos, fiestas, sábados y antes del rosario, a la tarde; Canciones que cantaban los niños, en tiempo de misa, en Omaguas, después de rezar con los misterios de fe; De la confesión y dolor; Del santísimo sacramento – jueves; Del santísimo virgen – sábado; Sobre los novísimos; Del purgatorio – el lunes; Sobre el cielo – en las fiestas; Acto de contrición – viernes; Otro en otro tono (Uriarte [1776a:1952a:211-227, [1776b:1986:598-613].

155 The puzzling outcome that Espinosa’s publication of the text preceded Bayle’s is likely due to the disruptive effects of the Spanish Civil War, which delayed Bayle’s preparation of Uriarte’s diaries.
consistent reworking of the original manuscript. Espinosa Pérez (1935:146, emphasis ours) characterized his editorial work in preparing the original manuscript for publication in the following way:

La copia del original me fue entregado 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. Además, lo he traducido al español, palabra por palabra, en un orden riguroso correspondiente al texto. En esa forma lo pongo en este Apéndice como documento interesantísimo y como base de comparación con el texto Kokama que va más adelante.

Interestingly, despite Espinosa Pérez’s efforts to “correct” the original manuscript, his decisions on the representation of the Omagua in the text appear to have been ignored by Bayle in his later publication (see below), since Espinosa’s and Bayle’s representations vary greatly, particularly with regard to word breaks. It should be noted that the word boundaries in Espinosa’s version correspond closely to the ones we ultimately chose, based on our analysis of the manuscript as reproduced in Uriarte ([1776]1952a), but that the word word boundaries in the latter published version coincide in a haphazard fashion with those of the Old Omagua words, as we analyze them. We assume that Bayle ultimately opted for a representation that was more faithful to the original manuscript, despite Espinosa’s cogent and linguistically informed analysis of the manuscript.

### 6.1.2 Uriarte ([1776]1952a), Uriarte ([1776]1986)

As alluded to above, the complete catechism was also published in 1952 by Constantino Bayle as an appendix to the two-volume diaries of Manuel Uriarte, who worked in the Maynas missions from 1750-1768, and was missionary in San Joaquín de Omaguas from 1756 until 1764 (Uriarte [1776]1986). The 1952 edition was republished in a single volume in 1986, and because of greater circulation and availability to the reader, page references here reflect the latter edition, although we also consulted the 1952 version. In addition to the complete catechism in Omagua, the appendices contain several ecclesiastical texts in Quechua, Tikuna (isolate), and Yameo (Peba-Yaguan, extinct) (see Uriarte ([1776]1986:597-624)).

Our own analysis is based on the Bayle version of the catechism, because it is not always clear in which cases Espinosa Pérez chose to modify the original orthographic representation in the manuscript (both in terms of individual graphemes and word breaks), and we wished to base

---

The copy of the original was given to me for correction, which I have undertaken by joining or separating what was necessary, but preserving intact symbols and letters, except in those cases in which the improper use of those [letters] resulted in a conceptual error or altered the true sense of the phrase. Furthermore, I have translated it into Spanish, word for word, in a rigorous order that corresponds to the text [i.e., the Omagua word order]. In that form I place it in this Appendix as one of the most interesting of documents and as a base of comparison with the Kokama text that appears subsequently.

---

The manuscript of Uriarte’s diaries were previously part of the private collection of the Spanish bibliophile Antonio Grañño Martínez (b. c1870 – d. 1945 Madrid) – see Pérez Bustamante (1945).
our analysis on the version that, as we believe, most closely represents the original manuscript. We have, however consulted Espinosa Pérez’s version in those cases in which we were unable to interpret the Omagua in Bayle’s text ourselves, cases in which Espinosa Pérez occasionally provided an alternate, and we think credible, interpretation of the orthography. Given his personal knowledge of Omagua, we suspect that Espinosa was able to make more informed decisions about ambiguous graphemes in the handwritten manuscript (e.g., <n> versus <r>), whereas Bayle had to rely solely on his visual inspection of the manuscript.

The complete Omagua catechism apparently did not include a Spanish translation, since neither Espinosa nor Bayle provide one. There does, however, exist a translation for a Quechua catechism (Uriarte [1776]1986:602-607), which closely – but not entirely – parallels the Omagua one. These translations have guided our interpretation of the general intent for many passages in the text, which has been important, since the literal translation of quite a number of passages is rather enigmatic. Please see §3.1 for details about the inclusion of the original Spanish in our interlinear representation.

### 6.2 Text of Full Catechism

(6.1) a. i. Taegra cana pecumessa tasupe amititipa Dios?
   ii. taegracana pecumessa tasupe, amititipa dios?
   iii. tairakana, pekumesa tasupe, amititipa Dios?
   
   `taira =kana pe= kumesa ta= =supe amiti =tipa Dios
   son.MALE.EGO =PL.MS 2PL= say 1SG.MS= =GOAL EXST =INTERR God
   
   CLOSE: ‘Children, you tell me, does God exist?’
   TARGET: ‘Children, tell me, does God exist?’
   SPANISH: ‘Decidme, hijos, ¿hay Dios?’

   b. i. Amiti mura.
   ii. Amiti mura.
   iii. amiti mura.
   
   `amiti mura
   EXST 3SG.MS
   
   CLOSE: ‘He exists.’
   SPANISH: ‘Sí Padre; Dios hay.’

(6.2) a. i. Maraetipa Dios?
   ii. Maraetipas Dios?
   iii. maraitipa Dios?
   
   `marai =tipa Dios
   what =INTERR God
   
   CLOSE: ‘What is God?’
   SPANISH: none

   b. i. Euate mairrisama, ay quiara tuyre carritama upacatu mara encana Yahuequetara, Yara huassu Dios mura.
ii. euatemai risama, ayquiara tuyreca ritama upacatu maraencana yahuequetara, yarahussu dios mura.

iii. iwati mai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkana, yawikitara yarawasu Dios mura.

(6.3) a. i. *Mara e pupe Dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upacatu Mara encana?*

ii. maraepupe dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upacatu maraencana?

iii. maraipupe Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upakatu marainkana?

(6.4) a. i. *Macate Dios yuriti?*

ii. macate dios yuriti?

iii. makate Dios yuriti?

(6.4) b. i. *Euatemairritama cate ayquiraratuya carritama cate, upacatu macate Dios yuritimuara.*
ii. euatemai ritamakate ayquara tuyaca ritamakate, upacatu macate Dios yuriti mura.

iii. iwatimai ritamakate, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate, upakatu makate Dios yuriti mura.

\[
iwati = \text{be.high.up} \quad \text{ritama} = \text{NOMZ:INACT village} = \text{LOC DEM.PROX.MS land} \quad \text{tuyuka ritama} = \text{LOC upa} = \text{kate makate Dios yuriti mura}
\]

all =INTSF where God be.in.place 3SG.MS

CLOSE: ‘In the high village, in this land village, everywhere is God.’
TARGET: ‘God is in Heaven, on Earth, everywhere.’
SPANISH: ‘En el cielo, en la tierra y en todo lugar está.’

(6.5)  

a. i. Ahuxeca Dios amiti?

ii. Ahuxeca dios amiti?

iii. awirika Dios amiti?

awirika\textsuperscript{159} Dios amiti

how.many God EXST

CLOSE: ‘How many Gods are there?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Cuántos dioses hay?’

b. i. Vyete titi Dios.

ii. Vyete titi Dios.

iii. uyepe\textsuperscript{160} titi Dios.

uyepe titi Dios

one be.alone God

CLOSE: One God alone.
SPANISH: ‘Un solo Dios no más.’

(6.6)  

a. i. Quasrachi Yaze cesucana Huera-cana, miara cana, Ehuatacana, roayatipa Dios?

ii. Quasrachi, yaze, cesucana, hueracana, miaracana, ehuatacana, roayatipa dios?

iii. k\textsuperscript{w}ara\textsuperscript{f}i, yasi, sesukanana, wirakana, miarakana, iwatakana, roayatipa Dios?

k\textsuperscript{w}ara\textsuperscript{f}i yasi sesu =kana wira =kana miara\textsuperscript{161} =kana iwata =kana roaya

sun moon star =PL.MS bird =PL.MS animal =PL.MS jungle =PL.MS NEG

tipa Dios

=INTERR God

CLOSE: ‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds, the animals, the forests, are they not God?’
SPANISH: ‘Pues el sol, luna, estrellas, pájaros, bosques y todas las demás cosas no son Dios?’

b. i. Roaya Dios mura, eyquiara upacatu, mara encana Dios yahueque maipura purai mura.

\textsuperscript{159}Note that awirika ‘how many’ differs from awiri ‘how many’, the word that appears in the corresponding sentence in the Catechism Fragment (see (5.5a)). Modern Omagua exhibits awirika exclusively, while Kokama-Kokamilla exhibits awiri.

\textsuperscript{160}See footnote \textsuperscript{139}.
(6.7) a. i. Marae rapa Dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upai mara encana?
   ii. Maraerapa dios yahueque emenua ayquiara upai maraencana?
   iii. marairapa Dios yawiki iminu aikiara upai marainkana?

   marai =ra
   =pa Dios yawiki iminu aikiara upai
   what =NOM.PURP =INTERR God make long.ago DEM.PROX.MS every
   marain =kana
   thing =PL.MS

   CLOSE: ‘Why did God create all these things long ago?’
   TARGET: ‘Why did God create all these things?’
   SPANISH: ‘¿Para qué crió [sic] Dios todas estas cosas?’

b. i. Ye me era maera.
   ii. Yemeeramaera.
   iii. yeneeramaira

   yene= era =mai =ra
   1PL.INCL= good =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PURP

   CLOSE: ‘For our well-being.’
   SPANISH: ‘Para bien del hombre.’

(6.8) a. i. Mania zenoni Dios yahueque emenua y ennae verano?

---

161 In both modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla, miara serves as a hypernym for ‘monkey’, but here the word appears to be used by Jesuit authors as a general term for ‘animal’, to the exclusion of birds. There is some reason to think that this use may have been correct at the time that the catechism was written, since its cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages refer, for example, to game animals in general, and not monkeys (e.g., Tupinambá emiar ‘presa, caça’ [Lemos Barbosa 1951:55]). Espinosa Pérez (1935:156) indicates that miarakanu is to be interpreted as a hypernym for all quadrupeds. Note that miara does not appear in the parallel clause in the Catechism Fragment (see (5.6a)).

162 Here aikiara and upai appear in the reverse order we would expect, given that modifiers are systematically prenominal in modern Omagua.

163 See footnote 144.
ii. Maniazenoni dios yahueque emenua yennae verano?

iii. maniasenuni Dios yawiki iminua yene weranu?

\[
\text{mania} = \text{senuni Dios yawiki iminua yene weranu} \quad \text{what.action} = \text{PURP God make long.ago 1PL.INCL COORD}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Why did God make us as well long ago?’

TARGET: ‘Why did God create us as well?’

SPANISH: ‘¿Y para qué crió [sic] Dios al hombre?’

b. i. Yenne yqua zenoni Dios semai sey enevaschita zenoni mura Dios, recumessa mai pura canna yenea amuya sucata zenoni: ayquiara tukurari yene yuriti uparichi Euatemairritama cateyacussa zenoni.

ii. yennye yquazenoni dios semai se yene vaschitazenoni mura dios, re cumessamaipuracanna yenea amuya sucatazenoni: ayquiara tukurari yene yuriti uparichi Euatemai ritamacate yacussazenoni.

iii. yeneikuasenuni Diossemai se, yenesa Sitasenuni mu Ra Dios, RaakumesamaipuRaakana yeneamuyasukatasenuni, aikiaa tuyukaari yeneyuritiuparafi, iwatimai ritamakate yeneususenuni.

\[
yene= \text{ikua} = \text{senuni Dios} = \text{semai se yene= safita} = \text{senuni} 1PL.INCL= know = \text{PURP God =FOC:VER} 1PL.INCL= love = \text{PURP mura Dios ia= kumesa= mai =pura =kana yene= 3SG.MS God 3SG.MS= say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS 1PL.INCL= amuyasukata=senuni aikiaa tuyuka=ari yene= observe =PURP DEM.PROX.MS land =LOC.DIFF 1PL.INCL= yuriti =upa =rafi iwati =mai ritama =kate yene= be.in.place =CESS =NASS be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL 1PL.INCL= usu =senuni go =PURP}
\]

CLOSE: ‘So what we may truly know God, so that we may love him, so that we may observe what he said, and ceasing to remain on this land, so that we might go to the high village.’

TARGET: ‘So that we may truly know God, so that we may love him, so that we may observe his commandments, and ceasing to remain on Earth, so that we may go to Heaven.’

SPANISH: ‘Para que en esta vida le conozca y sirva, guardando sus Mandamientos, y acabada, ir a gozarle en el Cielo.’

(6.9) a. i. Aua tipa Dios?

\footnote{The verb \textit{amuyasukata} is not attested in modern Omagua, and our gloss here is based on the Spanish translation \textit{guardar} in the corresponding Quechua catechism. We should point out that this form is an unexpectedly long root for Omagua, and it is likely that it is a Jesuit neologism (in the vein of \textit{yumunuyepeta} (see footnote 174)), although its morphological composition is unclear.}

\footnote{The sequence <se> does not correspond to any grammatical morpheme in modern Omagua or Kokama-Kokamilla (Cabral 1995; Faust 1972; Vallejos 2004, 2010a) of which we are aware, and we have been unable to locate any cognates to it in other Tupi-Guarani languages. Note that the sentence is completely grammatical without the <se>. Espinosa Pérez (1935:157) simply groups it together with =semai, yielding <seaise> ‘very much’.}
ii. Auatipa Dios?

   awa =tipa Dios
   who =INTERR God

   CLOSE: ‘Who is God?’
   SPANISH: ‘¿Quién es este Dios?’

b. i. R: Dios Papa, Dios Teagra, Dios Espíritu Santo, ayquiara musa puere ca personacana uyepe titi Dios mura.

ii. Dios Papa, Dios Teagra, Dios Espíritu Santo, ayquiara musapuereca personacana uyepe titi Dios mura.

iii. Dios papa, Dios taira, Dios espíritu santo. aikiara musapirika personakana uyepe titi Dios mura.

Dios papa Dios taira Dios espíritu santo
God father God son.MALE.EGO God Holy Spirit

   aikiara musapirika persona =kana uyepe titi Dios mura
   DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS one be.alone God 3SG.MS

   CLOSE: ‘God is the Father, God is the Son, God is the Holy Spirit. These three persons are one God alone.
   SPANISH: ‘Padre, Hijo y Espíritu Santo, tres Personas distintas y un solo Dios verdadero.’

(6.10) a. i. Ayquiara musa puereca personacana roaya pa musa puereca Dios cana?

ii. Ayquiara musapuereca personacana roaya puereca Diosscana?

iii. aikiara musapirika personakana, roaya musapirika Dioskana?

   aikiara musapirika persona =kana roaya =pa musapirika Dios
   DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS NEG =INTERR three God
   =kana
   =PL.MS

   CLOSE: ‘These three people, are they not three Gods?’
   SPANISH: ‘Pues estas tres personas, ¿no son tres Dioses?’

b. i. Roaya puereca Dios cana, ayquiara musa puerecana persona cana persona uypetiti Dios mura Santísima Trinidad nanimairashira.

ii. Roaya puereca Dioscana, ayquiara musapuerecana personacana persona uye titi Dios mura Santisima Trinidadaninmai rashira.

iii. roaya [musa]pirika Dioskana. aikiara musapirika personakana persona uyepe titi Dios mura. santísima trinidadaninmai raśira.

   roaya [musa]pirika Dios =kana
   NEG three God =PL.MS

   aikiara musapirika persona =kana persona uyepe titi Dios mura
   =PL.MS three person =PL.MS person one be.alone God 3SG.MS

   santísima trinidad =nani =mai ra= fira
   Holy Trinity =FOC:EXCL =3SG.MS= name
CLOSE: ‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are one God alone. The Holy Trinity is its name.’
SPANISH: ‘No, sino un solo Dios verdadero.’

(6.11) a. i. Ayquiara musa puereca persona cana suimaniamai Ahua rahuaca emenua?
ii. Ayquiara musapuereca personacasuisu, maniamai ahuara huaca emenua?
iii. aikiara musapirika personakanasuisu, maniamai awara uwaka iminua?
   aikiara musapirika persona =kana =sui maniamai awa
   DEM.PROX.MS three person =PL.MS =ABL which man
   =ra uwaka iminua
   =NOM.PURP transform long.ago
CLOSE: ‘Of these three people, which transformed into a man long ago?’
TARGET: ‘Of these three people, which became man?’
SPANISH: De estas tres personas, ¿cuál se hizo hombre?’
b. i. Dios Taegra Ahua rahuaca emenua.
ii. Dios taegra ahuara huaca emenua.
iii. Dios taira awara uwaka iminua.
Dios taira awa =ra uwaka iminua
God son.MALE.EGO man =NOM.PURP transform long.ago
CLOSE: ‘The son of God transformed into a man long ago.’
TARGET: ‘The son of God became man.’
SPANISH: ‘La segunda persona, que es el Hijo de Dios.’

(6.12) a. i. Mania zenoni Dios Taegra Ahua rahuaca emenua?
ii. Maniazenoni dios taegra ahuara huaca emenua?
iii. maniasenuni Dios taira awara uwaka iminua?
   mania =senuni Dios taira awa =ra uwaka iminua
   what.action =PURP God son.MALE.EGO man =NOM.PURP transform long.ago
CLOSE: ‘Why did the son of God transform into a man long ago?’
TARGET: ‘Why did the son of God become man?’
SPANISH: none
b. i. Rasaschita raschi yame; yenne erac mamaicana sui, ehuepe maitopatata sui verano rusuyepeta zenoni yenne.
ii. Rasaschitaraschi yame; yenneeracmamaicanasui, ehuepemai topa tatasui verano rusuyepetazenoniyenne.
iii. rasasitraʃi yene, yeneerasimamaikanasui ipipemai tupa tatasui[169] weranu rausuepetasenuniyene.

166 The appearance of =mai here is inexplicable for a number of reasons: 1) in modern Omagua =mai never occurs to the left of the limitative =nani; 2) the sentence is entirely grammatical without =mai; and 3) the parallel clause in the Catechism Fragment (see (5.10b)) lacks =mai. For these reasons we gloss it with a question mark.
167 In modern Omagua, maniamai has come to mean ‘what type (of thing)’.
168 See footnote [150].
ra = sasita =raʃi yene yene= era -siman =mai
3SG.MS= love =NASS 1PL.INCL 1PL.INCL= good -CORE.NEG =NOMZ:INACT
=kana =sui ipipe =mai tupa tata =sui weranu ra=
=PL.MS= ABL be.inside =NOMZ:INACT place fire = ABL.COORD 3SG.MS=
usuepe -ta =senuni yene
escape -CAUS =PURP 1PL.INCL

CLOSE: ‘Since he loves us, so that he might save us from our evils and the inner fire place.’
TARGET: ‘Since he loves us, so that he might save us from our evils and from Hell.’
SPANISH: none

(6.13) a. i. Aua ceueca cuara pe Dios Teagra Ahuara huaca emenua?
ii. Aua ceuecatuarape dios teagra ahuara huaca emenua?
iii. awa sewekakʷarape Dios taira awara uwaka iminua?
    awa seweka =kʷarape Dios taira awa =ra uwaka
    who womb =INESS God son.MALE.EGO man =NOM.PURP transform
    iminua
    long.ago

CLOSE: ‘In whose womb did the son of God transform into a man long ago?’
TARGET: ‘In whose womb did the son of God become man?’
SPANISH: ¿En dónde el Hijo de Dios se hizo hombre?’

b. i. Virgen Santa María ceueca cuarape Ahua rehuaca emenua, Espíritu Santo sui, mura Virgen Santa María ceueca sui rahuariemenua.
ii. Virgen Santa Maria ceuecuarape ahuare huaca emenua, Espiritu Santosui, mura Virgen Santa Maria ceuecasui rahuari emenua.
iii. virgen santa maría sewekakʷarape awara uwaka iminua. espíritu santosui mura, virgen santa maría sewekasui rauwari iminua.
    virgen santa maría seweka =kʷarape awa =ra uwaka iminua
    Virgin Mary womb =INESS man =ATTR transform long.ago
    espíritu santo =sui mura virgen santa maría seweka =sui ra =uwari
    Holy Spirit =ABL 3SG.MS Virgin Mary womb =ABL 3SG.MS= be.born
    iminua
    long.ago

CLOSE: ‘He transformed into a man in the womb of the Virgin Mary long ago. He is of the Holy Spirit and was born of the womb of the Virgin Mary long ago.’
TARGET: ‘He became man in the womb of the Virgin Mary. He is of the Holy Spirit and was born of the womb of the Virgin Mary.’
SPANISH: ‘En el vientre virginal de Santa María.’

169 In this sentence the typical order of the component words of the the neologism tata tupa ‘Hell’ are reversed.
170 The non-compositional meaning ‘save’ (cf. usuepe ‘escape’ and -ta CAUS) is also found in modern Omagua.
(6.14)  a.  i.  Virgen Santa María huarita sacapuere veranu muri apai tipa Virgen rayuriti?
   ii.  virgen santa maria huaritasacapirí weranu, muriapaitipa virgen rayuriti?
   iii. virgen santa maria uwa R

Lev Michael and Zachary O’Hagan

(6.15)  a.  i.  Dios Teagra Ahua rahuaca raschi emenua mara etipa raschira?
   ii. Dios teagra ahuara huacaraschi emenua, maraetipai raschira?
   iii. Dios taíra awara uwakaraţi iminua, maraitipai rafira?

Lev Michael and Zachary O’Hagan

171 The use of yuiri to indicate maintenance of a state is likely the result of a calque. Both in modern Omagua and elsewhere in the ecclesiastical texts, it only indicates remaining in a physical location.

172 See footnote 171.
mura =tina aise\(^{173}\) -tui Dios aise -tui awa wetanu yene= yara
3SG.MS =CERT true -\(^{175}\) God true -? man COORD 1PL.INCL= lord
yene= yumunuyepeta\(^{174}\) -tara
1PL.INCL= redeem -NOMZ:ACT

CLOSE: ‘His name is Jesus Christ. He is the true God and a true man, as well as
he who redeems us.’
TARGET: ‘His name is Jesus Christ. He is the true God and a true man, as well as
our redeemer.’
SPANISH: ‘Jesucristo, verdadero Dios y verdadero hombre, y nuestro Redentor.’

(6.16) a. i. *Maria mai Jesu Xto. ni umu nuyepeta emenua yenne?*
ii. *Mariamai Jesu Xto. niumunuyepeta emenua yenne?*
iii. *mariamai jesucristo yumunuyepeta yene?*

*maria\(^{176}\)mai jesucristo yene*
how(?) Jesus.Christ redeem 1PL.INCL

CLOSE: ‘How did Jesus Christ redeem us?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Cómo nos redimió Jesucristo?’

b. i. *Yenne ycuarasussanaraschi, Cruz ari taque tamai raumanuraschi (mura).* (Entre
paréntesis, con lápiz: mura.)
ii. *Yenne ycuarasussanaraschi, Cruz ari taque tamai raumanuraschi (mura).*
iii. *yeneikua rasusanara\(^{i}\)fi, cruzari taquetamai raumanura\(^{fi}\)i inumia (mura).*

*yene= ikua ra= susan\(^{177}\)=rasi cruz =ari takita
1PL.INCL= REAS 3SG.MS= suffer =NASS cross =LOC.DIFF nail
=mai ra= umanu =rasi iminua mura\(^{178}\)
=NOMZ:INACT 3SG.MS= die =NASS long.ago 3SG.MS

CLOSE: ‘Suffering for us, dying long ago nailed to the cross.’
TARGET: ‘Suffering for us, dying nailed to the cross.’
SPANISH: ‘Padeciendo y muriendo clavado en una cruz por nosotros.’

\(^{173}\)The Old Omagua root *aise* ‘true’ survives in modern Omagua only in the frozen form *ais\(^{i}\)mai*, ‘truth’, which is
employed in discourse to assert the truth value of a proposition (cf. Spanish *verdad* or *de veras*).

\(^{174}\)A reflex of the Old Omagua word *yumunuyepeta* is not attested in modern Omagua, but note the similarity of this
stem to Old Omagua *usuepeta* ‘save’, which does exhibit a modern Omagua reflex. Both stems appear to have been
at some point in time compositional: *usuepeta* contains *usu* ‘go’ and -\(^{\text{-ta CAUS}}\); *yumunuyepeta* contains *yumunu
‘send’ and -\(^{\text{-ta CAUS}}\). Because we do not expect Omagua to have exhibited a native word to express the Christian
concept of redemption (note that our gloss of ‘redeem’ relies heavily upon the original Spanish translation of a
similar Quechua catechism (see \(\text{§3.1}\)), we consider it most likely that *yumunuyepeta* is a Jesuit neologism.

\(^{175}\)Based on the reflex of Old Omagua *aise* in modern Omagua (see footnote \(\text{173}\)), it is clear that the sequence <tui> was
not part of the root. It does not correspond to any morpheme in modern Omagua or Kokama-Kokamilla (Cabral
\(\text{1995}\), Faust\(\text{1972}\), Vallejos\(\text{2004, 2010a}\)) of which we are aware, and we have been unable to locate any cognates to
it in other Tupí-Guaraní languages. However, if Old Omagua *aise* did not form part of the same class of adjectives
as *era* ‘good’ and *ayaise* ‘evil’ (see \(\text{§2.3.2.3}\) and footnote \(\text{124}\)), and was actually a stative verb (as many quality-
denoting roots are in modern Omagua), it would need to be nominalized in order to modify either *Dios* or *awa* (note
that the nominalization of stative verbs to serve as nominal modifiers is widely attested in these texts (see \(\text{§2.3.2.3}\)).
This raises the possibility that <tui> was a nominalizer.
(6.17) a. i. Mania huassu Jesu Xto.-Dios raschi raumanu menua?
ii. Maniahuaussu Jesu Xto.-Diosraschi ra umanu emenua?
iii. maniawasu jesucristo Diosraji raumanu iminua?

\[
\text{spanish: none} \quad \text{target: none}
\]

b. i. (Con letras desvaídas: R: Aguacai ruana pure (? Roaya.) R: Dios caisuara purai raumanu menua.
ii. awakaisurapura[i] roaya Dioscaisuara purai raumanu iminua[180]

\[
\text{spanish: none} \quad \text{target: none}
\]

---

176 This is the only attestation of mariamai as a manner interrogative word. Elsewhere in these texts, as in modern Omagua, manner interrogatives are expressed with mania. An alternative interpretation is that the word in the original manuscript was actually maniamai, where what has been interpreted as an \(<r>\) in \(<\text{Maria mai}\>) was actually an \(<n>\) in the original manuscript. However, maniamai is attested elsewhere in these texts meaning ‘which (one)’, and in modern Omagua as ‘what type (of thing)’. This would not be a great improvement over the choice of mariamai, given that response to this question clearly indicates that mariamai is intended to mean ‘how’. Consequently, we gloss it as such.

177 The verb root susana is not attested in modern Omagua, but it has cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, e.g., Tupinambá osay ‘suffer’ (Lemos Barbosa 1951:118).

178 The 3SG.MS pronoun muta is not grammatically obligatory in this context, which we suppose accounts for the fact that it is enclosed in parentheses in the original manuscript.

179 It is clear from the apparent messiness of the manuscript at this juncture that the copyist had difficulty in reproducing the text faithfully, and we assume that here an apparent =puta must in fact be puta, since otherwise there are no attestations of =puta encoding contrastive focus in Old Omagua (see [2.3,9,1]). We thank an anonymous reviewer for bringing this otherwise aberrant =puta to our attention.

180 The copyist of the manuscript appears to have erred in identifying the break between these two sentences, and we have repartitioned them between the second and third lines of our multilinear representation in order that the partitioned sentences make more sense in the broader doctrinal context. The principal source of confusion are the words \(<\text{Aguacai ruana pure}>,\> which appear with the annotation \textit{con letras desvaídas} ‘with faded words’, perhaps indicating a subsequent addition or correction. The transcriber appears to have interpreted \(<\text{Roaya}>,\> as belonging to these ‘faded’ words, and not to the other adjacent material, resulting in a rather doctrinally problematic sentence. In particular, under the problematic partitioning, the sentence reads that Jesus died as a god, rather than as a man, as is doctrinally correct. Note that under the partition we propose, Roaya appears clause-initially (rather than clause-finally, as the transcriber had it), the expected position for the clausal negator. We take this as good evidence (in addition to the doctrinal points) that our decision regarding the sentence breaks is correct.

181 While we have encountered no morpheme corresponding to \(<\text{cai}>\) in Omagua, nor has one been described for Kokama-Kokamilla by Vallejos (2004, 2010a). Faust (1972:104) describes a particle kai that ‘attracts someone’s
(6.18)  a.  i.  Jesu Xto. umanuraschi uyahuere tiparaca quere emenua?
    ii. Jesu Xto. umanuraschi, uyahuere tipa racaquere emenua?
    iii. jesucristo umanuraši, tipa rakakiri iminuś?
        jesucristo umanu =rafi uyawiri =tipa ra= kakiri iminuś
        Jesus.Christ die =NASS again =INTERR 3SG.MS= live long.ago
        CLOSE: ‘Jesus Christ having died, did he live again long ago?’
        TARGET: ‘Jesus Christ having died, did he live again?’
        SPANISH: ‘Habiendo muerto en cuanto hombre, ¿resucitó?’

b.  i. Vyahuere racaquere emenua musso puereca coema ari.
    ii. Vyahuere racaquere emenua mussopuereca coemaari.
    iii. uyawiri rakakiri iminuś musapirika kwemaari.
        uyawiri ra= kakiri iminuś musapirika kwema =ari
        again 3SG.MS= live long.ago three[183] dawn =LOC.DIFF
        CLOSE: ‘He lived again on the third day long ago.’
        TARGET: ‘He lived again on the third day.’
        SPANISH: ‘Sí, resucitó al tercer día.’

(6.19)  a.  i. Jesu Cto. uyahuere quereraschi emenua macate reusuemenua?
    ii. Jesu Cto. uyahuere quereraschi emenua, macate reusu emenua?
    iii. jesucristo uyawiri [raka]kiraraši iminuś, makate rausu iminuś?
        jesucristo uyawiri ra= kakiri =rafi iminuś makate ra= usu
        Jesus.Christ again 3SG.MS= live =NASS long.ago where 3SG.MS= go
        iminuś
        long.ago
        CLOSE: ‘Jesus Christ having lived again long ago, where did he go?’
        TARGET: ‘Jesus Christ having lived again, where did he go?’
        SPANISH: ‘Y después de resucitado Jesucristo, ¿a dónde se fue?’

b.  i. Eute mairatama cate raussu emenua.
    ii. euetemai ratamakate raussu emenua.
    iii. iwati mai ritama =kate ra= usu iminuś
        be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL 3SG.MS= go long.ago
        CLOSE: ‘He went to the high village long ago.’
        TARGET: ‘He went to Heaven.’
        SPANISH: ‘Subió por sí mismo a los Cielos.’

182 Our re-representation of <ruana> as =suara involves substantial alteration, but we take the representation <suara> in the following structurally parallel clause as good evidence that here the transcriber misinterpreted s as <r> and r as <n>, both of which are copying errors attested elsewhere in these texts.

183 The use of musapirika as an ordinal numeral here is likely a calque, as numeral terms have only a cardinal function in the modern language.
(6.20)  

a. i. *Era Xtiano cana Dios cumesamai puracana era amuyasu cata taracana era cemamai huassu ema, ranu umanuraschi macate rana sahuassuacana ussu?*

ii. *era xtianocana dios cumesamaipuracana era amuyasucatataracana eracemamaihuassuema, ranu umanuraschi, macate ranasahuassuacana ussu?*

iii. *era cristianokana Dios kumesamaipura canakana era amuyasukata taracana era cumesamaipusu rana umanuraschi, makate ranasawasuacana usu?*

close: ‘The good Christians, those who observe what God said, those without great evil, when they die, where do their souls go? 
TARGET: ‘The good Christians, those who observe God’s commandments, those without great evil, when they die, where do their souls go?
SPANISH: ‘Después de muertos los buenos cristianos que han guardado los Mandamientos de Dios, ¿adónde irán sus almas?’

b. i. *Euate mairitama cate muriapai sareguaraschi ranacaquere zenoni. *

ii. *Eutemai ritamacate, muriapai sareguaraschi ranacaquerezenoni. 

iii. *iwatimai ritamakate, muriapai sariwarasi ranakakirisenuni. 

CLOSE: ‘To the high village, so that they live being happy uninterruptedly.’
TARGET: ‘To Heaven, so that they may live forever happy.’
SPANISH: ‘Subirán a la Gloria.’

(6.21)  

a. i. *Ayaice xtiano cana (Con letra desvaída: upai Aucacana). Dios cumesamai puracana roaya amuyasu cata taracana era ecmamae huassi yara rana aumanuraschi, macate Dios yumupuricanacahuaacana?*

ii. *ayaice xtianocana (upai aucacana) Dios cumesamaipuracana roaya amuyasucatataracana eraecmamaehuassiyara, ranaaumanuraschi, macate Dios yumupuri canasahuacana?*

---

184 The sequence <sua> does not correspond to any morpheme identified for either modern Omagua or Kokama-Kokamilla (Cabral 1995; Faust 1972; Vallejos 2004, 2010a), and we have been unable to locate any cognates to it in other Tupí-Guaraní languages. Note that the sentence is completely grammatical without <sua>. Espinosa Pérez (1935:159) represents the same portion of text as <sahuacana>, without the complicating <sua>. It is unclear if he simply ignored a sequence of letters in the manuscript that made no sense to him, or if the introduction of these letters is an error on Bayle’s part.
iii. ayaise cristianokana (upai aucakana), Dios kumesamaipurakana roaya amuya-sukatatarakana erasimamaiwasuyara, ranaumanurafi, makate Dios yumupertu ranasawakana?

\textit{ayaise cristiano=kana upai aucu}^{185}=kana Dios kumesa=mai
\text{wicked Christian=}^{\text{PL.MS}}\text{every savage=}^{\text{PL.MS}}\text{say=}^{\text{NOMZ:INACT}}
\text{=pura=}^{\text{NOM.PST}}\text{roaya amuyasukata=tara=}^{\text{kana era}-}\text{sim}\text{a}
\text{=NOM.PST=}^{\text{PL.MS}}\text{NEG observe=}^{\text{-NOMZ:ACT=}^{\text{PL.MS}}\text{good}-\text{CORE.NEG}}
\text{=mai=}^{\text{NOMZ:INACT}}\text{wasu=yara rana=}^{\text{3PL.MS}}\text{eman}=^{\text{PL.MS}}\text{Si, makate Dios yumupu}
\text{send(?)=}^{\text{3PL.MS}}\text{rana=}^{\text{3PL.MS}}\text{sawa=}^{\text{kana}}

\text{CLOSE: }‘\text{The wicked Christians (every savage), those who do not observe what God said, those with great evil, when they die, where does God send their souls?}\text{’}
\text{TARGET: }‘\text{The wicked Christians (every savage), those who do not observe God’s commandments, those with great evil, when they die, where does God send their souls?}\text{’}
\text{SPANISH: }‘\text{Y las almas de los malos que han muerto sin guardar los Mandamientos de Dios, ¿adónde irán?}\text{’}

b. i. \textit{Euepete maitatopa quarape, muriapai ucairaschi, ranayuritizenoni.}

ii. \textit{Euepetemai ta topaquarape, muriapai ucairaschi ranayuritizenoni.}

iii. \textit{1}^{186}\text{ipe}^{187}\text{ema[ta]}^{186}\text{ta}^{187}\text{[tapa]}^{187}\text{w}^{187}\text{arape, muriapai ukairafi ranayuritisenuni.}

\text{ipipe=}^{\text{NOMZ:INACT}}\text{fire place=}^{\text{INESS}}\text{uninterruptedly burn=}^{\text{NASS}}
\text{rana=}^{\text{3PL.MS}}\text{yuri}^{\text{t}}\text{be.in.place=}^{\text{PURP}}\text{senuni}

\text{CLOSE: }‘\text{To the inner fire place, so that they may be there burning uninterruptedly.}\text{’}
\text{TARGET: }‘\text{To Hell so that they may burn forever.}\text{’}
\text{SPANISH: }‘\text{Al fuego del infierno para quemar sin fin.}\text{’}

(6.22) a. i. \textit{Yenne sahucana roayapa yennezúcana mucui umanu?}

ii. \textit{Yennesahucana roayapa yennezúcanamucui umanu?}

iii. \textit{yenesawakana, roayapa yenesuukanamukui umanu?}

\textsuperscript{185}This word \textit{auca} is borrowed from Quechua. Given that Quechua only began to be used as a \textit{lingua franca} in San Joaquín de Omaguas in the 1720s \textsuperscript{[Michael2014]}, the appearance of this word suggests that this text was written or at least modified in this later period. It should be noted that this deduction is not entirely ironclad, since the Jesuits working in Maynas may have become familiar with Quechua during their preparatory time in Quito, prior to entering the Maynas missions.

\textsuperscript{186}The word for ‘send’ in modern Omagua, which is also reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, is \textit{yumunu}. We cannot currently account for the sequence <puiri> on this form.

\textsuperscript{187}Here we alter the original <t> to \textit{p}, as this accords with the expected form \textit{ipipe} in the Jesuit neologism for ‘Hell’, as evident in other instances of this form (see (6.27b)).
Our souls don’t die with our bodies.’

SPANISH: ‘Pues qué, ¿nuestras almas no mueren con nuestros cuerpos?’

b. i. R: Roaya, miaracana yacatu yennezumucui ranaumanu; yenne Sahuacana muriapaitina ranaca quereari.
ii. Roaya, miaracanayacatu yennezumucui ranaumanu; yenneSahuacana muriapaitina ranacaquereari.
iii. roaya miarakanyakatu yenesuumukui ranaumanu. yenesawakana muriapaitina ranakakiriari.

They do not die with our bodies like animals. Our souls live uninterruptedly.

TARGET: ‘They do not die with our bodies like animals. Our souls will live forever.’

SPANISH: ‘No, que vivirán eternamente.’

(6.23) a. i. Huyahuentipa Yenne yara Jesu Cto. euate mairitama zui anquiquiara tuyucaritama cate rauriari?
ii. Huyahuentipa Yenneyara Jesu Cto. euatemai ritamazui a(nqui)quiara tuyuca ritamacate rauriari?
iii. uyawiritipa yeneyara jesucristo iwatimai ritamasui aikiara tuyuka ritamakate rauriari.

Will our master Jesus Christ from the high village to this land village again?

TARGET: ‘Will our Lord Jesus Christ come from Heaven to Earth again?’

SPANISH: ‘¿Nuestro señor Jesucristo vendrá otra vez del Cielo a la tierra?’

b. i. Huyahuere rauriari aiquiara tuyucaritama upa pupe catu.
ii. Huyahuere rauriari aiquiara tuyuca ritama upapupecatu.
iii. uyawiri rauriari aikiara tuyuka ritama upapupekatu.

See footnote 161.
uyawiri ra= uri =ari aikiara tuyuka ritama upa
again 3SG.MS= come =IMPF DEM.PROX.MS land village come.to.end
=pupekatu
=TEMP.OVRLP
CLOSE: ‘He will come again when this land village ends.’
TARGET: ‘He will come again when the Earth ends.’
SPANISH: ‘Sí, vendrá al fin de este mundo.’

(6.24) a. i. Mura guarashi pupe uyahuere tipa yeneca quere usuari?
ii. Mura guarashipupe uyahueretipa yenecaquereusuari?
iii. mura kwaraşı pupe uyawiritipayenekakirusuari?

mura[189] kwaraşı =pupe uyawiri =tipa yeneka =usu =ari
3SG.MS day =INSTR again =INTERR 1PL.INCL= live =AND =IMPF
CLOSE: ‘That day, will we go to live again?’
SPANISH: none

b. i. Vyahuere upa yenneca (entre líneas, Rú[190]caquere usuari.
ii. Vyahuere upa yene(ca)caquereusuari.
iii. uyawiri upa yenekakirusuari.
uyawiri upa yene= kakiri =usu =ari
again all 1PL.INCL= live =AND =IMPF
CLOSE: ‘Again we will all go to live.’
SPANISH: none

(6.25) a. i. Maria zenoni mura aquaschi pupe yenne Yara Jesu Cto. uyahuere ruraiari?
ii. Mariazenoni mura aquaschipupe yenneYara Jesu Cto. uyahuere ruraiari?
iii. maniasenuni[191] mura kwaraşı pupe yenyara jesucristo uyawiri rauriari?

mania =senuni mura[192] kwaraşı =pupe yene= yara jesucristo
what.action =PURP 3SG.MS day =INSTR 1PL.INCL= master Jesus.Christ
uyawiri ra= uri =ari
again 3SG.MS= come =IMPF
CLOSE: ‘Why will our Lord Jesus Christ come again on that day?’
SPANISH: ‘¿A qué vendrá Jesucristo ese último día?’

b. i. Vpacatu yenne sahuacai upai ayaize yene yahue quemai pura cana veranu racumessa zenoni rurari.

189 Note that in modern Omagua, mura does not exhibit any deictic or inter-clausal discourse anaphoric properties, in contrast to its apparent function in the text here. Although we know of no cognate to mura in other Tupí-Guaraní languages, let alone one with the relevant deictic or anaphoric properties, it is worth noting that the feminine genderlect counterpart to mura, namely āi, is the reflex of the Proto-Tupí-Guaraní distal deictic a?é ‘s/he, that one there’ (Jensen[1998:551]). The fact that mura appears to have deictic or discourse anaphoric properties here suggests that it originated as a masculine genderlect deictic pronoun, and that some of those properties were still retained in Old Omagua.

190 We interpret this to mean that <Ru> appear between lines of text. Since it is not an identifiable morpheme, and contributes nothing to the grammaticality or meaning of the sentence, we ignore it.
ii. Vpacatu yennesahuacai upai ayaize yenyahuequemaipuracana veranu racumes-sazenoni rurari.

iii. upakatu yenesawakai upai ayaise yeneyaw 1maipu =Rakana we =Ranu =Rakumesasenuni 1.

upa =katu yene= sawa =ka193 upai ayaize yene= yawiki all =INTSF 1PL.INCL= soul =? every wicked 1PL.INCL= do =mai =pura =kana weranu ra= kumesa =senuni ra=
=NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS COORD 3SG.MS= say194 =PURP 3SG.MS= uri =ari come =IMPF

CLOSE: ‘He will come in order to say all of our souls and all of the wicked things we have done.’
TARGET: ‘He will come to judge all of our souls and all of our wicked deeds.’
SPANISH: ‘Habiendo antes resucitado a todos, vendrá a juzgarlos.’

(6.26) a. i. Mura quarasschi pupe macate Jesu Cto. erusuari era Xtiánocana?

ii. Mura quarasschipupe macate Jesu Cto. erusuari era xtianocana?

iii. mura kweara-fipupe, makate jesucristo erusuari era cristianokana?

mura195 kweara-fi =pupe makate jesucristo erus =ari era cristiano 3SG.MS day =INSTR where Jesus.Christ take =IMPF good Christian =kana =PL.MS

CLOSE: ‘On that day, where will Jesus Christ take the good Christians?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Y dónde enviará Jesucristo entonces a los buenos?’

b. i. Era xtiano cana purai uyahuere raerusuari euate mairitama cate, rana sahuacana mucui ranazucana mucui, muriapai sararaquaraschiranaca querezenoni; ayquirara tuyucaritama cate Dios cumessamai pura cana rana amuya sucatu sepue.

ii. Era xtianocanapurai uyahuere raerusuari euatemai ritamacate, ranasahuacanamucui, ranazucanamucui, muriapai sara(ra)quaraschi ranacaquerezenoni; ayquirara tuyucarita cate Dios cumessamaipuracana ranaamuyasucatasepue.

191Here we change the original <Mariazenoni> to maniasenuni. The latter word appears elsewhere in the ecclesiastical texts as the reason interrogative word and is also the expected form for the reason interrogative based on the reconstruction of Proto-Omagua-Kokama interrogative words (see Table 2.15). There is no root maria elsewhere in the ecclesiastical texts or in the modern language, and handwritten <n> may have easily been interpreted by a copyist or by Bayle as r.

192See footnote 189

193See footnote 181

194Here we gloss kumesa as ‘say’ but translate it as ‘judge’. Modern Omagua exhibits no word that expresses the notion of ‘judgment’ in the sense of Jesus’ judgment of souls and deeds on Judgment Day. Note, however, that it is a feature in many Peruvian Amazonian languages that words glossable as ‘say’ or ‘speak’ have the connotation of ‘criticize’, a notion not that distant from ‘judge’. Alternatively, the use of kumesa here to express the notion of ‘judgment’ may be a Jesuit innovation, based on the idea that to speak of wicked deeds is to reveal them, thereby making them vulnerable to moral censure.
iii. era cristianokana purai, uyawiri rausuari iwatimai ritamakate ranasawakanamukui ranasuukanamukui, muriapi sarivarafi ranakakirisenuni, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate Dios kumesamaipurakana ranaamuyasukatasepi.

(6.27) a. i. Mua quaraschi pupe macate Jesu Cto. yumapuri suari Ayaize mai cana?

b. i. Vpacatu ayaizemaicana uyazaeahuere rayu mupuri usuari epue pemaita tato paraguape rana sahuacana macui, rana zucana macui, muri apairana ucairachis ranayuriti zenoni: ay quiere a tuya carita macate Dios cumessamai puracaca roaya rana amuyu su cata yeua.

---

196 See footnote 189.

197 Here we make a fairly radical change of <saraquarashichi> to sariwarashi. We believe this is justified for two reasons. First, in (6.20b), in which the topic in question concerns the fact that the souls of good Christians are happy in Heaven, Omagua sariwa is spelled <saregua>, a representation which follows common orthographic practices in these texts (see Table 3.1). In the passage in question here, a very similar topic is at issue, namely the fate of the souls that Jesus takes to Heaven. It is doctrinally correct that these souls would be forever happy, and this message is strongly suggested by the Spanish translation of the corresponding sentence in the Quechua catechism. Second, there is a plausible series of scribal errors linking the original form to the one we have proposed: 1) the sequence <ra> was copied twice; an <e> in the manuscript was interpreted by the transcriber as an <a>; and a <g> was interpreted as a <q>.
ii. Vpacatu ayaisemakana, uyawiri rayumupuriusuari ipipemai tata tupakʷarape ranasawakanamukui, muriapai ranaucairasi ranayuritisenuni, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate Dios kumesamaipurakana roaya ranaamuyasukataiku, 

\[ \text{Vpacatu ayaizemaicana uyawirirayumupuriusuari} \]

Here we have changed <yeua> to ikua. We assume that the original <c> was interpreted by a transcriber as <e>, and that the original form of the word was <yeua>, which is one of two typical orthographic representations of ikua in the ecclesiastical texts (see Table 3.1 and (6.33a)), the other being <icua>.

199 See footnote 186.

In our representation of this word we excise <zaue> to yield <uyahuere> uyawiri ‘again’. Espinosa Pérez (1935:161) encloses the sequence <za a> in parentheses at the same point, suggesting that there was some difficult-to-interpret set of letters in the original manuscript. It is not clear from his discussion, however, what precisely his use of parentheses indicates. Note that uyawiri ‘again’ would be appropriate here given the overall doctrinal message at this point in the catechism, i.e., that on Judgment Day Jesus will send the wicked Christians back to Hell, where they have been waiting prior to Judgment Day.

189 See footnote 189.

198 In our representation of this word we excise <zaue> to yield <uyahuere> uyawiri ‘again’.

197 See footnote 187.

(6.28)  

a. ii. Maretipanahacanayahuqueari Eupemai tata topaquarape renausumacia?

ii. Maretipanahacanayahuqueari Eupemai tata topaquarape renausumacia?

iii. maritipanahakayahawikari ipipemaitata tupakʷarapecranauca?

\[ \text{Maretipanahacanayahuqueari Eupemai} \]

\[ \text{Maretipanahacanayahuqueari} \]
CLOSE: ‘What do men do in order to not go to the inner fire place.’
TARGET: ‘What should people do in order to not go to Hell?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Qué debe hacer el hombre (o mujer) para no ir al infierno?’

b. i. Roaya Xitian 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.

ii. Roaya Xitianoraschi, sapuera Bautismopuepe Ctiano renahuacaari; rasui, Dios cumussamaiparacana sta Iglesia cumussamaiparacana veranu ranaamuyasucataraschi, roaya ranaasuari Epuepemai tata topa quarape.

iii. Roaya cristiano Rashia sapuera Bautismopupe cristiano ranauwaka ari. Roaya ranausuari ipipemai tata tupakwarape.

CLOSE: ‘Not being Christian, first they become Christian by way of the baptism. Then, observing what God said as well as what the Church said, they will not go to the inner fire place.’
TARGET: ‘Not being Christian, first they should become Christian by way of the baptism. Then, observing God’s commandments as well as the Church’s commandments, they will not go to Hell.’
SPANISH: ‘Quien no está bautizado, primero, hacerse cristiano con el santo bautismo, y lo segundo, guardar los diez Mandamientos de Dios y los cinco de la Iglesia, así escaparán al infierno.’

(6.29) a. i. Christiano cana nuamai hucha ya rasaschimeraetipa rana ya hueque ari, Epue pemai rana a su maca?

ii. Christianocana nuamai huchayararaschi, meraetipa ranayahuequeari, Epuempemai ranaasumaca?

iii. cristianokana nuamai utfayararaşfı, maraitipa ranayawikiari ipipemai [tata tupakwarape] ranaasumaka?

201 See [5.6a] in the Catechism Fragment, where matai similarly appears reduced as maii.
202 As a complement of uwaka ‘transform’, cristiano should be marked with the nominal purposive enclitic =ta, as awa is in (6.11a) and subsequent examples (see footnote 150).
Here we interpolate the collocation \textit{tata tupak}^{u} \textit{arape} between \textit{ipipemai} and \textit{rana=} , since it is clear from the corresponding Spanish that the \textit{ipipemai} that appears in this sentence is the first element of the neologism \textit{ipipemai tata tupak}^{u} \textit{arape} \textit{‘Hell’}, as in in (5.285). Espinosa Pérez (1935:161), in his representation of this sentence, interpolates \textit{<tata topacate>} here, suggesting either that he made essentially the same judgment, or that these words were
(6.30)  

a.  

i.  **Christiano cana era rana confessya raraschi rana sahuiteari veranu Santísimo Sacramento?**  

ii.  Christianocana era rana confessya raraschi, ranasahuiteari veranu Santísimo Sacramento?  

iii.  cristianokana era rana confessya raraschi, ranasahuiteari veranu santísimo sacramento?  

---  

b.  

i.  **Ranacahuai icari.**  

ii.  Rana cahuaiicari.  

iii.  ranasawaitiari.  

---

---

---

---

---

---
SPANISH: ‘Sí podrá.’

(6.31)  a. i. Hua tipa yuriti Santísimo Sacramento o puperi?
   ii. Huatipa yuriti Santísimo Sacramento opupe(ri)\footnote{1213}  
   iii. awatipa yuriti santísimo sacramentopipripipripipripipripipripipri?

   who =INTERR be.in.place Holy Sacrament =INESS

   CLOSE: ‘Who is in the Holy Sacrament?’
   SPANISH: ‘¿Quién está en el Santísimo Sacramento?’

b. i. Mura Jesu Cto. Dios Teagra, aycetui, Dios, aycetui Ahua, raSahua mucui razu-mucui, rasoe mucui verana, maeramani.
   iii. mura jesucristo, Dios taira, aisetui Dios, aisetui awa, rasawamukui rasuumukui rasuamukui weranu mairamani.

   mura jesucristo Dios taira aised -tui Dios aise -tui awa
   3SG.MS Jesus.Christ God son.MALE.EGO true -tui God true -?
   3SG.MS= soul =COM 3SG.MS= body =COM 3SG.MS= blood =COM COORD
   mairamani

   exactly(.as)

   CLOSE: ‘It is Jesus Christ, the Son of God, true God, true man, with his soul, his body and his blood exactly.’
   SPANISH: ‘Nuestro Señor Jesucristo, verdadero Dios y verdadero Hombre, con su cuerpo, su sangre, su ánima, como está en los cielos; así está ocultamente en el Santísimo Sacramento.’

\footnote{211}{Here our transliteration of <sahuite> as sawaiti relies heavily on (6.32a), in which the orthographic representation of the same word is clearly <sahuaiti>. This latter form, particularly with the medial sequence <ai>, is the expected one given the modern reflex sawaita. It is worth mentioning, however, that there is variation in the form of this root in modern Omagua. Only one speaker of Omagua retains a distinction between sawaita ‘encounter’ and sawiti ‘respond’, while all other speakers have collapsed the two to sawiti, which admittedly resembles the representation <sahuite> here. It is possible that this variation existed even in the Jesuit period, possibly influenced by the monophthongization processes widespread in Kokama-Kokamilla (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012). Also see §9.3.3.}

\footnote{212}{In our transliteration here we take the sequence <cahuaiicari> to have been a copying error from an earlier manuscript in which the word was given as <sahuaitaieari>. The copying errors would be, under this hypothesis: original <s> copied as <c>, <t> copied as <i>, and <e> copied as <c>. All these copying errors are attested elsewhere in the ecclesiastical texts as they have come down to us.}

\footnote{213}{Here it is unclear what to make of the orthographic sequence following <Sacramento>. Espinosa Pérez (1935:162) associates the final <ri> with <Sacramento>, giving <Sacramentoari> (n.b., with an inserted <a>), yielding a combination of ‘sacrament’ plus the modern diffuse locative =ari). However, this results in the order of postpositions =ari=pupe, which is unattested in modern Omagua. Instead, we opt for an analysis in which the entire sequence following <Sacramento> is a single morpheme (excising the final <ri>, and interpret the first <o> following <Sacramento> as an orthographic variant for /il/, yielding =iipe. It is noteworthy that this analysis also has the}
a. i. **Meterepe epuessa sui comulgaiara y acatumarae curataraschi, nuamai hucha yaraschi rana sahuaitimia Santísimo Sacramento?**

ii. meterepe epuessasui comulgaiarayacatu marae curataraschi, nuamai huchayaraschi, ranasahuaitimia santísimo sacramento

iii. mitiripe ipisasui comulgayaranakatu marai kurataɾə, nuamai utʃa[ra]ɾə, ranasahuaitimia santísimo sacramento

mitiripe ipisa sui comulga =yara =ya =katu in.middle.of night =ABL receive.communion =NOMZ:POSS =SIM =INTSF marai kurata =ɾaʃi nua =mai utʃa =yara =ɾaʃi thing drink =NOMZ:INACT sin =NOMZ:POSS =NASS rana= sawaiti =mia santísimo sacramento 3PL.MS= encounter =IRR Holy Sacrament

CLOSE: ‘Drinking in the middle of the night like a communicant, having big sins, would they encounter the Holy Sacrament?’

TARGET: ‘Drinking in the middle of the night like a communicant, but being a great sinner, would they receive the Holy Sacrament?’

SPANISH: none

b. i. **Roayamania ranasahuaitimia.**

ii. roaya mania ranasahuaitimia.

iii. roaya mania ranasawaitimia.

roaya mania rana= sawaiti =mia NEG how 3PL.MS= encounter =IRR

CLOSE: ‘They would never encounter it.’

TARGET: ‘They would never receive it.’

SPANISH: none

---

214 See footnote 173.
215 See footnote 175.
216 The appearance of the ablative =sui in mitiripe ipisasui is likely the result of a calque based on Spanish en medio de la noche or German mitten in der Nacht (depending on the native language of the author). The corresponding modern expression for ‘midnight’ is ipisamitirip, where =mitirip functions as a postposition, without need for the (additional) postposition =sui.
217 From Spanish comulgar ‘receive communion’.
218 The appearance of marai ‘thing’ as an apparent object here is probably a relic of a noun incorporation process common in Tupí-Guaraní languages (Dietrich 1994:112) but no longer attested in modern Omagua.
219 In modern Omagua, the affricate of this form has lenided, i.e., uʃa.
220 See footnote 211.
221 The doctrinal point being made here is not immediately clear, but we believe that the Jesuits were attempting to clarify that merely drinking sacramental wine was insufficient for absolution, and that the wine had to be drunk in the context of Holy Communion in order for it to have the desired spiritual effect. In particular, we interpret the mention of drinking in the middle of the night ‘like a communicant’ as referring to the hypothetical act of sneaking into the church and surreptitiously drinking the sacramental wine. We find it plausible that the Jesuits would have found it particularly important to communicate to new indigenous converts that salvation can only be achieved with the mediation of the priest, and not directly from the bread and wine consumed in the rites.
222 The combination of the negator and mania ‘how’ is analogous to modern Omagua nimania (where ni is also a
(6.33) a. i. *Nesepiari tipa ay quiera upacatu Dios comessamaicana, aicetui Dios, upai higuatara, roaya vischanisuri, roaya mue tasuri, Dios cumessa Ycua?*

ii. *Nesepari tipa ay quiera, upacatu Dios comessamaicana, aicetui Dios, upai higuatara, roaya vischanisuri, roaya muesarui, Dios cumessa Ycua?*

iii. *nesapiari aikiara, upakatu Dios kumesamaikan, aicetui Dios, upai ikuata, roaya wisanisuri, roaya mitesa, Dios kumesaikua?*

\( ne=\) sapiari \( =\) tipa aikiara \( \text{upa} =\) katu Dios kumesa \( =\) mai
\( 2SG=\) obey \( =\)  INTERR DEM.PROX.MS all \( =\) INTSF God say \( =\) NOMZ:INACT
\( \text{=kana aise}^{222} \text{-tui Dios upai ikua -tara roaya wifani} \)
\( =\) PL.MS true \( =\) God every know -NOMZ:ACT NEG be.dishonest
\( -\) suri \( \text{roaya mitesu} -\) suri Dios kumesa \( =\) ikua
\( -\) NOMZ:SUBJ NEG deceive -NOMZ:SUBJ God say \( =\) REAS

CLOSE: ‘Do you obey this, all of the things that God says, true God, he who knows everything, he who is not dishonest, he who does not deceive, because God says them?’

TARGET: ‘Do you obey all the words of God, true God, all-knowing, not deceitful, because God says them?’

SPANISH: ‘¿Creéis todo lo dicho por ser palabras de Dios, que no puede engañar ni engañarse?’

b. i. *Upcatu ta Hia mucuicatu tasapiari.*

ii. Upacatu taHiamucuicatu tasapiari.

iii. upakatu taियamukuikatu tasapiari.

\( \text{upa} =\) katu \( \text{ta=}\) \( \text{Iya} =\) mukui \( =\) katu ta= sapiari
all \( =\) INTSF 1SG.MS= heart \( =\) COM \( =\) INTSF 1SG.MS= obey

CLOSE: ‘I obey them with my all my heart.’

SPANISH: ‘Sí lo creo con todo corazón.’

(6.34) a. i. *Nesara tipa upacatu ne hia mucui catu Dios ari enehuchacana ratenepe ta ari, neumanuraschi raerusuri ene Sahua Euate mai ritamata cate, naraschi?*

ii. *Nesaratipa upacatu nehiamucuicatu Diosari ene huchacana ratenepetaaari, neumanuraschi, raerusuri ene Sahua Euatemai ritamacate, naraschi?*

iii. *nesaratipa upakatu nei�amukuikatu Diosari ene utfakana ratenepetari, neumanuraʃi, raerusuri ene sawa iwatimai ritamakate, naraʃi?*

\( \text{ne=}\) sara \( =\) tipa \( \text{upa} =\) katu \( \text{ne=}\) \( \text{Iya} =\) mukui \( =\) katu Dios
\( 2SG=\) await \( =\)  INTERR all \( =\) INTSF 2SG= heart \( =\) COM \( =\) INTSF God
\( =\) ari \( =\) end \( =\) utf\(a\) = katu \( =\) tenepeta = ari ne = umanu = raf\(i\)
\( =\) LOC.DIFF 2SG \( =\)  PL.MS 3SG.MS= forgive \( =\) IMPF 2SG= die \( =\) NASS

(negator), which is one way to express the meaning ‘never’. Although the exact constituents of the construction are unattested as such today, we translate roaya mania as ‘never’ based on this parallelism.

\(^{223}\) Omagua permits third-person object pro-drop in this context; the appropriate pronoun would be mua.

\(^{224}\) See footnote 173.

\(^{225}\) See footnote 175.
CLOSE: ‘Do you await God with all your heart, that he will forgive your sins, and that when you die he will take your soul to the high village?

TARGET: ‘Do you have faith in God, with all of your heart, that he will forgive your sins, and that when you die he will take your soul to Heaven?’

SPANISH: ‘¿Esperas firmemente en Dios que te ha de salvar?’

b. i. Muriaytasara ta hia (hua?) mucuicatu.

ii. muriat asara tahiamucuicatu.

iii. muriat asara taιamyamukiuikuatu.

muτia -i ta= sara ta = iya = mukui = katu

thus -229 1SG.MS= hope 230 1SG.MS= heart =COM =INTSF

CLOSE: ‘Thus I hope with all my heart.’

SPANISH: ‘Sí, espero.’

(6.35) a. i. Nesaschita tipa upcatu ne hai mucui catu yenne Papa Dios upacatu mara encana neucua tarischi ra erasemaicatu y cuα?

ii. Nesaschitatipata upcatu nehaimucuicatu yennePapa Dios upacatu maraencana neucuataarthi raerasemaicatuycuα?

iii. nesafitatipata upakatu nιyamukiuikuatu yenepapa dios, upakatu marainkana nekuatarαfi, raerasemaikatuikuα?

ne= safita =tipa upa = katu ne= ιya = mukui = katu yene=

2SG= love =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG= heart =COM =INTSF 1PL.INCL= papa dios upa = katu marain = kana ne= ukuata = raαfi ra= era

father God all =INTSF thing =PL.MS 2SG= pass.by231=NASS 3SG.MS= good = semai = katu = ikua

= FOC:VER =INTSF = REAS

CLOSE: ‘Do you love our father God with all your heart, even though you may pass by all things, because he is really truly good?’

TARGET: ‘Do you love our father God with all your heart, even though anything may happen to you, because he is really truly good?’

SPANISH: ‘¿Amas a Dios muy bueno, sobre todas las cosas?’

b. i. Upacatu ta hia mukuicatu tasas chitamura.

226 Based on the same construction in modern Omagua, we would expect that the possessor be expressed with the proclitic ne=, as independent pronouns are never used to indicate possessors (see §2.2.1).

227 See footnote 226.

228 We suspect that the use of saτa ‘await’ with the diffuse locative =αri, later in the sentence, is a calque on Spanish esperar en ‘have faith in’ (see §9.3.2.3).

229 See footnote 136.

230 See footnote 228.
ii. Upacatu tahiamuicatu tasaschita mura.

iii. upakatu tāiyamukuikatu tasafita mura.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upa} & = \text{katu} & \text{ta} = \tilde{\text{iya}} & = \text{mukui} & = \text{katu} & \text{ta} = \text{safita} & \text{mura} \\
\text{all} & = \text{INTSF} & 1\text{SG.MS} & = \text{heart} & = \text{COM} & = \text{INTSF} & 1\text{SG.MS} & = \text{love} & 3\text{SG.MS}
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘I love him with all my heart.’
SPANISH: ‘Sí, le amo.’

(6.36) a. i. Ne yememua tipa upacatu nehia mucuicatu ne huchacana pupe ne ya muerata y cu a yenne yara Dios?

ii. Neyememua tipa upacatu nehia mucuicatu ne huchacana pupe neyamuerataycua yennyara Dios?

iii. neyamimiatipa upakatu ni\text{\`y}amukuikatu neut cua yenne yara Dios?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ne} & = \text{yamimia} & = \text{tipa} & \text{upa} & = \text{katu} & \text{ne} = \tilde{\text{iya}} & = \text{mukui} & = \text{katu} & \text{ne} = \text{utfa} \\
2\text{SG.} & = \text{grieve} & = \text{INTERR} & \text{all} & = \text{INTSF} & 2\text{SG.} & = \text{heart} & = \text{COM} & = \text{INTSF} & 2\text{SG.} & = \text{sin} \\
\text{=kana} & = \text{pupe} & \text{ne} = \text{yumira} & \text{-ta} & = \text{ikua} & \text{yene} = \text{yara} & \text{Dios} \\
\text{=PL.MS} & = \text{INSTR} & 2\text{SG.} & = \text{get.angry -CAUS} & = \text{REAS} & 1\text{PL.INCL} & = \text{master God}
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Do you grieve with all your heart because you have angered our master God with your sins?’
TARGET: ‘Do you grieve with all your heart because you have angered our Lord God with your sins?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Te pesa haberle ofendido?’

b. i. Upacatu ta hia mucui catu ta ya memue amura.

ii. Upacatu tahiamuicatu tayamemuea mura.

iii. upakatu tāiyamukuikatu tayamimia mura.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{upa} & = \text{katu} & \text{ta} = \tilde{\text{iya}} & = \text{mukui} & = \text{katu} & \text{ta} = \text{yamimia} & \text{mura} \\
\text{all} & = \text{INTSF} & 1\text{SG.MS} & = \text{heart} & = \text{COM} & = \text{INTSF} & 1\text{SG.MS} & = \text{lament} & 3\text{SG.MS}
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘I lament it with all my heart.’
SPANISH: ‘Me pesa mucho.’

(6.37) a. i. Neceta tipa nesapiari upacatu ne hia mucuicatu?

ii. Necetatipa nesapiari upacatu nehiamuicatu?

iii. nesetatipa nesapiari upakatu ne\text{\`y}amukuikatu?

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ne} & = \text{seta} & = \text{tipa} & \text{ne} & = \text{sapiari} & \text{upa} & = \text{katu} & \text{ne} = \tilde{\text{iya}} & = \text{mukui} & = \text{katu} \\
2\text{SG.} & = \text{want} & = \text{INTERR} & 2\text{SG.} & = \text{obey} & \text{all} & = \text{INTSF} & 2\text{SG.} & = \text{heart} & = \text{COM} & = \text{INTSF}
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘Do you want to obey with all your heart?’
SPANISH: ‘¿Propones la enmienda?’

b. i. Upacatu ta hia mucui taseta tasapiari.

\[^{231}\text{The use of } \text{ukuata} \text{ ‘pass by’ appears to be the result of a calque based on Spanish } \text{pasar} \text{ (see §9.3.3).}
\[^{232}\text{Given that } \text{yamimia} \text{ is transitive in this instance (i.e., note } \text{mura}, \text{ we gloss it as ‘lament’, as opposed to ‘grieve’ in (6.36a). Note that } \text{yamimia} \text{ is not attested as a transitive verb in modern Omagua.}\]
ii. Upacatu tahiamucui taseta tasapiari.

iii. upakatu tāyamukuikatu taseta tasapiari.

\[ \text{upa} = \text{katu} \quad \text{ta=} \quad \text{ìya} = \text{mukui} = \text{katu} \quad \text{ta=} \quad \text{seta} \quad \text{ta=} \quad \text{sapiari} \]

\[ \text{all} = \text{INTSF 1SG.MS=} \quad \text{heart} = \text{COM} = \text{INTSF 1SG.MS=} \quad \text{want} \quad \text{1SG.MS=} \quad \text{obey} \]

CLOSE: ‘I want to obey with all my heart.’
SPANISH: ‘Sí.’

\[ \text{In modern Omagua, the subject of a complement clause verb that is coreferential with the subject of the matrix clause verb is elided. We do not know if the repetition of the coreferential pronominal proclitic was grammatical in Old Omagua.} \]
Chapter 7

Profession of Faith

Below we give the Profession of Faith as it appears originally in the appendix to Uriarte’s diaries (Uriarte[1776]1986:617). In this way the reader can evaluate our decisions as to sentence breaks in comparison with those that (presumably) reflect the original manuscript. In (7.1)-(7.6) we present this short text in the format outlined in §3.1.

**ACTUS FIDEI, SPEI, ET CHRITATIS, AC CONTRITIONIS, SIMULQUE ATRITIONIS.**

**EN LENGUA OMAQUA**

*Ta-Yara Jesu Cto., aycetui Dios, aycetui Abua enesamai tasapiari enecumafsamacana ari.* Enesemai tasaschita upacatu mara encana ucuataraschi. *Ene era Dios taschitaraschi, Epuepe maitata topa toaquase araschi veranu, taya me muea upacatu ta huchacana pupe tayo muerata y cu a ene era Dios ene yumaya huersrachita, ro ayahuere taya muerata ari Ene: upaita huchacana era ta confefsa yara ari: huchacana sepe Patiri. Ta Papa Jesu Cto., Cruz ariencumanu yena, tenepeta ta, ta huchacana, erusuta. Euate mairitama cate. Amén. JHS*

(7.1)  

**a. Ta-Yara Jesu Cto., aycetui Dios, aycetui Abua, enesamai tasapiari enecumafsamacana ari.**

b. Tayara jesu cto., aycetui dios, aycetui abua, enesamai tasapiari ene cumafsamacanaari.

c. *taya jesucristo, aisetui dios, aisetui awa, enesemai tasapiari ene kumesamaikanari.*

\[ta= \text{yata jesucristo aise }^{234}\text{-tui dios aise -tui awa ene }^{235}=\text{semai} \]

\[1SG.MS= \text{master Jesus.Christ true -}^{234}\text{ God true -?} \text{ man } 2SG =\text{FOC:VER} \]

\[ta= \text{sapiari ene kumesa }^{235}=\text{mai} =\text{kana }^{236}=\text{ari} \]

\[1SG.MS= \text{believe } 2SG \text{ say } =\text{NOMZ:INACT =PL.MS =LOC.DIFF} \]

CLOSE: ‘My master Jesus Christ, true God, true man, I truly believe in you and the things you say.’

TARGET: ‘My Lord Jesus Christ, true God, true man, I truly believe in you and your words.’

---

234 See footnote 173

235 The appearance of diffuse locative =ari would be ungrammatical in the corresponding modern Omagua sentence as
(7.2) a. Enesemai tasachita upacatu mara encanca ucuataraschi.
   b. Enesemai tasachita upacatu maraencana ucuataraschi.
   c. enesemai tasafita upakatu marainkana ukuaturaschi.

   \[\text{ene} = \text{sem} \quad \text{ta} = \text{sa} \quad \text{upa} = \text{katu} \quad \text{mar} = \text{ka} \quad \text{ukuata} = \text{rafı}\]

   2SG = FOC:VER 1SG.MS= love all =INTSF thing =PL.MS pass.by =NASS

   CLOSE: ‘I truly love you, even though all things may pass by.’

   TARGET: ‘I truly love you, even though anything may happen.’

(7.3) a. Ene era Dios taschitaraschi, Epuepe maitata topa toaquase araschi veranu, taya me muea upacatu ta huchacana pupe tayo muerata y cua ene era Dios.
   b. Ene era Dios taschitaraschi, Epuepemai tata topa toaquasearaschi veranu, tayamemuea upacatu tahuchacanupupe tayomuerataycua ene era Dios.
   c. ene era Dios ta[sa]taraʃi, ipipemai tata tupa taakisiaraʃi weranu, tayamimia upimacatu tautʃakanapupe tayumirataikua ene era dios.

   \[\text{ene} \quad \text{era} \quad \text{dios} \quad \text{ta} = \text{sa} \quad \text{ta} = \text{mai} \quad \text{tata} \quad \text{tupa} \quad \text{ta} = \text{us}
   \]

   2SG good God 1SG.MS= love =NASS be.inside =NOMZ:INACT fire place 1SG.MS= akisid

   =rafı weranu ta= yamimia upa =katu ta= utfa =kana

   fear =NASS COORD 1SG.MS= gripe all =INTSF 1SG.MS= sin =PL.MS

   =pupe ta= yumira -ta =ikuam. ene era dios

   =INSTR 1SG.MS= get.angry -CAUS =REAS 2SG good God

   CLOSE: ‘Loving you good God, and fearing the inner fire place, I grieve because I have angered you good God, with all of my sins.’

   TARGET: ‘Loving you good God, and fearing Hell, I grieve because I have angered you, good God, with all of my sins.’

(7.4) a. Ene yumaya huresrachita, ro ayahuere taya muerata ari Ene.
   b. Ene yumayahuressrachia ta, roaya huere tayamuerataari Ene.
   c. ene yumiawiaraʃi ta, roaya [uya]wir\[239\] tayumiratari ene.

   \[\text{ene} \quad \text{yumiawi} \quad \text{ta}= \text{rafı} \quad \text{ta} \quad \text{roaya} \quad \text{uyaw} \quad \text{ta}= \quad \text{yumira} - \text{ta} = \text{ari} \quad \text{ene}
   \]

   2SG help =NASS 1SG.MS NEG again 1SG.MS= get.angry -CAUS =IMPF 2SG

   CLOSE: ‘If you help me, I will not anger you again.’

---

236 The object of sapiai ‘obey, believe’ requires no oblique-licensing postposition. We suspect that the appearance of the diffuse locative is the result of a calque on the Spanish creer en ‘believe in’.
237 The argument structure of ukuata ‘pass by’ is reversed in comparison to (6.35a) (see footnote 231).
238 The modern Omagua reflex of this form is akiʃa. Our transliteration of <aquasea> as akiʃa, in particular the transliteration of the word-medial <a> as i, is based on two sources: 1) Espinosa Pérez (1935:163, emphasis ours) transcribes <raqsea>, which suggests that the medial vowel in question was i, and not a; 2) The Kokama-Kokamilla cognate is akitʃa, which exhibits i in the second syllable, as well as the Kokama-Kokamilla reduction of ia to a, a process which occurred in final position in words of three syllables or more (O’Hagan & Wauters 2012).
239 Our insertion of uya here makes the sentence comprehensible, and also follows Espinosa Perez’s (1935:164) transliteration of this portion of the catechism: <roaya huyahuere>. 
(7.5) a. Upaita huchacana era ta confesa yara ari: huchacana sepue Patiri.
   b. Upai tahuchacana era taconfesa yaraari. huchacanasepue Patiri [huanacarimai ta amuyasukatari] \(^{240}\)
   c. upai tautakana era taconfesayaraari. utfakanasepiti wanakarimai ta amuyasukatari.

\[
\begin{align*}
upai & = \text{every 1SG.MS} = \text{sin} = \text{PL.MS good 1SG.MS} = \text{confess} = \text{NOMZ:POSS} = \text{IMPF} \\
utfa & = \text{kana} = \text{sepi patiri wanakari} = \text{mai} = \text{amuyasukata} = \text{ari} \\
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘I will confess every sin well. Because of my sins I will observe what the priest orders.’
TARGET: ‘I will properly confess every sin. Because of my sins I will observe the priest’s instructions.’

(7.6) a. Ta Papa Jesu Cto., Cruz ariencumanu yena, tenepeta ta, ta huchacana, erusuta. Euatemairritama cate. Amén. JHS
   b. TaPapa Jesu Cto., Cruzari enc umanu yena, tenepeta ta tahuchacana, erusu ta Euatemai
   rritamacate.
   c. tapapa jesucristo, cruzari ene umanuikua, tenepeta taa tautakana. erusu taa iwatimai
   ritamakate.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ta} & = \text{papa jesucristo cruz} = \text{ari ene umanu} = \text{ikua} \text{ tenepeta taa} \\
\text{1SG.MS} & = \text{father Jesus Christ cross} = \text{LOC.DIFF 2SG die} = \text{REAS forgive} \text{ 1SG.MS} \\
\text{ta} & = \text{utfa = kanda} \^{241} \\
\text{1SG.MS} & = \text{sin} = \text{PL.MS} \\
\text{erusu taa} \text{ iwati} & = \text{mai} \text{ ritama = kate} \\
take \text{ 1SG.MS be.high.up} = \text{NOMZ:INACT village} = \text{ALL} \\
\end{align*}
\]

CLOSE: ‘My Father Jesus Christ, because you died on the cross, forgive me my sins. Take me to Heaven.’

\(^{240}\) The text in brackets does not appear in either Uriarte ([1776]1952a) or Uriarte ([1776]1986), but only in Espinosa Pérez (1935:164). Although it is enclosed in parentheses in the latter work (which likely reflects that it was enclosed in parentheses in the original manuscript), it must be included for the clause following the colon to be grammatical.

\(^{241}\) See footnote 114.
Chapter 8

Omagua Passages in Uriarte’s Diaries

In this chapter we present and analyze all of the Omagua utterances that Manuel Uriarte included in his diaries, which were published as Uriarte ([1776]1952b:6) and Uriarte ([1776]1986). We include these utterances as part of this larger work for two reasons. First, they are examples of mid-18th-century Omagua, and as such, help us to understand how Omagua differed at this point in time from modern Omagua. Second, unlike the ecclesiastical texts published with his diaries, there is no question regarding the authorship of the Omagua utterances found in Uriarte’s diaries themselves, which helps us judge Uriarte’s command of Omagua. This in turn allows us to better evaluate the likelihood of Uriarte playing a major role in authoring one or more of the ecclesiastical texts discussed in previous chapters.

We now briefly summarize what we know and can guess about these diaries. Manuel Uriarte kept a diary throughout his eighteen-year stay in Maynas, and up to the Jesuit expulsion. By this point his diaries had reached two large volumes, together with a set of ecclesiastical documents (Sp. papeles espirituales), linguistic notes (Sp. apuntes de lenguas) and conversations (Sp. pláticas). Fearing he would not be allowed to take his personal papers back with him to Europe, he spent the months leading up to the arrival in Maynas of the new secular head of the missions, Manuel Mariano Echeverría, reducing his diaries to a compendio that he could take along with his other papers in a small chest. Immediately preceding his departure from San Regis (Marañón River), his final missionary posting, Uriarte sent his original diaries to Echeverría, who had established himself in Lagunas (Huallaga River). Bayle writes the following with regard to the fate of his original diaries:

Los tomos los envió al Sr. Echeverría, Superior de los Curas, «suplicándole los guardase o quemase, si corrían peligro»; en caso contrario que los remitiese a su familia. Desde Rávena (13 de enero de 1776) escribe a su hermano Agustín: «Don Manuel Mariano, Prevendado [sic] quitense (y a falta suya Dn. Marcos o Dn. José Bazabe nro. Comisario) le darán las Memorias o Diarios que le dejé allá encargados en dos tomos.»


242 See Uriarte ([1776]1986:523) for the original account of these events.

243 Translation (ours):

The volumes he sent to Sr. Echeverría, Father Superior, “begging that he keep them or burn them if
When Uriarte and his Jesuit companions arrived at the Portuguese-controlled settlement of São Paulo de Olivença in Amazonas, Brazil, the Jesuit Superior, Francisco Javier Aguilar (b. 1720 Montilla, Spain – d. 1789 Rimini, Italy), demanded that they burn all of their papers. Uriarte made a final attempt to hand off his compendio, by that point the only record of his diaries in his possession, to José Basave, special commissioner appointed to oversee the Jesuit exodus. However, the fate of the compendio and the original version of the diaries that Uriarte sent to Echeverría remains unknown.

Uriarte is reported to have rewritten his diaries upon his arrival in Italy, beginning in December 1771 and finishing in early 1776 (Espinosa Pérez 1955:428). The level of detail throughout the diaries (names, exact dates, etc.) is impressive, especially if Uriarte actually worked entirely from memory, as is reported. In fact, the level of detail leads us to suspect that Uriarte was indeed able to smuggle some set of papers relating to his diaries out of the New World, although Uriarte does not specifically mention any such surviving papers.

The Omagua passages found in Uriarte’s diaries on the whole demonstrate a relatively strong control of Omagua grammar, although we have annotated them at points where the Omagua is either ungrammatical or exhibits the effects of calquing from Spanish. For some passages, Uriarte provides an in-text translation into Spanish, which is also given here. The English translations provided are our own. We contextualize each example to aid in their interpretations, and the Omagua passages are separated into sections according to the part and section number in which they are located in the original manuscript.

### 8.1 Part II, Section 71

In May 1756 a group of Portuguese soldiers, having deserted a military camp (Sp. real) on the Rio Negro, arrived at San Joaquín seeking rest, shelter, and food. Uriarte accepted them, but insisted that, along with being well mannered residents of the community, they participate actively in the church. The soldiers acceded, and Uriarte remarks that a lay Omagua church official (Sp. fiscal mayor) used to shout out the utterance given in (8.1) whenever a Portuguese soldier was late for Sunday church activities or a fiesta.

---

245 Jouanen (1943:23).
246 See Uriarte ([1776]1986:535-536) for the original narration of these events.
247 Uriarte ([1776]1986:239) does report, however, that he was able to hide a Tikuna ecclesiastical text in a book and subsequently smuggle it to Italy. We assume that the Tikuna ecclesiastical texts that are included in his published diaries (Uriarte [1776]1986:618-621) derive from this text. Furthermore, two Austrian Jesuits, Franz Xavier Plindendorfer (b. 1726 Wegscheid) (Jouanen 1943:742) and Franz Xavier Veigl, are reported to have sequestered some subset of their personal papers in their pillow sacks (Uriarte [1776]1986:536), suggesting that other Jesuits may have at least been able to do the same.
248 See Uriarte ([1776]1986:241-245) for a more detailed account of these events.
249 The utterances are presented in the same format found in the preceding chapters and outlined in §3.1.
8.2 Part II, Section 82

In August 1757, Uriarte is summoned to a house in San Joaquín where a young Omagua man named Manuel has hanged himself. Uriarte, who does not initially suspect suicide, is struck by a comment made by the young man’s grieving mother: “‘Se habría acordado que otros hartos parientes se mataban en el monte’” (Uriarte [1776]1986:253). To get to the bottom of the matter, Uriarte asks the question in (8.2a). The mother responds in (8.2b). In the end Uriarte denounces the suicide, indicating to the family that the man will not be buried in the church, and that they may throw his body in the river.

(8.2) a. i. Aiquara gue ca agua rati-ti ayucarann?
   ii. Aiquara gueca agua ratiti ayuca rann?
   iii. aikiara wika awa ratiti ayuka ranu?
      aikiara wika awa ra= titi ayuka ranu
      DEM.PROX.MS be.strong person 3SG.MS= be.alone kill
      ‘Did this strong man kill himself?’

b. i. Roaya amua pua zui nunanuzenom.
   ii. Roaya amua puazui nunanuzenom.
   iii. roaya amua puasui r[a]umanusenuni.
      roaya amua pua =sui ra= umanu =senuni
      NEG other hand =ABL 3SG.MS= die =PURP
      ‘So that he wouldn’t die from another hand.’

---

250 This word appears to have been adopted by several distinct linguistic groups by the middle of the 18th century as an ethnonym for the Portuguese, and is also attested in a mid-18th-century grammar of Secoya (Tukanoan) (see Cipoletti [1992:191]). Uriarte comments regarding this form: “los blancos carayoas (asi entienden, portugueses)” (Uriarte [1776]1986:242). The modern Omagua term for a white person is mai.

251 Translation (ours): “‘He must have remembered that so many other relatives killed each other in the forest’.”

252 Based on Omagua and the other ecclesiastical texts we expect the stative verb wika ‘be strong’ to be nominalized with =mai here, as stative verbs must be nominalized in order to function as nominal modifiers.

253 See footnote 141
The Omagua in (8.2) exhibits a number of grammatical inconsistencies, and unfortunately, the in-text translation that appears following each of these two passages does not appear to be Uriarte’s own, and as such we do not make use of it here. Perhaps the greatest problems involve the reflexive construction ratiti ayuka ranu (presumably ‘he killed himself’). This utterance would not be grammatical in modern Omagua, with titi ‘be alone’ in clause-initial position, although it is grammatical when titi follows the entire verb phrase, as in (8.3). Likewise the syntactic role of the 3PL.MS pronoun ranu is unclear, given that the reflexive verb should not take an object argument.

(8.3) awitaku las once yini, nani takumisa titikutu.

awi =taku las once yini nani ta= kumisa titi =katu
already =DUB eleven o’clock 1PL.INCL QUOT 1SG.MS= say be.alone =INTSF

“‘It’s already eleven o’clock’, I said to myself.”
(MCT:CI.S5)

The use of ablative =sui in (8.2b) is clearly a calque based on the Spanish de otra mano ‘by another hand’, as =sui otherwise only indicates motion away from some relevant reference point, and not an instrumental role. Lastly, the response in (8.2b) suggests that the question in (8.2a) should begin with a reason interrogative pronoun, but it does not.

8.3 Part II, Section 105

In the latter part of 1759, Uriarte and the residents of San Joaquín repeatedly came into conflict with the local secular governor (see Uriarte ([1776]1986:269-275)), who eventually threw an Omagua man named Pantaleón in the stocks. Uriarte then reports a relative of Pantaleón as having uttered the sentence in (8.4). The curaca, Tadeo Gualinima, freed Pantaleón without informing either the governor or Uriarte, and the two fled with their extended families to the Ucayali. They returned in 1760, but in the interim the governor had, on Uriarte’s recommendation, appointed Nicolás Zumiari as the new curaca.

(8.4) a. Ayaize Tuisa, yane zeta ya napara. Enome yomuer Patiri. roaya epecatarasi Pantaleón, upaicana usuaari caucacati.

---

254 In modern Omagua, ayuka means ‘hit’, though it is clear from cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages that Proto-Omagua-Kokama *ayuka meant ‘kill’. In modern Omagua, ‘kill’ is umanuta (cf. umanu ‘die’).

255 Here we change <n> to r and insert a. Our alteration is motivated by the deduction that the subject must be third person, since we assume it to be coreferential with the subject of the preceding sentence. The lack of a vowel in ra= in the original text is presumably due to an instance of heteromorphemic vowel hiatus resolution (a trait of fast speech), which is unusual in the ecclesiastical texts (see footnote 106).

256 The translation appears to have been inserted by Bayle himself, as it is identical to a translation provided in a footnote on the same page that comes from Lucas Espinosa, and more closely resembles an interlinear gloss than a free translation, which Uriarte’s own translations clearly are. In line with our own discussion of the grammatical inconsistencies of this passage, Espinosa himself comments on this passage in the following way: “Noto alguna diferencia en la estructura de las palabras comparando con el modo de expresión que emplean actualmente los omaguas, pero son perfectamente inteligibles las frases” [Translation (ours): “I notice some difference in the structure of the words when comparing them with the mode of expression that the Omagua employ currently, but the phrases are perfectly intelligible”] (Uriarte [1776]1986:253).

257 The surname also appears spelled as <Zamiari> in Uriarte’s diaries.

c. ayaize tuisa, yeneseta yawapa

**In modern Omagua, this form has reduced to yaupara.** This same reduction pattern has occurred with all words beginning with the sequence *yawa*, when the second syllable appears in unstressed position preceding a stop (e.g., *yawakara* ‘menstruate’ > *yaukara*).

In Uriarte’s Omagua passages, *patiri* appears in both vocative and referential contexts. In modern Omagua, Spanish *padre* has replaced vocative *patiri*, and the latter is only attested in referential contexts. In what follows we gloss *patiri* as ‘priest’ but translate late it as a vocative where appropriate.

In modern Omagua overt verbal subjects are obligatory, but no subject appears before *epekata* ‘open’ here. Note that otherwise, the same subject requirement appears to hold for Old Omagua.

See Uriarte ([1776]1986:312-316) for a more detailed account of these events.

Note, incidentally, the use of the Omagua toponym *Tawatini* (from *tawa* ‘clay’ and *tini* ‘be white’) and not the later Nheengatú toponym *Tabatinga*.

Podocnemis expansa and Podocnemis unifilis, respectively.

8.4 Part III, Section 13

During the Spanish invasion of Portugal in the latter half of 1762 (part of the events of the Seven Years’ War), the residents of San Joaquín feared reprisals from Portuguese soldiers in the western portion of Brazil. Word reached Uriarte via José Bahamonde (b. 1710 Quito – d. 1786 Ravenna), resident priest at Peba, located nearer the Brazilian border, that a garrison of 40 Portuguese soldiers was in fact stationed further east at *Tawatini* (modern-day Tabatinga). In these tense circumstances, an indigenous man named Simón Nicanor came to Uriarte with the news that he heard a tremendous noise while fishing in the *quebrada de Mayorunas* (location unknown), which Nicanor attributed to the soldiers’ drums. This rumor spread through San Joaquín, and many residents fled into the forest to escape a possible assault. During their absence, those Omagua that remained in the community snuck into the homes abandoned by those who fled and filled them with shells of *charapas* and *taricayas* (two turtle species). Uriarte reports that when the residents eventually returned, the Omagua who played the prank laughed, uttering (8.5).

258 In modern Omagua, this form has reduced to *yaupara*. This same reduction pattern has occurred with all words beginning with the sequence *yawa*, when the second syllable appears in unstressed position preceding a stop (e.g., *yawakara* ‘menstruate’ > *yaukara*).

259 In Uriarte’s Omagua passages, *patiri* appears in both vocative and referential contexts. In modern Omagua, Spanish *padre* has replaced vocative *patiri*, and the latter is only attested in referential contexts. In what follows we gloss *patiri* as ‘priest’ but translate late it as a vocative where appropriate.

260 In modern Omagua overt verbal subjects are obligatory, but no subject appears before *epekata* ‘open’ here. Note that otherwise, the same subject requirement appears to hold for Old Omagua.

261 See Uriarte ([1776]1986:312-316) for a more detailed account of these events.

262 Jouanen (1943:726).

263 Note, incidentally, the use of the Omagua toponym *Tawatini* (from *tawa* ‘clay’ and *tini* ‘be white’) and not the later Nheengatú toponym *Tabatinga*.

264 *Podocnemis expansa* and *Podocnemis unifilis*, respectively.
(8.5)  a. Tariqueja; yaua para suri.
    b. Tariqueja; yauaparasuri.
    c. tarikaya, yawaparasuri.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{tarikaya} & \quad \text{yawapara} \quad \text{-suri} \\
\text{turtle.sp.} & \quad \text{flee} \quad \text{-NOMZ:SUBJ}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Taricaya, fleeing person (i.e., coward).’

(Uriarte [1776]1986:315)

(Uriarte [1776]1986:ibid.) goes on to explain, stating: “Con que entendieron la frase y callaron: que querían decirles, que eran huidores, que corrían al monte lo mismo que las charapas al río”.

8.5 Part III, Section 28

In approximately June 1763, Manuel Ezeguazo, who was the elderly Omagua mayor (Sp. alcaldé) of San Joaquín, died. Uriarte reports the following interaction near to his death:

...éste [Manuel Ezeguazo], que había sido de mucha autoridad entre los Omaguas, me dijo cerca de morir: “Padre, no te olvidarás de mi hijo Andrés (era de unos siete años); le darás algún cuchillo”. Yo le respondí: “No sólo eso, sino lo criaré en casa, como mi hijo, si su madre quiere”.

(Uriarte [1776]1986:329)

Uriarte reports that Manuel then uttered (8.6) to his wife.

(8.6)  a. Ename ucagrachupi Andrés; taumanu cápuaré, erusu Padre ucacati.
    b. Ename ucagrachupi Andrés; taumanucápuaré, erusu Padre ucacati.
    c. ename uka rasupe Andrés. taumanu[sa]kapiri, erusu padre ukakate.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ename ukaira} & \quad \text{supe} \quad \text{Andrés} \\
\text{PROH} & \quad \text{be.stingy} \quad \text{APPL} \quad \text{Andrés}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
ta= & \quad \text{umanu} \quad \text{sa} \quad \text{kapiri} \quad \text{erusu padre} \quad \text{uka} \quad \text{ka} \quad \text{ALL}
\end{align*}
\]

265 We have chosen this transliteration of <tariqueja> based on the modern Omagua reflex tarikaya. However, we recognize that there are significant leaps implicit in our decision that may not be faithful to the phonemic representation of this word in the Jesuit period. For example, although <e> is elsewhere in these texts confused with /a/, the fact that it follows <qu> leads us to believe that it is really <e> in the manuscript (otherwise <qu> should be <c>, given standard Spanish orthographic conventions).

266 Translation (ours): “With which they understood the phrase and quieted down: that they meant to say to them that they were cowards, that they ran to the forest the same as a charapa to the river.”

267 Uriarte ([1776]1986:329) places the date near to the celebration of Corpus Christi, a Catholic holiday that takes place 60 days after Easter, which in 1763 fell on April 3.

268 This surname is also spelt <Eceguazu> (Uriarte [1776]1986:232), and corresponds to isiwasu ‘deer’.

269 Translation (ours): ‘This [man], who had a lot of authority among the Omagua, told me close to his death: “Father, you won’t forget my son Andrés (he was about seven years old); you’ll give him a knife or something”. I responded to him: “Not just that, but I’ll raise him in my home as my own son, if his mother is willing’.”
‘Don’t be stingy with Andrés. After I die, take him to the Father’s house.’

ORIGINAL: ‘No lo mezquines, llévalo, muerto yo, a casa del Padre.’

The above example is the only attestation in the ecclesiastical texts of the applicative function of =supe, which elsewhere functions as a postposition that attaches to nouns and licenses oblique arguments denoting a goal. It is not attested in the modern language. However, an applicative -tsupe has been described for Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a:380-382), and we assume it to be reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama (see §2.2.3.2.2).

With regard to its form, note that Uriarte writes <chupi>, with an initial unexpected affricate. We assume this to be an idiosyncratic orthographic representation, and not evidence for the alternative hypothesis that the applicative and oblique-licensing postposition reconstruct to distinct morphemes in Proto-Omagua-Kokama.

Diacritics are not found in the Lord’s Prayer or Catechism Fragment, and only once in the Full Catechism (see (6.22a)). Their inclusion is interesting, but difficult to interpret because of their sporadic appearance.

The insertion of sa is supported by Espinosa’s representation of the manuscript (see footnote 274). It is unclear, however, if Bayle accidentally omitted this sequence of letters in his own representation of the manuscript, or if Espinosa Pérez inserted it without comment in order to make the utterance intelligible.

Note that, unlike the Lord’s Prayer and Full Catechism, in which =kate is always rendered orthographically as <cate>, Uriarte consistently writes it as <cati> in the passages throughout this chapter. The only other attestation of the representation <cati> is in the Catechism Fragment, in which it occurs once (with <cate> elsewhere). This distribution in orthographic representation is similar to that of marai ‘thing’ (see footnote 122), although in the latter case a single orthographic representation (<marai>) is found throughout the Catechism Fragment.

That is, she is not to be so possessive over her son as to prevent Uriarte from caring for him.

Espinosa appears to agree with the interpretation of =supe as an applicative. The following passage contains his initials and appears as footnote (12) in Uriarte (1776:329).

A la letra: No mezquinar para Andrés; yo muerto después llevar Padre casa a (Enane ucacra chupi andres ta-umanu zacapuare, erusu Padre uca cati). No para mezquinar a Andrés, expresión enfática equivalente a éstas: No has de mezquinar, no mezquines a Andrés. Mezquinar: modismo regional equivalente a escatimar. Traducción completa: No escatimes a Andrés; yo, después que muera, (lo) llevarás a casa del Padre.

Translation (ours):

Literally: Not be stingy for Andrés; I dead after take Father house to (Enane ucacra chupi andres ta-umanu zacapuare, erusu Padre uca cati). Not to be stingy with Andrés, an emphatic expression equivalent to the following: You must not be stingy with, don’t be stingy with Andrés. Mezquinar, a regionalism equivalent to escatimar. The complete translation: Don’t skimp with Andrés; after I die, take (him) to the house of the Father.

Note that Espinosa’s representation of this section of the manuscript (included parenthetically in the quote above) differs from Bayle’s. Both contain features that are divergent from the proper phonemic representation of the Omagua, such that it is impossible to know which more faithfully reflects the manuscript. However, we should note that, in general, Espinosa appears to have taken more liberty in his transcription of the manuscript, presumably because of his own personal knowledge of Omagua.

Note that, although the final vowel <i> appears to follow Uriarte’s typical pattern of representing Old Omagua final /e/ as <i>, he in fact represents the final vowel of this morpheme as <e> in (8.7).
8.6 Part III, Section 50

At the beginning of 1764, when Uriarte was about to end his seven-year period as the missionary among the Omagua in San Joaquín, he attempted to hand over a set of wax tablets to the incoming priest, on which were recorded the debts owed by community residents to the mission for borrowing tools to carry out various tasks. However, the incoming priest, apparently overwhelmed at the thought of remaining alone in San Joaquín, refused responsibility for the tablets, telling Uriarte that he should turn them over to a secular official named Ponce. Uriarte refused, and instead pardoned all of the residents’ debts.

The Omaguas of San Joaquín were apparently unsatisfied with this turn of events, since they subsequently complained to Ponce that they did not receive payment for wax they had collected. One infers that Uriarte took the cancellation of their debts as having relieved him of the obligation to pay them, but that the Omaguas understood the situation differently, as evident from the utterance in (8.7), which was relayed to him via Ponce.

(8.7) a. Visanipura tenepeta mura: roaya yene zagauite marai, Mapa zupe Patiri zui.
   b. Visanipura tenepeta mura: roaya yenezagauite marai, Mapazupe Patirizui.
   c. wifanipura tenepeta mura. roaya yenesawaiti marai mapasupe patirisui.

\[ \text{wi} \quad \text{Sanipu} \quad \text{be.dishonest} = \text{FOC} \quad \text{forgive} \quad \text{3SG.MS} \]
\[ \text{roaya} \quad \text{yene} = \quad \text{sawaiti} \quad \text{mapa} \quad \text{=supe} \quad \text{patiri} \quad \text{=sui} \]
\[ \text{NEG} \quad \text{1PL.INCL= receive} \quad \text{thing} \quad \text{honeycomb} = \text{GOAL} \quad \text{priest} = \text{ABL} \]

‘[He] forgave it [our debt] disingenuously.\textsuperscript{280} We didn’t receive anything from the priest for [the collection of] the wax.’

ORIGINAL: ‘De chanza diría el Padre que nos perdonaba las deudas; nada nos dio para buscar cera.’

(Uriarte\textsuperscript{[1776]1986:348})

8.7 Part IV, Section 16

In the beginning of 1765, Uriarte was ordered to relocate from Santa Bárbara de Iquitos (on the upper Nanay River) to San Joaquín de Omaguas while Franz Veigl, then Superior, was away. Upon

\textsuperscript{276}Here tenepeta ‘forgive’ lacks a subject \textit{ra=}, just as \textit{epekata} does in \textsuperscript{8.4}.

\textsuperscript{277}Note that we reverse \textit{<au>} in our transliteration of \textit{<zagauite>}, as we understand this to be the same form as \textit{sawaiti} in the Full Catechism (see footnote \textsuperscript{211}). Interestingly, the orthographic representation of phonemic /wl/ here involves \textit{<gu>}, whereas in the Full Catechism this segment is represented as \textit{<hu>} (see Table \textsuperscript{3.1}). This suggests that the manuscript of the Full Catechism was not written by Uriarte (see footnote \textsuperscript{272} for other intertextual orthographic similarities).

\textsuperscript{278}In modern Omagua, we would expect the negative indefinite pronoun \textit{nima} ‘nothing’, rather than \textit{matai} ‘thing’. It is possible, of course, that the use of \textit{nima} in such grammatical contexts results from Spanish influence (cf., \textit{no nos dio nada} ‘he didn’t give us anything’).

\textsuperscript{279}See footnote \textsuperscript{275}.

\textsuperscript{280}Here we translate \textit{wifanipura} as ‘disingenuously’ as a closest approximation to a frustrative. Note that neither Old or modern Omagua exhibit a morphological frustrative, but that \textit{wifani} forms part of an adverbial frustrative in modern Omagua, \textit{wifaniati} ‘in vain’.
Uriarte’s departure for Santa Bárbara in September, an Omagua resident at San Joaquín reportedly uttered (8.8).

(8.8) a. *Patiriquera uri uyauera.*
    
b. Patiriquera uri uyauera.
    
c. patirikira, uri uyawiri.

   \[\text{patiri =}kira \text{ uri uyawiri}\]
   
   priest =DIM come again

   ‘Come again, Father.’

   ORIGINAL: ‘Padre Chiquito, vuelve otra vez.’

   (Uriarte [1776]1986:414)

8.8 Part IV, Section 58

Uriarte attributes the utterance in (8.9) to a group of Omagua who hoped that Uriarte might provide them with tools during a visit he made to San Joaquín in the early months of 1767 (before April), from his residence at San Pablo de Napeanos.

(8.9) a. *ye ne Patiri quera; umeucu.*
    
b. yenePatiriquera; ume ucu.
    
c. yenepatirikira, yume uku.

   \[\text{yene=} \text{patiri =}kira \text{ yume uku}\]
   
   1PL.INCL priest =DIM give needle

   ‘Father, give us needles.’

   ORIGINAL: ‘Nuestro Padre Chiquito, danos agujas.’


8.9 Part IV, Sections 121-122

In October 1768, as Uriarte and his Jesuit companions were being escorted out of Maynas as part of the Jesuit expulsion, they spent several days in San Joaquín. Uriarte reports the following dialogue between him and the Omaguas resident there at this time.

(8.10) a. *Patiriquera usu?*
    
b. Patiriquera usu?
    
c. patirikira usu?

   \[\text{patiri =}kira \text{ usu}\]
   
   priest =DIM go

   ‘Father, are you going?’

   [281]

[281] Although we translate this example with a vocative *patiri* (see footnote [259]), the lack of a second-person subject *ne* means that the translation would literally be ‘Is the priest going?’ However, we assume that our translation reflects the Omagua that Uriarte intended.
(8.11) a. *Patiri maraicua usu ene?*
   i. Patiri maraicua usu ene?
   ii. patiri, maraikua usu ene?
   
   *patiri marai =ikua usu ene*
   priest what =REAS go 2SG
   ‘Father, why are you going?’
   
   ORIGINAL: ‘¿Por qué te vas, Padre?’

b. i. *Dios aiquiara ceta.*
   ii. Dios aiquiara ceta.
   iii. dios aikiara seta.
   
   *dios aikiara seta*
   God DEM.PROX.MS.PRO want
   ‘[Because] God wants it.’
   
   ORIGINAL: ‘Porque Dios lo quiere.’

(8.12) a. *Eraya usu, yene patiricana; Zani za-ni yereba; Dios yumuyauereepe.*
   b. Eraya usu, yenepatiricana; Zani za-ni yereba; Dios yumuyauere epe.
   c. eraya usu yenepatirikan. sani sani erewa. Dios yumiaiwira epe.
   
   *eraya usu yene = patiri =kana*
   well go 1PL.INCL= priest =PL.MS
   
   *sani sani erewa*
   soon soon return
   
   *Dios yumiaiwira epe*
   God help 2PL
   ‘Go well, our Fathers. Return very soon. God help you.’
   
   ORIGINAL: ‘Andad con bien, nuestros Padres; dad presto la vuelta. Dios os ayude.’

(El texto original de Uriarte [1776]1986:527 se encuentra en el manuscrito adjunto.)
8.10 Isolated Lexical Items

In addition to the passages above, the following Omagua words in Table 8.1 appear in isolation in Uriarte’s diaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>Phonemic</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>egua ti</td>
<td>iwati</td>
<td>be high up</td>
<td>368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muzana</td>
<td>musana</td>
<td>cure (n.)</td>
<td>324, 330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumi</td>
<td>sumi۶۸۲</td>
<td>dark shaman (Sp. brujo)</td>
<td>233, 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chipate</td>
<td>ṭipate</td>
<td>palm sp. (Sp. yarina)</td>
<td>112, 228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Espinosa Pérez (1955:305) also gives <sumi> ‘brujo’ for Yameo, although the direction of borrowing is unclear.

In modern Omagua the initial affricate has lenided to a fricative (i.e., ṭipati).
Chapter 9

Historical Context of Old Omagua Texts

The principal goals of this chapter are to clarify the role of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts in the missionary practices of the Jesuits who worked with the Omaguas, and to better understand the processes by which the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts were developed. We begin by situating the ecclesiastical texts within the broader language policy of the Maynas Jesuits, showing that these texts constituted a critical tool for evangelical work in the context of extreme linguistic diversity and constant turnover in missionaries at particular mission sites. We also show that work on the development of ecclesiastical texts was grounded in significant basic linguistic work and were objects of continuous revision and elaboration in the context of a communal textual tradition. Turning to the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts themselves to better understand the textual practices involved in their development, we examine the Jesuit development of neologisms, use of calques, and by comparing the two catechistic texts, demonstrate that although the texts are quite similar in many respects, supporting the notion of a communal text tradition, they also show traces of different grammatical competencies in the Jesuits who contributed to their development, making it clear that different missionaries worked on them. Finally, we attempt to clarify to the degree possible who these contributors might have been.

We begin by presenting a brief overview of Jesuit interactions with the Omagua in §9.1. In doing so we focus on the continuity (or lack thereof) of relations between the Jesuits and Omaguas, which becomes relevant to our discussion in §9.5 of the likely trajectory of text creation and revision the Old Omagua ecclesiastical text. We next present an overview of Jesuit language policy in Maynas in §9.2, focusing on the interplay between lenguas generales and lenguas particulares, the development of descriptive linguistic resources in lenguas particulares, practical language learning and use of translators, and finally, the general use and development of ecclesiastical texts in Maynas. We then turn in §9.3 to a close examination of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts, first discussing how the creators of these texts made use of neologisms to express certain theological notions, and the degree to which the texts exhibit calquing on languages other than Omagua, which serves as a measure of the linguistic sophistication of those involved in developing the texts. In §9.4 we compare the two versions of the Omagua catechisms, which give us insight into how the texts changed over time, as well as how the linguistic abilities of the missionaries varied. Finally, in §9.5 we present a discussion of which specific Jesuits may have been involved in the development of the texts, how those texts are related to each other, and how they come down to us today.

284 See the discussion of interactions between Omaguas and Europeans in Chapter 1 for contextualization.
9.1 Jesuit Interactions with the Omagua in Maynas

In this section we summarize the history of interaction between the Omagua and the Jesuit missionaries who worked with them, with the goal of contextualizing the practices which gave rise to the ecclesiastical texts analyzed in previous chapters.

Although there were sporadic efforts to missionize the Omaguas of the upper Napo region in the 1620s and 1630s (see Chapter 1), sustained interaction between Jesuits and Omaguas dates to the arrival of Samuel Fritz (b. 1651 Trautenau, Bohemia – d. 1725 Jeberos, Peru) in 1685. When Fritz arrived in their territory, the Omagua inhabited the islands in the middle of the Amazon River, in a region stretching approximately from the confluence of the Amazon and Napo to the confluence of the Amazon and Juruá. Fritz founded almost 40 mission settlements, the most important of which was San Joaquín de Omaguas, founded in the first years of Fritz’s missionary activities, and then moved, by January 1689, to the mouth of the Ampiyacu river, near the modern-day town of Pebas in the Peruvian Region of Loreto.

In the decade following Fritz’s arrival, relations between Omaguas and Jesuits appear to have been amicable, and the Omagua communities experienced relative peace. By the 1690s, however, slave raids, originally launched intermittently from Pará (modern-day Belém, Brazil), became so intense and frequent that the downrivermost Omagua, as well as neighboring Yurimaguas and Aisuaris, fled to the comparative safety of the Jesuit mission settlements nearer the mouth of the Napo River, including San Joaquin de Omaguas. This influx of Omagua refugees coincided with the deterioration of the relationship between the Jesuits and the longer-term Omagua residents of the mission settlements. By 1697, Omagua unhappiness with the Jesuits reached the point of...
open conflict, and Omaguas in several settlements rose up against the Jesuit missionary presence, under the leadership of the Omagua cacique (indigenous leader) Payoreva. At Fritz’s behest, a small military force quelled the revolt, and Fritz subsequently instituted annual visits by secular military forces to intimidate the Omagua and stave off potential uprisings.

As Fritz’s control over the mission settlements began to slip, two additional missionaries were placed among the Omagua, in 1698: Wenzel Breyer (b. 1662 Dub, Bohemia – d. 1729 Quito) who joined Fritz in San Joaquín de Omaguas, and Franz Vidra (b. 1662 Szewitz, Bohemia – d. 1740 Santiago de la Laguna) who took up residence in Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, an Omagua settlement downriver of San Joaquín de Omaguas. In 1701, the Omagua, led again by Payoreva and this time joined by Peba and Caumari groups (both Peba-Yaguan peoples), set fire to the church and home of Franz Vidra in San Joaquín de Omaguas and abandoned the mission settlement there, subsequently fleeing to the downriver communities of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, San Pablo de Omaguas and Iviraté.


Portuguese slave raids continued against the Omagua, Yurimagua, and Aisuari, and in response to this untenable situation, Sanna attempted to relocate those living in San Joaquín de Omaguas and nearby settlements to Yarapa, a settlement on the lower Ucayali River, where he hoped they would be safe. Just as this relocation was taking place, at some point between May and June 1710, however, the group was attacked by the Portuguese, resulting in the capture of Sanna and a group of Omaguas and the deaths of many others. With Sanna’s capture, the last of the Jesuit missions among the Omagua was destroyed.

By October 1712 the majority of the surviving Omaguas had regrouped on the lower Ucayali (ibid.:128), and in October 1715, Juan de Zaldarriaga was sent to form a new Jesuit mission settlement there. This effort to renew a Jesuit presence among the Omagua failed when de Zaldarriaga died in April 1716 (ibid.:130). Another effort was made in May 1719, when Luis Coronado was sent to the same area. Coronado relocated the Omaguas to a new settlement on the Amazon

---

292 See payu ‘laquer’ and wa ‘trunk’, this collocation being a common to form arboreal species names.
293 Jouannen (1943:727); also known as Wenceslao Breyer.
294 Jouannen (1943:745); also known as Juan Bautista Sanna.
295 For the names and dates of tenure of all Superiors of the Maynas missions, see Jouannen (1943:722).
296 Anonymous ([1731]1922:99-114) for details.
297 For the names and dates of tenure of all Superiors of the Maynas missions, see Jouannen (1943:722).
298 For the names and dates of tenure of all Superiors of the Maynas missions, see Jouannen (1943:722).
299 In October of 1710, a group of Omagua refugees arrived at the mission at Lagunas, telling Fritz that most of the downriver Omagua settlements were abandoned, and that some Omaguas were currently being held at Carmelite mission settlements in Portuguese territory. They also reported that Sanna had gone to Pará to speak to the Portuguese governor there, in an ultimately unsuccessful bid to stop the slave raids against the Omaguas (ibid.:127).
River, upriver of the mouth of the Nanay, but died in March 1721, once again leaving the Omaguas without a resident priest (Maroni [1738]1988:365).

It was not until July 1723, when two German Jesuits, Bernard Zurmühlen (b. 1687 Münster – d. 1735 Lagunas, Peru) and Johannes Baptist Julian (b. 1690 Neumarkt – d. 1740 Latacunga, Ecuador) were sent to found a new mission settlement among the Omagua that a stable relationship between the Jesuits and surviving Omaguas was re-established (Anonymous [1731]1922:130). Zurmühlen remained with the Omagua until 1726, when he was appointed Superior and departed for Lagunas (it is unclear at what point Julian left) and during this time he moved the settlement one day’s journey upriver, at the suggestions of the Omagua themselves into territory previously inhabited by the Yameo, a Peba-Yaguan group among which Zurmühlen had also carried out missionary work (de Velasco [1789]1981:509, de Zárate [1739]1904:374, de Zárate et al. [1735]1904:299).

Zurmühlen’s tenure among the Omagua marked a period – which lasted until the Jesuit expulsion in 1767 – in which San Joaquín de Omaguas was not only stable, but also became the principal center for missionary activity in the lowland regions of Maynas. The record of the missionaries present in San Joaquín between Zurmühlen’s departure in 1726 and Iriarte’s arrival in 1748 (see below) becomes somewhat unclear, however. What is clear is that Karl Brentano (b. 1694 Komárom, Hungary – d. 1752 Genoa) was resident there as early as March 1737 and as late as August 1738, during which time he made significant efforts to populate San Joaquín de Omaguas with additional Peba-Yaguan groups from the hinterlands of the Itaya river basin (Brentano had previously worked with the Peba-Yaguan Yameos in San Regis). De Velasco ([1789]1981:509) indicates that Ignatius Mickel (b. 1692 Häusling, Austria – d. 1780 Landsberg, Germany) worked for 27 years among the Omagua, Payagua, Yameo and Jebero, but we have encountered no specific reference to him working in San Joaquín. Note that by 1738, Mickel was stationed at San Regis (Maroni [1738]1988:391), which appears to have regularly interchanged priests with San Joaquín making it likely that Mickel would have spent time in San Joaquín. The French explorer Charles Marie de la Condamine visited San Joaquín in July 1743, but does not mention the presence of a resident missionary (de la Condamine [1745]1813:225-228).

In 1748, Martín Iriarte (b. 1707 Galar, Spain – d. 1779 Ravenna) began working in San Joaquín de Omaguas, departing in 1756 when he was appointed Superior (Iriarte [1776]1986:221). Upon Iriarte’s appointment as Superior, Manuel Joaquín Uriarte (b. 1720 Zurbano, Spain – d. ∼1802 Vitoria, Spain) was appointed Vice Superior and took up residence in San Joaquín, remaining there...

301 For Zurmühlen’s birth, see Jouanen (1943:749); for his death, see de Zárate et al. ([1735]1904:339). He is also known as Bernardo Zurmillen, with various inconsistencies in the spelling of the surname.
302 Jouanen (1943:736); also known as Juan Bautista Julián.
303 Zurmühlen was Superior until 1729, when he was succeeded by his former counterpart, Julian, who remained Superior until 1735 (Jouanen [1943]722). Zurmühlen carried on as missionary at Lagunas beginning in 1730, lasting until his death on 15 April 1735 (de Zárate et al. [1735]1904:294-295).
304 See the 1731 letter from Pablo Maroni, then missionary among the Yameo, to Ángel María Manca Maroni ([1738]1988:379).
305 Jouanen (1943:726)
306 Jouanen (1943:738-739); also known as Ignacio Mickel.
307 Brentano himself had been missionary at San Regis as late as September 1734 (Maroni [1738]1988:391).
308 Jouanen (1943:735)

Table 9.1 summarizes in chronological order our knowledge of Jesuit missionaries who worked among the Omagua.

Table 9.1: Jesuit Missionaries Among the Omagua, 1621-1768

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simón de Rojas</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Aguarico River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto Coronado</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Aguarico River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Fritz</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>1685–1704</td>
<td>San Joaquín and downriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenzel Breyer</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>1698–1706(?)</td>
<td>San Joaquín and downriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franz Vidra</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>1698–1701–?</td>
<td>San Joaquín and downriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanni Battista Sanna</td>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>1701–1710</td>
<td>San Joaquín and downriver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan de Zaldarriaga</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1715–1716</td>
<td>lower Ucayali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis Coronado</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1719–1721</td>
<td>lower Ucayali &amp; San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Zumühlen</td>
<td>Westphal</td>
<td>1723–1726</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johannes Baptist Julian</td>
<td>Bavaria</td>
<td>1723–?</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm Grebmer</td>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>?–1735–?</td>
<td>Yurimaguas (Huallaga River)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karl Brentan</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>?–1737–?</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignatius Mickel</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>??</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martín Iriarte</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1748–1756</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel Joaquín Uriarte</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1756–1764</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josef Palme</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>1764–1768</td>
<td>San Joaquín</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

309 Jouanen (1943:741); also known as José Palme.

310 The following men were brought from Quito to San Joaquín by Fritz in August 1707: Pierre Bollaert (b. 1675 Malines, Belgium – d. 1709 San Joaquín de Omaguas); Andrés Cobo (b. 1673 Popayán, Colombia – d. 1758 Quito); Matías Laso (b. 1676 Buga, Colombia – d. 1721 at sea); and Ignacio Servela (Jouanen 1943:726, 728, 736). We do not include them in this table because we have been unable to determine the nature of their missionary activities with the Omagua, though they appear to be minimal.

311 The name ‘San Joaquín de Omaguas’ refers to several distinct locations from 1689 forward. The San Joaquín of Fritz and Sanna’s day was located near the mouth the Ampiyacu river; the San Joaquín established by Coronado was just above the mouth of the Nanay; and the San Joaquín established by Zumühlen was approximately one half day’s travel upriver of this site, and was located near to the modern community of San Salvador de Omaguas (Tessmann 1930:48, Myers 1992:140-141). Modern-day San Joaquín de Omaguas is yet further upriver, and appears to have been first established circa 1880 from a population of Omaguas working under the labor boss Sinforoso Collantes (O’Hagan in prep).

312 Espinosa Pérez (1936). We thank Manuel Berjón Martínez for this observation.

313 Bohemia was at the time of Fritz’s birth under the rule of the Habsburg monarchy, and corresponds to the majority of the modern-day Czech Republic.

314 Wenzel Breyer was appointed Vice Superior in November 1706 upon Fritz’s second journey to Quito (Anonymous [1731]1922:117). It is unclear if he had missionized in Omagua communities up to that time.

315 The last mention of Vidra working in Omagua territory is upon Fritz’s return from Quito in August 1701.
It is also important to note that not all the Omaguas on the Amazon River who survived the Portuguese slave raids fled upriver towards San Joaquín de Omaguas during the period beginning in the 1690s. Significant numbers of Omaguas remained in Portuguese territory, particularly in and around what is now the Brazilian town of São Paulo de Olivença, where they came to be called ‘Kambebas’. This town had been founded by Fritz in approximately 1693 and originally named San Pablo de Omaguas (Anonymous [1731]1922:31, 91). As late as 1987 speakers of Kambeba lived as far downriver as Tefé (Grenand & Grenand 1997:5).

9.2 Language and Evangelization in Maynas

Few factors shaped Jesuit missionary activities in the Gobierno de Maynas as much as its tremendous linguistic diversity. Even today, after almost five centuries of steady language shift, the Peruvian Region of Loreto is still home to some 23 languages, divided between nine language families and five linguistic isolates, in a region little larger than Germany (Solís Fonseca 2002:140). The following passage from 1699, drawn from a letter written to his brother by Wenzel Breyer, an occasional companion of Samuel Fritz, provides a vivid sketch of the linguistic situation in Maynas and the issues it posed for the Jesuit missionaries.

Hay aquí tantos pueblos y tantas lenguas, que entre la ciudad de S. Francisco de Borja y el río Napo se encuentran hasta 60 de ellos; sin embargo, toda aquella región se puede atravesar en 200 horas de camino. Como cada pueblo tiene su propia lengua y un misionero no puede aprender sino una o dos de ellas, la evangelización necesariamente se atrasa. Si todos los indios no hablaban más que una lengua, hace tiempo que estos pueblos podrían haberse convertido al cristianismo.

(Matthei (1969:252), excerpted in Downes (2008:70))

316 For those missionaries of greater German descent, we provide the name of the independent margraviate (Markgrafschaft), duchy (Herzogtum) or electorate (Kurfürstentum) extant over the area in and during the time at which they were born, given that Germany was not unified until 1871.

317 See Jorna (1991), Bonin & Cruz da Silva (1999), and Maciel (2000, 2003) and references therein for a history of the Kambeba in this region.

318 Loureiro (1978:95) erroneously gives 1689 as the founding date for San Pablo de Omaguas, but see Anonymous ([1731]1922:91) for a clear refutation of this.

319 The downriver location of some Kambebas in Tefé may support Loureiro’s (1978:95) hypothesis that Fritz’s Omagua settlement of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe (Anonymous [1731]1922:91) corresponds to modern-day Fonte Boa. However, the Kambeba of the 20th century appear to have been extremely mobile (see work by Benedito Maciel here: http://pib.socioambiental.org/en/povo/kambeba/), and it is not clear whether the presence of Kambeba speakers in Tefé is a result of more recent migration.

320 Translation (ours):
The purpose of this section is to describe how the Jesuits responded and adapted to this linguistically complex state of affairs, and to situate the production of ecclesiastical texts in the Maynas Jesuits’ use of indigenous languages in their evangelical efforts.

In the broadest terms, the Jesuits in Maynas pursued a two-pronged strategy in their evangelical work, where one prong involved the promotion of *lenguas generales*, especially Quechua, across diverse linguistic communities, and the second involved the simultaneous use of ‘local languages’ or *lenguas particulares* in a number of different ways in the relevant communities (see Solís Fonseca (2002:53-54) for a discussion of these terms). It is clear that a significant fraction of the Maynas Jesuits hoped that the promotion of Quechua as a *lengua general* would allow evangelical work to be carried out in a single linguistic framework across all the communities in which they worked and, not incidentally, free them of the obligation to master each local language. But it is equally clear that the adoption of Quechua by the Amazonian peoples with which the Maynas Jesuits worked was a slow and halting process at best, requiring evangelical activity to be carried out in the relevant *lenguas particulares*.

The Maynas Jesuits approached the challenge posed by the *lenguas particulares* with a number of interlocking strategies based either on developing competence in the *lengua particular* by the missionary or on the use of resources that allowed missionaries to carry out work in *lenguas particulares* without having developed significant competence in the languages in question. These strategies included practical language learning, the preparation of descriptive linguistic materials – including grammars and dictionaries – the use of multilingual members of indigenous communities as translators, and the preparation of ecclesiastical texts in indigenous languages.

The development of relative fluency in local languages was an ideal, and there are numerous mentions in the Jesuit chronicles of missionaries known for their mastery of *lenguas particulares*. In the first phases of Jesuit involvement with a given ethnolinguistic group, such learning relied either on monolingual language learning (as was probably the case with Fritz when he first arrived in the Omagua communities) or on learning from individuals bilingual in the *lengua general* Quechua and the *lengua particular* of the community. This first wave of missionaries, however, put considerable effort into the development of descriptive resources concerning the languages with which they were becoming familiar, which were then employed by subsequent missionaries to speed their own learning of the relevant *lenguas particulares*. It is likely that most Jesuits made some use of translators, however, since even the most skilled language learner would have required time to develop fluency, and in many cases, the duration of assignments at particular mission sites was sufficiently brief that fluency was not a practical goal. The fact that many mission settlements were inhabited by more than one ethnolinguistic group compounded the challenge to practical learning, of course. In this context, ecclesiastical texts written in *lenguas particulares* served as crucial resources which accumulated hard-won linguistic knowledge and allowed relative continuity in evangelical activity despite the rather frequent rotation of individual missionaries in and out of particular missions. In particular, these texts allowed missionaries with modest ability in the *lengua particular* of a given settlement to catechize its inhabitants and to perform prayers and masses without the need to constantly rely on translators. The production of ecclesiastical texts in local languages was, as we shall see, the fruit of extensive linguistic research, and a process of continuous tinkering.
9.2.1  *Lenguas generales* and *lenguas particulares* in Maynas

In this section we describe the Jesuit promotion of *lenguas generales* and the limits to the success of this linguistic policy, which left a considerable need for the development of linguistic and ecclesiastical resources in *lenguas particulares*.

The Jesuit promotion of *lenguas generales* focused on Quechua, in which most, if not all, of the Jesuits in Maynas appear to have been conversant (Chantre y Herrera 1901:94). The following passage, which follows Maroni’s ([1738]1988:168-169) discussion of the challenges posed by the linguistic diversity in Maynas, clearly articulates the role of Quechua as a *lengua general* in the Jesuit project there:

Por esto, nuestros misioneros, desde que se fundaron estas misiones, han tenido particular empeño para ... introducir en las reducciones que se han ido entablando, el uso de la lengua del Inga, que es la general del Perú, la cual, según se habla en las provincias del Cuzco, es la más copiosa y expresiva de cuantas se usan en esta América meridional. Como hallaron ya principios desta lengua en la ciudad de Borja y provincia de los Maynas, donde iban introduciéndola los españoles que asistían en aquella conquista, no fué muy difícilos el extenderla á otras reducciones que comunicaban con la de los Maynas.

An important avenue for the promotion of Quechua was evidently the education of indigenous children in the *reducciones* and Spanish-controlled town, where the teaching of Christian doctrine and that of Quechua went hand-in-hand. Consider, for example, the following passage, which describes the founding, by Father Cujía, of boarding schools for indigenous youths in the town of Borja:

---

321 It is not entirely clear what Quechuan variety (or varieties) were promoted by the Maynas Jesuits. Typically referred to as ‘Inga’, some sources indicate that the language is the same as that used in Cuzco. This is unlikely, however, both for geographical reasons (Cuzco Quechua was spoken quite distantly from Maynas) and because the surviving ecclesiastical texts prepared in ‘Inga’ by the Maynas Jesuits do not exhibit orthographic reflexes of the phonological features that distinguish Cuzco Quechua from more northerly varieties. The fact that many of the Jesuits learned ‘Inga’ in Quito suggests that one of the languages involved was a variety of Ecuadorean Quichua, while the fact that the center of gravity of the Maynas missions lay towards Huallaga and upper Marañón River basins suggests that San Martín Quechua would have played an important role.

322 Other than Quechua, the other language which appears to have been promoted as a *lengua general* was Omagua itself. There is only a single mention of Omagua serving this role, however, and its use appears to have been limited to the Peba-Yaguan groups living close to San Joaquin de Omaguas during the latter decades of the Jesuit presence in Maynas (Maroni [1738]1988:168-169).

323 Translation (ours):

Because of this, our missionaries, from the moment these missions were founded, have undertaken to introduce into the *reducciones* that have been established the use of the Inca language [read: Quechua], which is widespread in Peru, and which, according to what is spoken in the Province of Cuzco, is the most copious and expressive of so many [languages] used in South America. Given that they encountered the beginnings of this language in the city of Borja and the Province of Maynas, where those Spaniards involved in the conquest had been introducing it, it was not very difficult to extend it to other *reducciones* that communicated with the Maynas one.
Y queriendo concurrir también á la reducción de los gentiles de un modo muy provechoso, y no menos eficaz que sus compañeros, ideó, promovió y estableció en la misma ciudad [i.e., Borja], dos casas en que se juntasen los niños y niñas de las naciones amigos que quisiesen enviar su hijos á Borja. Una casa era como seminario de jóvenes que aprendían la lengua general del Inga, la doctrina cristiana... La otra casa era como un hospicio de niñas recientemente bautizadas que, fuera de enterarse bien de la doctrina y de la lengua inga, aprendían de algunas señoras piadosas de la ciudad, que se ofrecieron á enseñarlas gustosas, los ejercicios propios del sexo...

(Chantre y Herrera 1901:139)

This practice was by no means restricted to Borja and nearby indigenous peoples (probably mainly Cahuapanan, Jivaroan, and Candoshian). Similar efforts were reported among the Tukanoan peoples of the Napo (ibid.:391, 420), the Iquitos of the Nanay (ibid.: 489), and among the Peba-Yaguan peoples of the Ampiyacu area. With respect to the latter, Chantre y Herrera reports that Father José Casado was so successful in promoting Quechua in San Ignacio de los Pevas that the residents of the reducción began to use Quechua not only with outsiders, but among themselves:

...él en persona les enseñaba la lengua general del Inga con tanto empeño y aplicación, que llegó á conseguir en poco tiempo que toda la gente moza se gobernase en aquella lengua, no sólo tocante al catecismo, pero aun en el trato de unos con otros. Daba gracias al cielo de haber conseguido este señalado triunfo en un pueblo donde la lengua del Inga facilitaba la instrucción, tan difícil hasta entonces por la variedad de lenguas de tantas naciones.

(ibid.: 472-473)

The Jesuit reliance on Quechua is also suggested by Chantre y Herrera’s (1901:637) description of the general conduct of masses in the Maynas missions as carried out ‘en la lengua inga, ó en

---

324 Translation (ours):
And wanting to participate also in the conversion of the heathens in a very useful manner, and no less effective than his companions, conceived, sponsored, and founded in the same city [i.e., Borja], two houses in which they gathered together the boys and girls of the friendly peoples who wanted to send their children to Borja. One house was like a seminary for youngsters who learned the lengua general of the Inga and the Christian doctrine... The other house was like a lodging for recently baptized girls, who, apart from becoming well acquainted with the Christian doctrine and the Inga language, learned from a number of pious ladies of the city, who enthusiastically offered to teach them, the particular skills of their sex...

325 Translation (ours):
...he personally taught them the lengua general of the Inga with such determination and effort that in short order he succeeded in having the common people [i.e., indigenous people] handle their affairs in that language, not only with respect to the catechism, but even in interactions among themselves. He gave thanks to Heaven for this striking triumph in a settlement where the language of the Inga aided instruction, so difficult until then because of the variety of languages of so many peoples.
la particular de la nación’, and the fact that when the Jesuits introduced Western musical traditions in the missions, the songs were composed in Quechua (ibid.:651, 654). The active promotion of Quechua by the Jesuits is also suggested by the observation by Paul Marcoy regarding a group of Kokamas that he encountered in 1847 a little upriver of São Paulo de Olivença, whom he remarked spoke Quechua ‘which had been taught their grandfathers by the missionaries’ (Marcoy [1873]vol. IV, 397), a clear reference to the Jesuits of the 18th century. And of course, the role of Quechua as a lengua general entailed that learning it was a priority for all Maynas Jesuits. Guillaume D’Être (b. 1669 Douai, France – d. 1745 Quito) for example, wrote regarding his early language learning:

Llegué a esta misión en el año 1706 y mi primer cuidado fue el de aprender la lengua del Inga, que es general de todas estas naciones. (D’Être [1731]1942:31, emphasis in original)

Despite efforts to promote Quechua as a lengua general, however, it does not appear that widespread bilingualism in Quechua was common in the communities in which the Jesuits were involved. Rather, as the following observation of D’Être’s suggests, a relatively small number of bilingual individuals played a key mediating role.

Siendo la lengua común de los que habitan las dos riberas de este gran río, tiene, no obstante, cada pueblo su lengua particular, y solamente en cada nación se hallan algunos que entienden y hablan la lengua dominante. (D’Être [1731]1942:31)

There is ample evidence that Quechua served as the lingua franca in the Maynas missions, but that knowledge of Quechua was not sufficiently universal to supplant the need for evangelical work in local languages. Maroni ([1738]1988:169), for example, following his discussion of the promotion of Quechua as a lengua general, remarks:

...sin embargo de esto [i.e., the promotion of Quechua as a lengua general], no hay reducción, por antigua que sea, en que no se encuentren muchos, especialmente ancianos y mujeres, que ignoran del todo esta lengua, y así se ve precisado el misionero aprender ... la nativa de ellos, siquiera para doctrinarlos y confesarlos.

326 (Jouanen 1943:730).
327 Translation (ours):

I arrived at this mission in the year 1706 and my first duty was to learn the Quechua language, which is widespread throughout all these nations.

328 Translation (ours):

Even with the language being common to those who inhabit the two banks of this great river [presumably the Marañón], each village has, however, its own language, and in each nation one finds only a few who understand and speak the dominant language [i.e., Quechua].

329 Translation (ours):
Even in San Joaquin de Omaguas, we find that as late as 1756, Manuel Uriarte ([1776]1986:225) clearly felt the need to become familiar not only with Omagua but also with Mayoruna (a Panoan language[^330] and Masamae (a Peba-Yaguan language closely related to Yameo). More generally, the inadequacy of Quechua as a *lengua general* entailed that the Maynas Jesuits had to commit themselves to learning *lenguas particulares*. Significantly, they institutionalized this engagement with indigenous languages by encouraging the development of descriptive resources on these languages, so that knowledge of these languages could be preserved, thereby not requiring that each new missionary working with speakers of a given language begin from zero. The resulting Jesuit linguistic tradition in Maynas is the topic of the next section.

### 9.2.2 Jesuit Linguistics in Maynas

Detailed and broadly gauged linguistic research comprised an important part of the work of the Maynas Jesuits, and was key to their ability to learn the indigenous languages of the region and prepare ecclesiastical texts in them. The products of this research included grammatical descriptions (*artes*) and dictionaries (*vocabularios*), the development of which is described by Chantre y Herrera (1901:92) in the following terms:

> Al principio se contentaron los padres con hacer sus observaciones y advertencias gramaticales, llenando mucho pliegos de papel para sacar en limpio los números y las declinaciones más generales de los nombres. Lo mismo hicieron para rastrear y reducir á conjugaciones los verbos más usuales y señalar los tiempos. Poco á poco y á paso lento, sudando y remando llegaron á formar las gramáticas que estaban en uso, por las cuales se ve claramente el arteficio de las lenguas. Porque distinguen nombres y pronombres, con sus números, géneros, declinaciones y casos. Tienen sus conjunciones, adverbios y posposiciones en vez de preposiciones, como se usa en la lengua vascongada, y vemos varias veces en la latina. Los verbos se conjugan de un modo regular y tienen sus tiempos: presente, pretérito y futuro. En suma, se observa una construcción cabal de la misma manera que observar se puede en otras lenguas cultas.[^331]

[^330]: See Fleck (2003:1-4) and (Fleck 2007:139-142) for a discussion of this ethnonym.

[^331]: Translation (ours):

> At first the fathers contented themselves with making grammatical observations and warnings, filling many sheets of paper to lay out clearly the the number and most common declensions of the nouns. They did the same in tracing and reducing to conjugations the most common verbs, and indicating the tenses. Little by little, and with measured steps, sweating and laboring, they eventually developed the grammars that came into use, by which one could clearly see the structure of the languages, because they distinguish nouns and pronouns, adverbs, and postpositions, in place of prepositions, as are used in Basque, and we sometimes see in Latin. The verbs are conjugated in a regular manner and have their tenses: present, past, and future. In sum, one finds a sensible construction in the same way as one finds in other cultured languages.
Unfortunately, the vast majority of the linguistic work by the Maynas Jesuits is lost to us, so it is difficult to directly evaluate the quality or quantity of work. Most of these works were destroyed by the Jesuits themselves upon their expulsion from Maynas (Uriarte 1776,1986,535-536) (see footnote 5), and although there are indications that some manuscripts survived, their location in archives in the Americas and Europe remains to be ascertained. Nevertheless, some sense of the output of this work is conveyed by Hervás y Panduro (1800,271-272):

Me consta que entre dichos manuscritos eran excelentes los del P. Juan Lucero, que entró en las misiones el año 1661, y perfeccionó las gramáticas y los catecismos de muchas lenguas, y principalmente de los idiomas paranapuro [sic] y cocamo [sic]. Así mismo sé que el V.P. Enrique Riaer [sic] que entró en las misiones el año 1685, escribió un vocabulario y catecismos de las lenguas campa, pira, cuniva y comava, que son difíciles, y también hizo observaciones sobre sus dialectos. Me consta también que el P. Samuel Fritz (que entró en las misiones el año 1687, y fue el primero, registró todo el Marañón y sus ríos colaterales, e hizo mapa del Marañón), escribió gramáticas y vocabularios de algunas lenguas, y principalmente de la omagua y jebera. El P. Bernard Zumillen [sic], que entró en las misiones el año 1723, dejó excelentes manuscritos sobre algunas lenguas: el P. Matías Lazo, que entró en las misiones el año 1700, fue el primero que escribió la gramática de la lengua jurimagua: el P. Guillermo Grebner [sic] que entró en las misiones el año 1700, dejó muchos manuscritos sobre algunas lenguas, y principalmente sobre la omagua y la cocama. El P. Adam Widman, que entró en las misiones el año 1728, estuvo en ellas hasta el año de nuestra expulsión, y murió preso en Lisboa, perfeccionó las gramáticas de muchas lenguas, y sobre éstas dejó excelentes manuscritos.  

Chantre y Herrera (1901,93) similarly indicates that the Jesuits had created grammars and dictionaries for at least 20 languages in Maynas, including ‘...Omagua, which now has a grammar

332 In the original Italian version, the surname is Ricter (Hervás y Panduro 1784,66).
333 In the original Italian version, the surname is Grebmer (Hervás y Panduro 1784,66).
334 Translation (ours):

I know that among these manuscripts were excellent those of Father Juan Lucero, who entered the missions in 1661 and perfected grammars and catechisms of many languages, principally the languages Paranapura [a Cahuapanan language] and Kokama [Tupí-Guarani]. Likewise I know that the V.P. Richter, who entered the missions in 1685, wrote a word list and catechism of Kampa [likely Ashéninka, Arawak], Piro [Arawak], Conibo [Panoan] and comava [?], which are very difficult, and also made observations regarding their dialects. I know as well that Father Samuel Fritz (who entered the missions in 1687, and was the first, covered all of the Marañón and its tributaries, and made a map of the Marañón), wrote grammars and word lists of some languages, principally Omagua and Jebero [Shiwilu, Cahuapanan]. Father Bernard Zumühlen, who entered the missions in 1723, left excellent manuscripts on some languages: Father Matías Lazo, who entered the missions in 1700, was the first to write a grammar of Yurimagua [unclassified]; Father Wilhelm Grebner, who entered the missions in 1700, left many manuscripts on some languages, principally Omagua and Kokama. Father Adam Widman, who entered the missions in 1728, remained there until the year of our expulsion, and died a prisoner in Lisbon, perfected the grammars of many languages, and with respect to these, he left excellent manuscripts.
Lev Michael and Zachary O’Hagan

[lit. arte] and a large dictionary, and is one of the easiest to learn: sweet, soft, and harmonious’ (ibid: 92). The role of both the descriptive linguistic resources and ecclesiastical texts that were developed as part of the Jesuit linguistic project in Maynas is clear in Juan de Velasco’s description, reported by Hervás y Panduro (1800:271-272, emphasis ours), of Jesuit linguistic policy in the Reino de Quito, which encompassed Maynas:

Sobre las gramáticas de las lenguas del reino de Quito, el señor Abate Velasco me escribe en estos términos: «Habiéndose hecho común por órden de los superiores seglares la lengua quichua en la misiones del reino de Quito, y siendo muchísimos y diversísimos los idiomas de las naciones quiteñas, los misioneros formaban la gramática y el catecismo del idioma de la respectiva nación que empezaban a catequizar; y estas gramáticas y catecismos quedaban manuscritos en la librería de la misión para instrucción de los que sucedían en ésta.»

Materials in and on lenguas particulares were archived in both the regional Jesuit headquarters in Santiago de la Laguna (modern-day Lagunas, Region of Loreto) and at the Jesuit college in Quito. In this way, Jesuit priests arriving to Quito to begin their period as missionaries in Maynas were able to begin learning the languages spoken in the mission settlement to which they would be deployed. In 1724, Francisco Javier Zephyris (b. 1695 Brixen, Austria – d. 1769 Vienna) wrote to his brother portraying this undertaking:

Todavía me encuentro en Quito rompiéndome la cabeza con el aprendizaje de las diversas lenguas indígenas, que son por entero extrañas para un misionero europeo. Un sacerdote experimentado como es el P. Juan Bautista Julián de la provincia de Alemania superior, nos escribía que al llegar a su reducción no había podido hablar ni una sola palabra con los indios, ni menos entenderlos.

(Matthei (1972:134), excerpted in Downes (2008:71))

Regarding the grammars of the languages of the Kingdom of Quito, abbot Velasco [Juan de Velasco] writes to me in the following way: “Quechua having been made the standard in the Kingdom of Quito by order of the lay superiors, and the languages of the nation of Quito being many and highly diverse, the missionaries formed a grammar and catechism of the language of the relevant nation that they began to catechize; and these grammars and catechisms remained in manuscript form in the mission library for the instruction of those that followed in this [undertaking].”

Jouanen (1943:749). Brixen is today located in Italy.

I am still in Quito slaving over learning these diverse native languages, which are entirely foreign to a European missionary. A priest as experienced as Father Johannes Baptist Julian, from Upper Germany, wrote to us that upon arriving at his mission settlement he hadn’t been able to speak even one word with the Indians, let alone understand them.
9.2.3 Practical Language Learning and Reliance on Translators

As indicated in the previous section, Maynas Jesuits made use of descriptive linguistic materials when available, but there were no doubt many cases in which materials were not available. In either case, the commitment to learning *lenguas particulares* appears to have been significant. Uriarte, for example, identifies practical language learning as his most important task upon taking up his post at San Joaquín de Omaguas:

Dejada por Dios la sosegada vida, que tenía entre mis sanregis, hube de mudar rumbo y aplicarme a las diversas ocupaciones que incumbían a este pueblo y oficio, de cuidar de otros nuestros, pues fuera de la primera obligación de doctrinar y aplicarme a diversas lenguas, aunque predominaba la omagua (más para adultos era precisa noticia de mayoruna, masamaes), era preciso atender al abasto de toda la Misión baja y de Napo...

((Uriarte[1776]1986:225, emphasis ours)

The degree to which individual Jesuits became gained fluency in *lenguas particulares* appears to have varied significantly, and some, like the Italian Jesuit Ignacio Maria Franciscis, who worked briefly in San Joaquín de Omaguas, were singled out for their language learning ability. Franciscis (b. 1705 Palermo – d. 1777 Palermo) spent four months with Uriarte in San Joaquín de Omaguas in order to oversee the mission annex of San Fernando de Mayorunas, and both Juan de Velasco (b. 1727 Riobamba – d. 1792 Faenza), an Ecuadorian Jesuit, and Uriarte commented on Franciscis’ talent for language learning. De Velasco ([1789]1981:517-518, emphasis ours) comments:

Translation (ours):

God having abandoned the peaceful life that I had led among my sanregis [i.e., the residents of San Regis], I was compelled to change course and apply myself to the various affairs that are incumbent upon this community [San Joaquín] and office, watching over our other concerns, since apart from the first obligation to proselytize and apply myself to the various languages, even though Omagua predominated (save for the adults for whom the gospel was also needed in Mayoruna and Masamaes [a Yameo dialect]), it was necessary to attend to the supply of the entire lower Mission and that of the Napo...

Franciscis’ work in the New World began when he arrived in the Darién region of the Reino de Tierra Firme (modern-day Panama) in 1741 (Pacheco [1959:300], cited in Gallup-Díaz [2001:549]), where he wrote a grammar, vocabulary, and catechism in lengua dariela (Hervás y Panduro [1800:280], a Chocoan language (Constenla Umaña 2004). He subsequently worked in Guayaquil and Quito before coming to Maynas in 1748 (Uriarte[1776]1986:288), de Velasco ([1789]1981:513)). He was made missionary at Pizzas and then later transferred to San José de Pinches (a mission on the Pastaza founded in 1698 by Nicolás Lanzamani (de Velasco [1789]1981:510), where he seems to have spent several years (Uriarte[1776]1986:289). Following his four-month stay in San Joaquín (see above), he was ordered back to Pinches, and then to Guayaquil, where he resided at the time of the expulsion (Uriarte[1776]1986:290).

See footnote 128.

San Fernando de Mayorunas, a Panoan settlement on the opposite bank of the Amazon river from San Joaquín de Omaguas, was officially christened in January 1757 (Uriarte[1776]1986:249), but had been extant at least since 1754 (Uriarte[1754]1942:76).
El P. Ignacio María Franciscis fue hombre doctísimo y de muy raros talentos, especialmente para hacerse dueño, en poco tiempo, de los más difíciles idiomas... Tenía un don especialísimo para darse a entender y para instruir maravillosamente aun a los más rudos, don con que podía haber hecho grandes progresos, si no se los hubiera impedido su esencial insubsistencia..

And similarly (ibid.:517):

Llegó a poseer con perfección los idiomas del Perú, de los Encabellados y de los Omaguas, y con suficiencia los de los Yameos y Mayorunas.

The fact that Franciscis was deemed such a prodigy makes it clear that most missionaries had considerably greater difficulty in mastering the local languages. Especially in multilingual settlements, there is evidence that different missionaries specialized in different languages. The following passage, for example, which describes the blessing of a new church in San Joaquín IV in 1755, illustrates the complementary linguistic abilities of the missionaries working in and around the mission settlement (Uriarte [1776]1986:214):

Fueron viniendo los Padres para la dedicación o bendición; primero, el P. Joaquín Pietragrasa, que bendijo la iglesia y cementerio con las ceremonias del ritual, acompañado en procesión por la gente; el Padre Manuel Santos, portugués, que cantó Misa, y los Padres Iriarte, Bahamonde y Martínez, con el pueblo. Hubo tres días de funciones; en el primero dije yo, como pude, un breve panegírico en castellano. El segundo, el P. Vicesuperior, en lengua omagua, y en el tercero, el P. Bahamonde, en yamea e inga.

342 Translation (ours):

Father Ignacio Maria Franciscis was a very learned man of unique talents, especially as concerned mastering the most difficult of languages in little time... He had a very special gift for making himself understood and instructing the coarsest of individuals, a gift with which he would have been able to make great progress, if only his core intransigence had not impeded him.

343 Translation (ours):

He came to possess the languages of Peru perfectly, those of the Encabellado [likely the Secoya (see Cipolletti [1992])] and the Omagua, and proficiently those of the Yameo and Mayoruna.

344 Translation (ours):

The fathers were coming for the dedication or blessing; first, Father Joaquín Pietragrasa, who blessed the church and cemetery with the ritual ceremonies, accompanied by the people; Father Manuel Santos, Portuguese, who sang Mass, and Fathers Iriarte, Bahamonde and Martínez, with the pueblo. There were three days of rites; on the first, I, as much as I was able, gave a brief panegyric in Spanish. On the second [day], the Father Vice Superior [Iriarte], in Omagua, and on the third, Father Bahamonde, in Yameo and Quechua.
Despite the efforts of missionaries to learn the relevant *lenguas particulares*, it is clear that multilingual indigenous individuals, who served as interpreters, played a crucial role in Jesuit missionary activity in Maynas. Uriarte, for example, made use of interpreters during his time as missionary and explicitly advises the training of young children as interpreters in a series of directives he writes for future missionaries:

...con los niños especialmente, que son la esperanza, poner todo empeño, haciéndose querer de ellos, atrayendo los que se pueda a su casa y ocupándolos en aprender la doctrina y lenguas para ser después intérpretes, varayos, capitanes, fiscales, etc... ([Uriarte](1776)1986:223, emphasis ours)

### 9.2.4 Ecclesiastical Text Development and Use

The ecclesiastical texts were central to continuity in evangelical practices in the Jesuit *reducciones*, both in maintaining uniformity in the texts that Catholic practice demanded that its adherents commit to memory, and also in aiding newly arrived priests quickly in attaining sufficient competence to carry out basic evangelical activities. Uriarte ([1776]1986:192), for example, notes that upon his arrival in 1754 in San Pablo de Napeanos, an Iquito and Masamae *reducción* on the lower Nanay River, he found a variety of ecclesiastical texts in Iquito, Yameo and Quechua, which were written by his predecessor José Bahamonde (b. 1710 Quito – d. 1786 Ravenna) and it is clear that the availability of these resources were invaluable in both learning to speak the local languages and in carrying out evangelical work in them. And as Chantre y Herrera (1901:637) observes, the availability of translated ecclesiastical texts allowed the missionaries to adapt their linguistic choices to the communities in which they worked:

...y si eran varios [i.e., the languages used in the community], [the priest held mass] en la principal y más común según el padre juzgaba más conveniente, porque en todas las lenguas que eran muchas tenían los misioneros sus traducciones.

---

345 For his use of Iquito (Zaparoan) translators in the headwaters of the Chambira during his time at San Pablo de Napeanos, near the modern-day city of Iquitos, see Uriarte ([1776]1986:197-199); for his use of Omagua interpreters in his early days in San Joaquín, see Uriarte (ibid.:249).

346 Translation (ours):

...especially with the children, who are our hope, make every effort, endearing them, attracting those one can to one’s house and occupying them with learning the doctrine and languages to later become interpreters, varayos, captains, fiscales [lay church positions], etc...

347 (Jouanen 1943:726)

348 See also Chantre y Herrera (1901:485).

349 Translation (ours):

...and if there were several [i.e., languages used in the community], [the priest taught] in the main and most common [language], as the father found convenient, because in all the languages, and they were numerous, the missionaries had translations [i.e., of the ecclesiastical texts].
It is ecclesiastical texts of this type that are the empirical focus of this volume, and the purpose of this section is to clarify how these critical resources in the Jesuit project in Maynas were developed. The key point we make with respect to this issue is that the development of these texts is most accurately conceived of as a communal and collaborative endeavor, both among concurrently active missionaries and speakers of indigenous languages who shared knowledge of a given language, but also through time, as successive generations of missionaries sought to improve and clarify the ecclesiastical texts that came down to them.

It is clear that in developing the first versions of ecclesiastical texts in *lenguas particulares*, the Maynas Jesuits typically relied on multilingual individuals to translate a version in the *lengua particular* from an extant Quechua text. D’Être, for example, describes the development of the first versions of ecclesiastical texts in eighteen languages during his tenure as Superior, from 1719 until 1726 (Jouanen 1943:722), in the following terms:

No me era posible aprender las lenguas de tantas naciones, teniendo ellas entre sí tan poca semejanza, como la francesa con la alemana. Tomé, pues, el partido, para no ser inútil a la mayor parte de los pueblos, valerme de aquellos que sabían su lengua natural y la del Inga, y con su asistencia traduje en diez y ocho lenguas, por preguntas y respuestas, el catecismo, y lo que se debe enseñar a los neófitos, o en la administración de los sacramentos, o disponiéndolos a una santa muerte.

(D’Être [1731]1942:32)

Uriarte ([1776]1986:288) alludes to a similar approach in describing the work of Franciscis, who was present in San Joaquín for a brief period, making clear both the use of Quechua as a starting point and his reliance on translators.

...Padre Ignacio María Franciscis, siciliano y sujeto muy religioso y capaz, gran teólogo, filósofo, matemático, humanista, poeta; sabía muchas lenguas, como griega, hebrea, alemana, inglesa, francesa. Y de todas de la Misión hizo con gran trabajo Catecismo, correspondiente a las preguntas del inga, que se usa.

In describing Franciscis’ work on Mayoruna (Panoan) ecclesiastical texts, Uriarte ([1776]1986:290) makes clear the importance of the translator:

---

350 Translation (ours):

It was not possible for me to learn the languages of so many nations, there being as little similarity between them as between French and German. I took on the role, so as to not be useless to the majority of the communities, of availing myself of those that knew their mother tongue as well as Quechua, and with their assistance I translated into eighteen languages, by question and answer, the catechism and what should be taught to neophytes or in the administration of sacraments or in the dispensation of a holy death.

351 Translation (ours):

...Father Ignacio Maria Franciscis, a Sicilian and very capable subject, great theologian, philosopher, mathematician, humanist, poet; he knew many languages, such as Greek, Hebrew, German, English, French. And of all those [languages] of the Mission, he made with great effort a catechism of each, corresponding to the questions in Quechua, which is used.
...le sugerí un medio con que ejercitase su celo con fruto y sin fatiga. Éste fue que yo cuidaría, como antes, de los nuevos, y el Padre, con el intérprete Vicente, fuese sacando bien en su lengua instrucciones para bautizar, confesar, etc., y enseñase a ratos lengua inga a dos niños hijos del capitán, que tenía en casa y le servían.

The first version of an ecclesiastical text created by translation from a Quechua original, it was then available for improvement by those missionaries with sufficiently sophisticated knowledge of the lengua particular in question. The process of successive re-translation and editing by multiple missionaries that some ecclesiastical texts were subject to is nicely captured by the following passage, which describes a collaborative effort over three years by brother Peter Schooneman (b. 1711 Haarlem, The Netherlands – d. 1778 and Uriarte to improve the Iquito catechism:

A poco más de un mes de la despedida, subió el hermano Pedro á Santa Barbara, y conferenciando con el padre sobre la lengua de los Iquitos, empezaron la grande obra de corregir el catecismo en que había algunas cosas que enmendar, añadir, quitar y declarar. Porque, aunque se había traducido de la lengua Inga y por medio de un bien intérprete, y los misioneros anteriores habían trabajado muy bien en limarle y pulirle y ajustarle, todavía el hermano Pedro, como más práctico de la lengua en que había formado su vocabulario, descubría cosas que se debían corregir. Tres años enteros emplearon en el penoso ejercicio de perfeccionarse bien en la lengua para la corrección, y cada día encontraban nuevas dificultades, como le sucedió a San Xavier, ya en el ex María Virgine, ya en el mortuus, porque la única palabra de la lengua significa que no se casó la Virgen, y la otra significa muerte contra voluntad. Al fin todo se fué enmendando, declarando, y ajustando.

(Chantre y Herrera 1901:544)

Translation (ours):

...I suggested to him a means by which he might exercise his zeal productively and without tiring. This was that I would watch after the new [converts], as before, and that the Father [Franciscis], with the interpreter Vicente, would go about gathering in their language instructions for baptizing, confessing, etc., and occasionally teach Quechua to two boys, sons of the capitán, that he had in his house and who served him.

Translation (ours):

A little more than a month after saying farewell, brother Pedro went upriver to Santa Barbara, and talking with the father [there] about the language of the Iquitos, began the huge task of correcting the catechism, in which there were a few things to fix, add, remove, and clarify, because, although it had been translated from Quechua, and by means of a good translator, and although previous missionaries had worked well to refine, polish, and fix it, brother Pedro, as the most versed in the language whose dictionary he had compiled, discovered things that needed to be corrected. They spent three entire years in the punishing exercise of perfecting their knowledge of the language into order to correct the catechism, and each day encountered new difficulties, as happened to Saint Xavier, for example, in the case of [the terms] ex María Virgine and mortuus, because the only words in the language [to express these concepts] mean that the Virgin did not marry, and the other means involuntary death. Eventually they fixed and clarified everything.
It is worth noting that not only did Schooneman and Uriarte work together in improving the catechism, but it is clear that even the text that they took upon themselves to improve had been subject to editing and alteration by previous missionaries. One consequence of the evolving nature of these texts is that it complicates treating them as a stable text with a single author. Rather, it appears to have been more typical for a text to have been in a continuous state of redaction over the decades that most Maynas missions were occupied.

There is clear evidence that the Omagua catechisms that have come down to us were likewise the product of a process of successive editing and retranslation. For example, even though we do not have access to the original manuscript, the published versions of the Full Catechism indicate that portions of the text had been crossed out, and other text inserted in the margins or between the lines (see (6.17b), (6.21a) and (6.24b)). And as we shall examine in detail in §9.4, the two versions of the catechism are highly similar, but exhibit minor differences indicative of retranslation and editing by individuals with different strengths in their understanding of Omagua grammar.

9.3 Jesuit Language Use in Old Omagua Ecclesiastical Texts

In this section we examine aspects of Omagua language use in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts that reflect the goals and linguistic abilities of the Jesuit missionaries involved in their development. In §9.3.1 we discuss the Jesuit creation and use of Omagua neologisms, which reflects linguistic creativity on the missionaries’ part in light of perceived lacunae in the Omagua lexicon in key areas of Catholic thought and practice. In §9.3.2 we turn to evidence of calquing in the ecclesiastical texts, which reveals the areas in which the missionaries’ linguistic knowledge remained partial.

9.3.1 Neologisms in Old Omagua Ecclesiastical Texts

In developing ecclesiastical texts in the indigenous languages of Maynas, Jesuit authors frequently confronted the fact that those languages lacked lexical items that denoted important concepts in Christian doctrine. Pablo Maroni ([1738]1988:168) (excerpted in Downes (2008:70)) makes the following observation with that in mind:

Añádase que estas lenguas, al mismo paso que abundan de vocablos para explicar la variedad de manjares y bebidas, plantas, frutas, animales, y aun de la misma sabandija, asimismo son muy escasas y faltas de palabras para explicar lo que toca a la enseñanza cristiana, al pecado, a Dios, al alma y sus espirituales operaciones y otras cosas semejantes. Todas estas naciones ni un vocablo tienen para decir que creen lo que se les dice...  

We note that the process of redaction was not motivated by changes in the language itself during the Jesuit period (see Michael (2014a) for a discussion).

Furthermore, these languages, at the same time that they abound in words to explain the variety of delicacies and drinks, plants, fruits, animals and even minute insects, words to explain that which deals with Christian teaching, sin, God, the soul and its spiritual doings, and other similar things are extremely scarce and lacking. Not even one word do these nations have to say that they believe what they are being told...
The Jesuit authors of the ecclesiastical texts responded to this difficulty by developing neologisms to express notions relevant to Catholic practice.\footnote{Less frequently, they borrowed words from Quechua – e.g., \textit{utfa} ‘sin’ \cite{Rosat-Pontalti2009}, attested in modern Omagua \textit{uS} ‘sin, fault’ – or from Spanish without phonological adaptation – e.g., \textit{virgen} ‘virgin’.} Attested Omagua neologisms are given in (9.1)-(9.7), where the \textsc{close} translation is a literal translation and the \textsc{target} translation indicates the concept that the Jesuits were attempting to convey. In the last line of each example we indicate the names of the texts in which each neologism occurs.\footnote{\textsc{Lord} = Lord’s Prayer; \textsc{frag} = Catechism Fragment; \textsc{full} = Full Catechism; \textsc{prof} = Profession of Faith.} The examples ordered by frequency in the texts, with the most frequent neologisms first.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(9.1)] \texttt{iwatimai ritama}
\begin{verbatim}
iwati =mai ritama
be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village
\end{verbatim}
\textsc{close}: ‘high village’
\textsc{target}: ‘Heaven’
(\textsc{lord}, \textsc{frag}, \textsc{full}, \textsc{prof})

\item[(9.2)] \texttt{tuyuka ritama}
\begin{verbatim}
tuyuka ritama
land village
\end{verbatim}
\textsc{close}: ‘land village’
\textsc{target}: ‘Earth’
(\textsc{lord}, \textsc{frag}, \textsc{full})

\item[(9.3)] \texttt{ipipemai tata tupa}
\begin{verbatim}
ipe =mai tata tupa
inside =NOMZ:INACT fire place
\end{verbatim}
\textsc{close}: ‘inner fire place’
\textsc{target}: ‘Hell’
(\textsc{frag}, \textsc{full}, \textsc{prof})

\item[(9.4)] \texttt{yawikimaipurakana}
\begin{verbatim}
yawiki =mai =pura =kana
make =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS
\end{verbatim}
\textsc{close}: ‘what X made’
\textsc{target}: ‘creations’
(\textsc{frag}, \textsc{full})

\item[(9.5)] \texttt{kumesamaipurakana}
\begin{verbatim}
kumesa =mai =pura =kana
say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}
It is worth noting that there is complete consistency in the use of neologisms; no alternate neologisms are attested in any of the ecclesiastical texts or in Manuel Uriarte’s diaries, suggesting that these terms became standardized. Modern Omagua speakers, however, do not recognize these terms as having the neologistic meanings intended by the Jesuit missionaries. For example, they translate *iyawikitara* patiri as ‘high village’ and not as ‘Heaven’. In some cases, changes in the language have rendered Jesuit neologisms uninterpretable to modern Omaguas, as in the cases of (9.4) & (9.6), where *yaw* ‘make’, in use during the Jesuit missionary period, has been replaced by *ipu* ‘make’ (see footnote 109 for more details).

In addition to the neologisms enumerated above, there are two lexical items *amuyasukata* ‘observe’ (in the sense of observing God’s commandments) and *yumunuyepeta* ‘redeem’, that are not attested in modern Omagua, and which we also suspect to be Jesuit neologisms. Both words appear in the Lord’s Prayer and Full Catechism, and the first also appears in the Profession of Faith. We believe both words are morphologically complex, since they would be unusually long for morphologically simplex words, and we suspect that they were created by Jesuits to express the given theological notions, which seem unlikely to have been present in pre-colonial Omagua religious or moral thought. We have, however, been unable to morphologically segment these words and thus treat them as roots for interlinearization.

---

359 That is, the priest who presides over the celebration of the Eucharist.

360 Our translation of these words are based on the Spanish translation of the corresponding portions of the very similarly organized Quechua catechism found in the appendix to Manuel Uriarte’s diary (see §6.1.2).
9.3.2 Calques in Old Omagua Ecclesiastical texts

Unlike the neologisms described in §9.3.1, which are pervasive in the ecclesiastical texts, grammatical and lexical calques are infrequent. In other words, as far as we are able to tell in light of modern Omagua, the Omagua found in the ecclesiastical texts appears to be largely grammatically correct, suggesting that those involved in the development of the texts exhibited a high degree of fluency in the language. We discuss each type of calque separately in the following sections, indicating the source in the original text of each example discussed here. The translations given in this section are the target translations in the original text.

9.3.2.1 Comitative =mukui in Manner Adverbal Constructions

In modern Omagua, manner adverbials are expressed using the instrumental postposition =pupi (Old Omagua =pupe). However, in (4.1) of the Lord’s Prayer, reproduced in (9.9), we find a manner adverbial construction in which the comitative =mukui is used instead of the instrumental.

(9.9) tanupapa, iwati ritamakate yuritimukui, ene fira, tene ramutfa mura.

We consider the use of the comitative =mukui instead of the instrumental =pupe in (9.9) a calque, because of: 1) its divergence from the modern manner adverbial construction; and 2) the fact that comitative and instrumental meanings are expressed by a single preposition in Spanish (con) and German (mit), rendering confusion regarding the difference between the two Omagua postpositions plausible. In addition, Veigl’s (1788:199) description of Omagua indicates that the instrumental =pupe was employed in adverbial manner constructions during the Jesuit period. Veigl (ibid.) does not explicitly rule out the use of the comitative =mukui in this construction, but his failure to indicate that comitative can be used in place of the instrumental does suggest so.

9.3.2.2 Functional Extension of =sui ABLATIVE

In modern Omagua, the ablative postposition =sui licenses an oblique argument that denotes the source of a motion event. The Full Catechism, however, exhibits uses of this postposition to license obliques that do not participate in motion events, as in (9.10)-(9.12). In all these cases, the ungrammatical use of the ablative can be explained as an attempt to translate the Spanish preposition de ‘of, from’ in the corresponding Spanish sentence. The Spanish preposition in question is of course used to indicate sources of motion events, but has a considerably wider use, so that identifying
the Omagua ablative postposition with the Spanish preposition would lead to overgeneralizing the distribution of the ablative.

In (9.10), =sui indicates a partitive relation, a function unattested in modern Omagua.

(9.10) aikia mesapika personakanasui, maniamai awara uwaka iminua?

> aikia =sui plaza =kany maniamai =ra
dem.prox.ml three =sing =m which man =nom.purp
uwaka iminua
transform long.ago

‘Of these three people, which became man?

(see (6.11a))

In (9.11), =sui licenses an oblique argument that denotes the source of a non-motion event, or perhaps a metaphorical motion event, both unattested in the modern language.

(9.11) virgen santa maria sewekak arape awara uwaka iminua. espíritu santosui mura, virgen santa maria sewekasui awara iminua.

> virgen =sui maria =ra= seweka =k= arape =r awara =ra uwaka =ra
virgin =sing maria =m =womb =w =s =m which man =nom
iminua
long.ago

‘He became man in the womb of the Virgin Mary. He is of the Holy Spirit and was born of the womb of the Virgin Mary.’

(see (6.13b))

Finally, in (9.12), =sui appears to license the adverbial expression mitiripe ipisa ‘midnight’. In modern Omagua, adverbs, including ipisa ‘night, at night’, do not need to be licensed by a postposition, and we posit that this construction is a calque on Spanish de medianoche ‘at midnight’. Furthermore, the use of =mitiripe ‘in the middle of’ is itself ungrammatical here, since it precedes its putative complement, reflecting a morpheme-by-morpheme calque of medianoche.

(9.12) mitiripe ipisasui comulgayarayakatu marai kuratarasi, nuamai utfya[ra]rafi, ranasawaimia santissimo sacramento?

> mitiripe =sui comulga =ya =katu marai kurata
in.middle.of night =abl receive.communication =nomz:poss =sim =in.tsf thing drink
=rafi nua =mai utfya =ya =rafi rana =sawaiti =mia
=naas be.big =nomz:inact sin =nomz:poss =naas 3pl.ms= encounter =irr
santissimo sacramento
Holy Sacrament

\[^{363}\text{See (5.11a) in the Catechism Fragment for an equivalent calque on the same, parallel question.}\]

\[^{364}\text{This instance of =sui is grammatical, since uwari elsewhere means ‘fall’, i.e., it is a motion verb.}\]
‘Drinking in the middle of the night like a communicant, but being a great sinner, would they receive the Holy Sacrament?’
(see (6.30a))

Uriarte’s use of the Omagua ablative in his diaries likewise suggests calquing of Spanish de ‘of, from’, as in (9.13), where the ablative is used to express de otra mano ‘from another hand’, which, issues of idiomaticity aside, we would expect to be expressed with the instrumental.

\[ \text{roaya amua puasui r[a]umanusenuni.} \]
\[ \text{NEG other hand =ABL 3SG.MS= die =PURP} \]

‘So that he wouldn’t die from another hand.’
(see (8.2b))

\[ \text{9.3.2.3 Extensions of } =\textit{ari} \text{ DIFFUSE LOCATIVE} \]

Old Omagua exhibited a diffuse locative =\textit{ari}, whose modern reflex licenses an oblique argument that denotes an extended region that serves as a spatial ground with respect to a figure denoted by another referring expression, and is in contact with that figure. The ecclesiastical texts exhibit two instances in which presence of the diffuse locative appears to be motivated by the desire to find an Omagua counterpart to the preposition en ‘on’ in Spanish verb-plus-particle constructions in which the preposition does not encode any spatial semantics. These examples include (9.14), from the Full Catechism, and (9.15) from the Profession of Faith, where the use of =\textit{ari} appears to be motivated by the partial semantic overlap between the Old Omaga diffuse locative =\textit{ari} and the Spanish preposition en.

In (9.14), for example, the diffuse locative co-occurs with the verb \textit{sara} ‘await’, which in Omagua takes a direct object without requiring an adposition. The construction in (9.14) appears to be a direct calque of Spanish esperar en ‘have faith in’, where the use of \textit{sara} ‘await’ stems from the homophony of esperar ‘await’ and ‘hope’, and use of the diffuse locative stems from the (overgeneralized) identification of the diffuse locative with the Spanish preposition en. In order to make clear the presence of the calque we gloss \textit{sara} as ‘await’ but translate it as ‘hope’ in the target translations given here.

\[ \text{nesaratipa upakatu ne\text{iyamukuikatu Diosari ene utjakana ratenepetari, neumanura\text{f}}i, raerusuari ene sawa iwutimai ritamakate, nara\text{f}\text{i}?} \]
\[ \text{ne= sara =tipa upa=katu ne= } \text{iya =mukui =katu Dios =ari ene 2SG= await =INTERR all =INTSF 2SG= heart =COM =INTSF God =LOC.DIFF 2SG utja =kana ra= tenepeta =ari ne= umanu =ra\text{f}i ra= ensu =ari ene sin =PL.MS 3SG.MS= forgive =IMPF 2SG= die =NASS 3SG.MS= take =IMPF 2SG sawa iwati =mai =ritama =kate nara\text{f}i soul be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL ?} \]

\[ ^{365}\text{We do not consider the fact that we know Uriarte’s use of the Omagua ablative to have been calqued on Spanish} \]
\[ ^{366}\text{de to be sufficient evidence to conclude that Uriarte was the author of the ecclesiastical text sentences with calqued uses of } =\textit{sui}. \]

\[ ^{366}\text{Interestingly, German, the native language of several Jesuits who worked among the Omagua, does not express} \]
\[ ^{366}\text{‘have faith in’ with a construction that would result in calque (cf. in X Vertrauen haben).} \]
‘Do you have faith in God, with all of your heart, that he will forgive your sins, and that when you die he will take your soul to Heaven?’
(see (6.34a))

A similar calque is found in (9.15), where the Spanish verb-plus-particle expression creer en ‘believe in’ appears to be the basis of the use of the diffuse locative with the Omagua verb sapiari ‘believe, obey’. Note that sapiari is itself a transitive verb that takes a direct object with no need for a postposition, and that, at least in modern Omagua, does not participate in a construction resembling that found in (9.15).

(9.15) taya jesucristo, aisetui awa, enesemai tasapia ene kumesamaikanari.

‘My Lord Jesus Christ, true God, true man, I truly believe in you and your words.’
(see (7.1))

9.3.3 Semantic Extension of Lexical Items

The use of Omagua forms in ways inconsistent with native speaker uses of those same forms is not limited to functional morphemes, but also extends to contentful lexical items. An instance of semantic extension of an Omagua lexical item based on Spanish lexical semantics was already encountered in §9.3.2.3, in which Omagua sa ‘await’ was used to translate Spanish esperar ‘hope, await’, where the former Spanish sense was the one required in the passage in question. We now consider similar semantic extensions of Omagua words that stem from the fact that a Spanish translational equivalent participates in a homophony or polysemy network.

The first example we consider here involves the use of ukuata ‘pass by’ in the Full Catechism to express the notion ‘happen, occur’, as evident in (9.16). This appears to be a calque based on the fact Spanish pasar expresses both ‘pass by’ and ‘happen’. Beyond the fact that ukuata ‘pass by’ expresses only physical motion the subject of the verb past the object of the verb (at least in the modern language), the argument structure of Omagua ukuata ‘pass by’ reverses that intended by Spanish construction on which the Omagua expression in the catechism is calqued (i.e, aunque todas las cosas te pasen). That is, the second person appears as the subject and ‘all things’ as the object, the opposite of the Spanish construction.

(9.16) nesa itipatupatu nyamukuikatu yenepapa dios, upatu marainkana ne ukuata, raerasemaikatuika?

‘My Lord Jesus Christ, true God, true man, I truly believe in you and your words.’
(see (7.1))
‘Do you love our father God with all your heart, even though anything may happen to you, because he is really truly good?’
(see (6.35a))

The use of verb sawaiti ‘encounter’ (of which modern Omagua sawita is a reflex) in the Full Catechism presents a similar case, where the verb has been extended to express the notion ‘receive’, in the sense of receiving the Holy Sacrament, as shown in (9.17). We take this to be a calque motivated by the polysemy of Spanish recibir, which can denote at least two quite different types of receiving events: 1) one in which the grammatical subject is the recipient of some inanimate object (e.g., a gift); or 2) one in which the grammatical subject acts as a host, receiving a guest. The semantics of Omagua sawaita partially overlaps with that of recibir, denoting two types of events: 1) one in which a host welcomes a visitor; or 2) one in which the grammatical subject encounters some other entity (e.g., on a path). Old Omagua sawaiti thus presumably overlapped with recibir in the host-guest event type meaning, leading the authors of the catechism to identify the two words, thereby leading to the semantic extention of sawaiti to cover the other sense of recibir, which was not natively denoted by the Old Omagua verb.

(9.17) cristianokana era ranaconfayasayaraf, rana sawaitiari weranu santísimo sacramento?

A somewhat different process of semantic extension affected the word ayaise ‘wicked’ in the Lord’s Prayer, which both in modern Omagua and the other ecclesiastical texts predicates negative personality attributes like dishonesty or a propensity for anger or violence to individuals. In the Lord’s prayer, however, we find the word being used more broadly to indicate a notion like ‘bad, evil’, which can also be predicated of inanimates. We take the extension from ‘wicked’ to ‘evil’ to be a result of Jesuit authors’ searching for an antonym to eta ‘good’, which can be predicated of animates, inanimates, and even events, indicating general positive evaluation, without the kind of restriction to personality attributes we see for ayaise ‘wicked’. No such antonym exists as a single lexical item in modern Omagua at least, leading us to believe that ayaise was used in the Lord’s Prayer in a way that extended the native semantics of the term.

(9.18) ayaise maraisui neyumunuyepeta tanu

‘Deliver us from evil.’
(see (4.7))

367 See also footnote 211
368 See footnote 124 for additional comments.
Next we consider the use of \textit{kumesa} ‘say’ as a translational equivalent of ‘judge’ in the Full Catechism, as in (9.19). Modern Omagua exhibits no word that expresses the notion of ‘judgment’ in a moral, legal, or eschatological sense, and it is clear that elsewhere in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts \textit{kumesa} serves to express ‘say’, as in the modern language. We infer, then, that \textit{kumesa} meant ‘say’ in Old Omagua, and that the Jesuits extended the term to ‘judge’ in the ecclesiastical texts. The precise motivation for this extension is obscure, but it is worth noting that in both modern Loreto Spanish and in several Peruvian Amazonian languages, \textit{decir} ‘say’ and its indigenous counterparts often carry the connotation of ‘criticize’ (although this is not the case for modern Omagua)\footnote{See \textit{sawata} ‘criticize’.}, a notion not that distant from ‘judge’. If this secondary sense was also salient in the region when the ecclesiastical texts were being developed, it may have served as a motivation for extending the meaning of \textit{kumesa} ‘say’. This extension may of course be wholly a Jesuit innovation, grounded in the notion of judgement as a speech act, or on the idea that to speak of wicked deeds is to reveal them, thereby making them objects of possible moral censure.

(9.19) upakatu yenesawakai upai ayaise yeneyawikaimapurakana weranu rakumesasenuni rauriari.

\begin{verbatim}
upa = katu yene = sawa = kai upai ayaise yene = yawiki = mai
all = INTSF 1PL.INCL soul =? every wicked 1PL.INCL do = NOMZ:INACT
=puta = kana weranu ra = kumesa = senuni ra = uri = ari
=NOM.PST =PL.MS COORD 3SG.MS= say = PURP 3SG.MS= come = IMPF
\end{verbatim}

‘He will come to judge all of our souls and all of our wicked deeds.’
(see (6.25b))

Finally, we consider a strategy employed in the Lord’s Prayer for expressing passive voice, that relies on extending the function of the third person masculine pronoun to a non-referential role. This strategy is exemplified in (9.9) in §9.3.2.1. The construction, \textit{tene ra= mutfa mura}, literally ‘let him kiss it’, which aims to translate a jussive passive in the corresponding Spanish sentence (i.e., \textit{sancitificado sea tu nombre} ‘hallowed be thy name’ = ‘let his name be hallowed’), involves a transitive active verb. A passive-like effect is achieved by treating the third-person pronominal subject pronoun (here \textit{ra} = 3SG.MS) as non-referential, so that the pronominal object (here \textit{mu} 3SG.MS), coreferential with a full NP (here \textit{fira} ‘name’), is the sole referential argument of the verb, mimicking a passive. No other strategy is attested for expressing anything like passive voice in any of the Old Omagua texts, and there are no morphological and or syntactic strategies for doing so in the modern language, suggesting that the non-referential use the subject pronoun in this case is an example of grammatical creativity on the part of the contributors to the ecclesiastical text in question.

\subsection{9.4 Linguistic Comparison of Catechism Texts}

The goal of this section is to describe the differences between the Catechism Fragment and the Full Catechism, focusing on the differences in the Jesuit contributor’s use of, and facility with, Omagua grammar. This comparison demonstrates that although the two texts exhibit significant similarities, there are also subtle but pervasive grammatical differences between them, strongly suggesting that...
these two texts reflect contributions by at least two different missionaries to a common Omagua
text tradition.\(^{370}\) Both texts reveal that the contributors had significant control over most areas of
Omagua grammar but that they had different strengths and weaknesses in their ability to deploy
certain aspects of that grammar. We examine the differences between the catechistic texts in the
order that the differences occur, but we can make a number of general observations about these
differences at the outset, summarized in Table 9.2.

The Full Catechism exhibits two cases of ungrammatical ordering of prenominal modifiers,
while the Catechism Fragment exhibits no such cases. However, various phenomena involved
in question formation are better handled in the Full Catechism. For example, the distribution of
interrogative clitics and the use of \(wh\)-words distinguishing reason from purpose are both handled
correctly in the Full Catechism. Both texts also show heavy use of the adverb \(iminu\a\) ‘long ago’
to express past temporal reference, in the apparent absence of a grammatical morpheme to express
past tense as such, in a manner that was probably quite unusual for natively spoken Omagua in
that period. The Full Catechism also exhibits ungrammatical placement of this word, an adverb,
between a verb and its complement.

Note that the example passages in this section, which are copied from Chapters 5 & 6, are
reduced to a three-line interlinear format (phonemic representation, interlinearization and target
gloss) in this section, with passages from the Catechism Fragment preceding their counterparts in
the Full Catechism. Portions of the passages being discussed and compared are in boldface and
parenthetical notes refer the reader to the corresponding five-line interlinear versions.

1st Question-Response Pair    The translations of ‘tell’ in the question differ in (9.20a) and (9.21a),
with \(ikuata\), literally ‘teach’, chosen in the former and \(kumesa\) ‘say’ in the latter. It is ungrammatical
for the theme argument of \(ikuata\) to be realized as an oblique (licensed here by the postposition
\(=supe\ GOAL\)), while it is required that the recipient argument of \(kumesa\) ‘say’ (i.e., the hearer)
be realized as an oblique, as it correctly is in (9.21a) (see footnote 131). In this case, then, the
Catechism Fragment exhibits an apparent grammatical error not found in the Full Catechism.

(9.20)   a. \(ikuata\ epe tasupe, amititipa Dios?\)
        \(ikua\ -ta epe ta= =supe amiti =tipa Dios\)
        know -CAUS 2PL 1SG.MS= =GOAL EXST =INTERR God
        ‘Teach me, does God exist?’
        b. amiti mura.
        \(amiti mura\)
        EXST 3SG.MS
        ‘He exists.’
        (see (5.1))

(9.21)   a. \(tairakana, pekumesa\ tasupe, amititipa Dios?\)
        \(ta\ a\ =kana pe= kumesa ta= =supe amiti =tipa Dios\)
        son.MALE.EGO =PL.MS 2PL= say 1SG.MS= =GOAL EXST =INTERR God
        ‘Children, tell me, does God exist?’

\(^{370}\) See §3.2 for a discussion of orthographic differences between the texts.
**2nd Question-Response Pair** These passages exhibit two noteworthy differences. First, the question portion the Catechism Fragment passage (9.22) exhibits a resumptive pronoun *mu* 3SG.MS that is absent in the Full Catechism passage (9.23). The presence of this pronoun in this context is optional in the modern language, suggesting that the contributors simply opted for different constructions in this case, both grammatical.

Second, the response passage that delineates the ontological status of God is more elaborated in the Catechism Fragment than in the Full Catechism, where *wakutata* ‘protector’ is absent from the latter text. Furthermore, the Catechism Fragment response exhibits two uses of the comitative postposition (=mukui) NP coordination strategy, and one use of the coordination particle *weranu*, both of which are absent from (9.23). The uses of the two different strategies in the Catechism Fragment are both grammatical, and constitute more masterful uses of Omagua than the simple list in the Full Catechism passage.

(9.22)  

a. maraitipa Dios *mura*?  

\[ \text{marai =tipa Dios mura} \]  
what =INTERR God 3SG.MS  
‘What is God?’

b. iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkanamukui, yawikitara, *wakutata*, yenyarasemai *weranu*, muriai Dios mura.  

\[ \text{iwati =mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu marain be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all =INTSF thing =kana =mukui yawiki -tara wakuta -tara yene= yara =PL.MS =COM make -NOMZ:ACT carry.in.arm -NOMZ:ACT 1PL.INCL= master =semai weranu murtia -i Dios mura} \]  
‘The Creator of Heaven, Earth and all things, the protector, and our true Lord as well, thus is God.’ (see (5.2))

(9.23)  

a. maraitipa Dios?  

\[ \text{marai =tipa Dios} \]  
what =INTERR God  
‘What is God?’

b. iwatimai ritama, aikiara tuyuka ritama, upakatu marainkan, yawikitara yarawasu Dios mura.
iwati =mai ritama aikiara tuyuka ritama upa =katu marain
be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village DEM.PROX.MS land village all =INTSF thing
=kana yawiki -tara yara =wasu Dios mura
=PL.MS make -NOMZ:ACT master =AUG God 3SG.MS

‘God is the Creator of Heaven, Earth, and all things, the great Lord.’
(see 6.2)

3rd Question-Response Pair The questions in this pair exhibit a difference in the presence of the interrogative clitic =tipa, which appears on the instrumental-bearing interrogative word marai=pupe ‘with what’ in the Catechism Fragment in (9.24), but is absent on the corresponding element marai=pupe in the Full Catechism, in (9.25) [371]. The Full Catechism and modern Omagua exhibit the same pattern in not allowing the interrogative clitic to co-occur with a postposition, such as the instrumental =pupe, on interrogative words. If we assume that this is the correct pattern, we conclude that the contributors to the Catechism Fragment overgeneralized the distribution of the interrogative clitic from interrogative words that question core arguments only to all interrogative words, include ones that question obliques.

(9.24) a. maripupetipa Dios yawiki upakatu marainkana?
marai =pupe =tipa Dios yawiki upa =katu marain =kana
what =INSTR =INTERR God make all =INTSF thing =PL.MS
‘With what did God make all things?’
b. rakumesapupe purai.
ra= kumesa =pupe purai
3SG.MS= word =INSTR FOC:CONTR
‘With his words.’
(see 5.3)

(9.25) a. maraisapupe Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upakatu marainkana?
marai =pupe Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upa =katu marain =kana
what =INSTR God make long.ago DEM.PROX.MS all =INTSF thing =PL.MS
‘With what did God make all these things?’
b. rasemai kumesamai purape ra ni putarimaipupe purai.
ra= semai kumesa =mai =pupe ra= ni putari
3SG.MS= =FOC:VER say =NOMZ:INACT =INSTR 3SG.MS= ? desire
=mai =pupe purai
=NOMZ:INACT =INSTR FOC:CONTR
‘With and only with his words, and not with his desires.’
(see 6.3)

Another difference between the questions concerns the prenominal modification of marainkana ‘things’. The Full Catechism exhibits two prenominal modifiers aikiara DEM.PROX.MS and upakatu ‘all’ in the opposite order to that attested in modern Omagua, while the Catechism Fragment

[371] Note also that the forms of the interrogative word ‘what’ are slightly different.
only exhibits the modifier *upakatu*. If we assume that the correct order in Old Omagua was the same as in modern Omagua, the prenominal modifier order exhibited in Full Catechism passage is incorrect.

One final observation regarding the question passages concerns the position of the temporal adverb *imina* ‘long ago’ in the Full Catechism question, which appears between the verb *yawiki* and its object. Temporal adverbs very rarely occur in this position in the ecclesiastical texts, and it is ungrammatical for them to appear in this position in modern Omagua, suggesting that its appearance in this position in (9.25) is ungrammatical. Note that this adverb is entirely absent from the corresponding question in the Catechism Fragment.

Turning to the responses, we see that the Full Catechism passage in (9.25) exhibits a number of additional features, some of them anomalous. First, this response includes a clause that clarifies that in God’s creation of the world by means of the Word, the Word was necessary, and God’s desire (= will?) alone did not suffice. Also of interest, the form expressing ‘word’ in this response, namely *kumesa=mai*, bears an overt nominalizer, in contrast to the zero-derived nominalization in the corresponding Catechism Fragment response in (9.25). In modern Omagua this form is also zero-derived, suggesting that the form bearing the overt nominalizer is an overgeneralization by the contributors to the Full Catechism. Finally, we see that the Full Catechism exhibits the exclusive focus clitic =*semai* (see footnote 149).

**4th Question-Response Pair** The questions in this pair differ in the seemingly ungrammatical appearance of the interrogative clitic on the non-core argument interrogative word in the Catechism Fragment (9.26), providing another example of the overgeneralization of this clitic apparent in (9.24) above.

A difference in the content of the responses is evident in the substitution of *upakatu makati* ‘everywhere’ in the Full Catechism for *muriapi* ‘always’ in the Catechism Fragment in describing God’s location in the world, where the articulation given in the Full Catechism seems more doctrinally felicitous. The Catechism Fragment also exhibits the use of *weanu*, an NP coordinator (§2.3.7.1). The Full Catechism exhibits an optional sentence-final resumptive pronoun *muta* 3SG.MS that is absent from the Catechism Fragment.

(9.26) a. makate**tipa** Dios yuriti?

*b*  
 
makate =*tipa* Dios yuriti

*where =*INTERR God be.in.place

‘Where is God?’

b. iwati mai ritamakate, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate, muriapi rayuriti weanu.

*iwati =*mai ritama =*kate aikiara tuyuka ritama =*kate

be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =LOC DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC

muriapi ra = yuriti weanu

uninterruptedly 3SG.MS = be.in.place COORD

‘He is always in Heaven as well as on Earth.’

(see (5.4))

(9.27) a. makate Dios yuriti?
5th Question-Response Pair The interrogative words differ in the corresponding questions in (5.5a) and (6.5a), where in the former we see *awiri*, and in the latter *awirika* ‘how many’. The form in the Fragment is reconstructable to Proto-Omagua-Kokama on the basis of its appearance in Kokama, but the latter form is attested in modern Omagua. In (5.5a), *awiri* combines with the interrogative clitic =$pa$ but in (6.5a) *awirika* does not combine with either interrogative clitic, a restriction maintained today (i.e., *awirikapa*). The responses to these questions differ (trivially) in whether Dios ‘God’ is present or not.

6th Question-Response Pair The basic doctrinal issue addressed in the corresponding questions in Catechism Fragment and Full Catechism is the same, but the structure of the questions is somewhat different. In the Catechism Fragment, the question posed, regarding a number of entities in the natural world, is ‘Which of these is God?’, where the expected answer is ‘None of them’, while in the Full Catechism the question is ‘[are these things] not God?’, where the expected answer is ‘No, they are not God’. The Full Catechism also includes *miara* ‘animal’ (see footnote [161]) in its list of possible entities with which God might be identified, while the fragment does not. With respect to grammatical issues, it is noteworthy that the Full Catechism employs the interrogative word *mari* ‘what’ with an interrogative clitic in (9.28) to express ‘which’, where in the modern language we expect *makatimai* ‘which’, with no interrogative clitic. The Catechism Fragment does not have a corresponding element due to the different structure of the question, making it difficult to determine if the use of *mari* ‘what’ in the Full Catechism would have been grammatical in Old Omagua at the time.

(9.28) a. *kʷaraʃi*, yasi, sesukanaka, wirakana, iwatakanaka weranu, to maritipa aikiarakanaka Dios mura?

*b. nati* marai aikiara Dios mura. Dios yawikimaipurakanaka purai ranu.

---

*makate Dios yuriti*

where God be.in.place

‘Where is God?’

b. iwatimai ritamakate, aikiara tuyuka ritamakate, **upakatu makate Dios yuriti mura**.

*iwati =mai ritama =kate aikiara tuyuka ritama =kate upa*

be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =LOC DEM.PROX.MS land village =LOC all

=katu makate Dios yuriti mura

=INTSF where God be.in.place 3SG.MS

‘God is in Heaven, on Earth, everywhere.’

(see (6.4))
nati marai  aikiara  Dios mura
NEG.INDEF DEM.PROX.MS.PRO God 3SG.MS

Dios yawiki =mai  =pura  =kana  purai  ranu
God make  =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS FOC:CONTR 3PL.MS

‘God is none of these things. They are God’s creations.’
(see [5.6])

(9.29)  a. kwarañi, yasi, sesukana, Wirakana, miarakana, iwatakana, roayatipa Dios?

kwarañi yasi  sesu =kana  wira =kana  miara  =kana  iwata  =kana  roaya
sun  moon  star  =PL.MS  bird  =PL.MS  animal  =PL.MS  jungle  =PL.MS  NEG
=tipa  Dios
=INTERR  God

‘The sun, the moon, the stars, the birds, the animals, the forests, are they not God?’

b. roaya Dios mura.  aikiara upakatu marainkana Dios yawikimaipura purai mura.

roaya Dios mura
NEG  God 3SG.MS

aikiara  upa =katu  marain =kana  Dios yawiki =mai  =pura
DEM.PROX.MS  all  =INTSF  thing  =PL.MS  God  make  =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST
purai  mura
FOC:CONTR 3SG.MS

‘They are not God. All these things are God’s creation.’
(see [6.6])

Turning to the responses, we find that they differ in content, as evident in (9.28) and (9.29), reflecting the differences in the questions posed. Thus the Full Catechism exhibits a noun with two prenominal modifiers aikiara upakatu marainkana ‘all of these things’ with no counterpart in the Catechism Fragment. Significantly, this collocation shows the same reversed order of prenominal modifiers found in (9.25), confirming that contributors to this text felt this to be the correct order. This response also exhibits what appears to be simple grammatical error, a third-person singular pronoun mu that does not agree in number with its antecedent, namely those things that are not to be identified with God. The counterpart of this pronoun in the Catechism Fragment (ranu in (9.28)) does exhibit the correct agreement.

Finally, the Catechism Fragment response exhibits the collocation nati marai, which is clearly intended to mean ‘none’ or ‘none of them’ (cf. marai ‘thing’). Interestingly, neither modern Omagua or modern Kokama exhibit a reflex of nati, which appears to function as a negation element here, nor has it yet proved possible to identify a corresponding element in Tupinambá or any other Tupí-Guaraní language.

7th Question-Response Pair  The questions in these pairs exhibit two differences, the most significant being the difference in choice of interrogative word. The Catechism Fragment question (9.30) employs a reason interrogative (formed from marai ‘what’ and =ikua REAS), while the Full Catechism question (9.31) employs a purpose interrogative (formed from marai ‘what’ and =ra NOM.PURP – see [2.3.6]). The responses make clear that the purpose interrogative is correct, and
as a result we take the use of reason interrogative in the Catechism Fragment to reflect the failure of the contributors to that text to master the subtle distinction between reason and purpose interrogatives in the language. The fact that a contributor to the Full Catechism did have mastery of the reason-purpose distinction in Omagua interrogative formation suggests a fairly high degree of fluency.

(9.30) a. maraikutipa Dios yawiki upakatu aikiara marainkana?

marai =ikua =tipa Dios yawiki upa =katu aikiara marain =kana
what =REAS =INTERR God make all =INTSF DEM.PROX.MS thing =PL.MS

‘Why did God make all these things?’

b. awa erasenuni.

awa era =senuni
mankind good =PURP

‘For the well-being of man.’

(see (5.7))

(9.31) a. marairapa Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upai marainkana?

marai =ra =pa Dios yawiki iminua aikiara upai marain
what =NOM.PURP =INTERR God make long.ago DEM.PROX.MS every thing =kana =PL.MS

‘Why did God create all these things?’

b. yeneeramaira.

yene = era =mai =ra
1PL.INCL= good =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PURP

‘For our well-being.’

(see (6.7))

The responses are both fully grammatical, but exhibit interestingly different strategies for indicating purpose. The Catechism fragment response employs the purpose postposition =senuni, which cliticizes to era ‘good’ directly, as we would expect, while the Full Catechism response employs the nominal purposive =ra, which attaches to the nominalized era=mai (see footnote 144).

8th Question-Response Pair The questions in this pair exhibit the pattern seen in the previous pair, where the Catechism Fragment incorrectly employs a reason interrogative word in a context which calls for a purpose interrogative, while the Full Catechism employs the purpose interrogative word maniasenuni (see §2.3.6). The Full Catechism question exhibits another instance iminua ‘long ago’ occurring between the verb and its object, a position in which temporal adverbs may not appear in the modern language (see above). Note that the questions also differ slightly in their content, with the Catechism Fragment asking why ‘man’ was created and the Full Catechism using the first person inclusive pronoun yene instead.

373Recall, however, that the Catechism Fragment does, however exhibit the correct ordering of prenominal modifiers to marainkana, while the Full Catechism exhibits the reverse order.
(9.32) a. **marai** Dios yawiki weranu mura awa?

marai =ikua =tipa Dios yawiki weranu mura awa
what =REAS =INTERR God create COORD 3SG.MS man

‘Why did God also make man?’

b. Diossennai raikuasenuni, mura rasafitasenuni, rakumesapurakana rasenuseruni, umanumaipura rayawa|sasenuni iwati|ai ritamakate.

Dios =semai ra= ikua =senuni mura ra= safita =senuni ra=
God =FOC:VER 3SG.MS= know =PURP 3SG.MS 3SG.MS= love =PURP 3SG.MS=
kumesa =pura =kana ra= senu =senuni umanu =mai
word =NOM.PST =PL.MS 3SG.MS= hear =PURP die =NOMZ:INACT
=pura ra= yawa|isma|=senuni iwati =mai ritama =kate
=NOM.PST 3SG.MS= arrive =PURP be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =LOC

‘So that he may truly know God, so that he may love him, so that he may hear his words, so that the dead may arrive in Heaven.’

(see (5.8))

(9.33) a. **mani** Dios yawiki **imiu** yene weranu?

mania =senuni Dios yawiki imiu yene weranu
what.action =PURP God make long.ago 1PL.INCL COORD

‘Why did God create us as well?’

b. yeneikuasenuni Diossennai se, yenesafitasenuni mura Dios, rakumesamaipurakana yeneamuyasukata|asenuni, aikiara tuyukaari yeneyuritiuparasi, iwati|ai ritamakate yeneususenuni.

yene= ikua =senuni Dios =semai se yene= safita =senuni mura
1PL.INCL= know =PURP God =FOC:VER ? 1PL.INCL= love =PURP 3SG.MS
Dios ra= kumesa =mai =pura =kana yene= amuyasukata
God 3SG.MS= say =NOMZ:INACT =NOM.PST =PL.MS 1PL.INCL= observe
=senuni aikiara tuyuka =ari yene= yuriti =upa =rafi
=PURP DEM.PROX.MS land =LOC.DIFF 1PL.INCL= be.in.place =CESS =NASS
iwati =mai ritama =kate yene= usu =senuni
be.high.up =NOMZ:INACT village =ALL 1PL.INCL= go =PURP

‘So that we may truly know God, so that we may love him, so that we may observe his commandments, and ceasing to remain on Earth, so that we may go to Heaven.’

(see (6.8))

The responses differ in relatively minor ways related to expressive choices in the content deriving from differences in the questions, but the Catechism Fragment interestingly does not employ the neologism *amuyasukata* ‘observe’ (see §9.3.1) found in the Full Catechism, instead employing *senu* ‘hear, listen’ to express the concept of observing God’s commandments.

**10th Question-Response Pair** The two questions in this pair differ in the form of the interrogative clitic (=*tipa* in the Catechism Fragment, and =*pa* in the Full Catechism) and whether the predicative noun *Dios* is overtly marked for plural number, as in Catechism Fragment. Note that the
form of the clitic appears to vary freely in Old Omagua, and that number marking on semantically plural nouns modified by a numeral is optional in modern Omagua, suggesting that both questions are fully grammatical, with the differences simply reflecting different expressive choices. Finally, it is interesting to note in light of the apparent prenominal modifier ordering errors evident in the Full Catechism that in both questions the ordering of prenominal modifiers is correct (i.e., *aikiara musapirika* ‘these three’).

(9.34) a. *aikiara musapirika personakana, roaya*tipa* musapirika Dios?*

    *aikiara  musapirika persona =kana  roaya =tipa  musapirika Dios*
    DEM.PROX.MS three  person  =PL.MS NEG  =INTERR three  God

    ‘These three persons, are they not three Gods?’

b. *roaya mura musapirika Dios. aikiara musapirika personakana**uyepesemai** Dios mura. santísima trinidadnani rafira.*

    *roaya mura  musapirika Dios*
    NEG  3SG.MS three  God

    *aikiara  musapirika persona =kana  uyepe =semai  Dios mura*
    DEM.PROX.MS three  person  =PL.MS one  =FOC:VER God  3SG.MS

    *santísima trinidad =nani  ra=  fira*
    Holy Trinity  =FOC:EXCL 3SG.MS= name

    ‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are truly one God. The Holy Trinity is its name.’

(see (5.10))

(9.35) a. *aikiara musapirika personakana, roaya*pa* musapirika Dios kana?*

    *aikiara  musapirika persona =kana  roaya =pa  musapirika Dios*
    DEM.PROX.MS three  person  =PL.MS NEG  =INTERR three  God

    =kana
    =PL.MS

    ‘These three people, are they not three Gods?’

b. *roaya [musa]pirika Dios kana. aikiara musapirika personakana persona**uyepe titi** Dios mura. santísima trinidadnani*maï* rafira.*

    *roaya [musa]pirika Dios =kana*
    NEG  three  God  =PL.MS

    *aikiara  musapirika persona =kana  persona uyepe titi  Dios mura*
    =PL.MS three  person  =PL.MS person  one  be.alone God  3SG.MS

    *santísima trinidad =nani  =mai ra=  fira*
    Holy Trinity  =FOC:EXCL =?  3SG.MS= name

    ‘They are not three Gods. These three persons are one God alone. The Holy Trinity is its name.’

(see (6.10))
The responses, each of which we analyze as consisting of three short sentences, differ in a number of important ways. In the first sentence, which is a non-verbal clause, the Full Catechism lacks the pronominal form \textit{muRa} 3SG.MS found in the corresponding Catechism Fragment sentence. Based on modern Omagua, we expect \textit{muRa} to be necessary here for the sentence to be grammatical (see §2.3.10). In the second sentence of the response, however, also a non-verbal clause, the Full Catechism exhibits \textit{muRa} in the expected position, just as in the Catechism Fragment, suggesting that its absence in the first sentence of the Full Catechism response may reflect a simple oversight, rather than a lack of mastery of non-verbal clauses.

The responses also differ in how the notion of God being a single god (despite being a trinity) is expressed in the second sentence, with the collocation \textit{uyepe titi} ‘one alone’ appearing in the Full Catechism (and attested in modern Omagua), while the Catechism fragment employs verum focus: \textit{uyepe=semai} ‘truly one’. We believe both of these constructions were grammatical. Finally, the third sentence of each of the responses exhibit the use of \textit{=nani} as an exclusive focus marker on \textit{trinidad} (also a strategy attested in the modern language (see §2.3.9.2)), but the presence of the nominalizer \textit{=mai} following the exclusive focus marker in the Full Catechism is inexplicable, and was presumably ungrammatical.

**11th Question-Response Pair**  The questions in this pair differ in two ways. We see that the interrogative word \textit{maniamai} ‘which’ in Catechism Fragment\textsuperscript{374} (9.36) bears the interrogative clitic \textit{=tipa}, whereas the corresponding interrogative word in the Full Catechism (9.37) does not. The \textit{wh}-word \textit{maniamai} is attested in modern Omagua (albeit with a meaning of ‘what type of’), where it cannot be marked by \textit{=pa}, the interrogative clitic in modern Omagua. The questions also differ in their treatment of the object of \textit{uwaka} ‘transform’, \textit{awa} ‘man’, with the Full Catechism object bearing the nominal purposive clitic \textit{=Ra}, as we expect based on modern Omagua, but the corresponding element in the Catechism Fragment lacking this clitic, rendering the construction ungrammatical. The responses show the same difference in appropriate use of the nominal purposive.

Other than the difference in the use of the nominal purposive, the responses also differ in the Fragment marking \textit{taira} ‘son’ with the verum focus marker \textit{=semai} to maintain the fact that it is God’s true son who transformed into a man.

(9.36)  a. aikia musapirika personakanasui, maniamaitipa awa uwaka iminua?
    \begin{align*}
    \text{aikiara} & \quad \text{musapirika persona} =\text{kana} =\text{sui} \quad \text{maniamai} =\text{tipa} \quad \text{awa} \\
    & \quad \text{DEM.PROX.MS} \quad \text{three person} =\text{PL.MS} =\text{ABL} \quad \text{which} =\text{INTERR \text{man}} \\
    \text{uwaka} & \quad \text{iminua} \\
    & \quad \text{transform long.ago}
    \end{align*}

   ‘Of these three people, which became man?

b. Dios tairasesmai awa uwaka iminua.
    \begin{align*}
    \text{Dios} & \quad \text{taira} =\text{semai} \quad \text{awa} \quad \text{uwaka} \quad \text{iminua} \\
    & \quad \text{God \ male.EGO} =\text{FOC:VER \ man transform long.ago}
    \end{align*}

   ‘The son of God truly became man.

(see (5.11))

(9.37)  a. aikia musapirika personakanasui, maniamai awara awa uwaka iminua?

\textsuperscript{374}In modern Omagua, \textit{makatimai} ‘which’.
12th Question-Response Pair  The same difference in the use of *maraikua* and *maniasenuni*, discussed above in the questions of (9.32) and (9.33) is found in (5.12) and (6.12). In the responses, the Fragment shows an additional clause describing Christ’s taking Christians to Heaven that is absent in the Full Catechism, although the latter states that Christ will save Christians both from their evils and from Hell, whereas the former does not mention Hell (see footnote 169).

Interim Summary  In Table 9.2 we summarize the major findings laid out at the beginning of this section with regard to the grammatical characteristics of each of the two catechistic texts. A check mark indicates grammatical uses of the construction in question, while an ‘X’ indicates ungrammatical uses.

9.5 Text History

The goal of this section is to combine our knowledge of the history of Jesuit interactions with the Omaguas and our analysis of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts to identify likely Jesuit contributors to the development of the texts, and to the degree possible, clarify how these texts have come down to us in the present.

Our assessment of which Jesuits are likely to have contributed to the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts is based on: 1) the length of their engagement with the Omaguas; 2) their fluency in Omagua, as explicitly discussed in historical materials, or as implied by explicit mention of their involvement in the preparation of descriptive linguistic materials; 3) the political and demographic stability of the mission settlements in which the missionary in question worked; and, of course, 4) any explicit mention of their having developed ecclesiastical texts (see Table 9.3). We emphasize, however, that in no case is it possible to identify the contributors with certainty, as none of the manuscript copies of these texts are known to be signed or annotated in any way that indicates their provenance.

The first Omagua catechism mentioned in the historical record dates to the Jesuits’ first major encounter with the Omaguas, Simón de Rojas’ and Humberto Coronado’s 1621 expedition to the Aguarico River basin (see Chapter 1). The ultimate fate of this document is unknown, although given broader Jesuit linguistic practices (see §9.2), we expect that a copy of this catechism was archived in Quito. Although the Catechism Fragment was located in Quito (see Chapter 5) we do not believe that it is a copy of the de Rojas and Coronado catechism, as there is, as we discuss
Table 9.2: Summary of Grammatical Differences Between Catechistic Texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 7</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 10</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓, ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRAG, Q&amp;R 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FULL, Q&amp;R 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simón de Rojas</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>Aguarico River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humberto Coronado</td>
<td>??</td>
<td>1621</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Fritz</td>
<td>Bohemia</td>
<td>1685-1704</td>
<td>San Joaquín and downriver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilhelm Grebmer</td>
<td>Baden</td>
<td>?-1735-?</td>
<td>Yurimaguas (Huallaga River)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
below, good reason to believe that the Catechism Fragment is a copy of a text in use in the Maynas missions in the mid-18th century.

We also do not know if Samuel Fritz was aware of the existence of this first catechism when he passed through Quito, en route to Maynas, in 1685 (Jouanen 1943:732), or whether he availed himself of it. However, the fact that he does not mention the catechism in his correspondence, in which he does discuss the linguistic diversity of Maynas, the fact that he was learning Quechua in Quito, and the likelihood that he would be sent to work among the Omagua (Bravo Santillán & Grosser 2007:69), suggests that he did not. We suspect, then, that de Rojas and Coronado catechism was never incorporated into the main Maynas Old Omagua ecclesiastical text tradition, possibly due to the fact that there was a significant break, both in time, and institutionally, between de Rojas’ and Coronado’s efforts to missionize the Upper Napo Omaguas, and Fritz’s engagement with the Omaguas sixty four years later.

Samuel Fritz is of course the prime candidate for having initiated the Old Omagua ecclesiastical text tradition. Fritz is reported to have prepared an Omagua wordlist and grammar (Hervás y Panduro 1800:200), which testifies to his linguistic abilities, and we deem it very likely that Fritz came to be fluent in Omagua, given his complete immersion in Omagua society and the success of his evangelical activities. We also have no reason to believe that Quechua was spoken by the Omagua during the early years of Fritz’s work in their communities, meaning that Fritz probably did not rely on translation from a Quechua model, a common first step in ecclesiastical text preparation by the Maynas Jesuits (see §9.2.4). Fritz was also the longest-serving Jesuit among the Omaguas, giving him ample time in which to prepare and make use of the texts. Given his prominence in the Jesuit hierarchy of Maynas, it is very likely that the ecclesiastical texts he developed were both archived in Santiago de la Laguna and served as the basis for the versions that we analyze here.

With Fritz’s departure for Lagunas in 1704 to serve as Superior begins a long period characterized by significant upheavals and dislocations for the Omaguas and the missionaries who worked with them. Between 1710 and 1723 in particular, there was no stable Jesuit presence among the Omaguas (see §9.1), making it unlikely that further work on ecclesiastical texts was carried out until the re-establishment of San Joaquín de Omaguas in 1723 by Bernard Zurmühlen and Johannes Baptist Julian. Since by this time the Jesuit linguistic and textual practices we describe in §9.2 were presumably well established, it is likely that they brought with them to the new settlement copies of earlier linguistic and ecclesiastical materials produced, one assumes, by Fritz.

Although San Joaquín de Omaguas was stable after the mid-1720s, it was not until the arrival of Martín Iriarte in 1748 that any missionary spent more than three years among the Omagua since Sanna, some 40 years earlier. It is clear that Iriarte spoke Omagua fluently (see §9.2.2), and

---

375 Fritz worked among the Omagua between 1685 and 1704, with two long absences from Omagua mission settlements (in addition to two journeys to Quito): 1) his trip to and subsequent imprisonment in Pará (modern-day Belém, Brazil) from September 1689 until July 1691; 2) a stay in Lima that lasted from July 1692 until May 1693 (Edmundson 1922:24-26).

376 Fritz may have archived his work in Quito during his trips there in 1701 and 1707 (Anonymous [1731]1922:107-108, 115); Edmundson (1922:28-29) or in Santiago de la Laguna in 1704, when he became Superior. Note also that both Zurmühlen and Julian could have continued their interaction with a smaller group of Omaguas while Superiors at Lagunas (see footnote 303), and archived written records there.

377 Here it is important to mention the Omagua manuscripts written by Wilhelm Grebmer (see §9.2.2). Although it is unclear whether these constituted ecclesiastical or linguistic texts, or both, they would have been based on work with Omaguas living in Yurimaguas, where he was missionary in 1735, or at Santiago de la Laguna, where he would...
since he stayed in San Joaquín for eight years, he would have had ample time to improve Omagua ecclesiastical texts. Indeed, even if these texts had been entirely lost in the years following Fritz’s departure (an unlikely event in any case, given the practice of maintaining copies in Santiago de la Laguna and Quito), Iriarte would probably have been able to re-create them. Iriarte is thus the first clear candidate for a major contributor to the Omagua ecclesiastical texts after Fritz.

Manuel Uriarte succeeded Iriarte in 1756, but the Omagua passages in his diaries are heavily calqued (see Chapter 8), casting doubt on his ability to contribute to the ecclesiastical texts, which for the most part appear to reflect considerable knowledge of Omagua grammar.

The last priest stationed in San Joaquín, Josef Palme, arrived in 1764 and stayed until the Jesuits were entirely expelled from Maynas in 1768. Little is known about Palme’s facility with Omagua, but it is certainly conceivable that he contributed to polishing the ecclesiastical texts. Note, however, that Palme could not have had any influence on the Catechism Fragment, since that text had been taken by Franciscis before Palme’s arrival (see §5.1.1 and footnote 339). If Palme contributed to what comes down to us as the Full Catechism, this may account for some minor variation between the two texts. We conclude from this survey that some or all of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts that we analyze in this volume are likely based on versions created by Samuel Fritz in the 1690s, and possibly added to or modified by Martín Iriarte in the early 1750s. Other than these two missionaries, no clear candidates as contributors to the Omagua texts emerge.

The survival of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts is in certain respects surprising, since in the latter phases of their expulsion in 1767 and 1768 the Maynas Jesuits destroyed most of the linguistic descriptions and ecclesiastical materials that they had developed, in order that they not fall into the hands of other religious orders (see Chapter 8 and footnote 5). The actual manuscripts that have come down to us appear to have been done so by three different routes. Although much about their histories remains obscure, the Catechism Fragment’s survival appears to have centrally involved Ignacio Franciscis, the survival of the Lord’s Prayer centrally involved Joaquín Camaño, and the remaining texts appear to have been preserved by Manuel Uriarte.

As described in §5.1.1, the Catechism Fragment was published by González Suárez after a copy of the manuscript was given to him as part of a collection of ecclesiastical texts uncovered in Quito. Where this collection was discovered is unclear, but it may have been held in private hands. In any case, Suárez identified the handwriting of the Catechism Fragment as Franciscis’, based on its similarity to a document that he confidently identifies as written by Franciscis. Ignacio Franciscis worked briefly in San Joaquín de Omaguas with Manuel Uriarte in 1761, and we deduce that he copied a catechism text available there, and and brought it back to Quito, where he himself ended up before the expulsion (see §5.1.1 and footnote 339). Franciscis is almost certainly not the author of the Catechism Fragment, however, since he was in San Joaquín de Omaguas for only four months. In fact, it appears, given the highly linguistically disparate nature of the ecclesiastical texts in his handwriting in this collection, that Franciscis was actively collecting texts in different languages, copying them wherever he found them.

The text of the Lord’s Prayer published by Hervás y Panduro was probably given to him by Joaquín Camaño (see §4.1), who was one of Hervás y Panduro’s main sources for linguistic in-
formation on South American languages (Clark 1937). Although Camaño never worked with Omaguas, he was clearly quite knowledgeable about the language, suggesting that he had access to materials on it. Where Camaño obtained the text is unknown at this point, but it is worth noting that Camaño lived in Faenza, Italy subsequent to the expulsion (Furlong Cardiff 1955:14-15), close to Iriarte and Uriarte, who lived in nearby Ravenna (Bayle 1952:1986:82). As we discuss below, it is clear that Uriarte preserved several texts, and may have given Camaño the copy of the Lord’s Prayer. This might explain why this text does not appear in the appendix to Uriarte’s diaries. The remaining ecclesiastical texts survived as part of the manuscript of Uriarte’s diaries, but it is not entirely clear that Uriarte brought the texts back to Europe from Maynas. Uriarte claims to have rewritten his diaries in their entirety following the expulsion, since he supposedly destroyed the original during the Jesuit expulsion, but he does explicitly indicate that he was able to smuggle a single ecclesiastical text in Tikuna with him back to Italy (Uriarte [1776]1986:239). This latter text forms part of the set of indigenous ecclesiastical texts found with his diary. It is curious, however, that he mentions smuggling only the Tikuna text, and not any of the other manuscripts appearing with his diary, raising the possibility that they may have been brought to Europe by others (e.g., by Iriarte), and then bundled with the diary manuscript. It is possible, of course, that Uriarte re-wrote the catechism from memory, but he presumably would not have been able to do so for the other ecclesiastical texts bundled with his diary, meaning that these other texts must have found their way to Europe by some means. We also doubt that the two catechism versions we compare in §9.4 would be so similar if Uriarte had rewritten the Full Catechism from memory after several years’ living in Italy, and some fifteen years after having ceased working with the Omaguas. In this light, it is important to recall that someone, possibly Uriarte, provided Camaño with the grammatical and lexical data that informed Hervás y Panduro’s and Gilii’s works, suggesting that some Jesuit or Jesuits succeeded in bringing a significant quantity of linguistic materials to Italy. As to how Uriarte acquired the Omagua text itself (assuming he did not write it in Italy), he may have done so by: 1) copying a version kept at San Joaquín when he left from there in 1764 to return to San Regis de Yameos; or 2) taking it for himself during the trip that led the remaining Jesuits out of Maynas in 1768, when all of the remaining priests in the lower Marañón mission left via San Joaquín. If he also smuggled out a Yameo text, to which he would presumably have had access, given that he resided in San Regis de Yameos for the four years preceding the expulsion, this would then account for the group of Omagua, Yameo and Tikuna texts in the appendix to his diaries. This account would also explain why the texts in Franciscis’ manuscript are not in the same set of languages as those appended to Uriarte’s diaries. Franciscis may have simply copied a set of texts that Uriarte had in his possession in 1761 but not 1768, or he may have gathered the texts from missionaries besides Uriarte. In sum, this account leads to the conclusion that the text copied by Franciscis and published in González Suárez (1904) is slightly older than the one in Uriarte ([1776]1986). Dissimilarities between the two catechisms (which were reviewed in §9.4) can be accounted for either as changes by Uriarte (assuming he took a copy when he left San Joaquín in 1764) or by Palme between 1764 and 1768 (assuming Uriarte took a copy when left San Joaquín for the last time in 1768 after the expulsion).
Chapter 10

Conclusion

On the basis of a careful analysis of Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts, the present work has sought to shed light on the grammar of Old Omagua as it was spoken in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, and on the process by which the Jesuit missionaries of Maynas developed these texts. This work also provides high-quality representations of the ecclesiastical texts in question to serve as a resource for further analysis by others.

Old Omagua grammar, as revealed in the ecclesiastical texts, is largely similar to that of the modern language, but the texts provide clear evidence for morphemes and constructions that are absent in the modern language, yielding key insights into earlier stages of the language. In several cases, such as the privative $=\text{ma}$, the structural elements either no longer or scarcely found in the modern language are retentions from the Tupí-Guaraní precursor to Omagua, serving to show that Old Omagua, and by extension, Proto-Omagua-Kokama, preserved aspects of Tupí-Guaraní morphology no longer found in its modern daughter languages. In other cases, such as the negative purposive $=\text{maka}$, the texts provide evidence for a morpheme absent in the modern language, but present in Omagua’s modern sister language, Kokama-Kokamilla. Such evidence allows one to reconstruct such morphemes to Proto-Omagua-Kokama, which is especially valuable for morphemes that lack cognates in other Tupí-Guaraní languages. In yet other cases the texts provide evidence regarding the original phonological form of elements which have since undergone phonological erosion, as in the case of the Old Omagua $\text{roaya}$, which has reduced to $\text{Rua}$ in the modern language. The full implications of the linguistic information contained in the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts for the reconstruction of Proto-Omagua-Kokama and the linguistic history of its daughter languages lies beyond the scope of the present work, but it is clear that considerably greater progress will be possible by making use of these texts.

The insights into Jesuit linguistic and text development practices yielded by the ecclesiastical texts and complementary historical materials are significant. Ecclesiastical texts like the Omagua ones analyzed in the present work were critical components of one of two prongs of a broader language policy that combined the promotion of Quechua as a lengua general with evangelical work carried out in the Amazonian lenguas particulares of each group. The ecclesiastical texts made it possible for missionaries to carry out crucial evangelical activities such as catechizing converts and youths, and teaching key prayers, even before mastering the relevant local languages. As such, these texts were central to maintaining a degree of continuity in the face of relatively frequent rotations of mission personnel. These texts are also evidence of a sophisticated language policy that promoted the development of descriptive linguistic resources and the maintenance of
archives that preserved both descriptive materials and ecclesiastical texts for use by subsequent missionaries.

A close comparison of the two catechistic texts analyzed in this volume confirms an intriguing conclusion to be drawn from the historical materials describing the development of ecclesiastical texts, namely, that the ecclesiastical texts were not produced by a single author at a single point in time, but instead successively reworked and polished as part of a communal text tradition. The two catechisms are overwhelmingly similar, but show a variety of subtle differences in the words or grammatical constructions employed to express a given notion, which points to contributions by different individuals. Perhaps the best evidence for the involvement of different individuals, however, is that the contributors to the different texts exhibit different masteries of Old Omagua grammar. Although the contributors to both texts exhibit significant knowledge of the language, the contributors to the Full Catechism, for example, show mastery of the subtle distinction between reason and purpose interrogative words, while the contributors to the Catechism Fragment conflate this distinction, resorting in all cases to reason interrogatives. In contrast, the contributors to the Catechism Fragment generally ordered prenominal modifiers correctly, while the contributors to the Full Catechism inverted the correct order on a number of occasions.

This work has also sought to narrow down the likely contributors to the ecclesiastical texts, identifying Samuel Fritz and Manuel Iriarte as probably having been important in the communal text tradition in which the Old Omagua texts were embedded. Many of the details of these contributions remain unknown, however, and the precise means by which these texts survived the destruction of Jesuit linguistic descriptions and ecclesiastical texts during the expulsion remains unclear.

This work represents a first exploration of the Old Omagua ecclesiastical texts analyzed here, and they no doubt have much more to tell us, both about the language in which they were written, and the circumstances and manner in which they were created. Even this initial foray, however, shows us that the long-neglected texts created by the Jesuits of Maynas constitute invaluable linguistic and historical resources.
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This monograph presents a detailed philological study of the oldest known texts written in Omagua, a Tupí-Guarani language of western Amazonia. Produced in the 17th and/or 18th centuries by Jesuit missionaries as a central component of their evangelical work in the Gobierno de Maynas, these texts include: 1) a version of the Lord’s Prayer (Pater Noster); 2) a short fragment of a longer catechism; 3) a second complete catechism; and 4) a Profession of Faith. In addition, we present an analysis of brief Omagua passages found in the diary of Manuel Uriarte, a Jesuit missionary active among the Omaguas during the mid-18th century. Each text is presented in a detailed interlinear format that allows the reader to follow, from the original lines of each text, analytical decisions regarding the successive steps of resegmentation of word boundaries, phonemicization, morphological segmentation and glossing, and generation of free translations. Each text is footnoted extensively with bibliographic and interpretive annotations. In addition to philological analyses of each text, we present a substantial grammatical sketch of Old Omagua (i.e., 17th- and/or 18th-century Omagua) as attested in these texts, drawing comparisons where helpful with modern Omagua, its sister language Kokama, Proto-Omagua-Kokama, and colonial-era Tupinambá, the next most closely related language. This grammatical sketch not only serves as the basis for insights into how Omagua has evolved since the early colonial period, and helps to clarify the relationship of Omagua and Kokama to other Tupí-Guaraní languages (a subject of much controversy), but also allows the reader to critically evaluate the interlinearized and annotated ecclesiastical texts presented in the volume. We conclude by historically contextualizing the production and circulation of Omagua ecclesiastical texts, summarizing Jesuit engagement with the linguistic diversity of the Gobierno de Maynas, and discussing the strategic role played by successively reworked and re-edited ecclesiastical texts in surmounting the evangelical challenges posed by this diversity. We further show how a close examination of the texts themselves yields additional insights into Jesuit linguistic and text development practices.
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