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1 Introduction

This article explores the diachrony of three purpose clause markers (PCMs) in Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK), the ancestor of two closely related Tupí-Guaraní (TG) languages of northwest Amazonia spoken in Peru. My principal goal is to explain an absolutive pattern of control in these purpose clauses, which is otherwise unattested in the language, via an account in which PCMs have as their origin a combination of TG detransitivizing suffixes, a purpose suffix, and a postposition. I show that a similar system is attested in at least one other TG language, Kamaiurá, although this similarity has been obscured by sound change and the apparent replacement of certain grammatical morphemes. This similarity is important for the description of purpose clauses in other TG languages, an often underdescribed domain, as well as for the reconstruction of PCMs in Proto-Tupí-Guaraní (PTG).

†My warmest thanks go to Omagua speakers †Lazarina Cabudivo Tuisima, †Manuel Cabudivo Tuisima, Amelia Huanaquiri Tuisima, Arnaldo Huanaquiri Tuisima, Alicia Huanío Cabudivo, and Lino Huanío Cabudivo. This article has improved because of comments from Andrew Garrett and Lev Michael, as well as audience members at Fieldwork Forum (FForum) in the Department of Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley in April 2012, and the Annual Meeting of the Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas (SSILA) in Portland in January 2015. The fieldwork that forms the basis of the Omagua data herein was supported by the Haas Scholars Program (2010) at the University of California, Berkeley, as well as National Science Foundation (NSF) Documenting Endangered Languages (DEL) award #0966499 Collaborative Research: Kokama (cod) and Omagua (omg): Documentation, Description, and (Non-)Genetic Relationships (2011 & 2013).

†1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; abs = absolutive; agt = agent; all = allative; arg = argumental; attr = attributive; aug = augmentative; caus = causative; cl = clausal; comp = comparative; coref = coreferential; cpl = completive; dem = demonstrative; desid = desiderative; dist = distal; erg = ergative; fs = female speech; fut = future; ger = gerund; hort = hortative; imp = imperative; inact = inactive; incl = inclusive; ine = inessive; intr = intransitive; me = male ego; ms = male speech; neg = negation; nom = nominal; nomz = nominalizer; obj = object; pat = patient; perm = permissive; pl = plural; pp = postposition; pres = present; prox = proximal; pst = past; purp = purpose; rel = relational; sg = singular; ss = sentence suffix; subj = subject; tr = transitive.
POK PCMs include two suffixes and an enclitic that attach directly to verbs (Table 1). The distribution of these markers is in part constrained syntactically: *-\textit{tara} requires the omission of the grammatical subject (A, S) of the purpose clause in which it appears, while *-\textit{maira} requires the omission of the grammatical object (P); the omitted argument is coreferential with the absolutive argument (S, P) of the matrix clause. The other marker, *\textit{=tsenuni}, requires all arguments to be present.

Table 1: Purpose Clause Markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMG</th>
<th>KK</th>
<th>POK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-\textit{tara}</td>
<td>-\textit{tara}</td>
<td>*\textit{tara}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-\textit{maira}</td>
<td>-\textit{maira}</td>
<td>*\textit{maira}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=\textit{smuni}</td>
<td>-\textit{tsen(u)}</td>
<td>*\textit{tsenuni}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This work builds on a significant contribution to the study of this system in Kokama by Rosa Vallejos (2014). Data on Omagua comes from fieldwork carried out by me and my colleagues since 2010. More broadly, this work is embedded in an attempt to reconstruct POK (O'Hagan 2011, 2014; O'Hagan and Wauters 2012; O'Hagan et al. 2013; Wauters and O'Hagan 2011), and to better understand the substantial role of grammaticalization in the history of POK and its relation to the rest of the TG language family, from which it exhibits notable divergences. In this vein, Michael et al. (to appear), based on Bayesian phylogenetic methods applied to lexical traits, have proposed the TG classification in Figure 1. Relevant in what follows are the positions of Paraguayan Guaraní, a member of the Guaranian subgroup, Tupinambá and POK, their ancestor a sister to the Southern subgroup, and Kamaiurá, which is a sister to the rest of the TG family.

After briefly reviewing common sources of PCMs crosslinguistically (§1.1) and the history and sociolinguistic situation of Omagua and Kokama (§1.2), this article is organized as follows: §2 provides background on TG grammatical topics necessary to understanding the proposals laid out subsequently; §3 reviews the same set of grammatical topics in POK and how they have changed, as well as the distribution of purpose clause markers; §4 lays out the account of the origin of these markers; and in §5 I conclude.

1.1 Sources of Purpose Clause Markers

Heine and Kuteva (2002) outline sources for PCMs in the world’s languages that can be grouped into three broad categories: case markers (e.g., allative); verbs (e.g., ‘go to’); and complementizers. Verbs grammaticalize into PCMs principally through serial verb constructions in isolating languages, and since TG languages are not isolating, and since they typically do not exhibit an overt complementizer, I home in on case markers. Heine and Kuteva

---

1 They are: Lev Michael, Clare Sandy, Tammy Stark, and Vivian Wauters. The Omagua Documentation Project began in January 2009 at the University of California, Berkeley, based on a text corpus of ~100,000 words produced by Arnaldo Huanaquiri Tuisima. Previous recordings of the language were made in 2004 by Edinson Huamancayo Curi, followed by a preliminary phonological sketch (Grohman 2006).
citing Seiler (1985), illustrate the use of a goal suffix in Imonda in multiple syntactic environments. In (1a), the suffix -m attaches to a noun denoting a physical goal in space, while in (1b) it attaches to a noun denoting a metaphorical goal. In order to bring these examples in line with what follows, I will refer to construals as in (1b) as ‘purpose interpretations’. Lastly, in (1c), the same suffix -m attaches to a verb, a construction I will refer to as a ‘purpose clause’: here the event of searching for fish is construed as the purpose of the event of going.

(1) a. nē -m at uagl -n
   bush -GOAL CPL go -PST
   ‘He has gone to the bush.’

b. tēta -m ai- fōhō -n
   game -GOAL PL- go.down -PST
   ‘They have gone hunting for game.’

c. tōbtō soh -m ka uagl -f
   fish search -GOAL I go -PRES
   ‘I am going to search for fish.’

The functional overlap between case and purpose clause marker relates to POK PCMs in two ways. I show that two POK markers *-tara and *-maiva contain as part of their origin a suffix reconstructable as *-ram that exhibits the interpretations in (1b,c), but not the spatial goal interpretation in (1a). Second, I show that the third POK marker, *=tsenuni, derives from a postposition with a related meaning, namely ‘ahead of’.
Another source of PCMs not discussed by Heine and Kuteva are nominalizers. This is especially true of South American languages, as exemplified by Aymara, a language of the Andes, in which the ‘agentive’ suffix is formally identical to the ‘goal embedder’ (2).

(2) a. q’ipi ‘carry on back’
   q’ip.iri ‘porter’
  b. qama ‘stay at home’
   qam.iri ‘rich person’
  c. sirwis.ø al.iri.w sara.ø
   beer.ZERO buy.GOAL.SS go.1>3FUT
   ‘I’m going to buy beer.’
   [Hardman 2001:2001]

This functional overlap relates to POK PCMs in that *-ram combines with stems derived with two nominalizer-like elements (see §2.2), one of which targets an agent.

1.2 Omagua and Kokama History & Sociolinguistic Situation

At the time of European contact in 1542, the Omagua dominated the banks of the Amazon River from the mouth of the Napo in Peru to the mouth of the Juruá in Brazil [de Carvajal 1542:1934] but by the middle 17th century [de la Cruz 1653:1900] Omagua settlements had relocated to riverine islands, likely in response to severe population decreases brought on by European disease [Myers 1992]. In late 1685, the Bohemian Jesuit Samuel Fritz began proselytizing among the Omagua, going on to found nearly 40 mission settlements, one of which was christened San Joaquín de Omaguas [Anonymous 1731:1922]. By the late 1690s, disease and increasing Portuguese slave raids had nearly eradicated remaining Omaguas. Some scattered in an area that would come to be controlled by Carmelite missionaries and the Portuguese crown, while others fled upriver, ultimately settling in a community on the left bank of the Amazon River by the middle 1720s. This community, also known as San Joaquín de Omaguas (SJQ), became a prominent Jesuit settlement until the expulsion of the Jesuits from Spanish territories in 1767 [Uriarte 1776:1986].

Around 1880, as part of the large-scale dislocation of indigenous populations due to plantation-style labor and the rubber boom, the Jesuit settlement was abandoned, and SJQ, along with most Omaguas, moved slightly upriver to its current site [O'Hagan in prep]. By the 1920s, language shift had begun to take hold, following some forty years of increasing contact with and immigration of outsiders and the later arrival of a Spanish-language school. Children born in the 1930s, unlike those born in the 1910s, did not acquire Omagua as a dominant first language, but rather grew up with Spanish as a dominant first language. Today the youngest of six known speakers of Omagua was born in 1936.

The Kokama were first contacted by Juan de Salinas y Loyola, a Spanish conquistador, on the lower Ucayali in October 1557 [Jiménez de la Espada 1897:LXXIII]. The Kokamilla, in contrast, resident on the lower Huallaga, likely had contact with Spaniards beginning in 1611,

3See Newsom 1996 and Porro 1981 for further details.
when Diego Vaca de Vega began undertaking incursions into the upper Marañón basin.  The first significant Kokamilla and Kokama settlements were Santa María de Huallaga (1649) and Santa María de Ucayali (1651–1652), respectively (Stocks 1978:116-117).

The Kokama resisted Spanish and Jesuit influence more than did the Omagua. Like the Omagua, however, they suffered from disease during this period, especially following a Spanish expedition to the Ucayali in 1644. In July 1670 the Jesuit Juan Lorenzo Lucero founded Nueva Cartagena de Lagunas, a settlement that would become the headquarters of the Jesuit mission in the region, as well as the pivotal site through which Jesuits relocated Kokamas from the Ucayali to the Huallaga basin, where they could more easily be controlled.

In the early 19th century, the Kokama began a rapid expansion into the lower Marañón, founding the modern-day city of Nauta in 1829 (Larrabure i Correa 1905). This expansion continued, and, in combination with the social upheaval of the late 19th century, results today in Kokama communities being found in the greater Ucayali, Marañón, Nanay, and Itaya basins. The Kokamilla, who speak a mutually intelligible dialect, continue to occupy the lower Huallaga. Vallejos (2010:31-32) posits ~20,000 ethnic Kokama in ~120 communities, with ~1,000 speakers. Like Omagua, all speakers of Kokama are also native and dominant speakers of Spanish and most are above 60 years of age.

2 Tupí-Guaraní Background

In this section I examine a set of TG grammatical topics necessary for understanding the proposals I lay out in §4 as to the origin of PCMs in POK, especially as those proposals concern the combinatorial possibilities of the grammatical morphemes that have come to compose these PCMs. I begin with the semantic status of roots and their interaction with a suffix *-a (§2.1) before moving on to so-called nominalizers (§2.2), nominal temporal reference and purpose (§2.3), purpose clauses (§2.4), and postpositions (§2.5). I rely on the morphosyntactic reconstruction of PTG developed by Cheryl Jensen (1998).

2.1 Argumental *-a

Partee (1987) has argued that noun phrases may contextually be one of three semantic types – ‘referential’ (type e), ‘predicative’ (type ⟨e, t⟩), or ‘quantificational’ (type ⟨⟨e, t⟩, t⟩) – and that a number of type-shifting operations allow for the derivation of one type from another (e.g., via determiners). Chierchia (1998) has homed in on the semantic type of bare nouns, arguing that kinds (or generics) are of type e. In this way, nominal reference can be seen as a distinction orthogonal to semantic type, since kinds, strictly speaking, do not refer, and for this reason Chierchia relabels Partee’s ‘referential’ category as ‘argumental’. Here it is sufficient to note that inherently argumental nouns may function as verbal arguments without further operation, while inherently predicative nouns cannot. Importantly, however, predicative nouns in this framework are not necessarily able to predicate in the traditional sense in which verbs do, although they may. Rather, they are simply non-argumental.

---

6In what follows I refer to the type of a bare noun as the inherent type of a noun, or nominal root.
Within the TG context, Queixalós (2006) has proposed that all roots in PTG were inherently predicative, and thus that all nouns functioning as arguments, irrespective of their referentiality, were derived via the suffix \(*\,-a^7\). That nouns derived via \(*\,-a\) exhibited this interpretational flexibility can be appreciated in (3), in which both the subject and object are marked with \(-a\), even though only the subject refers\(^8\).

(3) kunuʔum -a kiwaw -a o - awiki -potat o- uw -a wite
boy -ARG comb -ARG 3.ERG- make -DESID 3.COREF- father -ARG COMP

‘The boy wants to make a comb like his father’s.’


Nouns functioning as predicates, in contrast, optionally combined with \(*\,-a\) (with different referential properties), as can be seen in (4). In a Chierchian framework, then, both argumental and predicative nouns predicated in PTG. These various functions ultimately lead Queixalós (2006:265, emphasis in original) to describe \(*\,-a\) as deriving ‘an expression that is capable of referring, and not an expression that in fact refers’. In what follows I refer to this suffix as the ‘argumental suffix’, since it is minimally required for the derivation of verbal arguments.

(4) a. je= tutir -a morerekwat
1SG.ABS= uncle -ARG chief
‘My uncle is (a) chief.’
b. je= tutir -a morerekwar -á
1SG.ABS= uncle -ARG chief -ARG
‘My uncle is the chief.’


The productivity of \(*\,-a\) varies across TG languages: in most languages it has become sensitive to the phonological shape of the root to which it attaches. In Tupinambá, for example, vowel-final roots never combine with the reflex of \(*\,-a^9\). In POK the situation is somewhat different: all roots were vowel-final, the result of the “freezing” of vowels of various qualities to the right edge of consonant-final roots (O’Hagan 2011:24-27). One such vowel was the argumental suffix \(*\,-a\). As a result, a POK noun of any phonological shape can function as an argument and as a predicate without additional operation.

---

7Elsewhere this suffix is referred to as ‘nominal case’ (Jensen 1998), or ‘argumentative case’ (Cabral 2001; Rodrigues 2001), among others (see Queixalós (2006:260)). It may also combine with verbal roots, in which case it is often described as an event nominalizer (Jensen 1998:540), and it is evidence of this sort that has contributed to the debate over the distinction between noun and verb in TG languages (contributions to Queixalós (2001a) \textit{inter alia}), outside the scope of this paper. See Queixalós (2001b); Rodrigues (1996); Rose (2002) for more discussion of this suffix.

8Throughout this article I alter Seki’s glosses in order to make them more transparent with regard to the description given herein.

9For languages of this type it will be useful to think of the argumental suffix as exhibiting a null allomorph \(*\,-Ø\) that occurred following vowel-final roots.
2.2 “Nominalizers”

In addition to the argumental suffix, PTG exhibited a number of verbal suffixes that are traditionally described as nominalizers. Jensen (1998:539-544) reconstructs seven such nominalizers: an event nominalizer (her ‘action nominalizer’), an agent nominalizer, a circumstantial nominalizer, two patient nominalizers, a clausal nominalizer, and an adverbial nominalizer. With the exception of the event and clausal nominalizers, however, these nominalizers are striking in that they must combine with *-a if the resulting stem is to be argumental. This can be seen in Tupinambá in (5).

(5) poj -tar -a
    feed -NOM:AGT -ARG
    ‘he who gives food’
    Tupinambá (Lemos Barbosa 1956:260)

The fact that consonant-final nominalizers do not derive an argumental noun leads me to instead consider them a sort of valence-changing device, i.e., as detransitivizing devices akin to passives. These detransitivizing suffixes alter the argument structure of the verb by reducing valence by one; the argument that survives detransitivization varies according to the suffix involved in the derivation and corresponds to an argument with a particular semantic role (e.g., an instrument). The resulting derived stem is a predicative noun that can be made argumental via *-a. I will refer to these suffixes via the semantic role with which they associate, e.g., the ‘agent suffix’.

Lastly, two of the abovementioned suffixes warrant further attention, namely the agent suffix and the clausal nominalizer. Jensen (1998:540) reconstructs three allomorphs of the agent suffix (*-ar, *-tsar, *-tar) that occur with consonant-final, vowel-final, and diphthong-final verb roots, respectively (see (5)). POK has generalized the diphthong-final allomorph to all phonological environments, and, due to the freezing of argumental *-a, inherited the form *-taR (see §3.1). Jensen (1998:542) reconstructs the clausal nominalizer as *-BaPe, retained in POK as *=mai. Unlike the agent suffix, the function of *-BaPe varies substantially across TG languages: in some languages it may nominalize an argument in any syntactic position, while in others it is more restricted in some way (ibid.).

2.3 Nominal Temporal Reference and Purpose

TG languages are often described as exhibiting a two-way temporal distinction on nouns, typically referred to as ‘nominal tense’, with past and future values. Jensen (1998:511) reconstructs an ‘anticipatory suffix’ (i.e., nominal future tense) with three allomorphs (*-ram, *-wam, *-am) that occur with vowel-final, labial- and velar-final, and alveolar-final verb roots, respectively. This suffix attaches directly to a nominal root and derives a predicative

---

10It is not clear that PTG *-BaPe was a suffix. It exhibits clitic-like properties in Omagua and Kokama, and participates, along with other right-edge verbal elements, in various differential orderings (e.g., in Tupinambá), suggesting that it and these other elements may have been clitics or perhaps not bound in any way at all. For the ease of exposition I will preserve Jensen’s suffixal analysis, simply indicating the Omagua and Kokama forms as clitics where appropriate.

11See Tonhauser (2007) and Thomas (2014) for detailed semantic analyses of the reflexes of this suffix in Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbyá, respectively.
stem, as evidenced by the fact that it must combine with *-a in order to function as an argument, as shown in (6). (In (7) below a stem derived with a reflex of *-ram lacks the argumental suffix and does not function as an argument, as is expected).\footnote{Throughout this article I alter Lemos Barbosa’s glosses in order to make them more transparent with regard to the description given herein.}

(6) iβá -ram -a 
fruit -NOM.FUT -ARG

‘that which will be fruit, future fruit’
Tupinambá \cite{LemosBarbosa1956:101}

Furthermore, it seems that in PTG a future interpretation was not basic to *-ram. That is, *-ram in isolation seems to have encoded purpose \footnote{See \cite{Tonhauser2006:292-302} for the polyfunctionalit of Paraguayan Guaraní -rá in this vein.}, while in combination with *-a it encoded future temporal reference \footnote{It is these two sequences that I propose to be the source of two of the POK PCMs (see §3.4); similar sequences appear in the following description of purpose clauses in Kamaiurá.}. Because of this I will refer to *-ram and its reflexes as a ‘purpose suffix’.

(7) maʔanuar -a karamema -ram Mara o- potat 
what -ARG gift -PURP Mara 3.ERG- want

‘What does Mara want for a gift?’
Kamaiurá \cite{Seki2000:111}

The distinction between purpose and future temporal reference has collapsed in languages that have lost coda nasals (e.g., Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbyá). This is because reflexes of *-ram are -rā in these languages, and in being vowel-final, they do not combine with the reflex of *-a. As such, -rā comes to express both purpose and future temporal reference: in (8a) the noun suffixed with -rā is a core argument; in (8b) it is an adjunct licensed by -rā.\footnote{See \cite{Tonhauser2006:292-302} for the polyfunctionalit of Paraguayan Guaraní -rá in this vein.}

(8) a. a- vende soʔo -rā 
A1sg- sell meat -RA

‘I am selling for/future meat.’

b. a- vende che- vaca soʔo -rā 
A1sg- sell B1sg- cow meat -RA

‘I am selling my cow for meat.’
Paraguayan Guaraní \cite{Tonhauser2006:296}

Both \cite{Jensen1998:544} and \cite{LemosBarbosa1956:259} show that the agent suffix and purpose suffix may co-occur, yielding the sequence (for diphthong-final roots) *-tar-am. Similarly, both \cite{Jensen1998:544} and \cite{LemosBarbosa1956:254} show that the clausal nominalizer and the purpose suffix co-occur, as is illustrated in (9), yielding the sequence *-βaʔé-ram.

(9) i- wasu o- s asaβ -βaʔé -ram -a 
water -AUG 3.ERG- 3.ABS- cross -NOMZ:CL -PURP -ARG

‘he who will cross the river’
Tupinambá \cite{LemosBarbosa1956:256}
2.4 Purpose Clauses

Purpose clauses are underdescribed in the grammars of many TG languages, frequently only described as part of two polyfunctional constructions, one traditionally referred to as the ‘gerund’ or ‘dependent serial verb’, the other a directive construction involving a verbal proclitic that often has the shape $ta=$, as well as some other highly variable final enclitic. In this section I examine purpose clauses in Kamaiurá, which approximate those observed in POK. In contrast to the grammatical morphemes discussed in the preceding sections, there is no reconstruction of PTG purpose clauses, and so the degree to which this system can be projected to the proto-language remains an open question (see §4.4).

Kamaiurá purpose clauses are distinguished based on coreference restrictions between arguments of the matrix and purpose clauses.

Diferentemente das orações adverbiais locativas e de assunto examinadas acima, nas orações finais são usados distintos afixos nominalizadores, selecionados conforme a valência do verbo e a função do nominal na oração dependente.\textsuperscript{[14]}

(Seki 2000:187)

Kamaiurá employs the gerund construction when subjects are coreferential (10).

(10) paku -a a- juka we- karu -m
    pacà -ARG 1SG.ERG- kill 1SG.COREF- eat -GER
    ‘I killed a paca to eat.’ (Seki 2000:187) SUBJ = SUBJ

Three constructions are employed when coreference holds between the P argument of the matrix clause and an argument of the purpose clause, all of which involve a combination of reflexes of the detransitivizing and purpose suffixes. When coreference is with the A argument of the purpose clause, the construction consists of a verb suffixed with -$\text{tar}$, followed by the ‘attributive’ suffix -$\text{am}$. The purpose clause verb exhibits no person markers.

(11) Sapaì -a a- enòj moì -a juka -\text{tar} -\text{am}
    Sapaì -ARG 1SG.ERG- call.to snake -ARG kill -AGT -PURP
    ‘I called to Sapaì so he would kill the snake.’ (Seki 2000:187) P = A

When coreference is with the S argument of the purpose clause, the construction consists of a verb suffixed with -$\text{taw}$, a reflex of another PTG detransitivizing suffix, followed by -$\text{am}$. The purpose clause verb exhibits absolutive person markers.

(12) Kawa a- enòj i- jo -\text{taw} -\text{am}
    pers.name 1SG.ERG- call.to 3.ABS- go -EVENT -PURP
    ‘I called Kawa to go.’ (Seki 2000:187) P = S

When coreference is with the P argument of the purpose clause, the construction consists of a verb prefixed with -$\text{emi}$, followed by the attributive suffix -$\text{am}$. The purpose clause verb exhibits absolutive person markers.

\textsuperscript{[14]}Translation (mine): ‘Unlike the locative adverbial sentences discussed above, in purpose clauses distinct nominalizing affixes are used, which are selected based on the valence of the verb and the function of the noun in the dependent sentence.’
Kamaiurá exhibits an additional construction for encoding purpose that is employed when coreference need not (but may) hold between clauses. This construction consists of the ‘hortative’ proclitic \( ta= \) and the enclitic =\( katu \). (14) is an example of coreference between grammatical subjects, while (15) is an example of no coreference.

(14) \( o-\) juka paku \(-a \) \( t= \) o- \( ?u = katu \)
3- kill paca \(-\text{ARG HORT} = \) 3- eat \( =\text{PURP} \)
‘He killed a paca to eat [it].’ (Seki 2000:202) SUBJ = SUBJ

(15) ka\-a\-her \(-a \) e- karaj \( ta= \) je \(-r- \) ea\-a \( \text{} =\text{} katu \) ne \(-r- \) ehe
letter \(-\text{ARG 2SG- write HORT} = \) 1SG= REL- remember \( =\text{PURP} \) 2SG= REL- PP
‘Write letters so I remember you.’ (Seki 2000:201)

2.5 Postpositions

The final grammatical morpheme involved in the origin of the system of purpose clause markers in POK is a postposition, and I therefore conclude this section by noting that TG languages exhibit a rich set of postpositions that are inflected for the person of their complement via a set of prefixes that also encode the possessors of nouns, the subjects of stative (inactive) intransitive verbs, and the direct objects of transitive verbs, i.e., following an absolutive distribution\(^\text{15}\). One of these postpositions has been reconstructed by Jensen (1998:514) as *enoné ‘ahead of’. The third-person absolutive prefix with which it co-occurred has been reconstructed (ibid.:498) as *ts-, yielding the sequence ts-enoné ‘ahead of it’.

3 Proto-Omagua-Kokama Background

In this section I review the reflexes of the TG morphemes discussed in \( \S \) 2 in POK, and describe its system of PCMs, in order to provide the background to demonstrate that, generally speaking, the grammatical morphemes involved in the origin of the POK PCMs are retained both as productive grammatical morphemes and frozen in the purpose clause markers themselves.

3.1 Nominalizers

The PTG agent suffix *-\( \text{tar} \) is retained in POK as *-\( \text{tara} \), having combined with the argumental suffix (cf. PTG *-\( \text{tar-a} \) in \( \S \text{2.2} \)). In Omagua it functions as an agent nominalizer (e.g., \( \text{kamata-tara} \ ‘\text{work}’-\text{NOMZ:AGT} ‘\text{worker}’ \)), that is, the deverbal nouns that it derives correspond to A and S\(_A\) arguments and are argumental. The clausal nominalizer *-\( \text{ba?é} \) is

\(^{15}\text{See O’Hagan (2011:41-48) for a discussion of the retention of TG postpositions in POK.} \)
retained in POK as *=mai[18]. In both daughter languages it targets the subjects of stative intransitive verbs (S<sub>P</sub>) and the objects of transitive verbs (P), as in (16), in which it attaches to *iri ‘be muddy’ and to *fukai ‘dig’.

(16) a. kati yuká *iri =mai =k”ara
    yonder DEM.DIST.MS be.muddy =NOMZ:INACT =INE
    ‘yonder in that mud’
    Omagua (MCT:C4.S1)

    b. ta= atika =s mini ta= *fukai =mai
    1SG.MS= throw.out =PURP 1SG.MS= dig =NOMZ:INACT
    ‘...in order to throw out what I had dug up.’
    Omagua (MCT:C2.S3)

### 3.2 Nominal Temporal Reference and Purpose

The PTG purpose suffix *-ram is retained in POK as *-ra. The loss of the coda nasal due to regular sound change[17] as in Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbyá, in combination with the fact that all roots in POK are vowel-final, means that the purpose and future interpretations are not distinguishable on morphological grounds alone. However, the morphosyntactic behavior of POK *-ra is not identical to Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbyá -rã (cf. (8)). Rather, nouns suffixed with *-ra may not function as core arguments, appearing only as adjuncts, as in (17).

In this construction nouns always receive a purpose interpretation, as is expected given the fact that stems derived with *-ram only were not argumental in PTG.[18]

---

[18] This is demonstrable through regular sound change. Three of the clausal nominalizer’s four segments are relevant: the voiced bilabial fricative, the glottal stop, and the final vowel. PTG *P was lost in POK, and final stressed *e raised to *i categorically. The correspondence β:m, however, presents a more complicated picture, since *β otherwise corresponds to POK *w (i.e., POK merged PTG *β and *w.) In this vein, it is clear that *β in some roots participated in a series of phonological alternations that included *p and *m. Although these latter two segments are not discussed as variants of *-βaʔé for Tupinambá, Tupinambá does exhibit *m βaʔé ‘thing’ (Lemos Barbosa 1951:85), almost certainly the source of the clausal nominalizer; and *m b regularly corresponds to POK *m. Thus POK either retains an archaic form of the clausal nominalizer, or the reconstruction of the clausal nominalizer needs to re-evaluated. (The frustrative -βiʔá, inherited into POK as *=mia, and not ť=wania, is also an instance of this irregular correspondence.)

[17] That is, in contrast to the observation that in POK vowels of various qualities were “frozen” to consonant-final roots, POK occasionally exhibits the loss of a final consonant instead of the freezing of a vowel, e.g., Tupinambá pem ‘weave’ (Lemos Barbosa 1970:195), but POK *yape (ţi=yapema, ţi=pema). (The sequence yu is a reflex of an irregular series of absolutive prefixes that occurred with monosyllabic verb roots in PTG, which have been reanalyzed as part of verb roots in POK.) This process likely resulted in an intermediate form *-rã, which, given that POK merged oral and nasal vowels, yielded the reconstructable form *-ra.

[18] The interaction of sound change and the productivity of *-a require clarification. In order to account for the distribution of nouns derived with -rã in Paraguayan Guaraní and Mbyá, the loss of coda nasals must have occurred during a period of productivity of reflexes of *-a (n.b., reflexes of *-a are productive in these languages to this day), such that derived nouns began to combine with the null allomorph of the argumental suffix (generally) combines with vowel-final roots. In POK the loss of coda nasals must have occurred at the same time as the freezing of final vowels (i.e., at the time at which nouns in the language came to be inherently argumental), such that derived nouns could never have been analyzed as combining the same null allomorph.
I cut trees for my house.

Kokama (Vallejos 2010:291)

In order to function as core arguments, nouns suffixed with *-ra must additionally be marked with a reflex of *=mai, a reflex of the PTG clausal nominalizer, in which case they always receive a future interpretation, as is expected given the combination of the purpose suffix *-ram and argumental suffix *-a in PTG. However, a significant difference from PTG *-ram-a is that POK does not exhibit a productive reflex of PTG *-a, and as such, it can be thought of as employing *=mai in the same function. This is shown in (18), from a text in which the narrator describes his conscription into the Peruvian army: the clothes in question are not previously owned by the narrator, and will only become his clothes, so to speak, once they are given to him.

(18) rana= yumi tana= firi -ra =mai
3PL.MS= give 1PL.EXCL= clothes -PURP =NOMZ:INACT
‘...they gave us our clothes...’
Omagua (LHC:2011.07.12.1)

3.3 *ts-enoné > *=tsenuni

The PTG inflected postposition *ts-enoné was retained in POK as *=tsenuni. The absolute prefixes with which this root combined were not retained as productive morphemes in POK, but were instead frozen to nominal, verbal, and postpositional roots, resulting in new, unanalyzable roots (O’Hagan 2011:17-42). PTG *o raised to *u in POK, and final stressed *e raised to *i categorically. In Omagua, *e subsequently raised to i and affricates lenited to their fricative counterparts (Wauters and O’Hagan 2011), resulting in =sinuni. In Kokama, final syllables of many, but not all, grammatical morphemes were apocopated, resulting in modern -tsenu (ibid.).

3.4 Purpose Clauses

Two POK PCMs exhibit syntactic constraints on their distribution: *-tara requires the omission of the grammatical subject (A, S) of the purpose clause; *-maíra requires the omission of the grammatical object (P). The omitted argument is coreferential with the
absolutive (S, P) argument of the matrix clause. The third PCM, *=-tsenuni, requires all arguments to be overt. In the examples that follow, I bracket the purpose clause, indicating omitted arguments with ‘Ø’ and applying in the first line of interlinearization the same subscript to them as their coreferent in the matrix clause. PCMs themselves are in boldface.

3.4.1 *-tara

The examples in (19) are instances in which the S argument of the matrix clause is coreferential with the omitted grammatical subject of the purpose clause. Note that, in both Omagua and Kokama, transitive purpose clauses with -tara exhibit a preverbal object, as with ipira ‘fish’ in (19b). This is a marked word order in both languages – where unmarked order is SVO – and in §4.1 I show that this has a diachronic explanation.

(19) a. tsa= 1sg.fs mena=ui husband go =pst:prox ... [Ø aya -tara]  
    ‘My husband went ... to hunt.’ S = S  
    Kokama (Vallejos 2014:52)  
  
b. tsr= 1sg.fs papa=usu ipasu=kati [Ø ipira sikii -tara]  
    ‘My father used to go to the lake to fish for fish.’ S = A  
    Omagua (AmHT:2011.06.13.1)

The examples in (20) are instances in which the P argument of the matrix clause is coreferential with the omitted grammatical subject of the purpose clause.

(20) a. papa=na irusu ina= tairi=na [Ø yumisarika -tara]  
    father =pl.fs take 3pl.fs son.me =pl.fs [Ø play -purp]  
    ‘[Two] parents took their children to play.’ P = S  
    Omagua (ZJO 2011, E-1, p. 81, AmHT, Sp. given)  
  
b. rana= 3pl.ms erura ta= tairi= [Ø nai mutsanaka -tara]  
    bring 1sg.ms= son.me [Ø grandmother cure -purp]  
    ‘They bring my son in order (for him) to cure grandmother.’ P = A  
    Kokama (Vallejos 2014:52)

Finally, note that the agent nominalizer and the purpose clause marker *-tara are homophonous in POK. That it is homophony and not polysemy at work is not obvious at first glance, given that *-tara purpose clauses exhibit reduced verbal properties identical to the *-tara nominalizer, allowing only the causative *-ta to follow the verbal root. However, *-tara purpose clauses are incompatible with plural enclitics, a defining feature of nouns elsewhere in Omagua and Kokama, whereas the agent nominalizer is compatible with them.

22In other words: ’... the subordinator -tara indicates that the A/S argument is missing in the adverbial clause, with its referent being either the S or the O argument of the main clause. In other words, the Absolutive argument of the main clause controls the ellipsis of the Nominative argument in the adverbial clause. Schematically: [S/O [O Ø(S/A)] V-tara]’ (Vallejos 2014:51).
3.4.2 *-maira

The examples in (21) are instances in which the S and P arguments of the matrix clause are coreferential with the omitted grammatical object of the purpose clause, respectively.

(21) a. ami, uri =ui [rana= yatsuka -ta -mira O₁]
    grandfather come =PST:PROX [3PL.MS= bathe -CAUS -PURP O]
    ‘Grandfather comes so that they ... give (him) a bath.’       S = P
    Kokama (Vallejos 2014:53)

b. ta= sasta ta= awati [atawari =kana mu -mira O₁]
    1SG.MS= shell 1SG.MS= corn [chicken =PL.MS eat -PURP O]
    ‘I shelled my corn for the chickens to eat.’                     P = P
    Omagua (MCT:C3.S3)

It is noteworthy that *-maira purpose clauses exhibit the same set of reduced verbal properties as *-tara purpose clauses, even though, unlike the latter, there is no reason to suspect that they are nominal since there is no homophonous nominalizer.

3.4.3 *=tsenuni

The examples in (22) illustrates the overt realization of all arguments in a *=tsenuni purpose clause: the first two vary the transitivity of the purpose clause verb relative to an intransitive matrix clause verb; the second two vary the transitivity of the purpose clause verb with respect to a transitive matrix clause verb.

(22) a. yapá yini=i usu parana =kati [yini=i yasuka =smuni ikati]
    HORT 1INCL= go river =ALL [1INCL= bathe =PURP there.FS]
    ‘Let’s go to the river to bathe there.’                        INTR, INTR
    Omagua (LCT:2010.08.13)

b. upa rana=i uri [rana=i kurata =smuni kaisuna]
    all 3PL.MS= come [3PL.MS= drink =PURP manioc.beer]
    ‘They would all come to drink manioc beer.’                   INTR, TR
    Omagua (LHC:2011.06.29.1)

c. rana= atika yini=i yakisa [yini=i yapita =smuni prata]
    3PL.MS= throw.out 1INCL= hair [1INCL= remain =PURP be.bald]
    ‘They got rid of our hair so we’d be bald.’                  TR, INTR
    Omagua (LHC:2011.07.12.1)

d. ta=i muruka akia tuyuka [ta=i yanukata =smuni yawiri
    1SG.MS= furrow DEM.PROX.MS soil [1SG.MS= place =PURP manioc
    iwa]
    stalk]
    ‘I make furrows in the soil in order to place manioc stalks.’    TR, TR
    Omagua (MCT:C1.S5)
3.4.4 Interlude: Stativity and Alignment

In the preceding examples I have shown that alignment in *-tara and *-maira purpose clauses follows a nominative-accusative distribution, in which PCMs are sensitive to the overtness of either the grammatical subject or object, while the argument of the matrix clause that controls coreference with the non-overt argument of the purpose clause follows an ergative-absolutive distribution, i.e., is either an intransitive subject or transitive object. However, I have examined purpose clauses that contain active predicates only. In fact, a closer examination reveals that *-tara and *-maira occur only with active predicates; only *=tsenuni occurs with stative ones.

(23) uSIMA -TA mura rua ra= iPUjI =SMUNI emerge -CAUS 3SG.MS NEG 3SG.MS= be.heavy =PURP
  ‘Take that out so it won’t be heavy.’
  Omagua (MCT:C3.S2)

It is not surprising that *-maira does not occur with stative predicates, since it otherwise requires the omission of a P argument, which is simply absent from the argument structure of a stative intransitive verb. However, given what has been seen of *-tara, and its requirement that an A or S argument be omitted, it is surprising that it does not occur with stative predicates. The fact that it does not requires an amendment to the descriptive generalizations above, namely to state that *-tara requires the omission of an A or S argument. This then is reminiscent of active-stative or split-S alignment systems (Mithun 1991), and is a direct reflection of the fact that the PTG detransitivizing suffix *-tar targeted agents (see below).

4 Origin of POK Purpose Clause Markers

In this section I develop a proposal for the origin of the system of purpose clause markers in POK that accounts both for the phonological shape of these markers as well as their morphosyntactic properties, in particular omitted arguments, coreference, and alignment. I propose that POK *-tara (§4.1) and *-maira (4.2) originate from distinct combinations of the TG detransitivizing suffixes, clausal nominalizer, and purpose suffix seen in the the preceding sections (akin to the Kamaiurá constructions in [2.4], while *=tsenuni originates from a combination of an absolutive prefix *ts- and the postposition *enoné ‘ahead of’. I claim that the argument omission facts observed for *-tara and *-maira in [3.4.1] and [3.4.2] result from independent syntactic requirements on the suffixes that comprise these morphemes at a prior stage of the language. The constructions from which these various POK PCMs originated are summarized in Table 2.

---

However, I think it is misleading to describe purpose clause alignment in POK as active-inactive, since neither *-tara nor *-maira make reference to Sp. Rather, there is simply a gap in the alignment that is filled by *=tsenuni. Because of this, I will continue to refer to the alignment of purpose clauses in POK as nominative-accusative.
Table 2: Purpose Clause Marker Origins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OMG</th>
<th>KK</th>
<th>POK</th>
<th>PTG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>-tara</td>
<td>*-tara</td>
<td>*-tar-am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mira</td>
<td>-mira</td>
<td>*-mira</td>
<td>*-baʔé-ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=smuni</td>
<td>=tsen(u)</td>
<td>*=tsenuni</td>
<td>*=ts-enoné</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1 *-tara

I propose that the POK PCM *-tara derives from a combination of the PTG agent and purpose suffixes (< PTG *-tar-am), and for this reason the omitted argument in a *-tara purpose clause is the agent (A, S\textsubscript{A})\textsuperscript{24} I have shown that PTG *-ram is retained in POK as *-ra, and I suggest that the loss of coda nasals occurred at a time at which the affixation of the purpose suffix to the agent suffix could be analyzed as productive. This would have yielded two sequences at a point prior to POK, both of the shape [tara], one consisting of the agent and argumental suffixes, the other consisting of the agent and purpose suffixes, resulting in homophony between the agent nominalizer and purpose clause marker ultimately retained in POK. In fact, it is the merger of oral and nasal vowels that is ultimately responsible for this homophony, as schematized in Figure 2 which tracks both the phonological shape and morphological composition of these suffixes across three morphophonological changes. The PCM is on the second line, the agent nominalizer on the third.

\[
\text{PTG} \rightarrow \text{N#} > \emptyset \rightarrow \tilde{V} > V \rightarrow \text{roots become vowel-final}
\]

*-tar-am \rightarrow *-tar-\tilde{a} \rightarrow *-tar-a \rightarrow *-tara

*-tar-a \rightarrow *-tar-a \rightarrow *-tar-a \rightarrow *-tara

Figure 2: Sound Change Chronology for *-tara

Morphosyntactically, the source of POK purpose *-tara mirrors the Kamaiurá construction seen in \([11]\) in the combination of the agent and purpose suffixes, and in the fact that the coreferential argument of the purpose clause is omitted. By the time of POK, however, this sequence cannot be analyzed as compositional since the language lacks an agent nominalizer either of the shape \(\uparrow-ta\) or \(\uparrow-tar\). This noncompositionality holds further because, when vowels were frozen to consonant-final roots in pre-POK, the \(\epsilon\)-less allomorph of purpose *-ra would have been lost, thus obscuring the original connection between the final vowel of this purpose clause marker and the purpose suffix that was retained in POK, namely *-ra.

Finally, for this proposal to fully account for the argument realization and coreference restrictions seen in \([3.4.1]\) it needs to be elaborated in two ways. The first way concerns the direct objects of transitive verbs in a *-tara purpose clause, namely their permissibility and their order with respect to the verb. I posit that these objects were originally the only

\textsuperscript{24}The fact that POK nouns derived with the agent nominalizer *-tara function as arguments, and that verbs suffixed with the PCM *-tara do not, lends further evidence to the proposal that POK PCM *-tara exhibits no reflex of the PTG argumental suffix *-a.
argument that could be licensed by a verb detransitivized by *-taR, and that the construction more generally preserves an archaic OV word order reconstructed for PTG subordinate clauses (Jensen 1998:556-557).

The second way concerns the fact that not all verbs in sentences such as these would have involved intransitive matrix clause verbs, opening up the possibility that more than one verbal argument could have been available for coreference. This can be seen in (20), in which either the subject or object of the transitive matrix verb is in principle available to be coreferential with the subject of the purpose clause. Given that it is always the object of a transitive matrix verb that controls coreference, I observe that coreference came to hold obligatorily between the single argument of the purpose clause and the nearest argument of the matrix clause (i.e., to the left). In the case of an intransitive verb this would have been the subject (SA), while in the case of a transitive verb this would have been the direct object (P), resulting in an absolutive pattern of control.

4.2 *-maiR

I propose that the POK PCM *-maiR derives from a combination of the PTG clausal nominalizer and purpose suffix (< PTG *-bařé-ram)25. Based on the same logic applied to *-tara, I deduce that the clausal nominalizer *=mai must have at a stage of pre-POK targeted only P arguments, since this is the necessarily omitted object in this purpose clause, even though its reflexes in Omagua and Kokama target P and Sp. It is because of the fact that POK *-maiR is composed of the clausal nominalizer *=mai, then, that the omitted argument of a *-maiR purpose clause is the P argument.

Morphosyntactically, the source of POK purpose *-maiR mirrors the Kamaiurá construction seen in (13) in the combination of a detransitivizing suffix that targets P and the purpose suffix, although in this case it is noteworthy that the form of the detransitivizing suffix is different (in Kamaiurá, emi-, of which POK exhibits no productive cognate). The coreferential argument of the purpose clause is also omitted. Unlike POK *-tara, however, *-maiR can be analyzed as compositional at the time of POK because the language also exhibited the clausal nominalizer *=mai. However, in both modern Omagua and Kokama this compositionality no longer holds. In the former it is because the purpose clause marker has monophthongized to -mira (see footnote 25), while the clausal nominalizer has not. In the latter it is because the form of the clausal nominalizer is =mi only in a single morphological context – preceding the plural enclitic =nu (Faust 1972:68) – whereas in all other environments it has reduced to =N, a placeless nasal that surfaces phonetically as [n] word-finally.

Similar to the direct objects of transitive verbs in a *-tara purpose clause, I posit that the subjects (A, SA) of a *-maiR purpose clause were the only argument that could be licensed by a verb detransitivized by *-bařé. Thus the *-maiR purpose clause exhibits an overt subject but no object (P), whereas the *-tara purpose clause exhibits an overt object but no subject. Furthermore, as in (11) I observe that coreference came to hold obligatorily

25Note the monophthongization of *ai in the Omagua form -mira. Monophthongization regularly occurred in Kokama in non-initial position (Wanters and O’Hagan 2011), but is largely unattested in Omagua. A few forms, however, exhibit it (e.g., *marai ‘what’ is retained as mari), and I suggest here that such instances are due to Kokama influence, which is plausible given that some Kokamas were coresident with Omaguas in Jesuit missions as early as the 1750s (Uriarte [1776]:1986).
between the object of the purpose clause and the nearest noun of the matrix clause. In the case of an intransitive verb this was the subject ($S_A$), while in the case of a transitive verb this was the direct object ($P$), resulting in an absolutive pattern of control.

### 4.3 Grammaticalization of $\ast=$tsenuni

I propose that the POK PCM $\ast=$tsenuni derives from a combination of the PTG third-person absolutive prefix $\ast$ts- (Jensen 1998:498) and the spatial postposition $\ast$enoné ‘ahead of’ (ibid:514). The extension of spatial elements to encode temporal relations is well attested crosslinguistically (e.g., Heine and Kuteva (2002:141)), and in that light, unlike $\ast$-tara and $\ast$-maira purpose clauses, I propose that POK first employed $\ast=$tsenuni to encode a temporal relation in a construction in which it appeared in the temporally posterior clause. This can be seen by reinspecting (22a), reproduced in (24) with a paraphrase of what the temporal interpretation would have been.

(24) yapá yini= usu parana =kati yini= yasuka =smuni ikati
HORT 1INCL= go river =ALL 1INCL= bathe =PURP there.FS
“Let’s go to the river ahead of bathing there.”

In (24) the event of bathing occurs posterior to the event of going to the river. I suggest that an implicature came to hold, by which the posterior event was construed as the purpose of the anterior event. This implicature was then grammaticalized, resulting in the purpose construction observed today. However, it is noteworthy that neither the temporal nor the purpose functions of reflexes of $\ast$enoné are present in any TG language of which I am aware, nor does an adposition with the meaning ‘ahead of’ appear as a common source of PCMs in the grammaticalization literature, although ones with related meanings certainly do (see §1.1). Regarding the morphosyntactic properties of $\ast=$tsenuni PCMs, I note that, since $\ast=$tsenuni grammaticalized from a temporal clause-linker, and because all arguments in all temporal clause-linking constructions were overt in POK (O’Hagan 2014), all arguments in the matrix and purpose clause of a $\ast=$tsenuni purpose clause are overt, and thus no coreference is necessary. This in turn yields the primary difference between $\ast$-tara and $\ast$-maira purpose clauses on the one hand, and a $\ast=$tsenuni purpose clause on the other.

Weak evidence for the proposal that $\ast=$tsenuni encoded a temporal relation at an early stage of POK lies in the fact that Omagua and Kokama do not share a common construction for encoding a temporal relation of anteriority. In (25) the temporally posterior event is encoded by two unrelated clause-initial particles.

(25) a. rana= umanu =suri [airafi ta= tua =suri]
3PL.MS= die =PST:DIST [before 1SG.MS= grow.up =PST:DIST]
‘They died before I grew up.’
Omagua (LHC&AHC:2011.06.22.1)

b. [anan tua eyu -ari =N]
[before spirit.type eat -PROG =NOMZ]
‘Before the spirit eats you...’
Kokama (Vallejos 2010:646)
If \(*=tsenuni\) exclusively encoded purpose at this stage, then POK would be expected to exhibit a single (different) construction for encoding this temporal relation, which should be retained by both Omagua and Kokama, given that the clause-linking systems of the two languages are largely parallel (O’Hagan 2014). Rather, the reanalysis of the temporal construction appears to have been the catalyst for each language to innovate a distinct temporal construction.

4.4 POK and Kamaiurá Purpose Clauses

In this section I make comparative remarks on POK and Kamaiurá purpose clauses, in order to answer the question: why does POK not appear to have a purpose construction parallel to that involving \(-taw\) in Kamaiurá in (12)? In other words, why does POK not appear to have a construction that targets \(S_A\) apart from \(A\)? To get at this, I note that there are striking similarities between the purpose clauses of the two languages. The Kamaiurá system can be thought of as involving three constructions: 1) one for coreference between subjects (the ‘gerund’); 2) one for coreference between matrix \(P\) and a variable argument of the purpose clause; and 3) one for a lack of coreference (\(ta= =katu\)). The POK system can be thought of as involving two constructions: one for coreference between matrix \(S/P\) (absolutive) and a variable argument of the purpose clause; and one for a lack of coreference (*=tsenuni). Although POK lacks an analogue to the Kamaiurá construction for subject coreference, the two remaining constructions are largely parallel in their syntactic distribution, namely one requires some degree of coreference, the other none at all.

All of the Kamaiurá subconstructions involving matrix \(P\), unlike the other two constructions, involve detransitivizing suffixes that target a particular syntactic position – \(A\), \(S\), or \(P\). Furthermore, one of those nominalizers, \(-tac\), is cognate to the agent suffix involved in the origin of POK \(*-tara\). However, some differences obtain. First, alignment in Kamaiurá purpose clauses is ergative-absolutive, i.e., there is differential treatment of the subjects of transitive versus intransitive verbs. Second, the nominalizer that makes reference to purpose clause \(P\) is not a reflex of PTG \(*-ba?é\), as it is in POK, but is a distinct prefix \(emi\). For the sake of consideration, if one projects the Kamaiurá system to PTG, then POK has extended the function of \(*-tara\) to both purpose clause \(A\) and \(S_A\), and developed \(*-maica\), based on the nominalizer \(*-ba?é\) instead of the nominalizer \(*emi\). Of course speaking in this way requires a proper reconstruction of the PTG system of purpose clause marking, which is outside the scope of this paper, thus claims as to directionality remain tentative. However, the fact that similar systems exist between distant subgroups of TG (Figure 1) suggests that a system not unlike that of POK or Kamaiurá existed in PTG.

I conclude this section by noting a possible motivation for the apparent extension of \(*-tara\) in relation to the distribution of the \(-taw\) purpose construction in Kamaiurá. Kamaiurá \(-taw\) is a reflex of the PTG ‘circumstantial nominalizer’, which, like the agent suffix, exhibited three allomorphs (*-aβ, *-tsaβ, *-taβ) following consonant-final, vowel-final, and diphthong-final verb roots, respectively (Jensen 1998:540-541). At least one interpretation of nouns derived with this suffix was of an instrument. POK similarly exhibits a reflex of this morpheme in

---

26 Of course each language could have innovated the constructions in (25) even if POK exhibited a construction distinct from the \(*=tsenuni\) one to encode this temporal relation.

27 Note, however, that Seki (2000) does not describe how stative verbs participate in purpose clauses.
the instrumental nominalizer *-ta. What is of note here is that, as noted in §4.1 POK *-ta is another instance in which a final consonant has been lost instead of an additional vowel having been added. Because of this, pre-POK verb roots suffixed with *-ta would have been vowel-final stems, and straightforwardly taken the r-initial allomorph of the purpose suffix *-ram, yielding *-ta-ra. Thus this apparent extension may be more accurately thought of as epiphenomenal on attested sound changes.

5 Conclusion

In this article I have developed a proposal for the origin of three PCMs in POK. This proposal accounts for a pattern of control otherwise unattested in the language, in which the absolutive argument of a matrix clause is coreferential with an obligatorily omitted argument of the purpose clause, which follows a nominative-accusative alignment; this is because the PCMs involved in it have as their origin a set of TG detransitivizing suffixes with these syntactic distributions. The proposal also adds a new source of PCMs to the grammaticalization literature, namely an adposition meaning ‘ahead of’.

This work builds on previous descriptive work on this system (Vallejos 2014), and further contributes to the understanding of the role of sound change and grammaticalization in the development of POK. To this end I have couched the POK system in an overview of purpose clauses in a related language, Kamaiurá, and shown that two POK PCMs have correlates elsewhere in TG. Ultimately the most precise understanding of the historical phenomena presented in this article will rely on a thorough reconstruction of the distribution of PTG detransitivizing suffixes, as well as purpose constructions, both of which are fruitful areas for future research.
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