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1 Introduction

• This talk explores temporal clause-linking in Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK), a Tupí-Guaraní (TG) language of northwest Amazonia, comparing it with related and unrelated but geographically proximate languages

• POK clause-linking is divergent from TG clause-linking, and more in line with areal tendencies in this domain, especially in recruiting nominal postpositions to express temporal relations between clauses, without the borrowing of particular forms

1.1 Sociohistorical and Linguistic Background

• POK is a Tupí-Guaraní language that underwent significant restructuring due to language contact in the pre-Columbian period (Cabral 1995; Michael 2010, to appear; O’Hagan 2011)
  – It is the westernmost Tupí-Guaraní language and the only one of the region
  – It is not known what non-TG language(s) pre-POK – the TG language that gave rise to POK – was in contact with
  – This talk is oriented toward providing possible such candidate languages

• POK is the precursor to modern Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla, spoken in Loreto, Peru
  – Omagua: 6 known speakers, all born in San Joaquín de Omaguas (Amazon River) and between 77 and 94 years old
  – Kokama-Kokamilla: two dialects, ~1,000 elderly speakers throughout the Huallaga, Marañón, Urituyacu, Samiria, Ucayali, Itaya and Nanay river basins (Vallejos 2010:10)

∗Thanks go to Lev Michael (Berkeley) and Rosa Vallejos (UNM) for helpful contributions to this talk. Omagua data comes from the author’s field notes and texts collected by the author and Edinson Huamancayo Curi; Kokama data comes from Vallejos (2010) and personal communication with Rosa Vallejos. Financial support for the documentation of Omagua and Kokama comes from NSF DEL #0966499 Collaborative Research: Kokama-Kokamilla (cod) and Omagua (omg): Documentation, Description and (Non-)Genetic Relationships.
- Omaguas, when first contacted in 1542, were politically and culturally dominant along a large expanse of the Amazon River from the mouth of the Napo to the Juruá
  - They lived in several dozen communities situated on large riverine islands (Anonymous [1731]1922; de Carvajal [1542]1934; Newsom 1996; Porro 1981)
  - Some salient cultural practices are clearly non-TG, e.g., body-length cotton tunics (Sp. *cushma*) and cranial deformation (see de la Cruz ([1653]1900))
  - The first long-term Jesuit mission settlement among the Omagua was founded in 1686 (Anonymous [1731]1922)

- Kokamas, when first contacted in 1557, lived along the lower Ucayali (Jiménez de la Espada 1897:LXXIII)
  - The first long-term Jesuit mission settlement among the Kokama was founded in 1651–1652 on the Ucayali (Stocks 1978:116-117)
  - The first long-term Jesuit mission settlement among the Kokamilla was founded in 1649 on the Huallaga (ibid.)

Figure 1: Contact Locations of Omagua and Kokama-Kokamilla (Michael to appear)

- Assuming that pre-POK was spoken more or less in the area in which its daughter languages are spoken (there are no TG languages closely related to either Omagua or Kokama elsewhere on the continent), its speakers were likely in contact with speakers of Zaparoan, Peba-Yaguan, Tukanoan and Panoan languages (Figure 2)

- Traditional comparative work (Rodrigues 1958, 1985; Rodrigues and Cabral 2002) and more recent phylogenetic work (Chousou-Polydouri et al. 2013) has shown that Omagua and Kokama (and thus POK) are most closely related to Tupinambá (Figure 3)
– Tupinambá was spoken widely along the Brazilian Atlantic coast through the XVIII century (Anchieta 1595; Figueira 1687)
– A massive geographic split separates Tupinambá and pre-POK
  * Speakers of pre-POK came to inhabit a linguistically highly diverse region

• Road Map:
  – §1.2 Terminology
  – §2 Temporal Clause-linking in Proto-Omagua-Kokama
  – §3 Temporal Clause-linking in (Proto-)Tupí-Guaraní
  – §4 Temporal Clause-linking in Northwest Amazonia

1.2 Terminology

• Clause-linking: ‘means that languages employ to represent a general set of semantic relations between clauses’ (Dixon 2009)

  – Focal Clause (FC): ‘refers to the central activity or state of the biclausal linking’
Figure 3: Phylogenetic Classification of Tupí-Guaraní (Chousou-Polydouri et al. 2013)

- **Supporting Clause** (SC): ‘may set out the temporal milieu for the Focal clause, or specify a condition or presupposition for it or a preliminary statement of it, etc.’

- Types of clause-linking:
  - **I**: temporal
  - **II**: consequence
  - **III**: possible consequence
  - **IV**: addition
  - **V**: alternatives
  - **VI**: manner

- Marking/encoding of these relations may appear in SC or FC

- For some constructions, SC-FC order may be reversible, in others not

- Ir relative time: ‘Supporting clause serves to place the event or state of the Focal clause in temporal perspective’ (Dixon 2009:10)
‘reference is to a point in time or a length of time’ (POINT vs. PERIOD)

‘Supporting clause refers to something which is in the past, in the future, or at the same time as that referred to in the Focal clause’ (OVERLAP, ANTERIORITY, POSTERIORITY)

• 1c CONDITIONAL:
  - SC = protasis; FC = apodosis
  - POSSIBLE CONDITIONAL: ‘It is possible that the condition (set out in the Supporting clause) could be met, and then the event described by the Focal clause would eventuate.’ (Dixon 2009:16)
  - CONDITIONAL COUNTERFACTUAL: ‘This describes a condition which might have been met in the past but wasn’t, if it had been, the event described by the Focal clause could have happened.’ (ibid.)

• For expositional reasons and because of how such constructions are treated in most Tupí-Guaraní languages, I will collapse ‘manner’ as a type of temporal overlap

• Two asterisks (**) correspond to Proto-Tupí-Guaraní forms; one asterisk (*) corresponds to Proto-Omagua-Kokama forms

2 Temporal Clause-linking in Proto-Omagua-Kokama

2.1 Point Overlap

• Temporal overlap between points is encoded via the enclitic *pupekatu in the SC
  - All arguments in the SC and FC are overt
Coreference is permissible (1a) but not obligatory (1b)

(1) a. kunumi ta=j =pupikatu ta=j usu iminaa kamata -tara wipi
    young.man 1SG.MS= =OVRLP.PNT 1SG.MS= go long.ago work -PURP one
    hacienda =kati
    plantation =LOC
    ‘When I was a young man I went to work on a plantation.’
    (Omagua, LHC:2011.07.07.1)

b. niawaj emete =puka ipatsu =ka ara wapuruk aki
    no.one EXST =OVRLP.PNT lake =INE ship enter
    ‘When there is no one, the ship enters the lake.’
    (Kokama, Vallejos (2010:445))

• N.B.: Many Kokama grammatical morphemes have lost certain final CV sequences (O’Hagan and Wauters 2012), which will be noticed when comparing Omagua and Kokama examples

2.2 Period Overlap

• Temporal overlap between periods may be encoded via one of several strategies, based on coreference between arguments, all in the SC

  – S/A=S/A: *=pupe (2a)
    * subject of SC is elided
    * FC nominative controls coreference
    * event of the supporting clause must be construed as the means by which the event of the focal clause is carried out

  – S/A=S/A: *-wa (2b)¹
    * subject of SC is elided
    * FC nominative controls coreference

  – S/O=S/A: *-ari (2c)
    * subject of SC is elided
    * FC absolutive controls coreference

  – non-coreferential: *=kate (Veigl 1788)

(2) a. ta= usu =usari uwata =pupi karupama -tara
    1SG.MS= go =FUT walk =MAN clear.land -PURP
    ‘I will go _j walking to clear land.’
    (Omagua, LHC:2010.08.10.1)

b. yatfu -wa tsu= umi mukuika waina =nu =ui
    cry -GER 1SG.FS= see two women =PL.FS =PST.PROX
    ‘I saw two women _j crying.’
    (Kokama, Vallejos, p.c.)

¹In Omagua -wa has been lost and thus coreference restrictions are distinct.
c. yatfu-ari  tsa=  umi mukuika waina  =nu  =ui
   cry  -GER 1SG.FS= see  two  women =PL.FS =PST.PROX
   ‘I saw two women crying.’
   (Kokama, Vallejos, p.c.)

• Three of these markers exhibit polysemous functions as nominal postpositions

(3) a. rana=  pita  =pupi  rana=  fukai akia  kakwaraN
   3PL.MS=  foot  =INSTR  3PL.MS=  dig  DEM.PROX.MS hole
   ‘With their feet they were digging this hole.’
   (Omagua, MCT:C4.S2)

b.  ta=  sakita mura  ra=  yaki  =ari
   1SG.MS=  cut  3SG.MS  3SG.MS=  head  =LOC.DIFF
   ‘I cut down at it across its head.’
   (Omagua, MCT:C2.S2)

c. yuká  iwira  =kati  ta=  tikita  ta=  tukwini
   DEM.DIST.MS tree  =LOC  1SG.MS=  tie.up  1SG.MS=  hammock
   ‘I’m going to tie up my hammock at that tree.’
   (Omagua, LCT:2010.08.13.1)

• The nominal function is older, as evident in comparative data, e.g., Tupinamba pupé, ar-i and kotí, respectively, which exhibit the same semantics (Lemos Barbosa 1956)

• -wa does not exhibit a nominal function in POK

2.3 Period Anteriority and Period Posteriority

• Period anteriority and period posteriority may be encoded by one of two markers, *=katikatu and *=tsuikatu, respectively, in the SC
  – All arguments in the SC and FC are overt
  – Coreference is permissible but not obligatory

(4) a. kamata  mi  ta=k  uri  =katikatu
   work  2SG  1SG.MS=  come  =ANT.PER
   ‘Work until I come.’
   (ZJO 2011, E-2, p. 7, AmHT)

b. yanan  ya=j  kakiri  ya=j  uwari  =tsuika
   like.that.FS  3SG.FS=  live  3SG.FS=  be.born  =POST.PER
   ‘He has been living like that since he was born.’
   (Kokama, Vallejos (2010:286))

• As with markers of period overlap, markers of period anteriority and period posteriority exhibit polysemous functions as nominal postpositions

---

2However, it is a reflex of the PTG gerund **-posição (Jensen 1998:529-532), which itself appears to be related to the PTG diffuse locative **-βo (ibid.:514).
(5) * wepe vecino erura -ka ajanaka ikitu =katika
    one neighbor bring -REP here.FS Iquitos =ALL
    ‘A neighbor brought him back here to Iquitos.’
    (Kokama, Vallejos (2010:892))

- *tsuikatu does not attach to nouns, but *tsui, an ablative, does

(6) awi uri -ari nt= papa ipasu =sui
    already come -PROG 2SG= father lake =ABL
    ‘Your father is already coming back from the lake.’
    (Omagua, LCT:2010.08.13.1)

2.4 Morphological Complexity

- Three temporal clause-linking markers are (historically) morphologically complex
  - *=pupe PERIOD OVERLAP – *=pupekatu POINT OVERLAP
  - *=kate PERIOD OVERLAP – *=katekatu PERIOD ANTERIORITY
  - *=tsui n/a – *=tsuikatu PERIOD POSTERIORITY

- PTG **katú ‘be good’
  - Grammaticalized to “intensifier” in POK (also in PTG (Jensen 1998:539))

(7) amust= katu akia kuv ta= ipuraka =mai
    be.far =INTSF DEM.PROX.MS swidden 1SG.MS= make =REL
    ‘The swidden that I made is really far away.’
    (Omagua, MCT:C1.S5)

- Verbal use replaced by POK *era ‘be good’, of unknown origin

2.5 Point Anteriority and Point Posteriority

- No one construction expressing point anteriority-posteriority can be reconstructed to POK, as both languages exhibit markedly different morphosyntactic strategies

(8) a. rana= uma=ku =suri airafi ta= tua =suri
    3PL.MS= die =PST.DIST ANT.PNT 1SG.MS= grow.up =PST.DIST
    ‘They died before I grew up.’
    (Omagua, LHC&AHC:2011.06.22.1)

b. ikwafii karuka ta= ufima =sakapiri amaisui
    yesterday afternoon 1SG.MS= leave =POST.PNT from.here.FS
    ‘Yesterday afternoon, after I left from here...’
    (Omagua, LHC&AHC:2011.07.06.1)

(9) a. anan tua eyu -ari =N
    before spirit.type eat -PROG =NOMZ
    ‘Before the spirit eats you...’
    (Kokama, Vallejos (2010:646))
‘After they sit up in the tree...’
(Kokama, Vallejos (2010:641))

2.6 Conditionals

• Possible conditionals are characterized by marking the protasis with the non-asserted enclitic *=ratfi, and the apodosis left bare of any conditional-specific marking, although it may exhibit non-conditional-specific marking, e.g., tense, as in (10)

— All arguments in the SC and FC are overt
— Coreference is permissible but not obligatory

(10) mu uri =rafi uyawiri n= umai =usari ta= uka upa -ta -pa
2SG come =NASS again 2SG= see =FUT 1SG.MS= house finish -CAUS -COMPL
‘If you come again, you will see my house all finished.’
(Omagua, LHC:2010.08.10.1)

• Counterfactual conditionals exhibit *=ratfi in the protasis, and mark the apodosis with the irrealis enclitic *=mia, cognate to the PTG frustrative **βiʔā (Jensen 1998:538-539)

(11) na= papa kumitsa =ra ai na= ika a ra= =mia
2SG= father speak =NASS already 2SG= recognize 3SG.MS= =IRR
‘Had your father spoken, you would have recognized him.’
(Kokama, Vallejos (2010:639))

• Conditionals and counterfactuals do not involve nominal postpositions

2.7 Interim Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temporal</th>
<th>POK</th>
<th>Spatial/Relational</th>
<th>PTG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POINT OVERLAP</td>
<td>*=pupekatu</td>
<td></td>
<td>**pipé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD OVERLAP (COREF)</td>
<td>*=pupe</td>
<td>INSTRUMENTAL</td>
<td>**pipé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD OVERLAP (COREF)</td>
<td>*=wa</td>
<td></td>
<td>**-(á)bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD OVERLAP (COREF)</td>
<td>*=ari</td>
<td>DIFFUSE LOCATIVE</td>
<td>**ar-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD OVERLAP</td>
<td>*=kate</td>
<td>LOCATIVE</td>
<td>**kotí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD ANTERIORITY</td>
<td>*=katekatu</td>
<td>ALLATIVE</td>
<td>**kotí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERIOD POSTERIORITY</td>
<td>*=tsukan</td>
<td>( *=tsui ABLATIVE)</td>
<td>**tsuwí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSSIBLE CONDITIONAL</td>
<td>*=ratfi</td>
<td></td>
<td>**βiʔā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTERFACTUAL CONDITIONAL</td>
<td>*=ratfi + *=mia</td>
<td></td>
<td>**βiʔā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Clause-linking in (Proto-)Tupí-Guaraní

- Jensen (1998:528-532) reconstructs three markers encoding temporal relations between clauses

Table 2: PTG Clause-linking (Jensen 1998)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PTG</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>-</strong>(r)(VmV)</td>
<td>(see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-</strong>(r)(ire)</td>
<td>POINT POSTERIORITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-</strong>(t)a (\sim) (*-\text{áβo})</td>
<td>PERIOD OVERLAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In Kamaiurá, a TG language of Brazil whose clause-linking system is exemplary of much of the family, the verbal suffix -(r)amu\é encodes both point and period overlap\(^3\)
  - There need not be coreference between arguments of the SC and FC, as in (12b)

  (12) a. \([\text{jeneu?uramu\é}]_{\text{SC}}\text{ moj\üa jenerekij tipi kati}\) POINT OVERLAP
    
    \begin{align*}
    \text{jene}= & \quad \text{u\üu -ramu\é moj\ü -a} \\
    1\text{PL.INCL}= & \quad \text{bite -TEMP sucuri -ARG 1PL.INCL= REL- pull deep.down ALL}
    \end{align*}
    
    ‘Quando nos morde, o sucuri nos puxa em direcão ao fondo.’
    ‘When it bites us, the sucuri pulls us downward.’
    (Seki 2000:190)

  b. \([\text{maitsarawa a?ea keramu\é}]_{\text{SC}}\text{ iwira ajuap}\) PERIOD OVERLAP
    
    \begin{align*}
    \text{maitsarawa} & \quad \text{a?e -a ker -am\üe iwira a-} \\
    \text{Maitsarawa} & \quad \text{DEM -ARG sleep -TEMP tree 1SG.ERG- cut.down}
    \end{align*}
    
    ‘Maitsarawa, enquanto ele dormiu, eu cortei pau.’
    ‘While Maitsarawa slept I cut down pau.’
    (Seki 2000:190)

- The same marker also encodes a reason relation between clauses\(^4\)

  (13) \([\text{ahaa amanu\é}]_{\text{SC}}\) REASON
    
    \begin{align*}
    \text{a-} & \quad \text{ha aman -a kir -am\üe} \\
    1\text{SG.ERG-} & \quad \text{go rain -ARG rain -TEMP}
    \end{align*}
    
    ‘Eu vou porque está chovendo.’
    ‘I’m leaving because it’s raining.’
    (Seki 2000:192)

- The verbal suffix -(r)ire encodes point posteriority

  (14) \([\text{?a\ña wi jeikire}]_{\text{SC}}\text{ tahan ma?ekuru?ia tsaromekorinewa}\) POINT POSTERIORITY

\(^3\)In Tupinambá, there appears to be a distinction between point overlap encoded by -(r)eme, cognate to -(r)amu\é, and period overlap encoded by a complex form -(r)eme-\(\beta\epsilon\) (Lemos Barbosa 1956:248-252).

\(^4\)POK, in contrast, exhibits a dedicated reason marker *=i\k\ua\ (from *=i\k\ua 'know', of TG origin), which patterns syntactically like the other markers seen above.
‘After I arrive here, I will go looking for panela.’
(Seki 2000:194)

- Neither -(r)amuê nor -(r)ire are polysemous in the nominal domain and POK exhibits no reflexes of them

- In Kamaiurá, reflexes of **-a ~ **-ábo, traditionally known as a ‘gerund’ construction (Anchieta 1595; Rodrigues 1953) encode relations of period temporal overlap (manner), succession or purpose (i.e., ambiguously) when subjects are coreferential
  - S/A=S/A, subject of SC is elided
  - FC nominative controls coreference

(15) a\-jot [kuruta?ia pim]_SC  
  a- jot kuruta?i -a pi -m  
  1SG.ERG- come flute -ARG play -GER  

‘I came playing flute.’  
‘I came and played flute.’  
‘I came to play flute.’  
(Seki 2000:196)

- Although POK exhibits a reflex of this marker *-wa, it does not exhibit the same coreference restrictions as its cognate morphemes elsewhere in TG (see (2b))

- Kamaiurá possible conditionals are encoded via the general irrealis enclitic =ram, in combination with the above -(r)amuê on the protasis verb

  - The apodosis receives no special marking

(16) [iju?uramuêram]_SC wararuwijawa ojuka  
  i- u?u -ramuê =ram wararuwijaw -a o- juka  
  3.ABS- bite -TEMP =IRR cachorro -ARG 3SG.ERG- kill  

‘If it bit him, he would kill the cachorro.’  
(Seki 2000:194)

- This construction may also be interpreted as a counterfactual conditional

(17) [amana kiramuêramerak]_SC nahaitie  
  aman -a kir -amuê =ram =e =rak n= a- ha -ite  
  rain -ARG rain -TEMP =IRR =EPV =ATT NEG= 1SG.ERG- go -NEG

\(^5=ram\) is related to POK *=ratfi.
Another possible conditional construction involves multiple iterations of irrealis =ram on all constituents in the sentence except the apodosis verb.

\]
\[i- je?ia -ma?e =ram je= r- eko -ramu=e =ram iwira?a =ram
\]
\[3.ABS- be.tall -NOMZ =IRR 1SG.ABS= REL- OP -TEMP =IRR fruit =IRR
\]
\[a- po?o ne= =upe
\]
\[1SG.ERG- retrieve 2SG.ABS= =DAT
\]

‘Se eu fosse [um que é] alto, eu tiraria com a mão a fruta para você.’
‘If I were tall, I would retrieve the fruit for you.’
(Seki 2000:194)

4 Clause-linking in Northwest Amazonia

• The purpose of this section is to enumerate a number of structural and semantic similarities in the clause-linking systems of POK and neighboring, but genetically unrelated, languages

4.1 Iquito (Zaparoan)

• Point overlap is expressed via the SC-initial free form hi?itikari

\[(19) \text{hi?itikari} taa hawána nási =na kia= nu= ituu -Ø
\]
\[when \cop dry \text{swidden=clf} 2SG= 3SG.IRR= burn -PERF
\]
‘When the swidden is dry, you will burn it.’
(Michael 2009:153)

• Period overlap is expressed via the SC-initial free forms iyákari ‘period of time’ and hi?itikari

\[(20) \text{nu=} asa -ki \text{iyákari} \text{hi?itikari} ki= kapi -ki
\]
\[3SG= eat -PERF \text{period.of.time when} 1SG= \text{cook}-PERF
\]
‘He ate while I cooked.’
(Michael 2009:153)

• When the SC is construed as a means, the instrumental postposition =hata is used

\[(21) \text{ki=} \text{himi} -\text{ri}?i \text{íni} =\text{hata}
\]
\[1SG= \text{leave -MOM fly.NOMZ =INSTR/COM}
\]
‘I will leave flying.’
(Michael 2009:164)

• Period anteriority is expressed by a combination of the free form iyákari and the nominal allative postposition =ánuru, occurring SC-initially
(22) \(\text{nu}=\) raati -Ø -kuráana umáata iyákari =ánuura yaaha \(\text{nu}=\)
3SG= drink -PERF -REC.PAST.REP a.lot period.of.time =ALL until.now 3SG=
ámuu -kiaaki núana naháaha kill -REM.PAST.PERF tree also
‘He drank a lot, until he killed the tree as well.’
(Michael 2009:154)

- Period posteriority is expressed by the SC-initial collocation hiítikarii iyákari yaaha (or iyákari yaaha hiítikarii), which resembles the period overlap construction in (20)

(23) \(\text{narata kí=}\) iúkii piyíini iina yawííni =hina hiítikarii iyákari
like.it 1SG= live.IMPERF all ART day =LOC when period.of.time
yaaha pí= namíiti’ -Ø -kura iimi tarawahiuni
until.now 1PL.INCL= begin -PERF -REC.PAST ART.PL.INAN work
‘I live like this all the time, since we began this work.’
(Michael 2009:155)

- Potential conditionals are expressed via the discontinuous ‘non-assertional’ morpheme -sa-kari on the protasis verb
  - The apodosis verb carries no conditional-specific marking
  - The apodosis may exhibit either a realis or irrealis word order depending on the temporal definiteness of the proposition (see (Lai 2009; Beier et al. 2011))

(24) ákari aasi ani -sa -riì -kari iina yawííni =hina pí= iúkii =na
now rain come -NASS -MOM -NASS ART day =LOC 1PL.INCL= be.IMPERF =CLF
kí= kí= núana hikati -riì aasamu =hina
1SG= 1SG- tree.IRR get.out -MOM creek =LOC
‘If the rain falls now in these days that we are in, I will get my timber out of the creek.’
(Michael 2009:156)

- Counterfactual conditionals are expressed via the the counterfactual proclitic (i)tí= on both the protasis and apodosis verb
  - Both the protasis and apodosis exhibit irrealis word order

(25) ka= kia= tí= inika -riì kia- kúwaaha ítí= kia= átuu -kiáana
NEG= 2SG= CNTF= wake -MOM 2SG- heart CNTF= 2SG.IRR= tell -PERF.REP
‘Had you not awakened, your heart would have warned you.’
(Michael 2009:157)

4.2 Yagua (Peba-Yaguan)

- Point overlap is encoded via the suffix -numátiy – a complex form segmentable as -numaa ‘now’ and -tiy (see below) – here attaching to the auxiliary verb g
(26) sa- g -numaa -tiy jiti jii sa- vaturuy rq chanay varyi
3SG- IRR -now -Tiy arrive 3SG- woman IRR rejoice then
‘When he arrives his wife will rejoice then.’
(Payne 1985:103)

• Period overlap is encoded in one of four ways
  – the -numaa-tiy construction illustrated in (26)
  – nominal locative suffix -mu
    * coreference is permissible, although not required
  – nominal instrumental/comitative suffix -ta
    * coreference appears to be obligatory (it lacks coreferential prefixes)
    * the SC is arguably restricted to being interpreted as the means by which the event
      of the FC is carried out (not explicitly stated)

(27) a. riy- yarqova -numaa jiy- jiya janu -mu
3PL- make.noise -now COREF- go -INF -LOC
‘They make noise going.’

b. suvoga naana- jivay jiy- vanyu damuqy -janu -mu
string.bag 3DL- make COREF- man hunt -INF -LOC
‘She makes string bags while her husband hunts.’

c. sa- jiti jiy- yaq -jada -ta jiyu
3SG- arrive jump -DISTR -INF -INSTR/COM here
‘He arrives here dancing.’
(Payne 1985:117)

  – nominal postposition tuunu ‘beside’
    * coreference is not necessary; both verbs are finite

(28) deeramiiy sqqniy -yag sa- tjiwa tuunu
children shout -DISTR 3SG- play while
‘The children are shouting while they play.’
(Payne 1985:105)

• Possible conditionals involve the same -tiy seen in the expression of temporal overlap in (26),
  marked on the protasis
  – The apodosis exhibits no special marking

(29) yi- g -tiy jiya rumu yi- g -maa jiriy ray -juy jarusiy -tay
2SG- IRR -Tiy go there 2SG- IRR -PERF bring 1SG -ALL rice -PART
‘If you go there, you must bring back some rice for me.’
(Payne 1985:104)

• The marker -tiy appears in a number of other complex forms (e.g., ritiy ‘so that’, daryatiy
  ‘so that’, vartiyy ‘then’, ramiyy ‘therefore’), and arguably exhibits non-asserted semantics
  similar to POK *=ratfi and Iquito -sa-kari

• Counterfactual conditionals are not discussed in Payne (1985)
4.3 Máhiiki (Tukanoan)

- Possible conditionals are of three types, depending on whether the subjects of the protasis and apodosis are identical, and, in the case of different subjects, whether the possibility is considered probable or uncertain.

- High-probability different-subject possible conditionals are encoded via -tu in the protasis.

  \[(30)\] Ivan dáí -tu ótē -yo
  Ivan come -DS.HPROB.COND dance -1PL.FUT
  ‘If Ivan comes, we will dance.’
  (Michael 2012:2)

- Uncertain different-subject possible conditionals are encoded via one of two types of subordinating morphology in the protasis, followed by the free form bētū.

  \[(31)\] nómio -juna kwako -ji bētū áó áà -yo
  woman -PL cook -PL.SUBORD DS.UNCERT.COND food eat -1PL.FUT
  ‘If the women cook, we will eat.’
  (Michael 2012:3)

- Same-subject possible conditionals are encoded via one of the same two types of subordinating morphology in the protasis, followed by the free form máńí.

  \[(32)\] yì ōıkí įkito sáí -kí máńí móńí -má -yi
  1SG.PRO brother Iquitos go -MASC.SG.SUBORD SS.COND return -NEG -1SG.FUT
  ‘If my brother goes to Iquitos, he won’t return.’
  (Michael 2012:4)

- Counterfactual conditionals are of two types depending on whether the subjects of the protasis and apodosis are identical.

  - In both, the protasis is identical to that of a possible conditional, and the verb of the apodosis receives past tense morphology and the frustrative suffix -da.

    \[(33)\] yì áchió raka ōkú -kí máńí ótē -da
    1SG.PRO aguardiente drink -MASC.SG.SUBORD SS.COND dance -FRUST
    -bì
    -1SG.PAST
    ‘If I had drunk aguardiente, I would have dance.’
    (Michael 2012:4)

5 Conclusions

- POK resembles Iquito and Yagua in recruiting a nominal instrumental postposition to encode period overlap with a manner interpretation (POK *=pupe, Iquito =hata, Yagua -ta).

  - This clause-type in the three languages is more reduced than others we have encountered.
• POK resembles Iquito in recruiting its nominal allative postposition to encode period anteriority, although Iquito lacks the symmetry found in POK in recruiting its ablative to express period posteriority (POK *=katekatu, Iquito =ánuura)

• POK resembles Yagua in recruiting its nominal locative postposition to encode period overlap that does not require a manner interpretation (POK *=kate, Yagua -mu)

• POK resembles Iquito, Yagua and Máñhi in marking the protasis of a possible conditional with markers that approximate non-assertive markers (POK *=rat, Iquito -sa-kari, Yagua -tiy, Máñhi -tu)
  
  - POK resembles in Máñhi in that counterfactual conditionals are minimally distinguished from their possible conditional counterparts by marking the apodosis with a frustrative, or, in the case of POK, a marker that derives from a frustrative (POK *=mia, Máñhi -da)
  
  - POK conditionals also resemble TG ones, but differ in not allowing multiple iterations of *=rat and requiring overt marking on the apodosis for counterfactual interpretations
  
  - Iquito counterfactuals do not follow the POK-Máñhi pattern

• Despite strong similarity across these languages in the semantics of clause-linking markers, many clause-linking constructions remain syntactically distinct (e.g., Yagua -tiy appears to be a second-position clitic, unlike POK *=rat)

• POK has derived markers of point overlap, period anteriority and period posteriority from simplex forms present elsewhere in the clause-linking paradigm (§2.4)
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