On the Pre-Columbian Origin of Proto-Omagua-Kokama[1]

Lev Michael
University of California, Berkeley

Abstract

Cabral (1995, 2007, 2011) and Cabral and Rodrigues (2003) established that Kokama and Omagua, closely-related indigenous languages spoken in Peruvian and Brazilian Amazonia, emerged as the result of intense language contact between speakers of a Tupí-Guaraní language and speakers of non-Tupí-Guaraní languages. Cabral (1995, 2007) further argued that the language contact which led to the development of Kokama and Omagua transpired in the late 17th and early 18th centuries, in the Jesuit mission settlements located in the *provincia de Maynas* (corresponding roughly to modern northern Peruvian Amazonia). In this paper I argue that Omagua and Kokama were not the product of colonial-era language contact, but were rather the outcome of language contact in the Pre-Columbian period. I show that a close examination of 17th and 18th century missionary chronicles, Jesuit texts written in Omagua and Kokama, and modern data on these languages, make it clear that Omagua and Kokama already existed in a form similar to their modern forms by the time European missionaries arrived in Maynas in the 17th century. Moreover, I show that several key claims regarding ethnic mixing and Jesuit language policy that Cabral adduces in favor of a colonial-era origin for Kokama are not supported by the available historical materials. Ruling out a colonial-era origin for Omagua and Kokama, I conclude that Proto-Omagua-Kokama, the parent language from which Omagua and Kokama derive, was a Pre-Columbian contact language.

Keywords: Omagua, Kokama, Tupí-Guaraní, Jesuit, Amazonia, language contact, abrupt creolization

1. Introduction

In the apt words of Cabral (2007, p: 365), the Omagua and Kokama languages of Western Amazonia represent "one of the most interesting outcomes of a language contact situation in

---

Amazonia." These two closely-related languages were long thought to be members of the continent-spanning Tupí-Guaraní (TG) family (e.g. Rivet 1910, Rodrigues 1958, Lemle 1971), but as comparative work on TG languages advanced in the 1980s, Rodrigues (1984/5, p: 44) suggested that Kokama may have been significantly affected by contact with a non-TG language.[2] Based on data collected through fieldwork with Brazilian Kokama speakers, Cabral (1995) carried out detailed comparisons between Kokama and Tupinambá, the TG language apparently most closely related to Kokama, and concluded that Kokama grammar reflects a radical restructuring of Tupinambá grammar due to intense language contact. Cabral further argued that this contact and restructuring took place during the late 17th and early 18th centuries in Jesuit *reducciones*, or mission settlements, in the *provincia de Maynas* (corresponding roughly to the modern Peruvian *departamento* of Loreto). I refer to this proposal as the '*Reducción Genesis Hypothesis*' (RGH).

The principal goal of this paper is to argue that Omagua and Kokama did not emerge as contact languages in the Jesuit *reducciones*, but rather, that the language contact responsible for the development of Omagua and Kokama transpired before the arrival of European missionaries in western Amazonia. In short, I argue for a Pre-Columbian genesis of Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK), the ancestral language from which Omagua and Kokama sprang. I shall show that a close examination of 17th and 18th century historical materials significantly undermines the key empirical claims of the RGH, which, coupled with attestations of Omagua and Kokama from the late 17th and early 18th centuries that exhibit great similarities to modern Omagua and Kokama, indicate that these languages already exhibited their contact-influenced character when Europeans encountered them.

A secondary goal of this paper is a methodological one, namely, that claims regarding the sociohistorical circumstances of language contact require as much care in collecting and analyzing data as do claims about the linguistic processes associated with language contact. Adequately justifying such sociohistorical claims of course requires different types of data and analysis than linguistic analysis, including the close examination of historical and ethnographic materials, but as I hope to demonstrate in this paper, such analysis can contribute as much to our understanding of language contact as linguistic analysis.

Whether Omagua and Kokama are the results of colonial-era or Pre-Columbian language contact is significant both for our understanding of the social and linguistic history of Amazonia, and for scholarship on language contact. If these two languages arose in the Jesuit *reducciones*, as the RGH proposes, they yield insight into the linguistic consequences of the radical social transformations effected by the European powers and their local descendants. If, on the other hand, these languages arose from pre-Columbian language contact, they are arguably even more interesting, in that they can give us insight into Amazonian social and linguistic history prior to the arrival of Europeans, an era for which our knowledge is scant. If the latter account of the origin of these languages is correct, they also become especially significant for scholarship on language contact in the Americas. European colonialism of course brought about numerous contexts of intense language contact in the Americas (e.g. the Caribbean creoles, Media Lengua (Muysken 1997), and Míchif (Bakker and Papen 1997)), but instances of creoles, mixed languages, or languages with significant contact-induced grammatical restructuring in the

---

2   Prior to ongoing work by the author and colleagues, little data was available on Omagua (see §2 for discussion), leading discussion on the relationship of Omagua and Kokama to the TG family to focus on Kokama.

Americas, in which the principal languages were solely indigenous ones, are rare (e.g. Chinook Jargon (Lang 2008) and Tariana (Aikhenvald 2002)). Rarer still are known languages of the latter type whose emergence can be confidently dated to the Pre-Columbian period. As such, Omagua and Kokama can yield insights into processes of language contact prior to the arrival of Europeans in the Americas, a topic on which our knowledge remains sparse.

According to the RGH, prior to the arrival of European missionaries in the areas inhabited by the Kokamas and Omaguas, these two peoples spoke a language similar to, or identical to, Tupinambá (Cabral 1995, pp: 6, 296, 304). Cabral observes that when the Jesuits began forming Omagua *reducciones* in 1680s, they were initially inhabited solely by Omaguas, but quickly became multiethnic and multi-lingual due to movements of indigenous groups motivated by epidemics, slave raids, and Jesuit efforts to maintain control over the region (ibid, pp: 247, 294-295, 307-308). In this multi-lingual context, according to Cabral, first the TG precursor language, and subsequently "Kokama/Omagua"[3], served as a *lengua general*, or medium of interethnic communication, due to its promotion by the Jesuits as the "official language of the *Provincia de Maynas*" and its use as the principal language of proselytization (ibid, pp: 250, 294-295, 309-310).

Having argued elsewhere that Kokama/Omagua shows signs of having been affected by imperfect adult learning, Cabral (ibid. 308; see also 296, 309-310) infers that "[t]he non-Tupí-Guaraní speakers presumabl[y] did not meet the necessary conditions for learning the Kokama/Omagua language perfectly," suggesting that "[t]here was not enough time to learn the official language because there was the need for speaking a common language." Cabral (ibid. 310) also indicates that demographic factors were at play, namely, that "[t]he Tupí-Guaraní speakers presumably did not outnumber the non-Tupían speakers, at least not by the time that Kokama/Omagua stated developing towards a distinct linguistic entity." This imperfectly learned language was then acquired by children as their first language (ibid. 310). In the final stage of this process, ethnic Kokama/Omaguas gave up their original language in favor of the recently-emerged contact variety (ibid. 310). The result, according to Cabral (ibid. 307) was the replacement of a Tupinambá-like language with a rapid, or abrupt, creole that diverged significantly from the typical Tupí-Guaraní profile (see also Cabral and Rodrigues 2003, Cabral 2011). Abrupt creolization, as discussed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 150), is characterized by the rapid development of a stable creole language without an intermediate stable pidgin stage, generally in the time frame bracketed by the original group of adults and the complete language acquisition of the first full generation of children who acquire and develop the new creole language.

In the remainder of this paper, I show that a close examination of historical materials on 17th and 18th century missionary activity in Maynas undermines key assertions supporting the RGH and introduces additional evidence that renders the RGH implausible. In §2, I summarize scholarship regarding the classification of Omagua and Kokama, and in §3 I provide an overview of the history of interactions between European missionaries, Omaguas, and Kokamas, which is necessary to adequately evaluate the RGH. I then turn to empirical challenges to the RGH, arguing in §4 that historical materials show that the Jesuits did not promote Kokama or Omagua as *lenguas generales* in Maynas, but rather Quechua, thereby eliminating the putative driving

---

3   Cabral (1995, 2007, 2011) spells 'Omagua' in a number of different ways. For purposes of clarity I have standardized the name in quotations from those works to conform with the remainder of this article.

force behind the rapid creolization of Kokama/Omagua. In §5 I challenge the assumption that the *reducciones* in which Omaguas and Kokamas settled exhibited significant and early ethnic mixing, showing that the formation of ethnically diverse *reducciones* with Kokama or Omagua residents was both infrequent and a relatively late development during the Jesuit presence in Maynas. In §6 I evaluate the evidence for the sociolinguistic circumstances posited by the RGH as favoring abrupt creole genesis, including the crucial demographic claim that Omaguas were a minority in the multiethnic *reducciones*. I argue that the available evidence contradicts this demographic claim, and also show that the earliest attestation of Kokama, from 1681, is similarly problematic for the creole genesis mechanism posited by the RGH, as it would require an implausibly swift process of creole formation. In §7 I turn to the difficulties faced by the RGH in reconciling the restriction of creole genesis to multiethnic *reducciones* with the considerably wider distribution of Omagua and Kokama peoples in that era. These difficulties include the absence of any obvious sociolinguistic vector that would spread the creolized version of the TG precursor language (= 'Kokama/Omagua') to the non-*reducción* populations, and the grammatical convergence of Kokama and Omagua, despite the geographical separation of the *reducciones* to which their genesis could be attributed. Finally, in §8 I argue that the absence of any mention of the language shift entailed by the RGH in the Jesuit linguistic materials or commentary of the period indicates that the Jesuits did not witness any such shift, further undermining the RGH.

2. The classification of Omagua and Kokama

Since at least Maroni ([1738]1988, p: 304) and Hervás y Panduro (1784, pp: 63-66), scholars have considered Omagua and Kokama to be Tupí-Guaraní languages, based on lexical similarities between the former languages and languages such as Tupinambá and Guaraní. As grammatical information on Kokama became available however, Rodrigues (1984/5, p: 43) suggested that the language may have emerged from language contact involving TG and non-TG groups. Dietrich's (1990) quantitative comparison of morphosyntactic features among the then-accepted members of the TG family, likewise showed that Kokama was a grammatical outlier with respect to the core members of the TG family.

On the basis of fieldwork with Kokama speakers in the Peru-Brazil border area, Cabral (1995) showed that although Kokama exhibits numerous lexical similarities to Tupí-Guaraní languages, it diverges significantly from the typical TG grammatical profile, and from that of Tupinambá in particular, which she considered to have been, or been very similar to, the TG language involved in the genesis of Kokama.[4] I here summarize Cabral's comparison of Kokama and Tupinambá morphology, which looms large in her argument that modern Kokama is the result of radical contact-induced restructuring of Tupinambá.

Cabral characterizes Tupinambá as a polysynthetic language with rich inflectional and derivation morphology, much of it prefixing, in contrast to Kokama, which she describes as an

---

4 A reviewer questions the assumption underpinning Cabral's pairwise comparison of Kokama and Tupinambá grammar and lexicons, namely that Tupinambá is the language most closely related to Kokama (and hence Proto-Omagua-Kokama). Although beyond the scope of the current paper, a phylogenetic analysis of an extensive TG lexical dataset by the author and colleagues (Chousou-Polydouri et al., in prep) shows that Tupinambá, Kokama, and Omagua form a clearly defined subgroup within the TG family, lending support to Cabral's belief in the relatively close relationship between Tupinambá and Kokama.

isolating language that lacks inflectional morphology, and exhibits highly limited and exclusively suffixal derivational morphology (ibid., p: 118). Cabral (ibid., pp: 120-123, 135-136) observes that the cross-referencing and relational prefixes found in Tupinambá are entirely absent in Kokama, except when they are frozen as part of roots. Cabral also notes that cross-reference marking is frozen onto Kokama postpositions, which she identifies as developing from Tupinambá relational nouns (ibid., pp: 133-134). Cabral (ibid., pp: 124-125) likewise notes that Tupinambá's four case suffixes are absent in Kokama, except in nominal roots where they are similarly frozen. Cabral also observes that where Tupinambá cross-reference marking exhibits active/inactive alignment (ibid., pp: 178-180), the pronominal clitics that replaced these markers in Kokama exhibit nominative-accusative alignment. Finally, with respect to inflectional morphology, Cabral notes the complete loss of the Tupinambá rich system of modal suffixes (ibid., pp: 137-142), including a modal suffix associated with negation (ibid., pp: 143).

Cabral remarks that there are also significant differences in the derivational morphology of the Tupinambá and Kokama. Kokama exhibits neither of the two Tupinambá causative prefixes (except when frozen on roots), instead displaying a causative suffix *-ta,* which lacks cognates in other TG languages (ibid., pp: 145-146). Cabral also observes that Kokama lacks morphemes corresponding to Tupinambá's object, agentive, habitual agentive, instrumental, patientive, propensity, and circumstantial nominalizers (ibid., pp: 146-147, 150-152). Kokama similarly lacks morphemes corresponding to the Tupinambá diminutive and privative suffixes (ibid., pp: 147-149). Kokama likewise lacks productive reduplication to express pluractionality (ibid., pp: 157-158), and productive noun-incorporation (ibid., pp: 159-161), both found in Tupinambá.

Cabral considered the significant grammatical differences between Kokama and Tupinambá, in contrast to their considerable lexical similarity, to be compelling evidence that Kokama grammar resulted from radical contact-induced restructuring of Tupinambá grammar, combined with the retention of the majority of the Tupinambá lexicon (Cabral 1995, pp: 305, 307 308; 2007; 2011). Cabral further interpreted the considerable quantity of frozen cross-referencing and case morphology on Kokama roots (see also O'Hagan 2011) as compelling evidence that imperfect language learning played an important role in the genesis of Kokama. On these grounds, Cabral concludes that Kokama is not genetically related to the Tupí-Guaraní family in the strict sense (e.g. of Thomason and Kaufman (1988)) that the majority of both the lexicon and the grammar of Kokama were inherited from a TG language. This paper adopts the same conclusion regarding Proto-Omagua-Kokama, the language from which Omagua and Kokama descended.

In concluding this section, I briefly discuss the relationship of Omagua to Kokama. Cabral (1995) treats Kokama and Omagua as a single language, often referring to the language as 'Kokama/Omagua'. It should be noted, however, that Cabral had no access to modern Omagua data at the time, and her conflation of the two language names appears to stem from a comment made by one of her Kokama consultants that there was "no difference" between the two languages (Cabral 1995, p: 258). Although the languages are clearly closely related, ongoing work by Rosa Vallejos on Kokama-Kokamilla (Vallejos 2010a) and by the author and colleagues at UC Berkeley on Omagua leads us to conclude that the two languages are closely-related, but distinct (O'Hagan, Vallejos, and Michael, in prep.).

Modern Omagua and Kokama are phonologically quite similar, the most salient

differences being that Kokama /ts, tʃ/ corresponds to Omagua /s, ʃ/, and that Omagua /ɪ/ corresponds to Kokama /e/ (variably realized as [e, ə, ɪ]; Vallejos (2010a, p: 109)). Kokama has experienced widespread loss of final syllables and vowels of lexical roots and functional morphemes, as evident in Table 1.

TABLE 1

Other than differences in phonological form, there are also several cases where the two languages exhibit the same categories, but the morphemes that express those categories are not cognate, as in the case of negation (Omagua: *rua*, Kokama: *tima*), the similative (Omagua: *-sana*, Kokama: *-yá*), the jussive (Omagua: *tina*, Kokama: *yawa*), and the distant future tense (Omagua: =*usari*, Kokama: =*á*).

There are also several instances of one language exhibiting a grammatical category that the other lacks. For example Omagua exhibits a 'non-genuine' nominal suffix *-rana,* and an 'intensifer' *-katu*, which Kokama lacks. Similarly, Kokama exhibits several functional morphemes which Omagua lacks, including a medial past tense =*ikwá*, a reportive =*ía*, and an apprehensive =*era* (Vallejos 2010a).

I close this section with a brief discussion of the materials and publications available on Omagua and Kokama. Kokama is the most extensively described and documented of the two languages. A dictionary (Espinoza 1989), vocabulary (Faust 1959), a description of Kokama clause types (Faust 1971), a non-technical linguistic description (Espinoza 1935), and a pedagogical Kokama grammar (Faust 1972) were prepared in the 20th century, but the most substantial work on Kokama has been carried out more recently by Rosa Vallejos, who has described Kokama clause structure (Vallejos 2004), written an extensive descriptive grammar (Vallejos 2010a), and published articles on various topics in Kokama grammar (2009, 2010b). At least one Jesuit era grammar and vocabulary are also reported (Hervás y Panduro 1800, pp: 271-272), but appear to have been lost.

Several grammars and vocabularies of Omagua were prepared by Jesuits missionaries (Hervás y Panduro 1800, pp: 271-272), but the only surviving linguistic description of this era is a brief one appearing in Veigl (1788). Several ecclesiastical texts prepared by Jesuit missionaries have survived, however, and are analyzed by Michael and O'Hagan (submitted), who also provide a grammatical sketch of 17th and 18th century Omagua based on these texts. Brief wordlists from the 18th and 19th centuries are also available from a number of sources (Gilij [1781]1992, pp: 371-375, Hervás y Panduro 1784, Castelnau 1851, Marcoy 1866, von Martius 1867, and Orton 1875), while Rivet (1910) compiles and reviews a number of these earlier materials and carries out some basic grammatical analysis on this basis. The only modern materials of which I am aware stem from the documentation project currently led by the author. Some of these materials inform the analysis of Michael and O'Hagan (submitted), and a number of works, including a descriptive grammar of Omagua, are currently in preparation.

3. A sociolinguistic history of Omagua and Kokama in the early colonial period

An adequate evaluation of the RGH requires an integrated overview of the sociolinguistic history of the Omagua and Kokama peoples in terms of their relationships with missionaries and

reducciones (missionary settlements), from their early interactions with Europeans in the 17th century, to the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Americas in 1767-8. This section provides such a history, focusing on a number of factors particularly relevant to evaluating the RGH, including: 1) the distribution and movement of Omagua and Kokama populations; 2) the foundation and abandonment of particular mission settlements; and 3) the ethnic constitution of the population of the mission settlements.

When European missionaries ventured into the upper Amazon basin in the 17th century, the Omaguas and Kokamas were distributed across four principal areas spanning a significant fraction of western Amazonia (see Map 1). The Omaguas were settled in two areas: one continuous region consisting of the large islands and riverbanks of the Amazon proper, from near confluence of the Amazon and Napo Rivers to the confluence of the Amazon and Juruá Rivers (de la Cruz [1651]1900, pp: 79, 107), and another smaller area along the lower reaches of the Aguarico River, a tributary of the upper Napo (Maroni [1738]1988, pp: 427; Newson 1996). The Kokamas were likewise split into two major groups: one located on the lower reaches of the Ucayali River (Chantre y Herrera 1901, pp: 140; Grohs 1974, pp: 29, 46), and another group, often referred to as Kokamillas, along the lower reaches of the Huallaga River (Maroni [1738]1988, pp: 107; Grohs 1974, pp: 46). The total area spanned by these four groups exceeded 1200 kms from east to west, and 500 kms from north to south.

Not only did the Upper Amazon TG peoples extend over a significant area, they were numerous. Contemporary estimates of the main Amazon Omagua population range from 30,000 (Velasco 1941, pp: 379, 385; cited in Grohs 1974, p: 76) to 60,000 (Ortiguera 1968, pp: 239, 246, cited in Grohs 1974, p: 24) to a figure of 100,000 attributed to Richter (Stöcklein 1725, vol. I, p: 67; cited in Grohs 1974, p: 76). Modern estimates range from a very conservative 4,000-7,000 (Grohs 1974, p: 25), to a credible 91,000 (Denevan 1992, p: xxvi), to a fantastic 1.074 million (Myers 1988). It seems safe to say, based on this range of figures, that there were many tens of thousands of Amazon Omaguas, but that the population probably did not reach 100,000.

Grohs (1974, p: 22) cites a contemporary figure, attributed to Ordóñez de Ceballos, of 5,000 Aguarico Omaguas in the late 16th century, which seems broadly consistent with the fact the Aguarico Omagua were generally described to be a much smaller group than their main Amazon River counterparts. Newson (1995, pp.:332-333), in her careful study of demographic trends in the Napo and Aguarico River basins during the colonial period, estimates an 16th century Napo Omagua population of 10,000, reduced to approximately 1,000 by 1630, and to 500 by 1650.

The Ucayali Kokamas also appear to have been a smaller group than the Amazon Omaguas. Contemporary figures range from Cujía's estimate of 10,000 - 12,000 in 1644 to Pérez's estimate of 1,600 - 2,000 in 1653 (Grohs 1974, p: 48). The latter figure is surprisingly low, given the success of the Kokama-led rebellion against the Spanish in 1664 (see below), and current estimates of 20,000 - 25,000 ethnic Kokamas (Vallejos 2010, p: 13). At the same time, however, it seems reasonable to deprecate Myers' (1988) modern estimate of 1.28 million Ucayali Kokamas. Grohs (1974, p: 29) provides an estimate of 20,000 at time of contact, which I adopt here.

There is little textual evidence, unfortunately, for estimating the colonial era Kokamilla population on the Huallaga River. Figueroa (1904, p: 81; cited in Grohs 1974, p: 47) indicates that one Kokamilla *reducción*, Santa María de Huallaga, had a population of 600 in 1651. Since

we know this to be only one of several Kokamilla *reducciones* (see §3.1), an estimate of 1,000-2,000 Kokamillas seems conservative.

FIGURE 1

3.1 Interactions between European missionaries, Kokamas, and Kokamillas

Missionary interactions with the Kokamas and Kokamillas date to 1644, when Gaspar Cujía made friendly contact with the Kokamas of the lower Ucayali (Chantre y Herrera 1901, p: 140). Cujía's visit was motivated less by immediate evangelical goals than by a desire to reduce the frequency of raids by the Ucayali Kokamas against the christianized Jeberos and Mainas of the lower Huallaga and Marañon Rivers. Cujía appears to have be largely successful, and made several further visits to maintain good relations (ibid., p: 141). At this time, no Kokama *reducciones* had yet been founded, and the town of Borja, located on the Marañon River quite far upriver of its confluence with the Huallaga River, served as both the seat of the secular colonial government and the base of operations for missionary activities in the region.

Shortly after Cujía's visit to the Ucayali, Jesuit missionaries initiated evangelical efforts among the Kokamillas of the Huallaga River. In 1646 Lucas de la Cueva founded San Pablo de Pandebequeo, a Kokamilla *reducción*, near the established *reducción* of Limpia Concepción de Jeberos, on the lower Huallaga (ibid., p: 141-142). In 1649, Bartolomé de Pérez entered the Huallaga region, and in 1651 founded three Kokamilla *reducciones* (ibid., p: 144). He subsequently visited the Ucayali in an unsuccessful attempt to found a *reducción* among the Ucayali Kokamas (ibid., p: 145). Note that the Kokamilla missions founded on the Huallaga between 1646 and 1651 were most likely single ethnicity settlements, since the ethnic composition of multiethnic missions, such as Concepción de María, located on the Aipena River (a tributary of the lower Huallaga), is explicitly discussed in the chronicles (ibid., p: 142), and no such commentary is attached to the description of these Kokamilla *reducciones*.

The Jesuits renewed their efforts to evangelize the Ucayali Kokamas in 1659, when Tomás Majano founded several *reducciones* on the Ucayali (ibid., p: 211). It is clear that although Majano was able to convince some Kokamas to settle in these *reducciones*, the majority of Kokamas were unhappy with the missionary presence in their territory. Not long after the founding of these *reducciones*, the *gobernador de Borja*, the civil authority with jurisdiction over the area, ordered Majano to withdraw, after hearing of credible Kokama threats against Majano's life. Majano did so, and succeeded in convincing 100 Kokama families (~400-500 individuals) to come with him to the Huallaga, where he settled them in the *reducción* of Santa María de Huallaga (ibid., pp: 211-212). Missionary efforts among the Ucayali Kokamas thus proved abortive once again, leaving this large group of Upper Amazon TG speakers outside of missionary control and influence.

Even on the Huallaga, where Jesuit efforts had been most successful, missionary control proved tenuous. In 1664, many of the Kokamas and Kokamillas on the Huallaga revolted against the missionaries and the Spanish authorities, joined by the Panoan Chepeos. The resisting Kokamas killed a number of priests and attacked Spanish-friendly indigenous communities (ibid., p: 266), with hostilities between the Kokama-led forces and the Spanish and their indigenous allies continuing sporadically, peaking in major attack in 1666 in which a group of

8

Kokamas led by the Kokama leader Pacaya killed the missionary Figueroa, and then went on to attack Limpia Concepción de Jeberos, killing 41 Jeberos, and one Spanish soldier. Efforts by the *gobernador de Borja* to suppress the rebellion by force, including the execution of indigenous leaders (ibid., p: 227), were ineffective, and it was only in 1669, when the Jesuit Lorenzo Lucero intervened and sought a peaceful solution, that the rebellion ceased (ibid., p: 234).

In 1670, shortly after peace with the resisting Kokamas and their allies was achieved, Lucero founded Santiago de la Laguna (SLG) (ibid., p:252), a multiethnic *reducción* consisting of Kokamas, Kokamillas and the Panoan Chepeos, Gitipos, and Panos. It was only in 1670, then, that the first stable, major multiethnic *reducción* with a significant Kokama-Kokamilla population was formed. Significantly, Maroni ([1738]1988, p:107), writing about the distribution of indigenous groups in the Huallaga River basin in the 1730s, indicates that the Kokamillas lived three to four days upriver of SLG, suggesting that the majority of Kokamillas lived in Kokamilla-only settlements long after the establishment of SLG. Maroni also characterizes the Kokama residents of SLG as having come from the Ucayali (presumably descendants of the group that relocated with Majano), further suggesting that the Kokamilla population (which would be from the Huallaga) in the *reducción* was small.

The Kokama and Kokamilla population of SLG is somewhat difficult to estimate, since only total population figures are given in contemporary sources, conflating the Kokama and Kokamilla populations with the apparently more numerous Panoan populations. In addition, the total population of SLG appears to have fluctuated signficantly, due in part to epidemics that ravaged its population. Maroni (ibid, p:222) indicates that when founded the population included 1600 Kokamas and Panoan Chepeos, while Chantre (1901, p:252) indicates that the total population eventually reached 4,000. This latter figure might be exaggerated, however, since Maroni ([1738]1988, p:222) gives a total population of 1,072 in 1738, and Veigl (1788, p:120) gives a total of 1,500 in the 1760s. These figures suggest that the total population of Kokamas and Kokamillas in SLG fluctuated between several hundred and, at most, a couple of thousand individuals.

Significantly, the Kokamas who remained on the Ucayali were never made to settle in stable *reducciones* at any point prior to the Jesuit expulsion in 1767-8, meaning that the majority of Kokamas never lived in a *reducción* during the Jesuit period. Their resistance to Jesuit control is attested to by the fact that when Lucero asked the Kokamas who had relocated to SLG about inducing their Ucayali brethren to join the Huallaga missions, the Huallaga Kokamas instead suggested bringing Panoan peoples from the Ucayali (ibid., 250), which he succeeded in doing (ibid. 251). Myers (1974) estimates that due to a series of epidemics, the Kokama population on the Ucayali was reduced by 70% during the Jesuit period, suggesting that if we take Cujía's estimate as accurate, the Ucayali Kokama population was approximately 3,000-3,500 by the end of the Jesuit period.

The Kokama/Kokamilla population in the multiethnic *reducción* of SLG was thus a relatively small group in comparison to the Ucayali Kokamas, who were not stably settled in *reducciones*, and in comparison to the main body of Kokamillas on the Huallaga, who lived in single-ethnicity *reducciones* further upriver.

FIGURE 2

3.2 Interaction between European missionaries and Omaguas

Missionary interactions with the Omaguas began with an expedition led by the Jesuits Simón de Rojas and Umberto Coronado to the Upper Napo River in 1620. The expedition spent almost a year with the Omaguas of the Aguarico River area, and by virtue of a bilingual Quechua-Omagua translator, produced a number of ecclesiastical texts in Omagua, including a catechism (Maroni [1738]1988, p: 215-216). Despite the success of the expedition, subsequent missionary work with the Napo Omaguas was sporadic (Maroni [1738]1988, p: 217), and Jesuit relationships with Aguarico Omaguas crumbled in the wake of the 1637 rebellion of the Tukanoan peoples of the Upper Napo. In response, the Spanish authorities attempted to resettle the Aguarico Omaguas further upriver, only causing these Omaguas to rebel and kill the local government representative (Newson 1995, p.: 328). Most of these Omaguas relocated downriver to the Tiputini River, and out of Spanish control (Maroni [1738]1988, p: 220). Other than a mention of some of the Tiputini Omaguas eventually resettling in San Joaquín de Omaguas IV (Uriarte [1776]1986, p.: 225; Grohs 1974, p: 80), there is no record of further important contacts between the Jesuits and the Upper Napo Omaguas.

The next significant encounter between missionaries and the Omaguas arose from Laureano de la Cruz's expedition down the Napo and to the Amazon proper in 1647-9, during which he and his companions lived with the Amazon Omaguas for 17 months and explored Omagua territory and that of the adjacent Aisuaris and Yurimaguas (de la Cruz [1651]1900). De la Cruz's account is invaluable for its insight into Omagua society at the time, but did not directly lead to any sustained relationship with the Amazon Omaguas.

The proximal reason for the eventual establishment of amicable relations between the Jesuits and the Amazon Omaguas was an outbreak of smallpox in 1680 in Santiago de la Laguna (SLG), which led most of the Kokamas of the *reducción* to seek refuge with the Amazon Omaguas (Maroni [1738]1988, pp: 308-309). By this time, the Amazon Omaguas were already suffering from Portuguese slaving raids, and the visiting Kokamas' description of Lucero and his activities inspired the Omaguas to make contact with Lucero in an effort to enlist Jesuit aid against the Portuguese raids. Lucero returned with the visiting Omaguas to their communities, where he was apparently well received, and subsequent to his visit, the Omaguas sent several embassies seeking the immediate presence of a missionary (Maroni ([1738]1988, pp: 225-226).

It was not until 1686 that the Jesuits were able to send a missionary, Samuel Fritz, to the Amazon Omaguas, thereby establishing a relationship between the Jesuits and Omaguas that endured until the Jesuits expulsion in 1767-8. According to Jesuit accounts, the Omaguas received Fritz with great enthusiasm, and during the first three years of his work with the Omaguas he is reported to have 'founded' 40 settlements in Amazon Omagua territory, from the mouth of the Napo River to some distance downriver of the Juruá River. It seems clear that most (and perhaps all) of these were extant Omagua settlements, located on islands, to which Fritz gave his ecclesiastical approval. He chose one community located near the Ampiyacu River as the base for his evangelical work in the region, and christened it San Joaquín de Omaguas (I).[5] Building on his successes with the Omaguas, he extended his reach to the neighboring

---

5   The name 'San Joaquín de Omaguas' (SJQ) served to designate severals settlements that sequentially served as the principal base of Jesuit operations among the Omaguas. In order to disambiguate the various settlements, I append roman numerals to indicate the iteration of the settlement in question.

Yurimaguas and Aisuaris,[6] founding Nuestra Señora de las Nieves as a Yurimagua *reducción* in 1687/1688.

In 1693, Fritz convinced the Omaguas in three major settlements, San Joaquín de Omaguas (SJQ), Yoaiveté, and Ameiuaté, to give up their insular communities and found new settlements on the nearby banks of the Amazon proper. SJQ (II) was relocated to the mouth of the Ampiyacu River in the traditional territory of the Caumaris, a Peba-Yaguan people (Maroni [1738]1988, p: 335), and Fritz indicated that a "few families" of Pebas joined this settlement. Fritz indicates that these new settlements slowly grew as Omaguas from other insular settlements relocated to them (ibid., p: 335), but it seems clear that most Omaguas remained in their insular settlements.

Portuguese slave raids continued to increase in intensity, however, causing considerable turmoil in the Jesuit *reducciones* on the Amazon in the first decade of the 18th century. Intense Portuguese raids led a large number of Yurimaguas and Aisuaris to flee upriver to the comparative safety of Maynas in August 1700. These refugees stopped in SJQ for aid, but crucially did not join the *reducción*, subsequently settling a small distance downriver of the mouth of the Napo (ibid., pp: 335-343 *passim*, 346).

At the same time that Portuguese pressure on the Yurimaguas was increasing, the Omaguas in SJQ and neighboring settlements began to exhibit dissatisfaction with the Jesuits, first openly rebelling in 1697 (ibid, pp: 341). Fritz resorted to Spanish troops to quell the rebellion, but the Omaguas rebelled again in 1701, this time joining forces with the Caumaris and Pebas. Fritz again called in Spanish troops and succeeded in capturing Payoreva, the Omagua leader of the rebellion. Payoreva subsequently escaped, however, and returning to SJQ in 1702, convinced most of its residents to abandon the settlement for downriver Omagua communities.

In 1704 Fritz was named Superior and relocated to SLG, and was replaced in SJQ by Giovanni Battista Sanna, who succeeded in convincing the previous residents of SJQ to return to the *reducción*. Sanna also founded San Josef, a Caumari *reducción*, nearby (ibid., p: 352). This event is significant in that this is the first known instance of a non-Omagua population of any significant size even being located near an Omagua one by the Jesuits. Note, crucially, that the Jesuits specifically created a separate *reducción* for the Caumaris, rather than settling them with the Omaguas in SJQ.

Towards the end of that decade, Portuguese raids began to penetrate even further up the Amazon (ibid., p: 354), including a major raid of the downriver Omagua communities in 1708 (ibid., p: 355). In 1709 a Portuguese troop penetrated as far as the Yurimagua settlement near the mouth of Napo, capturing a large number of the residents, and delivering a message to the Jesuits that they were to quit the Amazon and Napo entirely (ibid., pp: 356-357). Fritz responded with a group of Spanish troops, and chased the Portuguese troops down the Amazon, managing to recapture most of the Yurimaguas. During this expedition Fritz also encountered Omaguas that had been induced to relocate from four different Omagua settlements to the Omagua settlement of Zuruité by Antonio Andrade, a lay priest allied with the Portuguese (ibid. 359). In response to this ecclesiastical encroachment, Fritz returned to SJQ with a large number of Omaguas from

---

6   Nothing is known about the ethnolinguistic identity of the Yurimaguas and Aisuaris, althouth Fritz (Maroni [1738]1988: 336) comments that the Yurimaguas' language was distinct from that of the Omaguas. Another comment (Maroni [1738]1988: 314) indicates that the Yurimaguas and Aisuaris spoke distinct languages, but were culturally similar.

downriver Omagua settlements.

There are two points worth noting with respect to the demographic and political turmoil in question. First, the demographic instability of the period involved movements of Omaguas between Omagua settlements, and not the formation of multiethnic settlements. Second, it is clear that some Omaguas were swayed by Carmelite clerics allied with the Portuguese, leading them to settle in communities outside the Jesuit sphere of influence in Maynas.

In 1710 the Portuguese responded with a much larger number of troops, leading Sanna to attempt to relocate the populations of SJQ and the neighboring *reducción* of San Pablo to the safer location of Yarapa, on the lower Ucayali. However, the Portuguese arrived in the midst of this relocation, killing many Omaguas, and capturing others, as well as taking Sanna prisoner (ibid. 361-362). With Sanna's capture, the Jesuit evangelical effort among the Omaguas foundered, and the Jesuits were not able to re-establish a stable presence among the Omaguas, in much reduced form, until 1723.

It is clear that in the wake of the collapse of the Jesuit presence on the Amazon, the Omaguas and Yurimaguas were scattered in small groups, with many taking refuge in the Yarapa area, on the lower Ucayali (ibid., p: 362-363). Fritz mentions an Omagua settlement, Copaca, in Portuguese territory (ibid., p: 365), and Maroni ([1738]1988, p: 421) similarly mentions five Omagua settlements taken over by Carmelites. Although it appears clear that the Omagua survivors were dispersed over much of their former range, many presumably taking refuge in areas away from the main river, they clearly did not inhabit multiethnic *reducciones* in this period.

In October 1715, the Jesuits attempted to resume evangelical work among the Omaguas, sending Juan de Zaldarriaga to form a new Omagua *reducción* on the lower Ucayali. This effort failed when de Zaldarriaga died in April 1716 (ibid., p: 365). Another effort was made in May 1719, when Luis Coronado was sent to the same area. Coronado moved them to a new settlement on the Amazon River, upriver of the mouth of the Nanay River, but Coronado died soon thereafter, in March 1721 (ibid., p: 365). The Jesuits finally succeeded in re-establishing themselves among the Omaguas in July 1723, when Bernard Zurmühlen and Johannes Baptist Julian arrived to found a new *reducción*, SJQ III (ibid., p: 371). Zurmühlen remained with the Omaguas until 1726, and in 1724 or 1725 he relocated the *reducción* half a day's travel upriver, at the suggestion of the Omaguas themselves, founding SJQ IV (ibid., p: p. 371).

The foundation of SJQ IV initiated a period that endured until the Jesuit expulsion in 1767-8 in which this *reducción* was not only stable, but became the principal center for missionary activity in the lowland regions of Maynas. It was also at this relatively late date that SJQ became a multiethnic *reducción*. From the mid-1720s on, the Jesuits encouraged individuals from an assortment of neighboring indigenous peoples to settle in SJQ IV, including the Peba-Yaguan Yameos, the Zaparoan Iquitos, and the Panoan Mayorunas (ibid., p: 372). However, as discussed in §6, there is no indication that the Omaguas were ever a minority group in SJQ IV.

In summary, it is clear that the Jesuit *reducciones* among the Amazon Omaguas remained essentially single ethnicity *reducciones* until the mid-1720s. Even the great turmoil 1710s did not apparently lead to multiethnic settlements of refugees, but rather movement between established Omagua communities, or movement by non-Omagua groups, like the Yurimaguas, to new *reducciones* distinct from the Omagua ones.

4. *Lenguas generales* in the *provincia de Maynas*

As described in §1.1, Cabral's articulation of the RGH places a great deal of weight on the idea that Omagua served as an 'official' *lengua general,* or lingua franca*,* in the *provincia de Maynas*. Cabral's position regarding the role of the official status of Omagua in the development of the contact variety is illustrated by the following passage (see also Cabral 1995, pp: 246-247, 255, 258, 294-295, 305, 307-308):

> Most members of different Indian groups, and sometimes entire fractions of ethnically distinct Indian tribes gave up their original language in favor of a more prevalent native language, the Kokama/Omagua language, as it became the official language in the Provinicia de Maynas. (Cabral 1995, pp: 250)

Cabral (2007, p: 371) repeats this claim when she characterizes "Kokama/Omagua" as "the main language used in the evangelizing process of the natives of the Provincia de Maynas."

However, a careful examination of historical documents regarding missionary activity in Maynas reveals little evidence that Omagua served as a *lengua general* or the principal language used in evangelization. On the contrary, there is abundant evidence that it was Quechua, and not Omagua, that the Jesuits attempted to promote as a *lengua general,* where we understand the term *lengua general* to refer to a language given a priveleged position for communication between the Jesuits and their indigenous converts, and as a medium of interethnic communication.

The following passage, which follows Maroni's ([1738]1988, pp: 168-169) discussion of the challenges posed by the linguistic diversity in Maynas articulates the role of Quechua in the Jesuit project there:

> Because of this [i.e. the linguistic diversity in Maynas], our missionaries, since the founding of these missions, have specifically resolved to introduce in the *reducciones* that they have been starting the Inga language, the general [language] of Peru, which is spoken in the *provincias* of Cuzco, and which is the richest and most expressive of the various that are used in South America. Since they already found the beginnings of [the use of] this language in the city of Borja and the *provincia de los Maynas,* where the Spanish who participated in the conquest [of the area] had been introducing it, it was not very difficult to extend it to the other *reducciones* which were in contact with those of the Maynas. (translation mine)

Likewise, Chantre y Herrera's (1901, p: 637) description of the general conduct of masses in the Maynas missions characterizes them as carried out "in the Inga language, or in the specific language of the nation [i.e. people]." (see also D'Etre 1942, p: 33). Similarly, when the Jesuits introduced western musical traditions in the missions, the songs, meant for use all across the diverse missionized groups, were composed in Quechua (ibid., pp: 651, 654).

Grammatical and lexical resources on Quechua were available in Quito, where many of the Jesuit missionaries prepared for their evangelical work, with many of them learning Quechua there, or in their mission sites. Guillaume D'Être, for example, wrote, regarding his early

language learning:

> I arrived at this mission [Santiago de la Laguna] in the year 1706 and my first duty was to learn the **Inga** language, which is widespread throughout all these nations. (D'Être 1942, p: 31; translation mine, emphasis in original)

The teaching of Quechua also played a central role in Jesuit education efforts directed towards young indigenous peoples, as evident in the following passage, describing the missionary activity of de Cujía in the town of Borja:

> And wanting to participate also in the conversion of the heathens in a very useful manner, and no less effectively than his companions, he 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 ... (Chantre y Herrera 1901: p. 139; translation mine)

This practice was not restricted to Borja, which mainly attracted Cahuapanan, Jivaroan, and Candoshian peoples. Similar efforts were reported among the Tukanoan peoples of the Napo (ibid., p: 391, 420), the Iquitos of the Nanay (ibid., p: 489), the Omaguas of SJQ IV (Maroni [1738]1988: 372), and among the Peba-Yaguan peoples of the Ampiyacu area. In the latter case, Chantre y Herrera reports, regarding the efforts of José Casado, that:

> ...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 between themselves. (Chantre y Herrera 1901, p: 472-473; translation mine)

The Jesuits even chose to teach Quechua as the *lengua general* (ibid, p: 294) to the Panoan Cunivos of the Ucayali, despite their living in proximity to the Kokamas of the region.

The active promotion of Quechua by the Jesuits is also suggested by the observation by French explorer Paul Marcoy regarding a group of Kokamas that he encountered in 1847 a little upriver of San Pablo de Olivença (in modern-day Brazil). Marcoy (1873, vol. IV, p: 397) remarked that these Kokamas spoke to him in Quechua, "which had been taught their grandfathers by the missionaries," a clear reference to the Jesuits of the 18th century.

In fact, the only passage that I have been able to locate that supports the Jesuits' promotion of Omagua as a tool for evangelization is the following observation by Maroni regarding missionary activity among the Peba-Yaguan Yameos and Caumaris during the 1730s:

Even greater is the difficulty that they are experiencing in introducing the language of the Inga in the new *reducciones* that are presently forming [i.e. in the 1730s], due to the limited experience that these Indians have with this language. In these *reducciones*, principally in those of the Yameos and Caumaris, it appears it is easier to introduce the language of the Omaguas than that of the Inga, not only because it is easier and less guttural than others of the Marañón, but also because the *reducción* of San Joaquín is now the head and seminary of the new nations and the kingdom from which the new conquests depart. (Maroni [1738]1988. pp: 168-169; translation mine)

This passage provides scant support for the widespread adoption of Omagua by non-Omaguas, however. First, this passage discusses missionary activity in 1730s, following the successful refounding of SJQ (IV) in ~1724, when SJQ served as a base for missionary activity directed at non-Omagua groups, as Maroni indicates in the final sentence of the passage. This is late in the Jesuit period in Maynas, and several decades after the point at which Cabral (1995) estimated Omagua and Kokama have appeared in their contact-affected forms. Second, it is clear from this passage that the use of Omagua as a *lengua general*, instead of Quechua, is unusual, and is a response to the fact that the Yameos and Caumaris have less experience with Quechua than other groups the Jesuits missionized. This supports the claim here that Quechua, and not Omagua, was usually the *lengua general* promoted by the Jesuits in Maynas, and that this unusual use of Omagua was limited to these Peba-Yaguan peoples.

In summary, there is very little evidence in the historical literature to support the conclusion that Omagua served as a *lengua general* in the *provincia de Maynas*, but abundant evidence that Quechua did. Moreover, Quechua served this function in the multi-ethnic *reducciones* with Omagua and Kokama populations, as well as more broadly in the Maynas missions. In this regard it is perhaps significant that although Cabral (1995, 2007) asserts at multiple points that Omagua served a *lengua general* in Maynas, she does not cite specific passages in the historical records to support this claim.

5. Ethnic mixing in the Jesuit *reducciones*

The second critical component of the RGH, as articulated by Cabral (1995) and sketched in §1.1, was that the Jesuit *reducciones* in which the Omaguas settled were of a multiethnic character at a sufficiently early point in their history for the emergence of Omagua in Jesuit period. On this account, the demographic characteristics of these mixed ethnicity communities promoted the development of the Omagua/Kokama contact variety. We first consider the Cabral's position on ethnic mixing in the relevant *reducciones*.

Cabral argues that ethnic mixing was a widespread and general process during the Jesuit period in Maynas, as evident in the following passage:

Although missionary villages were created from specific Indian villages, they were often transferred from one place to another for different reasons, such as epidemic waves, ecological conditions, white persecutions, among others. This mobility led to the mixing of members of different ethnic groups throughout the entire missionary period. (Cabral 1995, p: 247)

With respect to the Kokama and Omagua *reducciones* in particular, Cabral (1995, pp: 246-247) observes that:

> The Kokama/Omagua *reducciónes* were the first (as well as the main) missionary villages created by Spanish missionaries in the area. For a a variety of reasons different ethnic groups had to move away from their *reducciones* to the Kokama/Omagua ones, and in most of the cases they gave up their languages in favor of the Kokama/Omagua language.

Historical records clearly indicate a number of multiethnic *reducciones*, but it is significant that indigenous peoples apparently showed significant resistance to settling in multiethnic *reducciones*, as noted in the following passage, where he attributes this resistance to fears related to witchcraft and inter-ethnic violence (see also Jouanen 1943, p: 464):

> It was not possible for the missionaries to gather together from the outset these nations into a single settlement as they [i.e. the missionaries] wanted, because they discovered, unsurprisingly, the tremendous opposition to mixing one [nation] with the others, and gave up their plans. ... The concern [i.e. about living with other indigenous peoples] arising from the fact that no-one dies a natural death, but rather due to witchcraft or violence, was here, as in many other instances, the reason for not wanting to join with others and live exposed to the continuous threats that this represented. (Chantre y Herrera 1901, pp 142; translation mine)

Even in cases where multiethnic *reducciones* were successfully formed, however, it is evident that indigenous groups maintained distinct social networks and identities, as the following observations about SLG make clear:

> It is quite striking the scrupulous separation that the Cocama and Cocamilla Indians, themselves united, observe with respect to the Pano Indians, and these reciprocally of them, without mixing themselves in church, let alone in habitations, to such degree that neither the Cocamas or Cocamillas take as wives the daughters of the Panos, nor these of them [i.e. of the Cocamas or Cocamillas]. (de Escobar y Mendoza [1769]1908, pp: 44, cited in Chaumeil 1988, pp: 31-32)[7]

In fact, the first multiethnic *reducción* with a significant Omagua population of which we are aware is SJQ IV, founded in ~1724, well after the date that Cabral posits for the emergence of the Omagua-Kokama contact variety.

And despite Cabral's frequent references to ethnic mixing, the two pieces of evidence she cites to support instances of ethnic mixing prior to the foundation of SJQ IV are both problematic. The first is her discussion of Fritz's foundation of SJQ II, Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, and San Pablo, which involved moving insular Omagua communities to the adjacent river banks. It appears that Cabral (1995, pp: 247-248) interpreted these events as involving

---

7 Maroni ([1738]1988: 222) likewise observes that the Kokamas lived in a barrio separate from the Panoan residents of SLG.

members of other indigenous groups joining these new Omagua settlements, resulting in the formation of a multiethnic settlements.

A close reading of the original passage from Fritz diary, presented below, however, yields only the mention of a "few families" of Pebas who joined SJQ II, and no evidence that any significant number of non-Omagua peoples joining any of the other new Omagua settlements.

> I relocated San Joachim [sic] to the land of the Caumaris, next to the river, to a high site suited for the church and dwellings. To this settlement, in addition to the Omaguas, have been added a few families of the nation of the Pebas ... In the same manner, the Omaguas of Yoaivaté have moved to the land of the Mayorunas, and those of Ameiuaté to the land of the Curinas, founding two new villages under the patronage, one of Nuestra Señora de Guadalupe, and the other of San Pablo. To these two villages, as well as to San Joachim, the Indians who live on different islands are moving, so that they can be indoctrinated with greater ease when there are missionaries available to attend to them. (Translation mine; Maroni [1738]1988, p: 335; translation mine)

Cabral's interpretation of ethnic mixing in these *reducciones* may have resulted from her construal of the expression "the Indians who live on different islands" as referring to non-Omagua groups. However, it is clear that the islands in question were the exclusive territory of the Omaguas (Grohs 1974, pp: 75-76), so that the movements in question should be understood as the movement of Omaguas from insular settlements to the *terra firme reducciones*. Moreover, since Fritz is quite explicit about the minor ethnic mixing involving the Peba families joining SJQ II, it seems unlikely that he simply failed to mention other instances of ethnic mixing.

The second concrete instance of ethnic mixing that Cabral (1995, p: 248) cites involves the Yurimaguas and Aisuaris, who she claims joined extant Omagua *reducciones* when they fled from the Portuguese slave raids in 1700. As discussed in §3.2, however, it is clear that the Yurimaguas and Aisuaris stayed in SJQ relatively briefly, and formed an independent settlement as soon as possible.

In short, there is no evidence that the Omagua *reducciones* were in any significant sense multiethnic until the mid 1720s, following the foundation of SJQ IV. We return to the issue of the ethnic composition of this *reducción* below.

In closing our discussion of multiethnic *reducciones* it is important not to forget SLG, founded in 1670 with a population of Kokamas, Kokamillas, and a mixture of Panoan peoples (see §3.1). The possible role of this *reducción* in the genesis of the putative Kokama-Omagua contact variety is discussed in the next section.

6. Creole genesis and the RGH.

In this section I critically examine the abrupt creole genesis account associated with the RGH, focusing on three related issues: 1) discrepancies between the demographic facts presupposed by the RGH language contact scenario and our knowledge of the demographics of SJQ IV; 2) questions about the plausibility of the RGH language shift scenario in light of those demographic facts; and 3) an early attestation of Kokama that raises serious temporal difficulties for the

putative creole genesis account.

The RGH language contact and shift scenario is usefully summarized in the following passage:

> ...[T]he Kokama language is a kind of contact language that emerged in a multilingual context when speakers of different languages need a common medium for communication. The Tupí-Guaraní language spoken by the Kokama/Omaguas had the status of an official language in these social settings, and the non-Tupian speakers had to learn it rapidly, albeit failing to learn the Tupí-Guaraní language as a whole. The Tupí-Guaraní speakers presumably did not outnumber the non-Tupían speakers, at least not by the time that Kokama/Omagua stated developing towards a distinct linguistic entity. The children born in these missionary villages learned the new version of the Kokama/Omagua languages as their first language. The original Tupí-Guaraní language disappeared, as its speakers adopted the new version of the Kokama/Omagua language. (Cabral 1995, pp: 309-310)

Cabral (1995, p: 295) also invokes elsewhere the importance of "changes in native social structure (marriages between members of distinct ethnic groups, individual economic production)" in facilitating the language contact and shift process proposed by the RGH.

I first discuss the available evidence regarding the demographics of SJQ IV, which does not support the claim that Omaguas were a minority in this multiethnic *reducción*. As discussed in §3.2, by the 1730s, a significant number of Yameos, Iquitos, and Mayorunas had settled in SJQ IV. Fortunately, colonial records provide indications regarding the ethnic composition of the *reducción*, which were analyzed by Grohs (1974). This work indicates that the Omaguas were an absolute majority, even when this *reducción* was thoroughly multiethnic in character. Based on a number of historical sources, Grohs (1974, p: 78) indicates that of 360 inhabitants in 1732, 200 were Omaguas (= 55% of the total), and of ~600 inhabitants in 1735, 76 families were Omaguas (= 380 individuals, at 5 individuals per family, = 63%; = 304 individuals at 4 individuals per family, = 51%).[8]

It is plausible that these absolute figures may not tell the entire story, of course, because of the effects of inter-ethnic marriage, as suggested by Cabral. However, with respect to the specific issue of inter-ethnic marriages involving Omaguas, Paul Marcoy indicates that as late as 1847 he found Omaguas in the former Portuguese mission settlement of San Pablo de Olivença (located in Brazil), considering only Kokamas as suitable marriage partners, deprecating marriage with other indigenous groups such as the Yuris, Tikunas, and Mayorunas (Marcoy 1873, p: 401). In short, it seems that Omaguas did not embrace marriage with speakers of significantly different languages. The available evidence suggests, then, that Omaguas remained numerically superior and did not engage in significant intermarriage with any group other than Kokamas.

---

8   A reviewer suggests that an estimate of 8-10 individuals per family might be more realistic, based on the fact that 'families' among Amazonian indigenous are probably best understood as extended families, rather than nuclear ones. This is a reasonable observation, but unfortunately we have no clear idea what the Jesuit authors who reported these figures meant by the term 'family'. Clearly, the larger the number of individuals per family, the larger the Omagua percentage of the population of the *reducción* would have been, making an estimate of 4-5 individuals per family a conservative one.

These demographic facts raise serious doubts about the plausibility of the creole genesis account at the heart of the RGH. The process of imperfect learning of a given target language, to which creole genesis is often attributed, normally entails that full acquisition of the target language is impeded by limited access to that language, typically because of the small number of native speakers of that language with which learners have contact, or due to the restricted types of interactional contexts in which such contact takes place (Arends 1995). However, the non-Omagua residents of SJQ would presumably have had ample exposure to Omagua once they settled in the *reducción*. The Omaguas formed at least half of the population of SJQ IV, and living together in the relative close quarters of a mission settlement of fewer than 500 people, one would imagine that the Omagua and non-Omagua residents of the *reducción* would have interacted frequently, and in a variety of social contexts. There is no reason to believe, in short, that the non-Omagua residents of SJQ IV had limited access to Omagua. Moreover, it is not even clear to what degree adult non-Omaguas made significant efforts to learn Omagua; as late as 1756, Manuel Uriarte ([1776]1986, p: 225) indicates that apart from learning Omagua to communicate with the residents of SJQ IV, it was necessary to learn Mayoruna and Yameo to speak to the adults from these groups resident in SJQ.

Of course, it is certainly plausible that non-Omaguas who settled in SJQ IV as adults and attempted to learn Omagua did not attain full fluency in the language, but there is no clear reason why their children would have failed to acquire Omagua fluently from the Omagua majority in the settlement, and instead acquired the imperfectly-learned – and indeed, according to the RGH, the radically restructured – Omagua of their parents. Even harder to explain is why ethnically Omagua children would have acquired this hypothetically radically restructured Omagua instead of the Omagua of their parents, as required by the RGH. There is no reason to believe, in particular, that the hypothetical radically restructured Omagua would have been more prestigious or more widely used than Omagua proper. In short, given the known demographic facts relating to SJQ IV and established theories of creole genesis, there is little reason to suspect that this *reducción* would be an auspicious site for either the development of a creole or for its subsequent adoption by ethnic Omaguas.

The final matter I discuss in this section is an early attestation of Kokama, and the difficulties it poses for the RGH, and in particular, the implausibly rapid process of creole genesis that it requires. The earliest known attestation of either Omagua or Kokama whose date can be unambiguously fixed is a quotation of a Kokama utterance in a letter written by Lucero in Santiago de La Laguna (SLG), and dated June 3, 1681. Lucero includes this quotation in a passage in which he describes the flight of the Kokamas living there during the smallpox epidemic of 1680, mentioned in §3.1. As the Kokamas depart, he quotes them as saying:

> *Caquire tanu papa, Caquere ura Dios icatotanare*, which means: Stay with God, courageous man, and may he give you long life. (Maroni [1738]1988 p: 224; translation mine)

Crucially, this sentence is virtually identical to modern Kokama, and can be easily segmented and glossed, as in (1).

(1)   *kakɨrɨ tanu   papa, kakɨrɨ ura   Dios   ikatu-ta   n=ari*

19

<div align="center">
live   1pl   father live   3sg   God   be.good-CAUS 2sg=PROG

'Live, our father, live; and may God make you well.' (translation mine)
</div>

Crucially, this sentence includes several characteristics that Cabral identifies as features that distinguish Kokama from the hypothetical TG precursor language, including the non-TG first person plural pronoun *tanu,* the third person pronoun *ura,* and the causative suffix *-ta.*[9] Other traits shared with modern Kokama include the progressive suffix *=ari* (Vallejos 2010). In fact, this sentence would be perfectly intelligible to speakers of modern Kokama.

This latter fact, coupled with the fact that this utterance can be reliably dated to 1680 poses significant difficulties for the RGH, since it was produced only 10 years after the foundation of SLG, the first and – as far as we know – only, multiethnic *reducción* with a significant Kokama population. If we seek to defend the RGH we would be forced to argue that the abrupt creole emerged in a stable form very similar to the modern language in ten years at most. The more plausible conclusion is that Kokama already exhibited the non-TG characteristics identified by Cabral, and shared by modern Kokama, by the time that SLG was founded in 1670.

7. Geography and the *Reducción* Genesis Hypothesis

I now turn to geographic considerations that present difficulties for the RGH. In particular, I argue that the fact that only a minority of Kokamas and Omaguas lived in multiethnic *reducciones*, coupled with the wide geographic distribution of the Omagua and Kokama populations, poses significant problems for any account of the genesis of these two languages that assumes that the *reducciones* were the sites in which these languages emerged.

As summarized in §3, we have evidence of only two multiethnic Jesuit *reducciones* in Maynas that involved significant numbers of Kokamas or Omaguas: SLG, founded in 1670 and inhabited by Kokamas who migrated from the Ucayali River, and Kokamillas from the Huallaga River; and SJQ IV, founded in 1724/5 and inhabited principally by Omaguas from the Amazon River region. SLG and SJQ IV were, however, home only to minorities of the total Kokama and Omagua populations respectively. As described in §3.1, the majority of the Ucayali Kokamas were never settled by the Jesuits in any *reducciones* whatsoever, and there is evidence that Huallaga Kokamillas lived in significant numbers in locations other than SLG. Likewise, SJQ IV was inhabited by 200-400 Omaguas (see §6), out of an ethnic population which, even after the ravages of the late 17th and early 18th century, numbered several thousand (D'Etre 1942, p. 33).

Even if we grant, for the purposes of argument, that the TG precursor language experienced rapid creolization in SLG and SJQ IV, however, there is little reason to believe that the same creolization process took place in the Kokama and Omagua populations outside of the *reducciones*, since the forces to which the RGH attributes the formation of Kokama/Omagua, namely ethnic mixing and the promotion of Kokama/Omagua as *lenguas generales*, would have had little impact on non-*reducción* populations. Rapid creolization in the *reducciones* would thus have resulted in only the relatively small *reducción* populations speaking the TG-lexified abrupt

---

9   A reviewer notes that in most TG languages one would expect the verb in the imperative to bear a person prefix; as mentioned briefly in §2, the genesis of Proto-Omagua-Kokama involved the loss of the typical TG person prefixes, except where they remain frozen as parts of roots.

creole, with the considerably larger non-*reducción* populations retaining the TG precursor language. Given that the putative TG precursor language did not survive into the modern period, and indeed, is not even mentioned in the colonial period, defense of the RGH would require positing a process by which the TG-lexified abrupt creole spread swiftly from the *reducciones* and wholly supplanted the TG precursor language in the more numerous non-*reducción* populations. Recall, however, that these latter populations were generally located hundreds of kilometers from the *reducciones*, in the case of the Ucayali Kokamas and the Omaguas in Portuguese-controlled territory, with little or no direct contact between the *reducción* and non-*reducción* populations due to hostility towards the Jesuits, either on the part of the indigenous peoples themselves, in the case of the Ucayali Kokamas, or the Portuguese, in the case of the Omaguas living in Portuguese-controlled territory. In addition to the lack of a sociolinguistic vector connecting the *reducción* and non-*reducción* populations, there is no clear reason why contact between these two populations would result in the complete replacement of the TG precursor by its creolized descendant in the non-*reducción* populations. In short, identifying the *reducciones* as sites for the genesis of Omagua and Kokama is difficult to reconcile with the geographical distribution of Omagua and Kokama populations during the Jesuit period, without positing sociolinguistically implausible mechanisms of language spread and shift.

Another set of difficulties for the RGH is posed by the significant similarity of Kokama and Omagua, despite the geographical separation of SLG and SJQ IV, and their different multiethnic make-ups. As evident in Fig. 1, the Omaguas and Kokamas were geographically separated, as were the two major subgroups of each ethnicity, the Napo and Amazon Omaguas, and the Ucayali Kokamas and Huallaga Kokamillas. If we posit, contra the RGH, that Kokama and Omagua are descendants of an ancestral Pre-Columbian language, Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK), the fact that colonial era Omagua and Kokama were similar, but not wholly identical, and spoken in geographically non-contiguous regions is easily explained: the two languages and their dialects simply diverged as the groups spread along the major rivers of the upper Amazon region, subsequent to the Pre-Columbian genesis of POK. The RGH, in contrast, must explain why Kokama, which according to the RGH would have arisen in SLG, and Omagua, which would have independently arisen in SJQ IV, were so similar, despite the different ethnic compositions of the two *reducciones,* and the fact that they are approximately 400 kms apart (riverine distance; ~270 kilometers, straight-line distance, see Fig. 2), and were separated by travel times of well over a week during the Jesuit era. The two *reducciones* were clearly distinct speech communities with distinct circumstances of language contact: Kokamas, Xitipos (Panoan), and Pano (Panoan) in SLG, and Omagua, Yameo (Peba-Yaguan), Iquito (Zaparoan), and Mayoruna (Panoan) in SJQ IV. There is simply no reason to believe that abrupt creole genesis, were it to occur in both *reducciones*, would have produced such similar contact varieties.

8. Jesuit linguistics in Maynas and the RGH

Another set of facts that cast doubt on the RGH is the discrepancy between the drastic language change and shift it entails, and the lack of any mention of any such change or shift by the Jesuits working in the *reducciones* at the time that these changes supposedly took place. Recall that the RGH posits that when the Jesuits arrived in Maynas, Omaguas and Kokamas were speaking a TG language that the adults of other indigenous groups living in the Jesuit *reducciones*

subsequently acquired imperfectly, resulting in a massively-restructured but unstable version of the original TG language. On this view, Kokama/Omagua emerged when the children in these *reducciones* acquired and further restructured this unstable adult-acquired version. The RGH thus entails that in the 82-year period (1686-1768) in which the Jesuits lived and worked in the Omagua *reducciones*, the principal language would have gone from being a relatively typical TG language to one with a target TG lexicon, but with radically non-TG grammar, with an intermediate state in which both the TG precursor language and Kokama/Omagua were both in use.

Despite the striking nature of the language change and shift entailed by the RGH, there is no mention of any process like this in the Jesuit records of the era. This omission is especially significant given that linguistic work on the numerous languages of Maynas was a central preoccupation for the Jesuits, and as the following passage suggests, was a task carried with considerable sophistication and attention to detail:

> At first the fathers contented themselves with making grammatical observations and comments, filling many sheets of paper to lay out clearly 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 by measured steps, sweating and laboring, they eventually developed the grammars that came into use, by which one could clearly see the structure [lit. *artificio*] of the languages, since they identify 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 same way as on finds in other cultured languages. (Chantre y Herrera 1901, p: 92; translation mine)

Chantre y Herrera (ibid., p: 93) indicates that the Jesuits had created grammars and dictionaries for at least 20 languages in Maynas , including "... Omagua, which now has a grammar [lit. *arte*] and a large dictionary, and is one of the easiest to learn: sweet, soft, and harmonious" (ibid, p: 92; translation mine). Moreover, the Jesuits of South America displayed a significant interest in comparative linguistics;[10] indeed, the classification of the languages produced by the Jesuits of Maynas in the 18th century, as reported by Chantre y Herrera (ibid, p: 93) is identical in all significant respects to the modern classification of these languages.

With respect to Omagua and Kokama in particular, we know of at least three grammars and two dictionaries produced between approximately 1680 and 1730. None of these appear to have survived to the modern day, but Hervás y Panduro (1784, p: 271-272) mentions a grammar and dictionary of Kokama prepared by Lucero in approximately 1680, an Omagua grammar prepared by Fritz in approximately 1700, and a grammar and dictionary of Omagua prepared by Grebmer in approximately 1730. In addition, Veigl (1788, p:198-201) contains a grammatical sketch of Omagua, which is the only known grammatical description of Omagua surviving from this period. The Jesuits working with the Omaguas were also continuously involved in applying

---

10 Clark (1937), who discusses the correspondence between Hervás y Panduro and the Jesuit Camaño Bazán while the former was preparing his encyclopedic classification of the world's languages, provides an insight into Jesuit concerns with linguistic classification and, given the era, the sophistication they brought to the task.

their linguistic knowledge to proselytization and to the preparation of ecclesiastical texts, including catechisms and a variety of prayers. The preparation of such ecclesiastical texts began with the first Jesuits encounter with the Omaguas in 1620, continued with Fritz's work with the Omaguas in the 1690s, and through period in which SJQ IV was a multiethnic *reducción* (Michael and O'Hagan, in prep.).

In short, Jesuit linguistic description and ecclesiastical text preparation spanned the entirety of the Jesuit engagement with the Omaguas. It would be extremely surprising that with such close attention being paid to linguistic matters, that the process of radical linguistic change and shift required could have occurred utterly unremarked by the Jesuits working among the Omaguas and Kokamas. It is considerably more likely, I suggest, that Omagua and Kokama did not change appreciably during the Jesuit engagement with the Omagua and Kokama people. Since the Jesuit era Omagua ecclesiastical texts are so similar to modern Omagua (Michael and O'Hagan in prep.), and the sole Jesuit era attestation of Kokama (see §7) so similar to modern Kokama, I conclude that Omagua and Kokama were already in the heavily contact-affected form noted by Cabral prior to the arrival of the Jesuits in Maynas.

9. Discussion and Conclusion

In the preceding sections I have presented a set of converging arguments against the *Reducción* Genesis Hypothesis (RGH), i.e. the proposal that the intense language contact that restructured the grammar of Omagua and Kokama took place in the Jesuit *reducciones* of Maynas in the late 17th and early 18th century. Ruling out the RGH on the basis of these arguments, and assuming that Cabral (1995, 2007) was essentially correct in attributing the radical divergence of Omagua and Kokama from the typical TG grammatical profile to intense language contact, we are forced to conclude that the language contact events that gave rise to Proto-Omagua-Kokama (POK) in its heavily contact-affected form must have transpired prior to the arrival of the Jesuits in Maynas. Moreover, the geographical separation of the Napo and Amazon Omaguas and the Kokamas and Kokamillas, and the linguistic divergence of Omagua from Kokama bespeak a process of geographical spread and linguistic diversification that pushes the genesis of POK solidly into the Pre-Columbian period. In short, we are led to conclude that POK was a Pre-Columbian contact language.

This conclusion opens up a host of questions for future research regarding the language contact events from which POK emerged, ranging from the languages involved, to the sociolinguistic dynamics of contact, to the chronology of the contact events. The fact that the closest relative to the POK TG-precursor, Tupinambá, was spoken along the Brazilian coast, amidst a concentration of TG languages, suggests that the genesis of POK involved a rapid migration of speakers of the TG precursor from regions near, or on, the Brazilian coast to the upper Amazon. On the basis of the polychrome ceramic tradition associated with the Omaguas, Lathrap (1970:151-155) places Tupian arrival in the Upper Amazon at ~1200AD, suggesting that the radical restructuring of the grammar of the TG-precursor took place relatively swiftly. Indeed, the fact that 17th century Omagua and Kokama already exhibited features that distinguish the modern languages, and that they were geographically distant from each other, suggest that the two languages had already had ample time to begin to diverge from each other, placing the emergence of POK not much after the arrival of the speakers of the TG precursor

language in the Upper Amazon Basin. This relatively rapid emergence of POK, coupled with the fact that the rich riverine territory inhabited by the Omaguas and Kokamas when Europeans first encountered was unlikely to have been uninhabited when speakers of the TG precursor language arrived in the upper Amazon, suggest an intense process of intermixing with the original inhabitants of the region

Whether it will be possible to determine the sociohistorical circumstances of the genesis of POK and the non-TG languages involved remain open questions. Ongoing work on the reconstruction of POK (O'Hagan, Vallejos, and Michael, in prep.) will help clarify the precise ways in which the TG precursor – presumably a language similar to early colonial-era Tupinambá – was restructured under intense language contact, and hopefully yield further insight into these important questions. Rodrigues and Cabral (2012) argue for an Arawak substrate in Kokama/Omagua, but it may also be profitable to examine the possibility of borrowing from other language families in the region, especially the Peba-Yaguan and Zaparoan families, which were the immediate neighbors of the Omaguas when Europeans first encountered them. Combining these linguistic avenues of investigation with results from archeology and human genetics will hopefully yield a deeper understanding of these fascinating and important contact languages.

In closing, this paper has also sought to demonstrate a methodological point of broader relevance to the study of language contact: that an adequate understanding of the emergence of contact languages depends on the careful study of the sociohistorical circumstances in which they develop. Thomason and Kaufman (1988:212-213), among others, have compellingly argued that the outcomes of language contact are significantly shaped by the social relations between the speakers of the languages involved in the genesis of contact languages, and I have endeavored to show, by the close study of a particular language contact setting, that claims regarding the sociohistorical context of language contact require as much empirical support and analytical care as linguists are accustomed to providing for claims about linguistic structure, and that insufficient attention to such sociohistorical issues can lead to significant misapprehensions about how contact languages develop.

10. References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2002. Language Contact in Amazonia. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Arends, Jacques. 1995. The socio-historical background of creoles. In Jacques Arends, Pieter Muysken, and Norval Smith (eds.), *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*, pp. 15-24. Philadelphia: John Benjamins

Bakker, Peter and Robert Papen. 1997. Michíf. In Sarah Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: a wider perspective*, 365-426. Philadelphia John Benjamins.

Cabral, Ana Suelly. 1995. *Contact-induced language change in the Western Amazon: The non-genetic origin of the Kokama language*. University of Pittsburgh, PhD dissertation.

Cabral, Ana Suelly. 2007. New observations on the structure of Kokama/Omágwa. In Leo Wetzels (ed.), *Language Endangerment and Endangered Languages*, 365-379. Leiden: CNWS.

Cabral, Ana Suelly. 2011. Different histories, different results: The origin and development of two Amazonian languages. *Papia* 21(1): 9-22.

Castelnau, Francis. 1851. *Expédition dans les parties centrales de l'Amérique du Sud: de Rio de Janeiro à Lima, et de Lima au Para, Vol. 5*. Paris: Chez P. Bertrand.

Chantre y Herrera, José. 1901. *Historia de las misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el Marañón español (1637-1767)*. Madrid: Imprenta de A. Avrial.

Chaumeil, Jean Pierre. 1988. Introduction to *Noticias auténticas del famos río Marañon*, by Pablo Maroni, pp. 11-32. Iquitos: IIAP y CETA

Chousou-Polydouri, Natalia, Vivian Wauters, Zachary O'Hagan, Keith Bartolomei, and Lev Michael. In prep. A Bayesian phylogenetic internal classification of the Tupí-Guaraní family.

Clark, Charles Upson. 1937. Jesuit Letters to Hervás on American Languages and Customs. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 29(1): 97–145.

Denevan, William. 1992. *The Native population of the Americas in 1492*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

D'Être, Guillaume. [1731]1942. Carta del padre Guillermo D'Etre, misionero de la Compañía de Jesús, al padre Du Chambge, de la misma Compañía. In Juan B. Buendo Medina (ed.), *Cartas del Amazonas: Escritas por los misioneros de la Compañía de Jesús de 1705 a 1754*, pp. 31–43. Bogotá: Prensas de la Biblioteca Nacional.

Dietrich, Wolf. 1990. More Evidence for an Internal Classification of Tupí-Guaraní Languages. Berlin: Gebrüder Mann Verlag.

de la Cruz, Laureano. [1651]1900. Nuevo descubrimiento del río Marañon llamado de las Amazonas. Madrid: Biblioteca de la Irradiación.

Espinoza, Lucas. 1935. *Los tupís del oriente peruano: Estudio lingüístico y etnográfico*. Madrid: Imprenta de Librería y Casa Editorial Hernando S. A.

Espinosa Pérez, Lucas. 1989. *Breve diccionario analítico castellano-tupí del Perú: Sección cocama*. Iquitos: IIAP y CETA.

Faust, Norma. 1959. Vocabulario breve del idioma cocama (tupi). *Perú Indígena* 8: 150-158.

Faust, Norma. 1971. Cocama clause types. In David Bendor-Samuel (ed.), *Tupi studies 1*, 73-105. Norman: Summer Institute of Linguistics of the University of Oklahoma.

Faust, Norma. 1972. Gramática Cocama: Lecciones para el aprendizaje del idioma cocama. Lima: Ministerio de Educación y Instituto Lingüístico de Verano.

Figueroa, Francisco. 1904. Relación de las Misiones de la Compañía de Jesús en el país de los Maynas. Madrid: V. Suárez.

Gilij, Filippo Salvatore. [1781] 1992. *Ensayo de historia americana*, Volume 3. Caracas: Petróleos de Venezuela.

Grohs, Waltraud. 1974. *Los indios del Alto Amazonas del siglo XVI al XVIII: Poblaciones y migraciones en la antigua provincia de Maynas*. Bonn: Bonner Amerikanistische Studien.

Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1784. *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinitá, e diversitá*. Cesena: Insegna di Pallade.

Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1784. *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeración, división y clases de éstas según la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos*, vol. 1. Madrid: Imprenta de la Adminstración del Real Arbitrario de Beneficia.

Jensen, Cheryl. 1998. Comparative Tupí-Guaraní Morphosyntax. In Desmond Derbyshire and Geoffrey Pullum (eds.), *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, vol. 4, 489–618. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lang, George. 2008. *Making Wawa: The Genesis of Chinook Jargon*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lathrap, Donald. 1970. *The Upper Amazon.* Thames and Hudson.

Lemle, Miriam. 1971. Internal classification of the Tupi-Guarani linguistic family. In David Bendor-Samuel (ed.), *Tupi studies 1*, pp. 107-129.

Marcoy, Paul. 1866. *Voyage a travers l'Amerique du Sud, de l'Ocean Pacifique a l'Ocean Atlantique.* Paris: Librairie de L. Hachette et cie.

Maroni, Pablo. [1738]1988. *Noticias auténticas del famoso río Marañón.* Iquitos: IIAP y CETA.

Michael, Lev and Zachary O'Hagan. submitted. *A linguistic analysis of Old Omagua Ecclesiastical texts.* Cadernos do Etnolingüística: Serie Monografías.

Muysken, Pieter. 1997. Media lengua. In Sarah Thomason (ed.), *Contact languages: a wider perspective*, pp. 365-426. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Myers, Thomas. 1992. The Expansion and Collapse of the Omagua. *Journal of the Steward Anthropological Society* 20(1-2): 129–147.

Myers, Thomas. 1974. Spanish contacts and social change on the Ucayali River, Peru. Ethnohistory 21(2): 135-157.

Newson, Linda. 1995. Life and death in early colonial Ecuador. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

O'Hagan, Zachary. 2011. *Proto-Omagua-Kokama: Grammatical Sketch and Prehistory.* BA thesis, University of California, Berkeley. Available online: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/1vx978rq.

O'Hagan, Zachary, Rosa Vallejos, and Lev Michael. in prep. A reconstruction of Proto-Omagua-Kokama.

Orton, James. 1875. T*he Andes and the Amazons or across the continent of South America* (2 ed.). New York: Harper and Brothers.

Rivet, Paul. 1910. Les langues guaranies du Haut-Amazone. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 7(1): 149-178.

Rodrigues, Aryon. 1958. Classification of Tupi-Guarani. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 24(3): 231-234.

Rodrigues, Aryon. 1984/5. Relações internas na família lingüística Tupi-Guarani. *Revista de Antropologia* 27/28: 33-53.

Rodrigues, Aryon and Ana Suelly Cabral. 2003. Evidências de criouslização abrupta en Kokáma? *Papia* 13: 180-186.

Rodrigues, Aryon and Ana Suelly Cabral. 2012. The Arawak contribution to the origin and development of the Kokama-Omagua language. Talk presented at the 54th meeting of the International Congress of Americanists, Vienna.

Thomason, Sarah and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Uriarte, Manuel J. [1776]1986. *Diario de un misionero de Maynas.* Iquitos: IIAP y CETA.

Vallejos, Rosa. 2004. *Basic clause types in Kokama-Kokamilla.* MA thesis, University of Oregon.

Vallejos, 2009. The focus functions of =pura in Kokama-Kokamilla discourse. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 75(3): 399-432.

Vallejos, Rosa. 2010a. *A grammar of Kokama-Kokamilla.* PhD dissertation, University of Oregon.

Vallejos, Rosa. 2010b. Is there a ditransitive construction in Kokama-Kokamilla? *Studies in Language*, 34(1): 75-107.

Veigl, Franz Xavier. 1788. Status provinciae mayenensis in America meriodionali, ad annum usque 1768 brevi narrationes. *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und zur allgemeinen Literatur*, vol. 16: 93–208.

von Martius, Carl Friedrich. 1867. Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas, Volume 2. Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer.

TABLES AND FIGURE CAPTIONS

Omagua	Kokama	gloss
inami	*iná*	prohibitive particle
-katu	*-ka*	regressive (Omagua), reiterative (Kokama)
=kati	*=ka*	allative/locative
=nani	*=na(n)*	limitative (Omagua); 'only' (Kokama)
=mai	*=mi ~ =n*	relativizer (Omagua); nominalizer (Kokama)
=pupɪ	*=pu*	instrumental
=pupɪkatu	*=puka*	temporal clause linker
=raʃi	*=ra*	non-assertive (Omagua); conditional (Kokama)
=sɪnuni	*=tsen*	purposive
umai	*umi*	see
munui	*muni*	peanut
ɨmɨnua	*ɨmɨna*	long ago
yamɨmɨa	*yamɨma*	be sad
sɨkɨi	*tsɨki*	pull

Table 1: Vowel and syllable reduction in Kokama functional morphemes and lexical items

Figure 1: Distribution of indigenous groups in the mid-17th century

Figure 2: Location of major Jesuit *reducciónes* in Maynas

Apaporis

Negro

Caquetá

Aguarico

Japurá

Napo

Putumayo (Iça)

Yurimaguas & Aisuaris

Amazon

Omaguas

Tigre

Jutaí

Juruá

Marañon

Yavarí

Kokamas

Ucayali

Purús

Huallaga

Kokamillas

Scale: 100 km.

SJQ II

San Joaquín
(SJQ) I

SJQ III

Santiago de
la Laguna
(SLG)

SJQ IV

Scale: 100 km.