# Transitivity, Inflection, and Active agreement in Timucua

*George Aaron Broadwell*
*University of Florida*
Presented at Society for the Study of the Indigenous Languages of the Americas, Jan 2016

## 1 Introduction

Timucua is an extinct isolate, once spoken primarily in Florida.[1] Its relationship to other language families has not been clearly demonstrated. Our knowledge of Timucua comes almost entirely from bilingual 17th century Spanish religious materials, including Pareja (1612b, 1612a, 1613, 1614, 1627) and Movilla (1635). The only contemporary study of Timucua grammar is Granberry (1993); earlier work includes Swanton (n.d), Gatschet (1877,1878,1880), and La Grasserie, de (1893).

The agreement system of Timucua has been a puzzle for most scholars who have worked on the language. Swanton (n.d) writes

"As in most of the other languages of the Southeast, we find two sets of pronominal affixes, one prefixed and used most often in expressing objective relations, the other suffixed and employed most frequently to indicate subjective relations.... As I have already indicate, the usage of these affixes is very confusing. The examples sometimes indicate one series or the other used indifferently, and occasionally both appear in the same example. It may be of some significance that the pronominal suffixes are generally employed in verbs which employ the verbal suffix *-ta* or *-te*; the pronominal prefixes are used with both."

This paper will attempt to improve the description of the rather intricate agreement system of Timucua, and will argue that Timucua shows evidence for an active agreement system.

Active agreement systems appear to be an areal feature of Southeastern Native American languages Munro (2015), and are attested in Muskogean (Broadwell (2006) on Choctaw, Kimball (1991) on Koasati, Martin (2011) on Creek), Tunica Haas (1940), and Chitimacha Hieber (2015), among others.

Although active agreement is common in the area, it has never been documented for Timucua (e.g. it is not mentioned in Granberry (1993) or any prior work). This paper will demonstrate that Timucua shows evidence for an active agreement system. This paper is based on a corpus of about 59,000 orthographic words of Timucua, analysed with Fieldwork Language Explorer (FLEx) SIL International (2015).[2]

---

[1]This paper uses the following abbreviations: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, A = agreement from the A set, AFF = affirmative, ALL = allative, ART = article, AUG = augment, B = agreement from the B set, BEN = benefactive, CAUS = causative, COMP = complementizer, DECL = declarative, DESID = desiderative complement, FUT = future, HON = honorific, IMP = imperative, INDEF = indefinite, INS = instrumental, IRR = irrealis, LOC = locative, NEG = negation, negative, NMLZ = nominalizer/nominalization, NOM = nominative, NSUFF = noun suffix of uncertain function, OBL = oblique, ORD = ordinal, P = patient-like argument of canonical transitive verb, PART = participle, PASS = passive, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRES = present, PST = past, Q = question particle/marker, REL = relative, S = single argument of canonical intransitive verb, SG = singular, TOP = topic.

[2]I refer here to orthographic words, that is, sequences of letters separated by spaces from other sequences. It is difficult to give a reliable figure for the number of morphological words in the corpus, because the idea of orthographic word and morphological word are fairly discrepant in Timucua. The colonial authors were inconsistent in their writing of Timucua. Thus what appears to be a single Timucua morphological word like naquosonolebima might be written in different places as <na quosono leui ma>, <naquoso no leui ma>, <naquosono le uima>, <naquosonoleui ma>, etc. It is also often difficult to determine the spacing between orthographic words in the printed Timucua materials, since the texts are all justified with flush right margins, and thus the spacing between the letters varies in order to fit the line.

# 2 Granberry's account

## 2.1 Granberry's paradigm

Granberry (1993) gives the following chart of agreement markers.

| | Subj & Obj Agreement |
|---|---|
| 1sg | ni- ~ ho- |
| 2sg | chi- |
| 3sg | -- |
| 1pl | ni- ~ ho-...-bo |
| 2pl | chi-...-bo |
| 3pl | -mo |

Table 1 Granberry's paradigm for standard agreement

Granberry (1993:91) also lists a paradigm of periphrastic inflection markers, shown in 2 below, but as discussed in 2.5, his account of when they are used is quite minimal.

| | Periphrastic Subj Agreement |
|---|---|
| 1sg | -na |
| 2sg | -ye |
| 3sg | -- |
| 1pl | -nica |
| 2pl | -chica ~ -yaqe |
| 3pl | -- |

Table 2 Granberry's paradigm for periphrastic agreement

While some sample verbs in Pareja (1614) seem to follow the paradigm shown above, table (1) is inadequate to describe the range of agreement patterns shown in the corpus.

In particular there are four points where Granberry's description is demonstrably incorrect or unclear. These are

1. Use of *ni-* vs *ho-* as 1st person marker
2. Use of multiple prefixes in transitives
3. Use of *-bo* for 3rd person arguments
4. Use of periphrastic vs direct paradigm

## 2.2 First person *ni-* vs. *ho-*

Granberry writes "When first person prefixes are used, *ni-* and *ho-* occur with approximately equal frequency in contexts which seem stylistically the same. The nuances distinguishing *ni-* from *ho-*, if there were any, have so far been impossible to reconstruct." Granberry (1993:84)

In contrast to Granberry's claim, I do not find any evidence that *ho-* is regularly used as an agreement prefix. Granberry gives only a few examples of verbs with an apparent *ho-* prefix:

(1)     *ho-n-ta-la*                                                            Granberry (1993:90)
        1S-be-PRES-AFF
        'I am'

(2)     *ho-chi-mani-s-ta-la*                                                   Granberry (1993:84)
        1S-2S-love-BEN-NEG-PRES-AFF
        'I love you very much.'

I believe that both of these examples are incorrectly analysed. The first example shows contraction of an independent pronoun *ho*, and the second example shows a particle *ho*.

### 2.2.1 Contraction of an independent pronoun

The normal 1st person singular independent pronoun is *honihe*, but the texts show that there is a special short form of the pronoun, *ho*. Ho seems to show up most frequently before kinship terms such as 'mother' and 'father'.

(3)     *Ho  iso-na      ni-hebano  eca-si-bi-letequa      ...*              Movilla (1635:156-157)
        I    mother-1S  1S:B-word  teach-BEN-PST-earlier  ...
        'My mother taught me earlier ...'

It also appears in copular contexts such as the following:

(4)     *Ho-te  Christiano-ti-la-hacu             ...*                        Movilla (1635:149)
        I-AUG  Christian-NEG-AFF:1S:A-but ...
        'I am not a Christian, but...'

(5)     *"Mine  iri-mitono-care-ma      ho-n-ta-la,"      masi-bo-ni-qe...*    Movilla (1635:15)
        Lord   enemy-3:HON-PL-ART  I-be-PRES-1:S:A  say-PL:B-PASS-and
        '"It is I", he said to the Lord's enemies and..."'

Example (5) below shows that the independent pronoun *ho* may contract with a following vowel-initial word. In this case, the uncontracted form would be *ho intala*.

### 2.2.2 The particle ho

Timucua has a verb *mani* 'think, feel' that combines with several preverbal particles to give various verbs of cognition and emotion. *Nate + mani* means 'pardon', *cha + mani* is 'repent' and *ho + mani* means 'love'. In example (2), *ho* does not act as 1st person agreement, but is the preverbal particle.[3]
    We can see that *ho* is present in many examples where there is no 1st person argument. Consider the following examples.

---

[3]In Pareja (1614), the particle is often written with an acute accent, thus <*hó*>. This may indicate that it attracts stress.

(6)    *Nanacu Diosi qie-mi           le-cu man-ta        na-ho*                    Pareja (1612b:70)
       so         God   child-3:POSS be-if  think-PART  INS-love

       *mani-si-bo-hela*
        think-BEN-PL:B-should
       'So one should love them, thinking of them as the children of God.'

(7)    *Na-cheqeta-mi-ma   Yte-ye,         Ysa-ye,*                          Pareja (1612b:f54v-55r)
       INS-four-ORD-ART  father-2S:POSS  mother-2S:POSS

       *naboso=hache,  ho    mani-si=hache*
        honor=IMP        love  think-BEN=IMP
       'The fourth, honor your father and mother.'
       <span style="color:#b01050">El quarto, honraras a tu Padre y Madre.</span>

The preverbal particles show variable degrees of incorporation into the verb. In most textual examples,
the *ho* is fully incorporated to *mani*, and person and locative/instrumental applicative prefixes appear before
the *ho*. (See (6) and (8) for examples.)

(8)    Anoco           niye nipitama      echesosichiqe          cameta           chihomanisi
       ano-co          niye nipita-ma     eche-so-si-chi-qe      came-ta          chi -ho-mani-si
       person-INDEF  herb mouth-ART   enter-CAUS-BEN-2-if  using herbs-PART  2-love-think-BEN-

       habe   areco   bicho?
       -habe  areco   -bi-chi-o
       IRR    make-  PST-2-Q
       Have you put some herb in the mouth of a woman so that she will love you a lot?
       <span style="color:#b01050">As hechado alguna yerva en la boca de alguna, para que te quiera bien?</span>
       Pareja (1613:151)

Pareja (1614:127v) is the only example where a verbal prefix follows the *ho* particle. This probably
means that at the time of the Arte, speakers varied in the degree of incorporation. Granberry's example (2)
may be reanalyzed as follows:

(9)    *ho    chi-mani-s-ta-la*
       love  2S-think-BEN-NEG-PRES-1S:A
       'I love you very much.'

## 2.3 Multiple person prefixes

Granberry writes "Verbal pronoun prefixes may be used to indicate either verb subject or verb object, as
in the case with the independent pronouns. If both subject and object are indicated by prefix, the object
prefix is always in second place, as in *ho-chi-mani-s-ta-la* 'I love you very much'." Granberry (1993:84)
As I argued in section above, there is no reason to think that *ho-* is a 1st person agreement marker in
Timucua. Granberry's example involves a verb *mani* 'think, feel' that combines with a preverbal particle
*ho* to yield the meaning 'love'.

Unfortunately, this misanalysed example is the only evidence that he gives for multiple person prefixes.[4] In fact, the corpus of Timucua shows no examples of verbs with two agreement prefixes, and I believe that such combinations are not possible in the agreement system. As explained in section 3 below, all instances of transitive verbs with two local arguments have prefixed person agreement for the object and suffixed person agreement for the subject.

## 2.4 Use of the -bo suffix

Granberry's paradigm 1 also predicts that 3rd person plural arguments should always trigger the *-mo* agreement suffix, while the *-bo* suffix is restricted to 1st and 2nd persons.

An examination of the corpus shows that this is clearly false. The *-bo* suffix is extremely common in Timucua, with hundreds of examples. It regularly appears with 3rd person plural objects, as in the following examples:

(10)  Hitimichunu   huriqua      beheta        yribota       ano     Yglesima
      hiti-michunu  huri-qua     behe-ta       yribo-ta      ano     Yglesi-ma
      demon-REL:    entrance-LOC wait for-PART stand-PART  person  church-ART

      natocopontema             ynemi  yechibota
      na-toco-pon-tema          ynemi  yechi-bo-ta
      INS-come out-come-NMLZ  ALL    ask-PL:B-PART

Aguardaba le fuera Satanás, y a cuantos salían de la Iglesia, preguntaba ...

Satan waited for him outside, and when people came out of the church, he asked them ... (Conf, f23-24)

The demon waited, standing at the entrance, asking all the people who came out of the church...

(11)  ...Pilato,  lapusimonima              soldadcare    misoboniqe           Longinote,
      ...Pilato  lapu-si-mo-nima           soldado-care  miso-bo-ni-qe        Longino-te
      ...Pilate  request-BEN-3PL:A-when  soldier-PL    send-PL:B-PASS-if  AUG

      soldadomicarema,          iquenibomohaue       masimoqe        ....
      soldado-mi-care-ma        iqueni-bo-mo-haue    masi-mo-qe ...
      soldier-3POSS-plural-ART  kill-PL:B-3P:A-IRR  say-3P:A-if

... they asked Pilate to send soldiers to kill him (and his soldiers) ...[5]

...pidieron a Pilato que embiase soldados a matarle... Movilla (1635:f152)

Thus it cannot be correct to claim that *-bo* is only a marker of 1st and 2nd person plurals.

## 2.5 Use of the periphrastic paradigm

Although Granberry (1993) includes a periphrastic agreement paradigm (as slot 13) in his chart of verbal morphology, the description of its use is limited and incorrect. Granberry (1993:90) writes "SLOT 13 contains optionally and rarely used subject pronouns. They are identical in form with the nominal possessive

---

[4] Granberry also includes *ni-chi-* and c*hi-ni-* prefix combinations in his dictionary, though he does not cite examples of them.

[5] If -bo is plural object marker, then the Timucua text seems to mean 'they asked that soldiers be sent to kill Longinus and his soldiers'. (The *soldado-mi-care-ma* also is hard to understand if the text does not mean 'Longinus and his soldiers'.)

pronouns and are found only in questions. They normally take the place of subject pronoun prefixes and subject pronoun plural suffixes, but, very infrequently, SLOTS 1, 7, and 13 are all filled."

It is clear from the texts that periphrastic agreement is not confined to questions, contra Granberry. Consider the following examples:

(12)   *ychira equela-ma patu-**nica**-la*
       winter day-ART be:cold-1PL:A-DECL
       'We are cold on a winter day' Pareja (1627:f77)

(13)
       day  three  after-ART  live-PART  come out-PASS-aff  1S:B-say-PL:B-NEG-aff  but  day


       INS-three-ORD-ART  say-PRES-1PL:A-AFF
       'We do not say that he arose after three days, but on the third day.'Movilla (1635:f19v)

It is also not true that the suffixes in the periphrastic paradigm are identical to the suffixes which mark possessor on nouns. The following table compares the two paradigms.

|      | Periphrastic Agreement | Possessor Agreement |
|------|------------------------|---------------------|
| 1sg  | -na                    | -na                 |
| 2sg  | -ye                    | -ye                 |
| 3sg  | --                     | -mi                 |
| 1pl  | -nica                  | -mile (-nica for a few kinship terms) |
| 2pl  | -chica ~ -yaqe         | -yaqe               |
| 3pl  | --                     | -mi                 |

Table 3 Comparison of Granberry's periphrastic series with possessor agreement


# 3 A and B agreement paradigms

I propose an account of verbal agreement in Timucua which is is sensitive to the person features of the arguments. There are two agreement paradigms, which I have labelled A and B. The A paradigm is suffixal, but the B agreement involves a prefixal person portion and and a suffixal number portion.

The A and B agreement affixes appear at different places in the structure of the verb, and the 1st and 2nd plural B agreement are composed of a prefix and a suffix. The 2nd person A suffixes can appear in two positions, which I call the general and the restricted postion (as discussed in more detail in 3.1.3). B prefixes also appear in two possible positions -- one for core arguments and one for applied objects. Agreement for applied objects precedes the locative/instrumental applicative prefix *na-*, while core agreement follows the applicative. Thus the pattern follows a template like the following.

AGRB$_{Applied}$APPLIC = AGRB-verb -APPLIC-AGRB-PRES-AGRA$_{general}$-PAST-AGRA$_{restricted}${COMPLEMENTIZER/ILLOC FORCE}

The two paradigms are shown below:

|       | A paradigm                                          | B paradigm |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------|------------|
| 1sg   | -la~-le                                             | ni-        |
| 2sg   | -naye (general) ~ -chi- (restricted contexts)       | chi-       |
| 3sg   | --                                                  | --         |
| 1pl   | -nica                                               | ni-...-bo  |
| 2pl   | -naqe (general) ~ -chica (restricted contexts)      | chi-...-bo |
| 3pl   | -mo ~ -ma                                            | -bo        |

Table 4 Present paradigm

If both arguments of the verb are local (1st or 2nd person) then the subject shows A agreement and the object shows B agreement. However a range of other possibilities are found when one of the arguments of the verb is non-local. These possibilities are explored in the following sections.

### 3.1 Transitives with two local arguments

#### *3.1.1 Overall pattern*

When transitive verbs in Timucua have agreement for both subject and object, they show the agreement pattern just mentioned.

Consider the following examples which show both subject and object agreement.

(14)  ***chi***-*yechi-ta-**la***
      2S:B-ask-PRES-1S:A
      'I ask you' **1s>2s**

(15)  *...ibine  chaleca-coco-ma  **chi**-eca-**bo**-ha-**le**.*                1612 Baptism f35
      water   new-emph-ART     2S:B-wet-PL:B-IRR-1S
      'I will wet you (pl.) with the new water.' **1s>2p**

(16)  *chabeta-co     ta=**ni**-nahiabo-bi-**ch**-o?*                         Pareja (1613:f80)
      where-INDEF  away=1S:B-know-past-2S:A-Q
      'Where did you know me?' **2s>1s**

(17)  *Hubaaso  **ni**-na-hubuaso-ta-**naye**     inibiti  acola*             Pareja (1614:f48)
      love        1S:B-INS-love-PRES-2S:A  big      very
      'You love me greatly.' **2s>1**
      'El amor con que me amas es muy grande, o grandissimo.'

(18)  *hacha  **ni**-masi-**bo**-te-**ch**-o?*                               Pareja (1613:f22v)
      what    1PL:B-say-PL:B-PRES-2S:A-Q
      'What do you say of us?' **2s>1p**

(19)  *Heca  **chi**-mache tuqúi-so-**bo**-ta-**nica**-la.*                   Pareja (1614:f67r)
      we      2:B-be bothered-CAUS-PL:B-PRES-1PL:A-AFF
      'We bother you (pl).' **1p>2p**
      'Nosotros os afliximos.'

### 3.1.2 The form of the 1s:A suffix

A descriptive difficulty for this system is that the *-la ~ -le* suffix shown as the 1sg A affix is identical to a *-la* morpheme that seems to function as a sentence final affirmative. This suffix may be seen in examples like the following, where there is no plausible 1st person reference:

(20)  Natumama    hachipacha              eyoma,     vquasiro                          Pareja (1612b:f55r)
      na-tuma-ma   hachi-pacha              eyo-ma     vqua-siro
      INS-ten-ART  money/tribute-money  other-ART  take-DESID

      manetiquani,              caqi tumamano  yucha nahomala...
      mani-atiqua-ni            caqi tuma-mano  yucha na-homa-la...
      want-must not-must not  this  ten-TOP       two     INS-finish-AFF...
   The tenth you must not envy another's goods.  These ten commandments
      are wrapped up in two...
   <span style="color:#8B1A3A">El decimo, no cobdiciaras los bienes agenos.  Estos diez mandamientos se
      encierran en dos...</span>
   The tenth, you must not want to have the property of another; these ten are
      finished in two...

I consider *-la ~ -le* to be a marker of 1st person in some cases, rather than treating this as the affirmative in all instances.  The reasoning here is that all instances of 1st person singular subjects in the corpus have either the *ni-* 1sgB or *-la ~ -le* 1sgA affix.  Thus if we reanalyse (21) (repeated from (14) above)

(21)  ***chi**-yechi-ta-**la***
      2S:B-ask-PRES-1S:A
      'I ask you' **1s>2s**

as (22) below, we posit a ø marker of 1sg:

(22)  ***chi**-yechi-ta-Ø-**la***
      2S:B-ask-PRES-1S:A-AFF
      'I ask you'

However, this ø would only appear on verbs marked for affirmative.  See Broadwell (1996) for more extensive argumentation that *-la* has both an 'affirmative' sense and a 1st person singular person marking function.

### 3.1.3 Alternations for the 2s:A suffix

The alternation between the two forms of the 2nd person suffixes is unusual.  The most general form for an asserted 2s:A and 2p:A subjects are *-naye* and *-naqe* respectively, found in examples like the following:

(23)  'You (pl.) bother us.'
      <span style="color:#8B1A3A">'Vosotros nos afligis.' 2p>1p</span>

(24)　*Caqi　ano　　istico　chi-aho-si-bo-tanchu,*　　　　　　*Lucifer　hiti*　　　　Pareja (1627:f32v)
　　　　this　person　evil　　2B-reveal-BEN-PL:B-previously　Lucifer　evil

　　　　　*mota-**naqe**, Diablo　mota-nica...*
　　　　　say-2S:A　　devil　　say-1S:A
　　　　'This evil person who was explained to you before, you call Lucifer hiti and
　　　　　we call him diablo...'

The more restricted allomorphs of 2s:A and 2p:A are *-chi* and *-chica*, respectively. They are found in

　• questions
　• before the suffixes *qe* 'if, and then', *-qua* 'if', and *-he* 'future'.

　The most frequent instances of the restricted allomorphs are in yes-no questions (as in (16) and (18))
above, where the 2s:A agreement is combined with a question particle *-o*. However, there are also examples
of the suffixed agreement in other contexts, particularly before the suffixes *-he* 'future and *-qe* 'if' Consider
the following passages

(25)　*... na-quimo-ta*　　　　　　　*in-te-no*　　　　***ni**-masi-**chi**-he?*　　　　1612 Cat, f020v-021r
　　　　... INS-in the same way-PART　be-PRES-NOM　1S:B-say-2S:A-FUT
　　　　'What similarity will you give me?'
　　　　　Que semejanza me dareis...?

(26)　hitincono,　　　　　　　anonibita　　　　　　nanemireqe　　　　puen osta
　　　　hiti-nco-no　　　　　　ano-nibi-ta　　　　　na-ene-mi-reqe　　　pueno-s-ta
　　　　evil, demon-REL-NSUFF　person-resemble-PART　INS-see-away-each　come-benef-PART

　　　　oni　　　masichiqe　　ysacomantaqere　　　　　yayileno
　　　　o ni-　　masi-chi -qe　ysaco-man-ta-qere　　　　yayi-leno
　　　　yes 1S:B　say-2-if　　　happy-consent-PART-COMP　big, strong-AbstrNom

　　　　chiarecohale　　　　　　　　　　mastaqe
　　　　chi -areco-ha-le　　　　　　　　mas-ta-qe
　　　　2-make, prepare-irrealis-AFF:1SG:A　say-PART-if
　　　　where enumerable times the Devil appeared to her in human form, promising that he would make
　　　　　her a great lady if she would consent to have part [intercourse] with her,
　　　　a donde innumerables veces le apareció el Demonio en figura humana, prometiéndole que la haría
　　　　　gran señora si le consentía tener parte con ella
　　　　The devil, looking like a man, came to her every time she looked and said, "If you say yes to me,
　　　　　I will make you happy and strong" [Conf f28]

　This last example (26) is particularly useful for understanding the agreement system, since it has both
the I-you and the you-me combinations.

### 3.1.4 Distribution of agreement across verb chains

Timucua also frequently shows verb chains linked by *-ta*. In these chains, the first verb shows the B agreement for the object, while the final verb variably shows A or B agreement for the subject:

(27)  *Chi-yechi-ta      n-is-te-le*              *chitaco-co  picho-qua  yale-te?*      Pareja (1612b:f78)
      2S:B-ask-PART  1S:B-say-PRES-AFF  who-INDEF  entire-OBL  obey-PRES
      'I ask you, who entirely complies with it [this commandment]?'

The shift to B agreement on the verb *n-is-te-le* is probably an instance of the non-local object agreement paradigm discussed in section 3.3. We can contrast the pattern seen here with a very similar example (28) where the verb *yechi* 'ask' is inflected for both subject and object.

(28)  *Diosi  manda hebuani-ma   na-hapu-mi-ma        ofueno-ma,*          Pareja (1612b:f56v)
      God    commandment-ART  INS-three-ORD-ART  about-ART

      *chi-yechi-ta-la...*
      2B-ask-PRES-1S:A
      'I ask you about God's third commandment...'
      'Sobre el tercero mandamiento, os pregunto...'

## 3.2 Transitives with applied arguments

Timucua has two applicative affixes: *na-* 'locative/instrumental' and *-si* 'benefactive/malefactive'. The objects associated with these applicatives also show B agreement. In the following examples, *chalaso* 'tempt' is a verb that frequently takes an applied object:[6]

(29)  *... hachaqueni  ni-na-chalaso-bo-te?*                          Pareja (1627:f14v)
      ... why           1pB-INS-tempt-PL:B-PRES
      'Why does he tempt us?'

(30)  *chi-na-chalaso-bo-ha-lecu         man-tequa..*                 Pareja (1627:f15r)
      2P:B-INS-tempt-PL:B-IRR-COMP  want-so that
      'he wants to tempt you (pl.) so that...'

(31)  *... ni-na-cumeleso-bo-te-la*                                   Pareja (1613:f114)
      ... 1PL:B-INS-counsel-PL:B-PRES-AFF
      ... he is counseling us.

---

[6]There are about 28 instances of *chalaso* 'tempt' in our currently analysed texts. *Chalaso* appears with the *na-* applicative in all but a handful of examples. The few cases without the applicative are in nominalizations (e.g. *anochalososiba* 'temptor') or in irrealis complements to verbs of desire (e.g *chalasosiro* manda 'wanting to tempt').

(32) *utichucu   ano       mitica-ma iniheti inino-mile*                                    Movilla (1635:f4)
earth        person ALL-ART   sin      sin-1PL:POSS

*ni-na-paqe-so-si-bo-ta*                           *naso-ne-la*
1pB-INS-forget-CAUS-BEN-PL:B-PART  do like this-PASS-AFF
'It was done like this and with (the crucifixion) it caused (God) to forget the
sins of all of us people on earth.'

Consider the following example (33), which shows A agreement for the subject and B agreement for the
applied object:

(33) *Fili  redemptor  mundi  Deus,  Misere  nobis  mueno-mate  naqua*            Pareja (1612b:f56r)
Fili  redemptor  mundi  Deus,  Misere  nobis  call-and       this

*moso-ta        Espiritu  Sante  Deus  mueno-mate  naqua  moso-ta*
coord-PART  Espiritu  Sante  Deus  call-and       this     coord-PART

*tamalo-ta-nica-la       mota-qere  vtitima-mano*
ask-PRES-1PL:A-AFF  say-when   show reverence-TOP

*ni-tamalo-si-buo-mo-ta              ysi-no-la.*
1PL:B-ask-benef-PL:B-PL:A-PART  say-NOM-AFF
Saying 'Fili redemptor Deus, misere nobis' and 'Espiritu Sante Deus', we
ask, when we say with reverence 'Ora pro nobis', asking (lit. say asking)
them [the saints] to call on God for us.'

Note that in this example, *tamalotanicala* 'we call on' has A agreement for the subject, while *nitamalosi-
buomota* 'calling on him for us' shows B agreement for the applied object.

In these cases the B agreement for the applied object precedes the applicative marker. Contrast the
relative order of the applicative and the B agreement when the agreement is with with a core argument
(subject or direct object):

(34) *Iesu   Christo,  Dios anoco-mile      na-ni-quoso      mani-si=hache*         1612 Baptism f6r
Jesus  Christ    God lord-1PL:POSS  INS-1S:B-thank  want-BEN=IMP
'I must thank God for Jesus Christ.'

### 3.3 Transitives with non-local objects

When the object is 3rd person (nominal or clausal), the agreement for many verbs shifts from the A
paradigm to the B paradigm. This shift affects first and second person subject agreement, but does not
affect the 3rd plural *-mo ~ -ma* agreement marker. The paradigm that results in these cases is as follows:

|        | Subject      | Object |
|--------|--------------|--------|
| 1sg    | ni-          |        |
| 2sg    | chi-         |        |
| 3sg    | --           |        |
| 1pl    | ni-...-bo    |        |
| 2pl    | chi-...-bo   |        |
| 3pl    | -mo ~ -ma    | -bo    |

Table 5 Paradigm for transitives with non-local objects

This paradigm also matches that given for some verbs in the Arte. Pareja (1614:131v) gives the following paradigm for the verb faltar 'lack, miss'

| sg                                      | pl                                              |
|-----------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| ni-chebe-habe-la 'I will lack'          | ni-chebe-bo-habe-la 'We will lack'              |
| chi-chebe-habe-la 'You will lack'       | chi-chebe-bo-habe-la 'You (pl.) will lack'      |
| chebe-habe-la 'He/she will lack'        | chebe-mo-habe-la 'They will lack'               |

Table 6 Example verb in -haue paradigm

*Chebe* 'lack' is a transitive, but in these examples, no overt object is stated. This paradigm then seems to show the kind of agreement when the implied object is singular.

In the following paragraphs, I first demonstrate the shift from A to B agreement with local subjects and non-local objects. Then I show examples that support the position that 3rd person subject agreement does not shift.

### 3.3.1 Shifts to the Non-local object paradigm

A frequent verb that shows this pattern is *nahiabo* 'know'. As shown in (16) (repeated below as (35 ), this verb may show A agreement for the subject and B for the object.

(35)  *chabeta-co      ta=**ni**-nahiabo-bi-**ch**-o?*
      where-INDEF  away=1S:B-know-past-2S:A-Q
      'Where did you know me?' Pareja (1613:f80)

However, when there is a non-local object, the subject agreement is from the B paradigm. Consider the following examples:

(36)  *Mare-ma    chi-nahiabo-haue-ti-la.*                                    Pareja (1614:f139)
      never-ART  2S:B-know-IRR-NEG-AFF
      'You will never know'
        'Nunca sabras.'

(37)  *Chi-nahiabo-bo-haue    queni-habe-la*                                     Pareja (1627:f14v)
      2PL:B-know-PL:B-IRR   do-IRR-AFF
      'You (pl.) will know.'[7]

In example (37), the object of the verb know is the clausal answer to the question 'Why does he [the devil] tempt us?'.

The following example (38) also shows the local/non-local object effect. The first verb is *yechi* 'ask' with a 1st person subject and 2nd person object. It follows the usual A-B paradigm. In contrast the object of the verb *mo* 'say' is 3rd person nominal or clausal (i.e. 'We have said something'), and therefore its agreement is from the B set.

(38)  Chiyechitala               hacha  nimoba?
      chi -yechi-ta-la           hacha  ni-mo-ba
      2-ask-PART-AFF:1sgA   what   1:B-say-PL:B
      I ask you, what have we said?
      Os pregunto, que emos dicho?

### 3.3.2 The status of 3pA agreement in the Non-local Object paradigm

The 3rd person plural A agreement, *-mo ~ -ma*, does not shift when there is a non-local object. Notice that in the following passage, there are only 3rd person arguments, but the *-bo* agreement is for the object, while the *-ma* agreement is for the subject:

(39)  *masi-bo-ta        tamalo-bo-ta      neqero-qe              cuna*              Movilla (1635:153)
      say-PL:B-PART   ask-PL:B-PART   stand before-and then   neck

      *cocho-ma-la*
      cut-PL:A-AFF
      'he said to them and asked them and he stood before them and they cut his
         throat.'

The following example (repeated from above) also shows that verbs in the with only 3rd person arguments continue to show distinct subject and object agreement:

(40)  ...Pilato, lapusimonima             soldadcare    misoboniqe          Longinote,
      ...Pilato   lapu-si-mo-nima        soldado-care  miso-bo-ni-qe       Longino-te
      ...Pilate   request-BEN-3PL:A-when  soldier-PL    send-PL:B-PASS-if  AUG

      soldadomicarema,             iquenibomohaue        masimoqe        ....
      soldado-mi-care-ma           iqueni-bo-mo-haue      masi-mo-qe ...
      soldier-3POSS-plural-ART  kill-PL:B-3pA-irrealis  say-3PL:A-if
      ... they asked Pilate to send soldiers to kill him (and his soldiers) ...[8]
      ...pidieron a Pilato que embiase soldados a matarle... Movilla (1635:f152)

---

[7]This example comes from a section Pareja (1627) that does not appear to have an exact Spanish equivalent. I've translated it as 'you (pl.)' based on the morphology'

[8]If -bo is plural object marker, then the Timucua text seems to mean 'they asked that soldiers be sent to kill Longinus and his soldiers'. (The *soldado-mi-care-ma* also is hard to understand if the text does not mean 'Longinus and his soldiers'.)

# 4 Agreement in intransitives

Intransitives show a split in the type of agreement which they receive. Some intransitive verbs show A agreement and some show B agreement. Consider the following contrasts

(41)   ***ni**-nihi-**bo**-habe-le*
       1PL:B-die-PL:B-IRR-DECL
       'We will die' Pareja (1613:f151)

(42)   *ychira equela-ma patu-**nica**-la*
       winter day-ART be:cold-1PL:A-DECL
       'We are cold on a winter day' Pareja (1627:f77)

As Mithun (1991) has shown, splits of this type can have different semantic bases, including actionality, agency, control, and affectedness. What is the basis for the agreement split in Timucua?

Intransitive verbs belonging to both types are shown below:

| A intransitives (suffixed agreement) | B intransitives (prefixed agreement) |
| --- | --- |
| pueno 'come' | balu 'live' |
| toco 'come out' | nihi 'die' |
| patu 'be cold' | eya 'live, dwell' |
| hime 'return' | ni 'suffer' |
| hoboso 'receive' | fari 'return' |
| he 'eat' | |
| nioco 'run' | |

As the table shows, A type intransitives have subjects which are Agents ('come', 'come out', 'return'), Experiencers ('be cold'), and Recipients ('receive'). B type intransitives appear to have subjects which are Patients ('live', 'die', 'suffer') and Agents ('return').

Initially, the most puzzling contrast here is between *fari* and *hime*, which both appear to mean 'return', yet show different alignment patterns. Consider the following examples:

(43)   *Uti-qua     hime-ta-nica-la.*
       land-LOC   return-PRES-1PL:A-DECL
       'We returned by land' Pareja (1614:f14)

(44)   *nihi-ta      qisa  ni-fari-te-bo-la-hacu                    ...*
       die-PART   dirt   1PL:B-return-PRES-PL:B-DECL-but
       'We die and return to dust, but...' Pareja (1627:f47)

The context of these examples, however, makes clear that the subject of 'return' in (44) is the dead body. Thus in this instance 'return' has a non-agentive subject.

This allows us to make the following generalization about the agreement split in Timucua:

Intransitive verbs take B agreement when their subject is a patient; Intransitive verbs with non-patientive subjects take A agreement.

These examples also allow us to demonstrate that the distinction is not event/state, since both kinds of 'return' are events. Neither is control the correct distinction, since 'be cold' takes A agreement in (12), but the subject of 'be cold' does not control the sensation.

# Acknowledgements

I thank Ives Goddard, Doug Henning, Pam Munro, and Christopher Muntzner for comments on this paper. I also thank my student interns Ian Guitard, Jennifer Sierra, and Karen Burgos, who worked on adding text to the Timucua database.

# AIssues for further investigation

## A.1 Failure to mark a plural participant

When there is a plural subject and a plural object, the logic of the system above predicts *V-bo-mo...*, where *bo* is agreement with the plural object and *mo* is agreement with the plural subject. Such examples are found in examples like (11) above. In texts, however, it seems frequent that only one of the agreements is marked. Consider example , where the first verb *chico* shows plural object agreement and the second verb *yqueni* shows plural subject agreement.

(45)   *..nì-chico-bo-te-ma*                          *mine   maqe-mi-ma*                          1627 Cat f30
　　　...1PL:B-strike,bite-PL:B-PRES-ART   3SG    poison-3SG-ART

　　　*ny-yquen-ta-ma-la?*
　　　1PL:B-kill-PRES-3PL:A-AFF
　　...they bite us and their poison kills us.[9]

## A.2 Failure to shift to the NLO paradigm

The following examples ought to take B agreement since there is a 3rd person object. However, they show up with A agreement instead, for reasons that are unclear.

(46)   *Paha-nica*        *areco-ta-nica-la*                                      Pareja (1614:f20r)
　　　house-1P:POSS   build-PRES-1P:A-AFF
　　　'We build our house'
　　　　'Hazemos nuestra casa.'

---

[9]The original text has a question mark, corresponding to the Spanish question *por que criò los animales que nos muerden, y mata<n> con su veneno, como con las serpientes, y las viuoras, y culebras?* The Timucua splits the question into two parts: ...Serpents and vipers and poisonous snakes and fecheni snakes, red snakes and elatubasa snakes and other snakes bite us and their poison kills us. Why did he make them?

(47)   *Hebuano   eca-ta-nica-la*                                                         Pareja (1614:f39r)
       word       bring-PRES-1PL:A-AFF
       'We teach.'
         <span style="color:maroon">Nosotros enseñamos.'</span>

(48)   *Ano     lamono    tooma-ma  hachaquene-ma  na-habuoso-chi-he?*                    Pareja (1612b:12r)
       person  neighbor  ALL-ART   do what-ART      INS-love-2S:A-FUT
       How will you love your neighbor(s) as yourself?
         <span style="color:maroon">Como amareys al proximo como a vos mismo?[10]</span>

## A.3 Restricted versions of other agreement markers

In section 3.1.3 above, I gave evidence for special 'restricted' allomorphs of the 2nd person agreement in contexts before certain affixes. It seems likely that the 1st person forms show similar allomorphy, but at this point there are not enough well-understood examples of 1st person agreement to be sure. I defer this question for further investigation.

# References

Broadwell, George Aaron. 2006. *A Choctaw reference grammar.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Broadwell, George Aaron. 1996. Person marking patterns in Timucua. Paper delivered at SSILA. ms.
    https://www.academia.edu/20021294/Person_marking_patterns_in_Timucua

Gatschet, Albert. 1877. The Timucua language. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 16:1-17.

Gatschet, Albert. 1878. The Timucua language. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 17:490-504.

Gatschet, Albert. 1880. The Timucua language. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 18:465-502.

Granberry, Julian. 1993. *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Timucua Language.* Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama Press.

de la Grasserie, Raoul. 1893. *Esquisse d'une grammaire du Timucua.* Orleans: G Jacob.

Haas, Mary. 1940. *Tunica.* New York: J. J. Augustin.

Hieber, Daniel. 2015. Semantic alignment in Chitimacha. University of California, Santa Barbara. ms.

Kimball, Geoffrey. 1991. *Koasati grammar.* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Martin, Jack. 2011. *A grammar of Creek (Muskogee).* Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Mithun, Marianne. 1991. . Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67:510–546.

Movilla, Gregorio de. 1635. *Explicacion de la Doctrina que compuso el cardenal Belarmino, por mandado del Señor Papa Clemente 8. Traducida en Lengua Floridana: por el Padre Fr. Gregorio de Movilla.* Mexico: Imprenta de Iuan Ruyz.

Munro, Pamela. 2015. American Indian languages of the Southeast: An Introduction. In Michael Picone and Catherine Evans Davies, eds.  *New perspectives on language variety in the South: Historical and contemporary approaches,* 21-42. Tuscaloosa, AL: University of Alabama.

Pareja, Francisco. 1612a. *Cathecismo en lengua castellana, y Timuquana. En el qual se contiene lo que se les puede enseñar a los adultos que an de ser baptizados.* Mexico City: Impresa de la Viuda de Pedro Balli.

Pareja, Francisco. 1612b. *Catechismo y breve exposición de la doctrina christiana.* Mexico City: Casa de la viuda de Pedro Balli.

Pareja, Francisco. 1613. *Confessionario en lengua castellana y timuquana con unos consejos para animar al penitente.* Mexico City: Emprenta de la viuda de Diego Lopez Daualos.

Pareja, Francisco. 1614. *Arte y Pronunciacion de la Lengua Timucvana y Castellana.* Mexico City: Emprenta de Ioan Ruyz.

Pareja, Francisco. 1627. *Catecismo en lengua timuquana y castellana en el qual se instruyen y cathequizan los adultos infieles que an de ser Christianos.* Mexico City: Emprenta de Ioan Ruyz.

SIL International. 2015. *Fieldwork Language Explorer.* SIL International. http://fieldworks.sil.org/flex/

Swanton, John R. n.d. A Sketch of the Timuca Language. Bureau of American Ethnology, Smithsonian Institutian ms 2446-g. ms.

---

[10]Although the Spanish here has a singular object proximo 'neighbor', the Timucua seems to have a plural object, given the quantifier *tooma* 'all'.