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1 Introduction

Timucua is an extinct isolate, once spoken primarily in Florida. 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).

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subj &amp; Obj Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periphrastic Subj Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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) \[ ho-n-ta-la \]
    \[ 1S-be-PRES-AFF \]
    'I am'

Granberry (1993:90)

(2) \[ ho-chi-mani-s-ta-la \]
    \[ 1S-2S-love-BEN-NEG-PRES-AFF \]
    'I love you very much.'

Granberry (1993:84)

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) \[ Ho \ iso-na \ ni-hebano \ eca-si-bi-letequa ... \]
    I mother-1S 1S:B-word teach-BEN-PST-earlier ...
    'My mother taught me earlier ...'

Movilla (1635:156-157)

It also appears in copular contexts such as the following:

(4) \[ Ho \-te \ Christiano-ti-la-hacu \]
    I-AUG Christian-NEG-AFF:1S:A-but ...
    'I am not a Christian, but...'

Movilla (1635:149)

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 \(<h\circ\>\). 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.'
El quarto, honraras a tu Padre y Madre.

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?
As hechado alguna yerva en la boca de alguna, para que te quiera bien?
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. 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-que 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-que ...
    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) ...
    ...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

---

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

5If -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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periphrastic Agreement</th>
<th>Possessor Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg -na</td>
<td>-na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg -ye</td>
<td>-ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg -mi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl -nica</td>
<td>-mile (-nica for a few kinship terms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl -chica -yaqe</td>
<td>-yaqe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl --</td>
<td>-mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 position (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.

\[
\text{AGR}^\text{B_{applia Aplic = AGR}^-B\text{- Applia-AGR}^-B\text{- Pres-AGR}^-A_{\text{general}}^-PAST-AGR}^-A_{\text{nominal}} \{\text{COMPLEMENTIZER/ILLOC FORCE}\}
\]

The two paradigms are shown below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A paradigm</th>
<th>B paradigm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg -la--le</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg -naye (general)~ -chi- (restricted contexts)</td>
<td>chi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg --</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl -nica</td>
<td>ni-...-bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl -naqe (general)~ -chica (restricted contexts)</td>
<td>chi-...-bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl -mo ~ -ma</td>
<td>-bo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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**.
    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?
    where-INDEF away=1s:B-know-past-2s:A-Q
    'Where did you know me?' 2s>1p

(17) **Hubaaso ni-na-hubuaso-ta-naye inibiti acola**
    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?**
    what 1p:B-say-PL:B-PRES-2s:A-Q
    'What do you say of us?' 2s>1p

(19) **Heca chi-mache tuquí-so-bo-ta-nica-la.**
    we 2s: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 hchipaha 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...
    El decimo, no cobdiciaras los bienes agenos. Estos diez mandamientos se
    encierran en dos...
    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.'
    'Vosotros nos afligis.' 2p>1p
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-nib-i-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.

---

6There 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').
Consider the following example (33), which shows A agreement for the subject and B agreement for the applied object:

(33)  
\[ \text{Fili redemptor mundi Deus, Misere nobis mueno-mate naqua} \] Pareja (1612b:f56r)  
\[ \text{Fili redemptor mundi Deus, Misere nobis call-and this} \]  
\[ \text{moso-ta} \quad \text{Espiritu Sante Deus mueno-mate naqua moso-ta} \] coord-PART Espiritu Sante Deus call-and this coord-PART  
\[ \text{tamalo-ta-nica-la} \quad \text{mota-qere vittima-mano} \] ask-PRES-1PL:A-AFF say-when show reverence-TOP  
\[ \text{ni-tamalo-si-buo-mo-ta} \quad \text{ysi-no-la.} \] 1PL:B-ask-benef-PL:B-PL:A-PART say-NOM-AFF  
\begin{align*}
\text{Saying 'Fili redemptor Deus, misere nobis' and 'Espiritu Sante Deus', we} \\
\text{ask, when we say with reverence 'Ora pro nobis', asking (lit. say asking)} \\
\text{them [the saints] to call on God for us.'}
\end{align*}

Note that in this example, \textit{tamalotanicala} 'we call on' has A agreement for the subject, while \textit{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 a core argument (subject or direct object):

(34)  
\[ \text{Iesu Christo, Dios anoco-mile na-ni-quoso mani-si=hache} \] 1612 Baptism f6r  
\[ \text{Jesus Christ God lord-1PL:POSS INS-1S:B-thank want-BEN=1MP} \]  
'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 \textit{-mo} ~ \textit{-ma} agreement marker. The paradigm that results in these cases is as follows:
Table 5 Paradigm for transitives with non-local objects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg</td>
<td>chi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl</td>
<td>ni-...-bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl</td>
<td>chi-....-bo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl</td>
<td>-mo ~ -ma -bo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sg</th>
<th>pl</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni-chebe-habe-la 'I will lack'</td>
<td>ni-chebe-bo-habe-la 'We will lack'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chi-chebe-habe-la 'You will lack'</td>
<td>chi-chebe-bo-habe-la 'You (pl.) will lack'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chebe-habe-la 'He/she will lack'</td>
<td>chebe-mo-habe-la 'They will lack'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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=nii-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.
    never-ART 2S:B-know-IRR-NEG-AFF
    'You will never know'
    'Nunca sabras.'
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  
chachi-yechi-ta-la  
2-pl:ask-part  
chachi ni-mo-ba  
1-pl:what  
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  
negro-qe  
cuna  
say-pl:A-PART  
ask-pl:A-PART  
stand before-and-then  
neck  
cocho-ma-la  
cut-pl:A-PART  
'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)  

...Pilate,  
lapusimonima  
soldadcare  
misoboniqe  
Longinote,  
...Pilate  
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  
queni-bo-mo-haue  
masi-mo-qe  
soldier-3POS-plural-ART  
kill-pl:B-3pA-irrealis  
say-3PL:A-if  
... they asked Pilate to send soldiers to kill him (and his soldiers) ...  
...pidieron a Pilato que embiase soldados a matarle...  
Movilla (1635:f152)
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A intransitives (suffixed agreement)</th>
<th>B intransitives (prefixed agreement)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pueno 'come'</td>
<td>balu 'live'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>toco 'come out'</td>
<td>nihi 'die'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patu 'be cold'</td>
<td>eya 'live, dwell'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hime 'return'</td>
<td>ni 'suffer'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoboso 'receive'</td>
<td>fari 'return'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he 'eat'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nioco 'run'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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)  
Utí-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-agenteive 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.
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Issues 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.

\begin{align*}
\text{(45)} \quad & \ldots \text{ni-chico-bo-te-ma} \quad \text{mine maqe-mi-ma} \quad 1627 \text{ Cat f30} \\
& \ldots 1\text{PL}:\text{B-strike,bite-PL:B-PRES-ART} \quad 3\text{SG} \quad \text{poison-3SG-ART} \\
& ny-yquen-ta-ma-la? \\
& 1\text{PL}:\text{B-kill-PRES-3PL:A-AFF} \\
& \ldots \text{they bite us and their poison kills us.}\end{align*}

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.

\begin{align*}
\text{(46)} \quad & \text{Paha-nica} \quad \text{areco-ta-nica-la} \\
& \text{house-1P:POSS} \quad \text{build-PRES-1P:A-AFF} \\
& \text{'We build our house'} \\
& \text{'Hazemos nuestra casa.'} \quad \text{Pareja (1614:f20r)}
\end{align*}

\footnote{The original text has a question mark, corresponding to the Spanish question por que criô 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?}
Transitivity, Inflection, and Active agreement in Timucua

(47) **Hebuano eca-ta-nica-la**

word bring-PRES-1PL:A-AFF

'We teach.'

Nosotros enseñamos.'

(48) **Ano lamono tooma-ma hachaquete-ma na-habuoso-chi-he?**

person neighbor ALL-ART do what-ART INS-love-2S:A-FUT

How will you love your neighbor(s) as yourself?

Como amareys al proximo como a vos mismo?10

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.
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