## **Reconstructing honorific usage in Timucua**

Timucua (ISO: TJM; 29.652, -82.325) is language formerly spoken in Northern Florida. Franciscan missionaries produced seven books written in this language between 1612 and 1635. This paper discusses a previously undocumented system of honorifics in Timucua. The system has three key grammatical features – a preverbal honorific particle *ano*; an honorific possessive suffix –*mitono*; and an honorific passive –*ni* – which index the social status of persons described or addressed in dialogue.

We can see an example of two of these features (the preverb and the passive) in the following passage, where St Claire, defending her monastery from infidels, cries to God using honorific language:

(1) "Cagi **ano** patafilesta-care-ma, mine **ano** hubuaso-no-ma beta, hachibono inemi-ma this **hon** servant-plur-art self **hon** love-nom-art from thing all-art hã-ta caqi paha-ma na-taro-n-ta ea-te-ma this house-art loc-shut:up-pass-part give:up-part live-pres-art ni-melabo-bo-ta ni-iputu-si-bo-**ni**-haue, ... 1-mercy-pl:Abs-part 1-save-ben-pl:Abs-hon:pass-irr

'These your (honored) servants, who from love of you (honored), have given up all things and are shut up living in this house, have mercy on us and may we be saved (hon)...' [Pareja 1627, f278v-279]

We also see subtle distinctions of point of view and honorific distinction in the following two passages (Movilla 1635: f157-161). In the first passage (2), the actions of unnamed maidens are described in neutral language devoid of honorific marking. In the second passage (3), however, the actions affecting the virgin martyrs St Inez and St Lucia *are* described honorifically with the honorific passive.

- (2) Mine-care nubatima-s-ta hiocomo-ma-la
  3-plur show:reverence-ben-part greet-3pErg-aff
  'They (the maidens) greeted him (the priest) reverentially.'
- (3) Santa Inesi-qui, Acu Santa Lucia, acu yoqua care quene,
  St Inez-and this St Lucia this other plur and
  iqueni-bo-mo-ni-michu-qi
  kill-pl:Abs-3pErg-honor.pass-prev-desid
  'They wanted to kill (honorable) St Inez and St Lucia and these others...'

The richest source of data on the honorific system comes from the translations of Christian miracle stories, known as *exempla*. Although the translations of Christian exempla may initially seem to be unlikely sources of historical pragmatic information, in point of fact, these moral stories involve several different kinds of illocutionary acts, including simple descriptions, questions, replies, and commands. The different social statuses of the participants in the exempla thus provides ample data for a partial reconstruction of the pragmatics of honorific marking in Timucua.

## References:

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.

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.

Grammatical abbreviations: 1 = 1<sup>st</sup> person, abs =absolutive, aff = affirmative, art = article, ben =benefactive, desid = desiderative, erg = ergative, hon = honorific, loc = locative, nom = nominalizer, part = participle, pass = passive, plur = plural, pres = present, prev = previously mentioned.

## Gullah Structures, Atlantic Structures: A cross-linguistic analysis of individuated plural Determiner Phrases

Dr. Benjamin Hebblethwaite *University of Florida* 

The individuated plural Determiner Phrase (DP) in Gullah shares structural affinities with Jamaican Patwa, Belize Kriol, Sierra Leone Krio, English, the Gbe languages Aja, Fon and Ewe, and French-lexified Haitian Creole, to name a few languages. The structural traits of Gullah's individuated plural DP (*de goat dem* 'the goats') point to a combination of Germanic prenominal definiteness and Gbe post-nominal number marking. Cross-linguistic syntactic analysis illustrates the transmission of superstrate and substrate linguistic traits in Gullah and reveals the role of parameter settings in accounting for dialectal syntactic diversity.

## Split CP and the Ordering of Wh-Phrases in Yucatec Maya

The 'split' CP model<sup>3</sup> introduced explicitly ordered, CP-internal projections (e.g. IntP > TopP > FocP...), as opposed to an unsplit CP with a single head  $C^0$ . While initially reliant on Romance data, the past decade has seen the split CP model applied to a wider variety of languages, including those of Mesoamerica. Though researchers in Yucatec Maya (YM) favor an unsplit  $CP^1$ , I argue a split CP is essential for explaining the ordering restrictions on wh-phrases in YM.

YM has canonical VOS order<sup>2</sup>, shown in (1a) where the verb stem *chak-ah* ('boiled') precedes its arguments *ixim* ('corn') and *Lucina*. Preverbal phrases are CP-internal topic phrases or focus phrases. In (1b), the subject *Lucina* functions as a topic, indicated by the topicalizer =e'. The wh-phrase ba'ax ('what') also occurs preverbally but instantiates wh-focus<sup>1,4</sup>. Crucially, the topic phrase precedes the focus phrase. An ordering where the focus ba'ax precedes the topic Lucina=e' is ungrammatical, shown in (1c).

- (1) a. T=u chak-(ah) ixim Lucina.

  PFV=3.ERG boil-CPV corn Lucina

  'Lucina boiled corn.'
  - b. **Lucina=e'** <u>ba'ax</u> t=u chak-ah? Lucina=TOP what PFV=3.ERG boil-CPV 'As for Lucina, what did she boil?'
  - c. \*Ba'ax <u>Lucina=e'</u> t=u chak-ah? what <u>Lucina=TOP</u> PFV=3.ERG boil-CPV \*'As for Lucina, what did she boil?'

The unsplit CP model for YM treats topic phrases like Lucina=e' as CP adjuncts. Wh-phrases like ba'ax instantiate Spec, CP. The unsplit CP for (1b) is shown in (2).

(2) 
$$[CP [DP Lucina=e'] [CP [DP ba'ax] [C' [CØ] [IP t=u chak-ah]]]]$$

Given the ordering restriction in (1c), we predict that topic phrases invariably precede wh-phrases. As shown in (3a), however, topic phrases do <u>not</u> precede wh-phrases like *ba'axten* ('why'), i.e. wh-phrases that question adjuncts. Only an ordering with *ba'axten* preceding the topic phrase is grammatical, shown in (3b).

- (3) a. \*Lucina=e' <u>ba'axten</u> hook t(i)=e kah=o' holak?

  Lucina=TOP why leave LOC=DEF village=DIST yesterday

  \*'As for Lucina, why did she leave (from) the village yesterday?'
  - b. **Ba'axten** <u>Lucina=e'</u> hook t(i)=e kah=o' holak? why Lucina=TOP leave LOC=DEF village=DIST yesterday 'As for Lucina, why did she leave the village yesterday?

An analysis where *ba'axten* is of the same type as wh-phrases like *ba'ax* is inadequate, predicting (3a) to behave consistently with (1b). Given that *ba'axten* precedes the topic phrase, we might interpret *ba'axten* as a CP adjunct like topic phrases. As adjuncts are reorderable, an adjunct analysis also fails to account for the ungrammaticality of (3a).

Given that neither analysis – ba 'axten as a wh-phrase or ba 'axten as a CP adjunct – accounts for the ungrammaticality of (3a), I argue instead that wh-phrases like ba 'axten occupy a CP-internal projection IntP<sup>4</sup> with the lower FocP reserved for wh-phrases like ba 'ax that question arguments, and topic phrases occupying a projection TopP between the two. My analysis considers wh-phrases in matrix and embedded clauses. In addition to offering a more nuanced portrait of the YM CP, it lends further credence to the crosslinguistic viability of the split CP model and the cartographic approach generally.

Works Cited: <sup>1</sup>Aissen, Judith. 2017. Information structure in Mayan. In *The Mayan languages*, ed. by Judith Aissen, Nora C. England, and Roberto Zavala Maldonado, 293—324. New York: Routledge. <sup>2</sup>Armstrong, Grant. 2017. The syntax of non-verbal predication in Yucatec Maya. *Cuadernos de Lingüística de El Colegio de México*, to appear. <sup>3</sup>Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281—337. Dordrecht: Klewer. <sup>4</sup>Rizzi, Luigi. 2001, On the position of Int(errogative) in the left periphery of the clause. In *Current studies in Italian syntax*, ed. by G. Cinque and G. Salvi, 287—296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.