

LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 12 : 7 July 2012

ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.

Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.

Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.

B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.

A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.

Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.

Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.

G. Baskaran, Ph.D.

L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

Assistant Managing Editor: Swarna Thirumalai, M.A.

Object Agreement in Quechua and Nahuatl

George Bedell, Ph.D.

=====

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

12 : 7 July 2012

George Bedell, Ph.D.

Object Agreement in Quechua and Nahuatl

OBJECT AGREEMENT IN QUECHUA AND NAHUATL

George Bedell, Ph.D.

=====

This paper was prepared for the 7th International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, hosted by the University of Bremen, February 29 - March 2, 2012.

Agreement. A verb paradigm like (1) is familiar to any student of Latin.

(1)		s	pl
	1	<i>amō</i>	<i>amāmus</i>
	2	<i>amās</i>	<i>amātis</i>
	3	<i>amat</i>	<i>amant</i>

The forms in (1) are the present tense of the verb *amāre* 'love', categorized according to person and number. In the usual analysis, each form consists of the stem *amā-* followed by a suffix which carries information about person (first, second or third; abbreviated 1, 2 or 3) and number (singular or plural; abbreviated s or pl). The suffixes sometimes have phonological effects on stems, or show phonological variants depending on the stem, but it is not generally possible to analyse them into distinct person and number components.

Person and number semantically categorize noun phrases rather than verbs, as can be seen from Latin pronouns as given in (2).

(2)		s	pl
	1	<i>ego</i>	<i>nōs</i>
	2	<i>tū</i>	<i>uōs</i>
	3	<i>is, ea, id</i>	<i>eī, eae, ea</i>

The forms in (2) are in the nominative case, and can be used as subjects of clauses; if so, the finite verb of that clause must have the same person and number form. This relation is what is meant by 'agreement'; here the verb agrees with its subject in person and number. Latin third person pronouns, unlike first or second, are categorized for gender in addition to person and number, but verbs do not agree with their subjects in gender. Given that Latin verbs contain much the same information as Latin pronouns, it is not necessary to use subject pronouns; they are usually omitted unless involved in emphasis or contrast.

Subject Agreement in Quechua. When the Spanish arrived in Peru in the sixteenth century, they encountered Quechua among other languages, and studied it for political and religious purposes. They found a system of subject-verb agreement similar to that in Latin or Spanish. In (3) are present tense forms of the Quechua verb *munay* 'love' which agree in person and number with their subjects. Our primary source for Quechua is the 1607 grammar of Diego González Holguin. His romanization of Quechua is given for simplicity even though it fails to represent some of the phonological contrasts of the language. González uses *munay* 'love' as his model transitive verb. (Lib II, Cap 18, p. 46)

(3)		s	pl
	1	<i>munani</i>	<i>munaycu</i>
	12		<i>munanchic</i>
	2	<i>munanqui</i>	<i>munanquichic</i>
	3	<i>munan</i>	<i>munan(cu)</i>

There are two apparent differences between (1) and (3). Quechua makes a distinction between two first person plural forms, one in which the second person is excluded (*munaycu*) and one in which it is included (*munanchic*). These are called 'exclusive' (*exclusiuo*) and 'inclusive' (*inclusiuo*) by Gonçalves. We will abbreviate exclusive first person as 1, and inclusive as 12. Quechua also appears to have third person plural forms (*munan*) without the usual plural suffix (*cu*). This reflects the restriction of plurality to animate noun phrases in Quechua, and is not in fact a difference in agreement.

The forms in (4) are the Quechua pronouns, one for each of the categories in (3). (Gonçalves 1607, Lib I, Cap 7, pp. 11-12)

(4)		s	pl
	1	<i>ñoca</i>	<i>ñocaycu, ñocaycucuna</i>
	12		<i>ñocanchic, ñoqanchiccuna, ñocanchiccu</i>
	2	<i>can</i>	<i>cancuna, canchiccuna, canchiccu</i>
	3	<i>pay</i>	<i>paycuna, paypay</i>

The Quechua pronouns in (4) are somewhat more regular in formation than the Latin pronouns in (2); *-cuna* serves to mark noun plurals as well. There is also parallelism between the suffixes in *ñocaycu* and *munaycu*, and in *ñocanchic* and *munanchic*. For the same reason as in Latin, pronouns need not be used as subjects in Quechua, and appear primarily when emphasized or contrasted.

Object Agreement in Quechua. The forms in (3) do not exhaust the present tense; there are also the additional forms in (5). (Gonçalves 1607, Lib II, Cap 37-40, pp. 69-77)

(5)		s	pl
	1 - 2	<i>munayqui</i>	<i>munayquichic</i>
	3 - 2	<i>munassunqui</i>	<i>munassunquichic</i>
	2 - 1	<i>munahuanqui</i>	<i>munahuanquichic</i>
	2 - 1		<i>munahuanquichiccu</i>
	3 - 1	<i>munahuan</i>	<i>munahuanchic</i>
	3 - 12		<i>munahuanchiccu</i>

The forms in (5) show agreement not only with the person and number of their subject, but also with the person and number of their object, Quechua transitive verbs do not agree with the person or number of a third person object, so that the forms in (3) must be understood as having a third person object. With a first or second person object, the form must be one of those in (5). The abbreviations in (5) indicate the person of the subject followed by that of the object. There are no sequences of the same person (1 - 1, 2 - 2, 3 - 3), but these gaps are partly filled by reflexive verb forms; for this purpose, 12 counts as both 1 and 2.

The singular forms in (5) correspond to the Latin phrases in (6).

(6)	1 - 2	<i>tē amō</i>
	3 - 2	<i>tē amat</i>

2 - 1	<i>mē amās</i>
3 - 1	<i>mē amat</i>

In (6), *mē* and *tē* are not components of the verbs, but noun phrases. They appear among the Latin pronouns in (7).

(7)	s	pl
1	<i>mē</i>	<i>nōs</i>
2	<i>tē</i>	<i>uōs</i>
3	<i>eum, eam, id</i>	<i>eōs, eās, ea</i>

Latin verbs do not agree with their objects; thus the verb forms in (6) are the same as in (1). The pronouns in (7) differ from those in (2) being accusative rather than nominative case and therefore able to appear as objects. Most Latin transitive verbs take objects in the accusative case, but some take objects in other cases. With such verbs, object pronouns will have a different case form.

The plural forms in (5) with a second person object have the suffix *-chic* indicating that the object is plural. Thus *munayquichic* is equivalent to Latin *uōs amō* and not to *tē amāmus* or *uōs amāmus*. Similarly, *munassunquichic* is equivalent to Latin *uōs amat* and not to *tē amant* or *uōs amant*. The forms with a first person object are more complex because of the distinction between exclusive and inclusive first person plurals. Each has two plural forms, with *-chic* possibly followed by *-cu*. According to González, in *munahuanquichic* the suffix *-chic* indicates plurality of the subject, so that it is equivalent to Latin *mē amātis* and not to *nōs amas*. In *munahuanquichiccu* the suffix (or combination of suffixes) *-chiccu* indicates that the object is plural and also exclusive, so that it is equivalent to Latin *nōs amas*. In *munahuanchic* the suffix *-chic* indicates that the object is plural and also inclusive, while the suffix (or combination of suffixes) *-chiccu* indicates that the object is plural and also exclusive; both forms are equivalent to Latin *nōs amat* since Latin does not distinguish exclusive from inclusive. Because each of the four singular forms in (5) should have three plurals (plural subject, plural object, and both) it is clear that the agreement system is incomplete both for person and for number. Any important distinctions which are not made in the verb forms can be made by using object pronouns, just as in Latin. The corresponding Quechua pronouns are as in (8), which can be compared with (4).

(8)	s	pl
1	<i>ñocacta</i>	<i>ñocaycucta</i>
12		<i>ñocanchicta</i>
2	<i>canta</i>	<i>cancunacta</i>
3	<i>payta</i>	<i>paycunacta</i>

The suffixes *-cta* and *-ta* (the latter attached to noun stems which end in a consonant) are used with all Quechua noun phrases for the accusative case.

González' Analysis of Object Agreement. The verb forms presented in (5) illustrate the object agreement system in Quechua. In his 1607 grammar, Diego González Holguín analyses the system using the notion of 'transition' (*transición*). A definition of this notion appears in a chapter title. The English translations given for González in (i) to (iii) are the responsibility of this author.

- (i) On the transitions of active verbs, or the transitive conjugation which transfers its meaning to another person, including in the same word both the person who acts and the person who is acted upon.

De las transiciones de los verbos actiuos, o de la conjugacion transitiua que traspasa su significacion en otra persona inclusa en vna misma voz persona que haze y que padece.
(Gonçalez 1607, Lib II, Cap 37, p. 69)

Worth noting in this definition are the apparent derivation of the term 'transition' from the notion of 'transitive', the status of transitions as single components of a verb form (*en vna misma voz*), and, corresponding to the modern terms 'subject' and 'object', the notions of agent (*persona que haze*) and patient (*persona que padece*)

Gonçalez introduces new terminology for the transitions.

(ii) Let us call the first transition, which we used to call 'from first to second', the *yqui* transition because it is the first particle of the indicative of this transition.

Let us call the second transition, which used to be called 'from third to second', the *ssunqui* transition because *ssunqui* is the first particle of the indicative of this transition.

Let us call the third transition, which used to be called 'from second to first', *huanqui* because it is the first particle of the indicative of this transition.

Let us call the fourth transition, which used to be called 'from third to first' the *huan* transition which like the rest is the first particle of its indicative, and thus they will each have distinct names. The first *yqui*, the second *ssunqui*, the third *huanqui* and the fourth *huan*.

La Primera Transicion que auiamos de llamar de primera a segunda llamemos la transicion de (yqui) porque es la primera particula del indicatiuo desta transicion.

La Segunda Transicion que se llamaua de tercera a segunda llamemos la transicion de (ssunqui) porque es su primera particula del indicatiuo desta transicion el (ssunqui.)

La Tercera Transicion que se llamaua de segunda a primera llamese (huanqui) que es la primera particula de su indicatiuo.

La Quarta Transicion se llamaua de tercera a primera llamese la transicion de (huan) que esta como las demas es su primera particula de indicatiuo, y assi ya tendran nombres cada vna distintos. La primera (yqui) la segunda (ssunqui) la tercera (huanqui) la quarta (huan.) (Gonçalez 1607, Lib II, Cap 37, p. 70)

Though there is no explicit citation, it seems clear that the analysis being revised is that of Domingo de Santo Tomas in his 1560 grammar. The revision is partly terminological, but Santo Tomas does not use the notion of 'transition'. and does not clearly take a position on whether subject and object agreement are two separate suffixes or a single suffix.

Gonçalez' analysis can be summarized as (9), in comparison with the actual forms in (5).

- | | | |
|-----|-------|----------------|
| (9) | 1 - 2 | <i>yqui</i> |
| | 3 - 2 | <i>ssunqui</i> |
| | 2 - 1 | <i>huanqui</i> |
| | 3 - 1 | <i>huan</i> |

He explicitly recognizes the incompleteness of the system.

(iii) There are four transitions and there should be six, because there are three persons which figure in transitions: first, second and third, and each should figure in two transitions because there are two other persons to whom it could transfer its action; but two transitions are lacking, both those which would end in a third person, that of first person to third, which does not exist, and that of second person to third, which also does not exist, and thus there are only

four, two ending in a second person which come first, and two ending in a first person, which come last.

Las transiciones son quatro y auian de ser seys, porque las personas que causan las transiciones son tres primera, segunda, tercera, y cada vna auia de causar dos transiciones porque fuera de si a cada vna le quedan dos personas siempre a quien traspasar su accion, mas faltan dos transiciones ambas las que auian de terminarse en tercera, la de primera a tercera, y no la ay, y de segunda a tercera, que tampoco la ay, y assi quedan quatro no mas, dos a segunda las primeras que van puestas, y dos a primera las postreras. (Gonçalez 1607, Lib II, Cap 37, pp. 69)

Gonçalez' analysis thus takes the transitions to be units distinct from the subject agreement suffixes. But comparing (9) with (3), it would seem quite possible to segment *huanqui* and *huan* into two separate suffixes the second of which is identical to the second and third person subject agreement suffixes *-nqui* and *-n*, leaving the remaining *-hua* as a first person object agreement suffix. Gonçalez does not consider this alternative, perhaps because it does not apply to the transitions *yqui* and *ssunqui*. There is no way to segment these to isolate corresponding subject and object agreement suffixes. In the past tense (*preterito simple*) forms in (10), there is segmentation, not only in *huanqui* and *huan*, but also in *ssunqui*.

- | | | |
|------|-------|-----------------------|
| (10) | 1 - 2 | <i>munarcayqui</i> |
| | 3 - 2 | <i>munassurcanqui</i> |
| | 2 - 1 | <i>munahuarcanqui</i> |
| | 3 - 1 | <i>munahuarcan</i> |

In the forms in (10) the past suffix *-rca* comes between the two segments. But *yqui* remains anomalous; not only is it not segmentable in (10), but it does not resemble the appropriate subject or object agreement suffixes. Gonçalez' analysis makes *yqui* the model.

Subject Agreement in Nahuatl. As in Latin or Quechua, verbs in Nahuatl agree with their subjects. Our primary source for Nahuatl is the 1645 grammar of Horacio Carochi. His romanization is cited, which is superior to that used in most surviving literature in clearly indicating long vowels and glottal stops. The forms in (11) may be compared with those in (1) or (3); they are the present tense paradigm of the verb *nemi* 'live', and differ in the same categories of person and number. (Lib I, Cap 4, pp. 11-12)

- | | | | |
|------|---|---------------|---------------|
| (11) | | s | pl |
| | 1 | <i>ninemi</i> | <i>tinemî</i> |
| | 2 | <i>tinemi</i> | <i>annemî</i> |
| | 3 | <i>nemi</i> | <i>nemî</i> |

Person in Nahuatl is indicated by prefixes rather than suffixes, and plural number is indicated by a suffixed glottal stop, represented here by the circumflex accent on the final vowel. The first person prefix is *n-* in the singular and *t-* in the plural; the second person prefix is *t-* in the singular and *am-* in the plural, and there is no prefix indicating third person. When the following stem begins with a consonant, the vowel *i* is used to support a prefix which consists of a single consonant and the final *m* of *am-* assimilates. Like Latin, Nahuatl lacks a distinction between exclusive and inclusive first person plural.

The forms in (12) are Nahuatl pronouns; here a grave accent represents a non-final glottal stop. (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 5, p. 15)

(12)		s	pl
	1	<i>nê, nêhua, nêhuātl</i>	<i>têhuān, têhuāntin</i>
	2	<i>tê, têhua, têhuātl</i>	<i>amêhuān, amêhuāntin</i>
	3	<i>yê, yêhua, yêhuātl</i>	<i>yêhuān, yêhuāntin</i>

The forms in (12) are to be compared with the Latin pronouns in (2) and the Quechua pronouns in (4). Like pronouns in Latin or Quechua, Nahuatl pronouns are used for subjects or objects when the verb agrees with them only if the pronoun is emphasized or contrasted. In Nahuatl, unlike Latin or Quechua, emphasis or contrast also has syntactic consequences.

Object Agreement in Nahuatl. Object agreement in Nahuatl is both more extensive and more systematic than in Quechua. The forms in (13) and (14) are the present tense forms of the transitive verb *mictia* 'kill' with a definite third person object. (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 4, pp. 12-13)

(13)		s	pl
	1 - 3s	<i>nicmictia</i>	<i>ticmictiâ</i>
	2 - 3s	<i>ticmictia</i>	<i>anquimictiâ</i>
	3 - 3s	<i>quimictia</i>	<i>quimictiâ</i>

(14)		s	pl
	1 - 3pl	<i>niquinmictia</i>	<i>tiquinmictiâ</i>
	2 - 3pl	<i>tiquinmictia</i>	<i>anquinmictiâ</i>
	3 - 3pl	<i>quinmictia</i>	<i>quinmictiâ</i>

The third person singular object agreement prefix is *c-*, and the corresponding plural prefix is *quin-*. They are located between the subject agreement prefix and the verb stem. The prefix *c-*, like *n-* and *t-* is supported by *i* when attached to a stem beginning in a consonant. Following Spanish orthographic practice, *c* [k] is written *qu* when followed by a front vowel.

The forms in (15) and (16) are the present tense forms with a second person object, and those in (17) and (18) with a first person object.

(15)		s	pl
	1 - 2s	<i>nimitzmictia</i>	<i>timitzmictiâ</i>
	2 - 2s	x	x
	3 - 2s	<i>mitzmictia</i>	<i>mitzmictiâ</i>

(16)		s	pl
	1 - 2pl	<i>namêchmictia</i>	<i>tamêchmictiâ</i>
	2 - 2pl	x	x
	3 - 2pl	<i>amêchmictia</i>	<i>amêchmictiâ</i>

The second person object agreement prefixes are singular *mitz-* and plural *amêch-*.

(17)		s	pl
	1 - 1s	x	x
	2 - 1s	<i>tinêchmictia</i>	<i>annechmictiâ</i>
	3 - 1s	<i>nêchmictia</i>	<i>nêchmictiâ</i>

(18)		s	pl
	1 - 1pl	x	x
	2 - 1pl	<i>titēchmictia</i>	<i>antēchmictiâ</i>
	3 - 1pl	<i>tēchmictia</i>	<i>tēchmictiâ</i>

The first person object agreement prefixes are singular *nēch-* and plural *tēch-*. Note the similarity with the subject agreement prefixes in (11) and the pronouns in (12).

Just as in Quechua, there is no Nahuatl object agreement if both subject and object are first or second person. The gaps created by this restriction, indicated by 'x' in (15) to (18), are partly filled by reflexive forms. But Nahuatl differs from Quechua in the full participation of the third person in both person and number agreement. Nahuatl transitive verbs are obligatorily marked by a prefix associated with their object; if no third person agreement is present as in (13) or (14), the prefixes *tē-* or *tla-* may occupy the object agreement position. They indicate an indefinite third person object, either human or non-human, and create intransitive stems as in (19).

(19)	<i>tēmictia</i>	'kill someone'
	<i>tlamictia</i>	'kill something'

It is also common in Nahuatl to incorporate a noun stem into a verb form in the object agreement position, again resulting in an intransitive stem. In all three cases these stems will be accompanied by subject agreement prefixes and number agreement suffix as in (11).

Carochi's Analysis of Object Agreement. In his 1645 grammar, Horacio Carochi calls the various subject and object agreement prefixes in (13) through (18) 'semi-pronouns' (*semipronombres*). The English translations given for Carochi in (iv) to (vii) are based on Lockhart (2001), but with revisions.

(iv) In this grammar, we distinguish between semi-pronouns and pronouns, and we call those which are always compounded with nouns, prepositions, adverbs and verbs 'semi-pronouns'; they correspond to what are called 'affixes' in Hebrew grammar, although the Hebrew affixes are put after nouns and verbs and these semi-pronouns are put before. We call those which are used outside compounds 'pronouns'.

Distinguimos en este Arte semipronombres, y pronombres, y llamamos semipronombres à los que siempre se componen con nombres, preposiciones, adverbios, y verbos, y corresponden à los que en el Arte de la lengua Hebrea se llaman affixos, aunque los affixos Hebreos se posponen a los nombres, y verbos, y estos semipronombres se anteponen. Pronombres llamamos los que se vsan fuera de composicion. (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 4, p. 10)

(v) The following are called 'separated pronouns' because they are used separated from verbs, nouns and prepositions unlike the semi-pronouns of the preceding chapter, which are always compounded with other parts of speech....

The first person pronoun *Ego*, I, is *nê*, *nēhua*, or *nēhuātl*; *tēhuān*, or *tēhuāntin*, we; you, *tê*, *tēhua*, or *tēhuātl*; *amēhuān*, y *amēhuāntin*, you. The pronouns for *is*, *ea*, *id*, and *ipse*, *ipsum* are *yê*, *yēhua*, or *yēhuātl*; plural, *yēhuān*, or *yēhuāntin*.

Pronombres separados se llaman los siguientes, por que se vsa dellos separados de los verbos, nombres, y preposiciones, à distincion de los semipronombres del capitulo passado, que siempre se componen con otras partes de la oracion....

El pronombre de primera persona Ego, yo, es Nê, y Nēhua, y Nēhuātl. Tēhuān, y

Tèhuāntin, Nosotros. Tu, Tê, y Tèhua, y Tèhuātl. Amèhuān, y Amèhuāntin, vosotros. Pronombres de is, ea, id. y ipse, ipsa, ipsum. Yê, y Yèhua, y Yèhuātl. Plural, Yèhuān, y Yèhuāntin. (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 5, p. 15)

Carochi's distinction between pronouns and agreement prefixes (*semipronombres*) is clearly stated in (iv) and (v). Though they have similar meanings, pronouns are independent words, whereas agreement prefixes are components of larger words (in the following excerpts, verbs). Just as Gonçalves' analysis draws on earlier grammarians, Carochi's analysis appears almost intact in the earliest Nahuatl grammar of Olmos (1547). Olmos does not use the term 'semi-pronouns', but calls both subject and object agreement prefixes 'pronouns which join with verbs and nouns, and with prepositions' (*pronombres que se juntan con verbos y nombres, y con preposiciones*). (Olmos 1547, Cap 3, p. 17)

The first and second person object agreement prefixes are listed in (vi).

(vi) If the verb is active, and transitive, and its object is first or second person singular or plural, other semi-pronouns represent them, which are put after the subjects already mentioned, and they are *nēch*, 'me', *tēch* 'us', *mitz* 'you' and *amēch* 'you'....

Note that the first person objects *nēch* and *tēch* cannot co-occur with first person subjects, nor can the second person objects *mitz* and *amēch* with second person subjects, ... Because there are other particles for this which make a verb reflexive, which I will give a little later.

Si el verbo fuere actiuo, y transitiuo, y su paciente fuere primera, ò segunda persona singular, ò plural, para ellas siruen otros semipronombres, que se posponen à los dichos agentes, y son nēch, à mi, tēch, à nosotros, mitz, à ti, amēch, à vosotros....

Aduiertase que los pacientes de primera persona nēch, y tēch, no pueden concurrir con los agentes tambien de primera persona; ni los pacientes de segunda persona mitz, y amēch, con los agentes de segunda persona, ... Que para eso ay otras particulas que hazen que sea el verbo reflexiuo, que pondrè poco despues. (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 4, p. 12)

The role of reflexive forms is noted in (vi), in case subject and object are both first, or both second person. Carochi's term for object is 'patient' (*paciente*) and for subject, 'agent' (*agente*). Note also the use of 'transitive' (*transitiuo*) to categorize verbs which are accompanied by an object agreement prefix. In (vii), the list of object agreement prefixes is completed by adding the third persons.

(vii) I return to active verbs, and say that when their object is a particular thing or person and is mentioned, and their noun is not compounded with the verb, even so such a verb needs a sign of transition which refers it to its object, and this sign is *c*, mark of a singular object, and *quin* for a plural object, or *quim* if the verb begins with a vowel. But in the third person singular or plural and the second person plural, *c* becomes *qui* if the verb begins with a consonant because *c* could not be pronounced without great difficulty, as will be seen in the examples, ...

Bueluo a los verbos actiuos, y digo, que quando su paciente fuere de cosa, o persona particular, y que se nombra, y su nombre no se compusiere con el verbo, con todo eso el tal verbo ha menester vna señal de transicion que le refiera a su paciente, y este señal es (c) nota de paciente singular; y quin, para paciente plural, ò quim, si el verbo empieça por vocal. Pero en terceras personas de singular y plural; y en la segunda del plural la c, se buelue en qui, quando el verbo empeçare por consonante, por que la c, no se pudiera sin mucha dificultad pronunciar como se verà en los exemplos, ... (Carochi 1645, Lib I, Cap 4, p. 13)

Note the use of the term 'transition' (*transicion*).

If the sequences of subject agreement prefix and object agreement prefix are abstracted from (13) through (18), the result is (20). These Nahuatl sequences correspond to the Quechua 'transitions' in (9); (9) contains four items, and (20) contains twenty-eight.

(20)	s	pl
1 - 3s	<i>nic-</i>	<i>tic-</i>
1 - 3pl	<i>niquin-</i>	<i>tiquin-</i>
1 - 2s	<i>nimitz-</i>	<i>timitz-</i>
1 - 2pl	<i>namēch-</i>	<i>tamēch-</i>
2 - 3s	<i>tic-</i>	<i>anqui-</i>
2 - 3pl	<i>tiquin-</i>	<i>anquin-</i>
2 - 1s	<i>tinēch-</i>	<i>annēch-</i>
2 - 1pl	<i>titēch-</i>	<i>antēch-</i>
3 - 3s	<i>qui-</i>	<i>qui-</i>
3 - 3pl	<i>quin-</i>	<i>quin-</i>
3 - 2s	<i>mitz-</i>	<i>mitz-</i>
3 - 2pl	<i>amēch-</i>	<i>amēch-</i>
3 - 1s	<i>nēch-</i>	<i>nēch-</i>
3 - 1pl	<i>tēch-</i>	<i>tēch-</i>

Whereas the four items in (9) are taken by Gonçalves as suffixes which represent agreement with subject-object combinations, those in (20) are taken by Carochi as free combinations of subject and object agreement prefixes (subject to one general restriction). Though Carochi uses the term 'transition', it is in a completely different sense from Gonçalves.

Conclusion. Though verb-object agreement is a grammatical phenomenon which sixteenth and seventeenth century missionary grammarians cannot have been prepared for, it does not appear to have posed much of a challenge, at least on the evidence provided by Gonçalves, Carochi and their predecessors. No doubt this is largely because they were quite familiar with subject-verb agreement. None of them uses a term which corresponds directly to modern 'agreement', nor do we find the notion expressed in other terms. The closest approach is by Carochi, when in (vii) he points out that a third person semi-pronoun serves to 'refer' a verb to its object (*le refiera a su paciente*). But he does not go on to point out that this is a function of first and second person object agreement prefixes as well, not to mention subject agreement prefixes in relation to subjects. Also of some interest is Carochi's mention in (iv) of Hebrew, which has parallels with Nahuatl in that oblique pronouns appear as suffixes on prepositions. But this does not constitute verb-object agreement.

The differences between the analyses of verb-object agreement by Gonçalves and Carochi are due not to the difficulty of dealing with the phenomenon, but rather to the particular structures of Quechua and Nahuatl. The analysis of Carochi with independent subject and object semi-pronouns is dictated by the sequences in (20). In Quechua, though there are many fewer items to be analyzed in (9), and some of them are amenable to a sequential treatment, others are not. The transitions *yqui* and *ssunqui* are problematic for any morphological theory limited to a linear analysis into stems and affixes. For this reason, though Carochi's treatment seems more comprehensive and satisfying than Gonçalves', in fact object agreement in Quechua is of greater interest than in Nahuatl just because the relation between the meaning and morphosyntax is less direct. For discussion of these issues in a more recent form of Quechua, see Bedell (1994).

References

- Andres de Olmos, *Arte para Aprender la Lengua Mexicana*, 1547; publicado con notas, aclaraciones, etc. por Rémi Simeon, Paris, 1875; prólogo y versión al castellano de la introducción por Miguel León-Portilla, Guadalajara, 1972.
- Domingo de Santo Thomas, *Grammatica o Arte de la Lengua General de los Reynos del Peru*, Valladolid, 1560.
- Diego Gonçalez Holguin, *Gramatica y Arte Nueva de la Lengua General de todo el Peru, llamada lengua Qquichua, o lengua del Inca*, Ciudad de los Reyes, 1607; revised and reprinted, Genoa, 1842.
- Horacio Carochi, *Arte de la Lengua Mexicana, con la declaracion de los adverbios della*, Mexico, 1645.
- G. Bedell, 'Object-Verb Agreement in Quechua', *ICU Research Center for Japanese Language Education Annual Bulletin* 4:87-108, 1994.
- Horacio Carochi, *Grammar of the Mexican Language, with an Explanation of its adverbs*, translated and edited with a commentary by J. Lockhart, Stanford, 2001.
- G. Bedell, 'The Nahuatl Language', (Japanese version 'Nawatorugo no susume', *Gekkan Gengo* 11/1988 to 4/1989, Tokyo: Taishukan); *Language in India* <www.languageinindia.com> 11.11: 798-826, 2011.

=====

George Bedell, Ph.D.
Lecturer, Department of Linguistics
Payap University
Chiang Mai 50000
Thailand
gdbedell@gmail.com