

Portuguese Missionary Grammars in Asia, Africa and Brazil, 1550–1800

Otto Zwartjes

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY

Portuguese Missionary Grammars in Asia, Africa and Brazil,
1550–1800

STUDIES IN THE HISTORY OF THE LANGUAGE SCIENCES

AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND HISTORY
OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE – Series III

General Editor

E.F.K. KOERNER

Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft,
Typologie und Universalienforschung, Berlin
efk.koerner@rz.hu-berlin.de

The series *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences* (SiHoLS) has been established as a companion to the journal *Historiographia Linguistica*. The series intends to meet the revival of interest in the history of linguistic thought and to provide an organized reservoir of information concerning our heritage of linguistic ideas of more than two millennia. SiHoLS will publish book-length scholarly studies on (the evolution of) human reflection about the nature of language and the many ways in which it can be analyzed and used. These studies may concern particular aspects of language study, entire traditions, or special periods of their development. In addition, the series will include re-editions or entirely new translations into English of 'classic' works in the field that have been out of print for many years. These new editions will be introduced by a present-day specialist who places the book in its intellectual and socio-historical context, and highlights its significance in the evolution of our thinking about language.

A complete list of titles in this series can be found on
<http://benjamins.com/catalog/sihols>

Advisory Editorial Board

Cristina Altman (São Paulo); John Considine (Edmonton, Alta.)
Lia Formigari (Rome); Gerda Haßler (Potsdam)
John E. Joseph (Edinburgh); Douglas A. Kibbee (Urbana, Ill.)
Hans-Josef Niederehe (Trier); Emilio Ridruejo (Valladolid)
Otto Zwartjes (Amsterdam)

Volume 117

Otto Zwartjes

Portuguese Missionary Grammars in Asia, Africa and Brazil, 1550–1800

Portuguese Missionary Grammars in Asia, Africa and Brazil, 1550–1800

Otto Zwartjes

University of Amsterdam

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Zwartjes, Otto.

Portuguese missionary grammars in Asia, Africa and Brazil, 1550-1800 / Otto Zwartjes.

p. cm. (Amsterdam studies in the theory and history of linguistic science. Series III, Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, ISSN 0304-0720 ; v. 117)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Portuguese language--Grammar--History. 2. Portuguese language--Brazil--History. 3. Portuguese language--Asia--History. 4. Portuguese language--Africa--History. 5. Missions--Linguistics work--History. I. Title.

PC5025.Z93 2011

410.88'266--dc23

2011033750

ISBN 978 90 272 4608 0 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8325 2 (Eb)

© 2011 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

Preface & acknowledgements	XIII
CHAPTER 1	
Introduction	1
1.1 Goal of the study	1
1.2 The historiographical neglect of missionary linguistics	2
1.3 The contribution of missionary linguistics to the study of the typology of languages	4
1.4 Missionary linguists as field-workers: Their attitudes	10
1.5 The description of exotic languages and the development of linguistic concepts	14
1.6 The goals and structure of this study	17
1.6.1 What do we want to know?	18
1.6.1.1 Phonology and orthography	18
1.6.1.2 Morphosyntax	18
1.6.1.3 The lexicon	19
1.6.1.4 Extra-grammatical information	20
1.6.2 What do we have?	20
References	20
CHAPTER 2	
The Indian subcontinent	23
2.1 Introduction	23
2.1.1 Historical background	25
2.1.2 The Indian grammatical tradition	27
2.2 Tamil. Henrique Henriques (or, Anrique Anriquez) (1520–1600)	28
2.2.1 The life and work of Henrique Henriques	28
2.2.2 Henriques's Tamil grammar: Authorship and sources	29
2.2.3 Henriques's Tamil grammar and the Tamil language	31
2.2.3.1 Malabar and Tamil	31
2.2.3.2 The structure of Henriques's grammar	31
2.2.3.3 Henriques's treatment of Tamil orthography and phonology	32

- 2.2.3.4 Henriques's treatment of Tamil nominal declension 32
- 2.2.3.5 Henriques's treatment of the Tamil verb 35
- 2.2.3.6 Henriques's explicit comparisons between Tamil and Portuguese 38
- 2.2.3.7 Henriques's treatment of Tamil word order 39
- 2.2.3.8 Henriques's treatment of agreement in Tamil 40
- 2.2.3.9 Henriques's treatment of variation within Tamil 40
- 2.2.3.10 Henriques's meta-language 41
- 2.2.4 The reputation of Henriques's work 44
- 2.2.5 Other Tamil grammars 44
- 2.3 Konkani. Thomas Stephens (Thomaz Estevão 1549–1619) 45
 - 2.3.1 The life of Thomas Stephens 45
 - 2.3.2 Other early grammars of Konkani and neighbouring languages 46
 - 2.3.3 The Konkani language 48
 - 2.3.4 Stephens's Konkani grammar 49
 - 2.3.4.1 Stephens's treatment of phonology and orthography 49
 - 2.3.4.2 Stephens's treatment of Konkani nominal morphology 52
 - 2.3.4.3 Stephens's treatment of Konkani verbal morphology 54
 - 2.3.4.4 Stephens's treatment of Konkani syntax. Word order and agreement 56
 - 2.3.4.5 Stephens's treatment of ergativity 57
 - 2.3.4.6 Stephens's meta-language 58
- 2.4 Bengali. Manoel da Assumpçam (fl. 1743) 58
 - 2.4.1 Manoel da Assumpçam and his grammar 58
 - 2.4.2 The Bengali language 59
 - 2.4.2.1 Bengali and Portuguese 61
 - 2.4.3 The grammar 62
 - 2.4.3.1 Assumpçam's treatment of orthography and phonology 62
 - 2.4.3.2 Assumpçam's treatment of nominal declension 64
 - 2.4.3.3 Assumpçam's treatment of verbal morphology 64
 - 2.4.3.4 Assumpçam's treatment of syntax 66
 - 2.4.3.5 Assumpçam's treatment of word order and agreement 66
- 2.5 Marathi (Anonymous 1778a) 67
 - 2.5.1 The Marathi language 67
 - 2.5.2 The 1778 Marathi grammar 68
 - 2.5.2.1 The grammar's treatment of Marathi phonology and orthography 68
 - 2.5.2.2 The grammar's treatment of Marathi nominal morphology 70
 - 2.5.2.3 The grammar's treatment of Marathi verbal morphology 71

2.5.2.4	The grammar's treatment of Marathi syntax, word order and agreement	72
2.5.2.5	The grammar's treatment of ergativity	74
2.6	Hindi (Anonymous 1778b)	75
2.6.1	Previous grammars of Hindi by Europeans	75
2.6.2	The language	76
2.6.3.1	The grammar's view of the Hindi language	76
2.6.3.2	The structure of the grammar	77
2.6.3.3	The grammar's treatment of Hindi phonology and orthography	79
2.6.3.4	The grammar's treatment of nominal declension	84
2.6.3.5	The grammar's treatment of verbal inflection	84
2.6.3.6	The grammar's treatment of adverbs	85
2.6.3.7	The grammar's treatment of the article	85
2.6.3.8	The grammar's treatment of agreement and word order	87
2.6.3.9	The grammar's treatment of agreement and ergativity	88
2.7	Conclusion	89

CHAPTER 3

Missionary linguistics in Japan 93

3.1	Introduction	93
3.2	The activities of João Rodrigues (1562–1633)	94
3.2.1	His life	94
3.2.2	His work	96
3.2.3	Sources of Rodrigues' grammar	98
3.2.3.1	European sources	98
3.2.3.2	Japanese sources	103
3.3	The Japanese language as described by Rodrigues	111
3.3.1	Language variation: Coye and yomi	111
3.3.2	Geographical distinctions	111
3.3.3	Diachrony: The 'old language' and the concept of auctoritas	114
3.3.4	Christian terminology: Loans from Latin and Portuguese	118
3.3.5	On the best way of learning Japanese	120
3.4	Phonology and orthography	121
3.5	Morphology	127
3.5.1	Inflection	127
3.5.1.1	Nominal inflection and 'cases'	127
3.5.1.2	Adjective noun ("Nome adjectiuo")	130
3.5.1.3	Verbal inflection	133

- 3.5.1.4 Honorificity 136
- 3.5.1.5 Causatives 136
- 3.6 Syntax: Word order and agreement 137
 - 3.6.1 Japanese as an SOV language 137
 - 3.6.2 Japanese as a left-branching language 139
- 3.7 Rodrigues as an historian and ethnographer 140
- 3.8 Conclusion 140

CHAPTER 4

Missionary linguistics in Brazil

143

- 4.1 Introduction: Missionaries in Spanish and Portuguese America 143
 - 4.1.1 Missionaries and *lenguas generales*/*línguas gerais* 144
 - 4.1.2 Missionary linguistics in Portuguese America 146
- 4.2 Tupi grammars 148
 - 4.2.1 Joseph de Anchieta (1534–1597) 148
 - 4.2.1.1 Introduction: Anchieta and his forerunners 148
 - 4.2.1.2 The language described by Anchieta 148
 - 4.2.1.3 The structure of the grammar 151
 - 4.2.1.4 Phonology and orthography 152
 - 4.2.1.5 The concept of ‘case’ as applied to Tupi 156
 - 4.2.1.6 The pronouns 157
 - 4.2.1.7 Nominal and verbal inflection 159
 - 4.2.1.8 Nouns, ‘adjectives’, and ‘adverbs’ 161
 - 4.2.1.9 Syntax 162
 - 4.2.2 Antonio de Araújo’s *Cathecismo* (1618) 163
 - 4.2.3 Luiz Figueira (1575–1643) 164
 - 4.2.3.1 The language described by Figueira 165
 - 4.2.3.2 Orthography and phonology 165
 - 4.2.3.3 Morphosyntax 166
 - 4.2.3.4 The inclusive-exclusive distinction 166
 - 4.2.3.5 Syntax and agreement 167
 - 4.2.3.6 Word order 168
 - 4.2.4 The anonymous grammar of the *Língua geral amazônica*.
Biblioteca de Coimbra, no. 69 (1750) 168
 - 4.2.4.1 Introduction 168
 - 4.2.4.2 The author 169
 - 4.2.4.3 The manuscript 169
 - 4.2.4.4 Language variation 170
 - 4.2.4.5 Language change 171
 - 4.2.4.6 The grammar 171

4.2.4.7	The eight parts of speech and language universals	172
4.2.4.8	The pronominal system	172
4.2.4.9	The ‘ <i>pronomes extravagantes</i> ’	174
4.3	The Kiriri grammar of Luiz Vincencio Mamiani (1652–1730)	175
4.3.1	Introduction	175
4.3.2	The language	176
4.3.3	Sources for eastern Brazilian languages of the Macro-Jê family	177
4.3.4	The grammar	179
4.3.4.1	The sources of the grammar	179
4.3.4.2	References to other languages and language variety	182
4.3.5	Phonology and orthography	183
4.3.5.1	The vowels	184
4.3.5.2	The consonants	187
4.3.5.3	Diacritics	190
4.3.6	Morphosyntax	191
4.3.6.1	“Inflection”	191
4.3.6.2	The inclusive-exclusive distinction	194
4.3.6.3	The animate versus inanimate distinction	196
4.3.7	Syntax	196
4.3.7.1	Word order and agreement	196
4.3.7.2	Ergativity	198
4.4	Conclusion	201

CHAPTER 5

African languages	205
5.1	Introduction 205
5.1.1	Three grammars of African languages 206
5.1.2	Their context in the early study of African languages 208
5.1.3	Early catechisms in African languages 210
5.2	The Capuchin Hyacinth Brusciotto and his Kongo grammar (1659) 214
5.2.1	The language 214
5.2.2	Phonology 215
5.2.3	Morphosyntax 216
5.2.3.1	Nominal inflection, declensions, ‘cases’ and the noun-classes 216
5.2.3.2	Verbal morphology 217
5.2.4	Syntax 219
5.3	Pedro Dias (1622–1700) 220
5.3.1	The language 222
5.3.1.1	The structure of the grammar 224

5.3.2	Phonology and orthography	224
5.3.3	Morphosyntax	227
5.3.3.1	Nominal morphology	227
5.3.3.2	Verbal morphology	230
5.4	The anonymous “Arte da língua de Cafre”	236
5.4.1	The language	236
5.4.2	Phonology and orthography	238
5.4.3	Morphosyntax	238
5.4.3.1	Nominal morphology	238
5.4.3.2	Verbal morphology	239
5.4.4	Meta-language	241
5.5	Conclusion	241

CHAPTER 6

Arabic and Hebrew

243

6.1	Introduction	243
6.2	Arabic	243
6.2.1	Introduction	243
6.2.2	The grammars and their sources	245
6.2.3	The language	248
6.2.4	The structure of the grammar of de Sousa, compared with those of Erpenius and Guadagnoli	249
6.2.5	Phonology and orthography	252
6.2.6	Parts of speech and morphology	254
6.2.7	Syntax. Word order and agreement	255
6.3	Hebrew	256
6.4	Conclusion	260

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

261

7.1	Phonology and orthography	261
7.1.1	The Indian subcontinent	261
7.1.2	Japan	262
7.1.3	Brazil	263
7.1.4	Africa	263
7.1.5	Arabic and Hebrew	263
7.2	Morphosyntax	264
7.2.1	India	264
7.2.2	Japan	265

7.2.3	Brazil	265
7.2.4	Africa	266
7.3	Parts of speech	266
7.3.1	Adaptations of the traditional model	266
7.3.2	Articles	267
7.4	Extra-grammatical information	268
7.5	A Portuguese tradition?	268

APPENDIX

Lexicography	271
1. The Indian subcontinent	271
1.1 The Indian lexicographical tradition	271
1.1.1 Sanskrit	271
1.1.2 Tamil	271
1.2 Dictionaries compiled by Europeans	272
1.3 Konkani	274
1.4 Hindi	275
1.5 Other languages	276
2. Japan	276
2.1 The Japanese lexicographical tradition.	276
2.2 The Vocabulario of 1595 and the Dictionarium of 1603–1604	277
2.3 Meta-linguistic terms in the dictionaries	280
3. China and Cochinchina (Vietnam)	281
3.1 Introduction	281
3.2 The Chinese linguistic tradition	282
3.3 Chinese dictionaries composed by westerners	282
3.3.1 The Dicionário Português-Chinês	286
3.3.2 Other early European studies of Chinese	287
3.4 Cochinchina (Vietnam) and Malaya	290
3.4.1 The Roman alphabet and the description of tone	292
3.4.2 Morphology and syntax	293
3.4.3 Malay	295
4. Brazil	295
5. African languages	296
6. Arabic and Hebrew	301
6.1 Arabic	301
6.2 Hebrew	301
References	303
Index of biographical names	347
Index of subjects and terms	353

Preface & acknowledgements

Since this book is the result of almost two decades of academic activity, it is impossible to acknowledge the help and encouragement received from all the many colleagues who have contributed in one way or another to its final completion. To begin with, Kees Versteegh was the scholar who introduced me to the study of the history of linguistics. The Faculty of Humanities of the Radboud University (Nijmegen) offered me a post-doc position in 1997 with a project on the Arabic grammar of Pedro de Alcalá (c.1455–1505). Next, I am very grateful to the *Klassisk og romansk institutt* of the University of Oslo, for having given me the opportunity to continue with my research. In particular, I am grateful for the excellent support of scientific staff-members at the University of Oslo, especially Even Hovdhaugen and the library support I received from José María Izquierdo. I greatly benefited from a project financed by the Research Council of Norway (*Norges Forskningsrådet*), entitled “Oslo Project on Missionary Linguistics” (OsProMil for short), which enabled me to eventually organize altogether six international conferences on Missionary Linguistics in Oslo, São Paulo, Hong Kong & Macau, Valladolid, Mérida (Yucatán), and Tokyo (2003–2010).

I am grateful to the University of Amsterdam, particularly the Faculty of Humanities, the Department of Language and Literature, the Amsterdam Centre of Language and Communication (ACLC), and, last but not least, the Netherlands Organisation of Scientific Research (NWO) which funded my stay at the Institute for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and the Social Sciences (NIAS) in 2007–2008, an institute of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW). I take the opportunity to express my thanks to Kees Hengeveld who applied for the replacement subsidy of NWO. I also wish to acknowledge the *Norges Forskningsrådet* and the *Institutt for litteratur, områdestudier og europeiske språk* (ILOS, University of Oslo) for having funded a second sojourn at NIAS in Wassenaar in 2009.

The present book is the result of scholarly cooperation with many scholars, colleagues and friends, particularly Astrid Alexander-Bakkerus, the late Hans den Besten, Cristina Altman, Ramón Arzápalo Marín, Georg Bossong, Sandra Breitenbach, Julio Calvo Pérez, Even Hovdhaugen, José Antonio Flores Farfán, Pilar Máyne, Toru Maruyama, Carlota Rosa, Joaquín Sueiro Justel, Pierre Swiggers, Emilio Ridruejo, the late Thomas C. Smith-Stark and Klaus Zimmermann. Versions of most chapters included here were often first aired as papers at conferences.

Ensuing discussions and feedback received on various occasions have helped to shape the present volume.

The pre-final version of the present study has benefited from the valuable observations made by Toon van Hal (Louvain), Henning Klöter (Bochum), Karsten Legère (Göteborg), Joseph Abraham Levi (Hong Kong), Achuthan Menon (Leiden), Norval Smith (Amsterdam) and Masayuki Toyoshima (Tokyo). Regular disclaimers apply.

A part of this monograph was completed during my fellowship in 2010 at the Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA) and Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (TUFS), funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS; “Invitational Training Program for Advanced Japanese Research Institutes”).

This book has been revised by John Considine (Edmonton, Canada) and Gregory James (Hong Kong). Regular disclaimers apply. Thanks are also due to the staff of NIAS, particularly Wim Blockmans, Jos Hooghuis, the excellent library support of Dindy van Maanen and Erwin Nolet and Petry Kievit-Tyson, who revised an earlier version of the first chapter. I am grateful to Willem van der Wal for his patience.

Finally, as I am preparing the camera-ready copy of this volume, I wish to acknowledge the long-standing support of my work by the general editor of the series he directs since 1973 and the anonymous referees he chose, and the professional assistance received from staff of John Benjamins, in particular Anke de Looper.

Amsterdam, June 2011

O.Z.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

1.1 Goal of the study

The work presented here is the first general monograph focusing on the missionary grammars of Amerindian, African and Asian languages which were written in Portuguese in the colonial period.¹ Its aim is to provide an integrated framework, analysis and evaluation of these grammars. The languages which they described are referred to as *exotic languages* below; the word *exotic* is no more than a convenient shorthand, and is not meant to imply Eurocentric value-judgements of any sort. The definition of ‘missionary grammar’ used in this study is taken from Even Hovdhaugen:

A missionary grammar is a description of a particular language created as part of missionary work by non-native missionaries. It is a pedagogical, synchronic grammar covering phonology, morphology and syntax based on data mainly from an oral corpus (in a few cases from religious – mainly translated – texts).

(Hovdhaugen 1996a: 15)

In fact, it has to be observed that not all the grammars surveyed here are strictly ‘pedagogical’. Often they give irrelevant non-pedagogical information (cf. the work of Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés [1688–1747]). Not all grammars are strictly ‘synchronic’ either: language change is sometimes dealt with, discussing the speech of the ‘old’ and the ‘new’. Furthermore, not all grammars cover all the subfields of phonology, morphology and syntax, and finally, not all the grammars are based on an oral corpus. Hovdhaugen’s definition still holds for many grammars, and it provides a very useful theoretical starting point, but it should not be applied too rigidly in practice.

Most of the works of the Portuguese missionaries in the pre-modern period (16th to 18th century) have doubtless been lost. However, an interesting corpus of treatments of very diverse languages is still extant. It includes grammars of Tamil (Dravidian); Konkani, Marathi and Bengali (Indo-Aryan); Japanese; Kipeá-Kirirí (Macro-Jê); Tupinambá and the *Lingua Geral Amazônica* (Tupi-Guarani); Kimbundu and Sena (Bantu); and finally Arabic and Hebrew. Most of the grammars

1. More specialized monographs related to the Portuguese missionary-linguistic enterprise (cf. Buescu 1983; Fonseca 2006) have of course preceded it.

were written by Jesuits, although the Arabic grammars were mainly written by Franciscan monks and the Bengali grammar was the product of an Augustinian. The Hebrew grammar discussed in this monograph does not strictly belong to missionary linguistics, since it was not written as “part of missionary work”, but it will be described briefly, since it was written by a missionary in Portuguese.

1.2 The historiographical neglect of missionary linguistics

Scholars studying the history of linguistics in the early modern period have been concerned – disproportionately so – with writings on the vernaculars of Europe. In contrast, there was until recently a relative lack of research on the descriptions of non-Indo-European languages from the same period: a neglect of the pioneering work of the early missionaries who were committed to communicating with the locals. So, for instance, many scholars believed that linguistic data on the non-classic languages, the ‘savage’ languages as they were sometimes called, was not available prior to the ‘pioneering’ endeavors of Catherine the Great (1729–1796).² Likewise, Wolfart (1967: 154) remarked that the scarcity of data was the main obstacle for the study of American Indian languages. However, a huge amount of relevant data from missionary sources has been available in Europe for two centuries. Over the last two centuries the languages which were described by the early missionary linguists have been studied extensively, but scholars have until recently paid little attention to the achievements of those linguists.

In the 1990s this situation changed, and then followed what Koerner (2002: 19) characterizes as “a major decade devoted to what is generally called ‘missionary linguistics’” citing pioneer publications by Hovdhaugen (1996a) and Nowak (1999a). The missionary linguists’ contribution to the study of language is acknowledged today, but attitudes still need to change further and much research still needs to be done. The majority of modern linguists still neglect the topic and ‘missionary linguistics’ is seldom included in the university curricula or scholarly publications on the history of linguistics. Nevertheless, the study of missionary sources has increased over the last decades and the need for this is best illustrated by Schreyer’s words:

2. She was patron of the Russian opera, but also an avid collector of about 200 vocabularies. These were compiled in Peter Simon Pallas’ (1741–1811) *Linguarum totius orbis vocabularia comparativa Augustissimae cura collecta* which formed the basis of Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806) and Johann Severin Vater’s (1771–1826) *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde* (1806–1817) with contributions by Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835) and John Pickering (1777–1846), one of the founders of the American Oriental Society.

The Age of Discovery was also the age of the discovery of languages. There are literally thousands of published and unpublished dictionaries and grammars of ‘exotic’ languages, written before the 20th century. Usually these are the work of missionaries, undertaken as an essential preliminary to their endeavour to teach the Christian truth to the newly discovered heathens. Historians of linguistics are beginning to realise that these linguistic studies deserve more attention than they have so far received, if only because a history of linguistic worth its salt cannot afford to neglect such a large area of linguistic research. (Schreyer 1999: 101)³

It remains unclear why these works have been neglected since the 16th and 17th centuries when they were first produced. The mere fact that they were not reprinted (many, of course, were never printed in the first place) is not a sufficient explanation. Some works of great humanist scholars such as Antonio de Nebrija’s (c.1444–1522) Castilian grammar (1492) were also neglected for a long period – in the case of Nebrija’s grammar, until it was reprinted in the 18th century. A similar example is the *Diálogo de la lengua* (1535) by Juan de Valdés (c.1495–1541) (Haßler 2000: 65), which was printed for the first time by Gregorio Mayans y Sísar (1699–1781) in 1737. It is true that some missionary works were reprinted in the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century, when scholarly interest in Amerindian languages started to increase.⁴ Some of them have been studied quite systematically, including the Quechua and Nahuatl grammars and dictionaries produced for the Spanish, or the Japanese grammars and dictionaries produced by the Jesuits for the Portuguese. However, many grammars or dictionaries produced by the missionaries have not yet been reprinted or edited. Moreover, the works of the missionary linguists are studied mainly in the context of historical and descriptive linguistics rather than in terms of the importance they have had for the development of linguistics. The invention of an innovative meta-language, or the modified meanings of conventional terminology and the possible influence of local indigenous grammatical theory (particular in the descriptions of Asian languages), have hardly been topics for systematic study.

The main reason why modern linguists seem to ignore these pre-modern sources is probably because they dismiss their methodology as an attempt to superimpose the Greco-Latin grammatical model on the languages being described. This certainly did happen, as we discuss in Section 1.5 below. Even today a great number of linguistic models are still based on, or derived from, a Eurocentric

3. Zwartjes & Hovdhaugen (2004b: 2).

4. In this context, the editions and study of early missionary work by Nicolás León (1859–1929), Antonio Peñafiel (1839–1922) Francisco Belmar (1859–1926), Manuel de San Juan Crisóstomo Nájera (1803–1853), Joaquín García Icazbalceta (1824–1894) and Francisco Pimentel (1832–1893) in Mexico have to be mentioned, while in Europe comparable efforts were made by the German Julius Platzmann (1832–1902) and others.

tradition, and modern linguists often point out the shortcomings of the Latin-based model and the inappropriateness of imposing Eurocentric concepts onto other languages with a typologically different structure. Nevertheless, the Latin (and Eurocentric) based traditions could offer flexible models that could be adapted, extended or changed whenever necessary. Another reason for ignoring missionary grammars is that for years the description of languages was not considered a worthwhile scientific endeavour in many quarters. Theoretical linguists tended to cite linguistic data in support of their theories, which led to a tendency to see descriptive linguistics as an ancillary branch of theoretical linguistics or anthropological research only.⁵ In contrast, the missionaries had very clear reasons for taking a more practical, perhaps what we could call empirical, approach to writing grammars and compiling dictionaries. Their main purpose was to communicate with the local people and to teach them the Christian faith.

One last point is worth mentioning. Most missionaries had an excellent command of various ‘exotic’ languages. This was not in itself a guarantee of writing a good grammar, but we should certainly not dismiss the missionary linguists as ill-informed.

1.3 The contribution of missionary linguistics to the study of the typology of languages

In the 570-page study entitled *Western Linguistics* by Seuren (1998), one section describes Sir William Jones’s (1746–1794) well-known address of 1786. In this speech, which is often seen as the ‘birth of comparative philology’, Jones says

The Sanskrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and in the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident.

(Seuren 1998: 80)⁶

Seuren observes that the English Jesuit missionary Thomas Stephens (c.1549–1619) the author of the *Arte da Lingoa Canarim*, which was originally printed posthumously in Rachol in Goa in 1640, had already mentioned the affinity between Sanskrit, Latin and Greek in a letter dated 1583. It is illustrative of the total

5. See for instance Nowak (1996: 24–25) and particularly Dixon (1997: 130–135).

6. From “The Third Anniversary Discourse, on the Hindus”, delivered to the Asiatic Society, 2 February 1786. (Franklin 1995; <http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~kemmer/Words/jones.html>).

lack of regard for missionary sources for many centuries that this letter was not published in the West until 1957.⁷

With the exception of a handful of pioneering works, such as Conrad Gessner's (1516–1565) *Mithridates* of 1555 or Claude Duret's (1570–1611) *Thresor de l'histoire des langues de cest universe* of 1614,⁸ the birth of comparative philology is usually located at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The main Jesuit protagonists were Filippo Salvatore Gilij (1721–1789) (Olza Zubiri 1989) and Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (1735–1809), who did their research in Rome after the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Spanish and Portuguese territories. In other regions in Europe interest in the autochthonous languages of particularly South America was increasing during the second half of the 18th and the 19th century, as can be seen in the work of scholars such as Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835).⁹ It has recently been demonstrated that Humboldt based a great deal of his linguistic data on the work of Hervás y Panduro, who had made extensive use of missionary descriptions of exotic languages (Ringmacher 1994: 50).

It is difficult to explain why pre-modern Europe showed so little interest in the missionaries' linguistic documentation. It is true that many works were written for teaching purposes and many were printed locally. Moreover, the missionaries rarely brought their linguistic material back to Europe, because, as Law (2003: 219) observes, many of them died in the remote regions where they were stationed. So it can be seen that most of the linguistic works produced in the Americas and in Asia were not available in Europe for the first two centuries of European colonization (cf. Schreyer 1992: 2). However, it is too easy to conclude that European scholars did not have any access to these sources, as Percival assumes.¹⁰ Quite a few important missionary grammars were printed in Europe. The monumental

7. Cf. also M. Müller, "Lectures on the Science of Language": "Im Jahre 1767, legte der Missionär der Akademie die Frage vor: "Woher kommt es, dass das Sanskrit eine so grosse Anzahl von Wörtern und Wortformen mit dem griechischen und lateinischen gemeinsam hat?" (cited in Dahlmann 1891: 20–21).

8. Cf. Colombat (2008) and Schmidt-Riese (2008).

9. The other most important figures, next to Christoph Adelung and Johann Severin Vater, were Friedrich Schlegel (1772–1829), his elder brother August Wilhelm (1767–1845), Adriano Balbi (1782–1848), Johann Jakob von Tschudi (1818–1889), Hermann Ernst Ludewig (c.1810–1856), Alcide Dessalines D'Orbigny (1802–1857), Karl Friedrich Philipp von Martius (1794–1868), and Johann Baptist von Spix (1781–1826).

10. "Generalmente, los eruditos europeos ignoraban las lenguas del Nuevo Mundo, puesto que no tenían acceso a la literatura gramatical y lexicográfica impresa en la Nueva España" (Percival 1994: 70). [In this way, European scholars working in the Old World did not have access to the grammatical and lexicographical literature printed in New Spain and hence knew little if anything about the languages of the New World.] (Percival 1999: 19).

grammars and dictionaries of Quechua (Valladolid 1560) and Guarani (Madrid 1640), written by the Dominican Domingo de Santo Tomás (c.1499–1570) and the Jesuit Antonio Ruiz de Montoya (1585–1652) respectively, were printed in Europe, as was the multilingual book *Rituale seu Manuale Peruanum*, printed in Naples in 1607, containing texts in Latin, Spanish, Quechua, Aymara, Guarani, Mochica and Pukina, written by Luis Hieronimo de Oré (d. 1628) (Cerrón-Palomino 1995: 61–62; Torero 2002: 300 and 389). Brazilian-Portuguese sources were not printed locally but in Portugal. As a consequence of the *patronato/padroado* – *Propaganda Fide* controversy in the Catholic world, the Propaganda Fide Press decided to bypass the Spanish and Portuguese missions, ordering the printing of a great deal of linguistic data in many different languages, particularly from other continents than Latin America. These studies were printed in Rome, and even works from the Spanish missionary tradition were printed there, such as Ludovico Bertonio's (1557–1625) grammars of Aymara.¹¹ In the 17th century, Rome therefore became an important repository of linguistic studies on non-European languages. If humanist scholars in Europe had really been interested in studying exotic materials, they could have found them in Rome. Moreover, although most priests died in the remote places where they lived, some of them returned to Europe. Interested scholars could have asked the priests for their linguistic knowledge, but there is little evidence that this happened.¹² Neither those who were responsible for the printing of these works nor those missionary-linguists who did return to Europe informed the scholarly world about their 'discovery' of these typologically different languages. They may not have seen any need to do so.

During the Renaissance period in Europe, grammars of the vernacular languages of the nations of Europe began to emerge.¹³ Besides Latin and Greek the study of Hebrew was added to the education programme of missionaries and academics, and scholars not only studied the Hebrew language, but also the Hebrew grammatical tradition. So, for instance, Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522) quotes in his *De rudimentis hebraicis* (1506) Priscian and "Rabbi David" (i.e. Qimḥi) as well (Law 2003: 247–248; Zwartjes 2007a: 209). One of the Hebrew tradition's main contributions to descriptive linguistics was the introduction of the terms *root* (*radix*), *affix*, *suffix* and *prefix*. In addition, the scope of Europeans' interest in language expanded simultaneously with European expansion into other countries

11. Bertonio (1603a) and Bertonio (1603b) were printed by Luiz Zanetti in Rome, whereas Bertonio (1612a) and (1612b) were printed by Francisco del Canto in Lima.

12. There are some interesting texts written by Bernardo de Aldrete (1560–1641) (1972[1606], 1: 146) (see Binotti 2000).

13. For this 'explosion' of linguistic activity see Padley (1988), Lepschy (1998), Law (2003: 210–257) and particularly Aurox (1992b).

(Bossong 1992: 5). At first, this expansion focused more on the study of other Semitic languages such as Arabic, biblical Aramaic and other languages which had long standing written traditions, particularly the Asian languages. The Chinese language had already attracted the attention of some scholars in 1550 (Schreyer 1992). Not only did the languages of Asia catch the attention of missionaries and scholars, but so did local grammatical and lexicographical traditions. There is no evidence of a comparable interest in Amerindian languages in Europe at this time: the so-called ‘discovery’ of Amerindian languages was considerably later.

While these developments were taking place in Europe, the production of dictionaries and grammars began to increase in the New World and in Asia, often outnumbering what was being made in Europe. The missionaries abroad needed to describe typologically different languages, and they often adapted the traditional Greco-Latin model drastically in order to accommodate linguistic features they were unfamiliar with. The knowledge they acquired about indigenous languages equipped them with a more extended and refined linguistic framework than that of their contemporaries who were writing grammars of the national vernaculars in Europe. The flexibility which results from the continuous interplay between data and linguistic theory produced a more flexible approach, as is also the case in linguistic fieldwork today.

Often, the missionaries knew multiple exotic languages. For instance, the Jesuit Luis de Valdivia (1561–1642) already had knowledge of Mapudungun when he started to write his grammars of Allentiac and Millcayac (Zwartjes 2000a: 234).¹⁴ In a grammar of the Totonac language (1990 [first half of the 18th century]), written by an unknown author, Totonac paradigms were given together with their equivalents in Nahuatl and Spanish. Dominicans working in the Spanish tradition on descriptions of Chinese (the language of the ‘Sangleys’),¹⁵ had access to linguistic works produced in Manila where there were grammars and dictionaries for Japanese, Tagalog and other Philippine languages (Klötter & Zwartjes 2008). Priests in Manila usually worked in New Spain for several years, where they had access to the linguistic studies of Amerindian languages. Some missionaries moved directly from Asia to New Spain, such as the Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés, who had worked in the Philippines, where he wrote grammars of Japanese and Tagalog languages, the latter including a compendium describing Chinese. His works were printed in Mexico and he was appointed President of the San Agustín

14. His ‘new categories’ in verbal morphology are the ‘mixed tenses’, which were used in his description of Mapudungun. Later, Valdivia used the same ‘extended’ classification for his description of Millcayac and Allentiac (cf. Ridruejo 2009).

15. The first known printed work in the Philippines was in Chinese (written in 1593; see Kamen 2008: 157).

de las Cuevas Convent, in what today is known as Tlalpan, where he lived until he died in 1747 (Gómez Platero 1880: 388–389; Pérez 1908: 241–247; Bae 2005: 21). This means that his work on Asian languages was available in New Spain. Likewise, the Franciscan Juan de Ayora (died in 1582), who learned Tagalog, Ilocan and Chinese (Sueiro 2003: 151), was a student of the grammarian and lexicographer Alonso de Molina (c.1514–1585), the great specialist in Nahuatl. Ayora went on to write a grammar entitled *Arte de la lengua mejicana* and a *Vocabulario español mejicano*, which have been lost.¹⁶ Andrés de Olmos (c.1480–1568) wrote grammars of Nahuatl and Otomi – the latter is lost – and Alonso de Urbano (1529–1608) wrote a trilingual Spanish-Nahuatl-Otomi grammar and dictionary. It is likely that the descriptive methods of these highly polyglot missionary linguists benefitted from the increasing body of shared knowledge about non-Indo-European languages.

In the Portuguese territories, we see a similar situation. Goa and Macao, in particular, played an important role in the learning and teaching of exotic languages, both Indo-Aryan and non-Indo European. In India, texts were printed that related to the missions of Abyssinia and Ethiopia, while in Macao, the Christian refugees from Japan contributed considerably to a broader perspective of linguistic studies. In India, many missionaries produced descriptive grammars of several Indian languages (Konkani and Tamil) and it is significant that those who preached in China and Japan had often been educated in Goa. Native speakers of Chinese were brought to Goa at St. Paul's college and in this sense the study of several exotic languages was able to advance more rapidly because of the more conducive environment compared to progress in Europe with respect to language descriptions of the non-Indo-European languages. The Jesuit Gaspar do Amaral (died in 1645) who co-authored the *Diccionario da lingua Annamitica* with Antonio Barbosa (died in the 17th century) not only knew Vietnamese but also Japanese.¹⁷

The more systematic knowledge the missionaries had about grammatical categories and paradigmatic patterns, the more effective they were at identifying such patterns in a given exotic language when they studied it. An illustrative example is the description of the tonal system in some Asian languages. Because descriptions of tone were available in studies of Chinese (cf. Klöter 2007, 2009 and 2011), it was much easier to define tones in Vietnamese. In contrast, when missionaries wanted

16. Tormo Sanz (1978: 385) – without explicit reference to his sources – suggested that this work was a grammar and a dictionary of Purépecha (Tarascan), which is unlikely. The title 'Mexican' language usually is only used for Nahuatl.

17. "Por ser muito inteligente na lingua Japoneza a que se applicou com grande disvelo" (Machado 1965[1741], vol. II: 331–332).

to describe the languages of the Otomanguean family in New Spain, they could not rely on previous descriptions of tone (cf. Smith-Stark 2005a: 24).¹⁸

It is true that grammars and dictionaries of many languages were also printed in Europe – not only of Romance languages, but also of Germanic, Slavic and even non-Indo-European languages (see for instance Auroux 1992b; Zubiaur 1989).¹⁹ Most of them, however, were only developed for local usage, and scholars working within their own circles seldom consulted the works of their colleagues working outside their own region.²⁰ The more refined description of aspects in Slavic languages never led to a better understanding of the use of – for instance – the ‘passé simple’ and ‘passé composé’, or the ‘pretérito definido’/‘pretérito imperfecto’ in Spanish or in Portuguese.

Missionary grammars and dictionaries were practical tools for learning and teaching languages, so there was no direct need for systematic inter-linguistic typological research (the work of Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés is maybe one of the few exceptions). However, the comments and observations made by the authors were interspersed or linked to the more traditional Latin-based paradigms with respect to declensions and the conjugations of nouns and verbs. Although missionary linguists usually did not communicate their findings to their readers in a systematic way – passing on knowledge on linguistic typology was not the main objective of linguistic studies in this early period – it is evident that at least some of them were interested in describing typologically exotic features, being real *aficionados*. The missionaries often paid a great deal of attention to the exotic features of the languages they studied, and if they recognised any of comparable features in the other languages they were familiar with, they noted this down.

18. Other illustrative examples are the treatment of the so-called ‘transitions’, i.e. subject and object reference in verb inflection in several grammars of the Andean regions (cf. Adelaar 1997), or the formation of causatives in Philippine languages, called *facere facere* (Ridruejo 2004). Once recognized and identified in a certain language, others continued these new trends.

19. Most grammars of the non-Indo-European languages in Europe were published considerably later, such as the *Grammatica Linguae Ungaricae* (1682) by the Jesuit Pál Pereszlényi (1631–1689), the Basque grammar *Lo imposible vencido* (1729) composed by the Jesuit Manuel de Larramendi (1690–1766), the grammar of Northern Sami *En Lappisk Grammatica* (1748) written by Knud Leem (1696–1775), or the grammar of Finnish *Linguae Finnicae brevis institutio* (1649) written by Eskil Petraeus (1593–1657) (cf. Auroux 1992b: 56 for a more comprehensive list). A systematic comparison between these non-Indo-European languages was not begun yet.

20. Pandžić (2005) labels this process of grammatization *eso-grammatization*, distinguishing it from Auroux’s (1992a) *endo-* and *exo-grammatization*.

1.4 Missionary linguists as field-workers: Their attitudes

In this light, the attitude of missionary linguists can be considered as more open-minded than that of contemporary grammarians in Europe. This may seem paradoxical. After all, missionary works were developed for evangelization purposes and the efforts of the missionaries are often associated with colonial subjugation and the hegemony of Europeans. It is true that the missionaries were inevitably biased when doing their linguistic research in the sense that they were liable to taking a Eurocentric approach. Even today, field-workers are not totally free from Eurocentric approaches, as we can read in several articles in the volume edited by Newman & Ratliff (2001). The assumption that Christian terminology could not be translated explains the imposition of Latin, Portuguese, Spanish, etc., as well as the introduction of loanwords from these languages in native languages. This was a solution for the supposed non-existence of adequate equivalents in these languages (cf. Rafael 1993: 115, Aarvig 2004). Does this suggest the missionaries' lack of acknowledgement for what we now call the 'other'? This is what Kamen suggests (2008: 158):

All these pioneering works had a single purpose: to enable the European to understand, speak and write the native languages. They therefore adopted an exclusively one-way approach to the process of transfer of meaning. The Castilian language was translated into native terms; by contrast, little attempt was made to translate native concepts into Spanish.

Recent study (cf. Zimmermann 2009) demonstrates that their attitude might not have been so narrow. For example, the fact that most dictionaries were bi-directional means that the compilers translated from Latin, Portuguese, Spanish, etc. into the language of the 'other' and the other way around. These bi-directional approaches can be interpreted as an attempt to shape an image of the 'other', which would have been a valuable tool in the missionaries' educational practices. This knowledge of the 'other' would have been indispensable for an adequate description of the language under study. Descriptions of the strategies of politeness in Japanese or in Tamil are a good example. These descriptions of the languages went beyond the limits of what we expect in grammars and dictionaries today.²¹

Generally, any study of the other was a by-product of the main purpose: the refutation of idolatry.²² Some priests described local practices absolutely without

21. Renaissance grammars also included considerably more non-grammatical linguistic material, with extensive word lists embedded in or appended to them, while Renaissance dictionaries often contained grammatical information. The distinction between a dictionary of *language*, or dictionary of *things* (encyclopedia) was not as clear in the Renaissance period.

22. For instance Philippus Guadagnoli's (1596–1656) refutation of Islam (Guadagnoli 1649; cf. Remiro Andollu 1971).

prejudice, as we would expect in a neutral anthropologist's account. However, there were also priests who only studied the customs of the subjugated tribes with the objective of to condemning them; studying 'superstitions' was only considered justifiable if the purpose was to refute them. Bernardino de Sahagún's (1499–1590) words best reflect the missionaries' educational strategies:

The preacher [should know] of the vices of the republic in order to direct his teachings against them, and the confessor in order to know what to ask, and to understand what is said relevant to his charge; it is highly useful that they know what is relevant to the exercise of their offices ... In order to preach against these things and even to know whether they exist, it is indispensable to know they were used in the time of their idolatry. ... and the confessors do not even ask or believe such things to exist, not knowing even the language for asking them, nor would they understand it even if they were told. (Translation by López-Austin 1974: 113)

The missionary grammars were usually written to help the advanced learners who wanted to improve their knowledge of the native languages, or for the beginners who arrived from Europe. The missionaries' dictionaries always contrasted two or more languages; no monolingual dictionaries of the indigenous languages were written. The authors of these texts would have known what their pupils' level of knowledge was and it is generally accepted that they would have understood Latin. Methodologically speaking, these grammarians-lexicographers worked as translators.²³ They tried to order their linguistic records according to the Greco-Latin framework. At the same time, they tried to strike a balance in providing the right amount of information with references to linguistic data that their students were familiar with (descriptions such as, phenomenon X in language Y, is the same, or comparable with phenomenon Z in Latin, or in Portuguese) or to linguistic data that differed (descriptions, such as phenomenon X in language Y is not the same as phenomenon Z in Latin, Portuguese, etc.). Such approaches can be said to be 'glossocentric', or even 'Eurocentric', but this was not the only approach of these missionaries. Missionary grammarians tried to find equivalent structures in the target languages for categories such as the *supinum*, *infinitivus*, *gerundium*, etc., which is typologically a somewhat peculiar idea when seen in a global perspective. Moreover, they also worked bi-directionally, starting from the language being described and offering translations and periphrases, in so-called 'romances', or 'linguagens' etc. (cf. Zwartjes 2007c; Esparza Torres 2000: 45). In doing this, they discovered that the Latin, Portuguese or Spanish target languages also had gaps or 'shortcomings', similar to those they encountered

23. Some missionaries even composed poems in the local languages, such as Joseph de Anchieta (1534–1597), who wrote "cantigas" in Tupinambá (Martins 1954), Bernardo de Lugo (fl.1617), who wrote sonnets in Muisca (Ostler 1995) and Gaspar de San Augustin, who quotes poems in Tagalog (1787: 177–184).

translating from the European into the indigenous languages. When missionaries apply both approaches, there is always a place for observations and analysis that take into consideration the ‘otherness’. This means these texts are far less Eurocentric than many current researchers maintain. The missionaries’ use of meta-linguistic terms taken from local traditions demonstrates even more clearly this open-minded attitude. So, we see on the one hand the desire to dominate the lives of locals and often personal and collective self-interest leading to Eurocentrist or *glossocentrist* views of the indigenous population. On the other hand, particularly in the dictionaries of this period, we see a strong desire to understand and describe the specific characteristics, in modern terms the ‘otherness’ of the colonized, which is a recurring aspect of the colonial ethos of these linguists or linguistic anthropologists *avant la lettre*.

This led to explicit admiration of the languages the missionaries encountered. Peter S. Du Ponceau (1760–1844) wrote to the Moravian missionary John Heckewelder (1743–1823) in July 1816 that

if the beauties of the [Delaware] language were found in the ancient Coptic, or in some ante-diluvian Babylonisch dialect, how would the learned of Europe be at work to display them in a variety of shapes and raise a thousand fanciful theories on that foundation! What superior wisdom, talents and knowledge would they not ascribe to nations whose idioms were formed with so much skill and method! But who cares for the poor American Indians? (cited from E. Gray 1999: 153)

The missionaries generally did not make a correlation between civilization and linguistic refinement.²⁴ They accepted the cultural superiority of the Christian nations, but when analyzing the languages of the indigenous tribes, they admiringly talked about the ‘copiousness’ and ‘elegance’ of these languages, often ranking them high in terms of refinement. Garcilaso de la Vega el Inca’s (1539–1616)²⁵ words illustrate this:

... it has this particular flair, worth celebrating, that is as useful to the Peruvian Indians as Latin is to us. In addition to the benefits that it provides them in their commerce and contracts, it makes them wittier and more prone to learning, and from barbarous people it transforms them into politic and urban ones. (Garcilaso el Inca, Com. VII, 4. cited in Binotti 2000: 277).

The ‘savage nations’ were ignorant of Christianity and that legitimized the need for conversion. As Gray (1999: 4–5) discusses, the formulations of various negative

24. I am aware that this is a simplification of the facts. This is in strong disagreement with Mignolo (2003) (Klöter, personal communication) (2003, Chapter 1), cf. his analysis of Bernardo de Aldrete and José de Acosta (1540–1600).

25. Garcilaso el Inca (born Gómez Suárez de Figueroa) was not a missionary-linguist, but a historian and writer from the Spanish Viceroyalty of Peru.

types which Europeans used to contrast themselves with – ‘wild man’, ‘barbarian’, ‘savage’ and so forth – were hardly new. But the idea that a person’s speech could indicate the degree of ‘savagery’ scarcely belongs to the period under discussion here, for “until the eighteenth century, most European commentators had assumed that language was a divine, primordial endowment over which people themselves had little control” (ibid.). When the idea of the illiterate savage barbarian arose, it was not in missionary circles but in Europe, among people who never studied the missionaries’ grammatical descriptions and dictionaries. In Europe, men like James Burnett (Lord Monboddo; 1714–1799) might associate social fragmentation with savage speech and see peoples without European kinds of institutions as speaking an unrefined tongue (Gray 1999: 101). By contrast, missionary linguists collecting linguistic data admired the local languages in terms of structure and richness and they viewed these foreign languages as equal to European languages and all as deriving from a primitive source language. They believed that the languages they found were derived from the fall of the Tower of Babel and did not see them as inferior counterparts of their European languages. Sometimes, the ‘natural’ language of the natives was even considered as having its origins in the language of Paradise.²⁶ They did distinguish ‘polite’ forms of certain languages from more ‘crude’, or non-standard forms, but that only demonstrates their ability to see politeness, and indeed social complexity, in the languages they studied. It is significant that Portuguese and Spanish missionaries never compiled grammars or dictionaries of the varieties such as pidgins and creoles that resulted from contact with European languages: they were interested in independent ‘natural languages’ which had not been corrupted by linguistic contact.²⁷

26. For instance, Francisco Ximénez (1666–1730) observes that “En esta lengua Quiché, son como signos naturales con tal orden y correspondencia que no hallo otra lengua más ordenada ni aun tanto, de tal modo que me he llegado a persuadir que esta lengua es la principal que hubo en el mundo (Ximénez, cited in Chinchilla 1993: xiv) and in his *Arte* we read that “son imperceptibles algunos conceptos, que se explican en algunas composiciones, que no me espanto, algunos se desatienen, y no entiendan de el la palabra, y lo que digo, por lo que he penetrado de estas lenguas; que de todas las que yo tengo noticia entre la latina, o la nuestra castellana, alemana, italiana, etc. no ay lengua, ni mas propia, ni mas genuina, ni mas ordenada, ni regular que me holgara tener tiempo para irlo probando individualmente de cada cosa... (Ximénez 1993[c.1710], Cap. 4: f.34r; ed. Chinchilla, p. 70).

27. The Moravians did describe creoles, such as “Negerhollands”, a Creole once spoken on the Danish Virgin Island. Dahlmann (1891: 85) also reports that an ex-Jesuit with the name Ducoerjoin [sic] describes “Negerfranzösisch”, a language spoken in Saint Dominique, Martinique and Trinidad. Dahlmann refers to Ducoeurjoli (or Joly)’s *Manuel des habitants de Saint-Dominique ... suivi d’un traité de médecine domestique appropriée aux îles, d’une Pharmacopée américaine; du premier vocabulaire français-créole*, published in 1802.

In literature, the issue of ‘otherness’ and the colonizer has been often the subject of research, whereas astonishingly the linguistic body of work by missionaries in early-modern Europe has hardly been looked at, despite its relevance for literary and cultural studies in general.

1.5 The description of exotic languages and the development of linguistic concepts

In studying the missionary linguists’ encounter with the otherness of exotic languages, we trace and analyse the integration or confrontation (or both) of indigenous and Eurocentric features in grammatical works, with particular attention to the ‘national’ characteristics and to the processes of integration of trans-national or trans-lingual elements in these traditions. As Hanzeli (1969: 100) puts it,

Every new sound unit, every new grammatical distinction was first tried hopefully in the general framework of Latin and Greek. When, as it happened frequently, known Classical categories failed to cover the data at hand, new categories were created. The data had to be accounted for. (Hanzeli 1969: 100)

This might be done with the help of the grammatical traditions of an exotic language such as Japanese. If ‘local’ grammatical traditions are present in our corpus, for instance when non-Western terminology is used, we always comment on them.

These traditions always, as one might have expected, coexist with the Greco-Latin one. The European missionaries were educated using contemporary Latin-based grammars. In a two-model system, where an indigenous grammatical model was also available to the missionaries, the model with the highest prestige, namely Latin, was bound to dominate, but elements from the non-Western model might be present as well. Using ‘indigenous’ terms in descriptions of the indigenous language might be more effective, because the corresponding meta-language would be more compatible with the linguistic data themselves. However, the missionaries never borrowed entire foreign models on which to base their descriptions of indigenous languages; they only made limited use of details that derived from the local linguistic traditions. If they had abandoned the Latin grammatical tradition altogether, the works of the missionaries would probably have lost their practical usefulness for learners brought up in that tradition.

The degree to which Latin was used in theoretical-descriptive language categorizations varies considerably in the missionaries’ works. Some works seem more original than others; some solutions can be considered as more creative than others. A brief grammatical compendium will often contain less theory and will offer

some limited paradigms of the equivalents of the Latin declensions and conjugations. When comparing missionary grammars, it is easy to measure quantity, but how can we measure creativity or quality? The grammars range from mere imitations of the Latin model to more innovative approaches towards language description. The latter not only adopted but also in many cases adapted and even partially abandoned the Greco-Latin model in innovative ways, focusing on the idiosyncratic features of the native languages themselves.

Sometimes, it is possible to see the Latin model as having a bad effect on missionary linguistics. Rudimentary knowledge of Latin grammar or an uneducated background in combination with the good command of the indigenous languages may have been a positive benefit, as Hovdhaugen (1992: 120) postulated in the case of the Mochica grammar of Fernando de Carrera (1579–1662), whose “thoughts were not imprisoned and subjugated by the burden of the tradition of centuries of intensive grammar writing and language philosophy”. A good knowledge of Latin grammar and an inflexible attitude to the new language being described might conversely be deleterious. Nowak explored grammarians who analysed Greenlandic and showed that they not only left the descriptive parameters unchanged “in dealing with a different language, but that in fact the opposite occurred. The language was altered to fit the available means of description – often with spectacular results” (1996: 28).²⁸ Did this ever happen in the work of the Portuguese missionary linguists? It is difficult to answer this question, because it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess the linguistic documentation of extinct languages. We will never know if the variety recorded by the missionaries really represents ‘natural’ speech, or the more sophisticated forms the missionaries would have liked the language to display, and we will find it hard to ascertain whether they recorded all they might have. As Rowe remarks,

In general, sixteenth and seventeenth century grammarians felt obliged to find correspondences to the parts of speech of Latin, the Latin declension of nouns, and the mood and tense system of traditional grammar. A grammarian of the present day, trying to use the early works, generally finds that he can reinterpret the material presented in this Latin framework with some success, but he may be blocked by the very deficient treatment of phonology and by the fact that some forms and constructions alien to Latin are not given at all. (Rowe 1974: 365, cf. Winkler 2007: 330)

28. Did missionaries ever alter languages as they were used, rather than just misrepresenting them in grammars? They may possibly have done in very small speech communities, but it is highly improbable that a small number of missionaries would have had any influence on languages spoken by millions of people, such as Hindi, Chinese and Japanese.

The conflict of grammatical models is indeed often problematic from the point of view of modern linguistics and it is an easy task to point at the shortcomings of missionary works since they often did not resolve it in a satisfactory manner.

That is not to say that the Greco-Latin model never served the missionaries well. To put it in the words of Klein (2001: 39–40), it might have a “positiv-inspirierende” or a “negativ-blockierende Wirkung”: a “positive inspiring” or a “negative hindering effect”. We attempt to distinguish two different categories of the “negative hindering effect”. On the one hand, there were cases where missionaries simply did not realise that the Greco-Latin model was inadequate. They did not comment on the inapplicability of some Latin categories. More advanced descriptive techniques of more recent times will detect and unravel such clashes. On the other hand, there was a category of cases which is much more important for our final assessment of the contribution of early missionary linguistic empirical work: those cases where the missionaries realised that the Greco-Latin system was inadequate. Their comments on this consciousness particularly deserve our attention in this study.²⁹ As Dixon (1997: 130) observes: “Every language poses some kind of theoretical challenge, and solving this is likely to lead to feedback into theory, helping to enlarge and refine it”. What applies in modern fieldwork would also have applied to early-modern fieldwork: I believe, in examining the origins and development of early grammatical treatises, we will gain valuable insights into the way linguistic ideas were created and came to influence language theory in later years.

To conclude, missionary linguists of the period under study confronted methodological problems familiar to modern field researchers. As Gil (2001: 103) observes, “When confronted with a new language, it is sometimes easier to recognize the presence of exotic, unexpected, and hitherto-unknown items than to come to grips with the absence of familiar, commonplace, and presumed-to-be-universal entities”. Missionaries of the period under study were fully aware of the fact that they had to shape the linguistic data into a model they were familiar with, but they were often also conscious of the fact that while some elements or features were universal, others were absent, and in other cases equivalents were present. Unfamiliar elements or features might be given new names, such as *saltillo* (used in New Mexico) or *cor-tadillo* (in the descriptions of Philippine languages) for ‘glottal stop’, *ligatura* (also in the Philippines; Ridruejo 2005), but such innovative terminology is more an exception than the rule. The main work by missionaries was the re-semantisation of traditional terminology as words were applied for other purposes. We shall

29. One example can be quoted from a section from the Japanese grammar of Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1738: 93): “Estas oraciones, que se siguen, parecen de infinitivo segun nuestra traduccion Castellana, y no son infinitivos en el language Japón”. [“The following sentences resemble [constructions with] the infinitive according to our Castilian translation, but they are not infinitives in the Japanese language”].

demonstrate this in the extensive use of the term ‘particle’ and ‘article’ in descriptions of several languages. To take another example, in the missionary grammars of Philippine languages, topicalisation was described centuries before the term itself was introduced. So it was that Francisco López (died in 1631) observed that “One should also know that the nominative placed at the beginning of a sentence is used for other cases” – an inventive use of the concept of the nominative, but one which describes topicalisation rather successfully.³⁰ For López and many of his contemporaries, the Greco-Latin grammatical tradition and its terminology were not a restrictive ‘straitjacket’ (as Galeote called it once ‘la horma’ [the ‘last’]³¹), but a flexible and open model which could be adapted to anything the human mind can produce.

In Becker’s (1995: 291) terms, “each language, from the point of view of another, appears full of holes”. Too often modern linguists criticize missionary linguists as being biased, or even hindered by a too rigid application of the Greco-Latin model. This might be true in some cases (see Tozzer 1977: 8–9), but it has to be stressed that many missionaries were often fully aware of the fact that the Greco-Latin model was inadequate. Moreover, as we noted in Section 1.4 above, several commented that it was not just the exotic languages that had ‘holes’: sometimes Latin was found wanting. It was a linguistic revelation that some exotic languages were even more elegant, more copious and more refined or sophisticated than Latin. This reflects the positive view the missionaries often had of exotic languages.

1.6 The goals and structure of this study

Missionary sources can be used for two broad purposes: as contributions to a better understanding of the indigenous languages themselves, or as contributions to the history and historiography of the language sciences. We are chiefly interested in the latter.

Given this aim, we could have structured our survey in various ways. What we have chosen is, in the first place, to proceed geographically, dealing with texts from the Indian subcontinent in Chapter 2; from Japan in Chapter 3; from Brazil in Chapter 4; from Africa including the African diaspora in Chapter 5; and from the Arabic-speaking world in Chapter 6 (which closes with a section on Hebrew). Within each chapter, we proceed chronologically. In Chapter 7, we conclude with a comparative examination of some selected linguistic features.

30. “Ytem es de saver que el nominativo puesto al principio de la oración sirve para otros casos” (F. López 1628: 13r). See also Sueiro Justel (2005) and Winkler (2007) analysing the Chamorro grammar of the Jesuit Diego de Sanvitores (1627–1672).

31. Paper delivered at the First International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Oslo, 2002.

These features include, for instance, ergativity, even though this was by no means an established concept in pre-modern linguistics. Of course, applying a relatively new concept to pre-modern work risks anachronism and even unfairness, but it is sometimes unavoidable. Likewise unavoidable is the use of modern grammars to understand the languages surveyed by the missionaries. Often, a modern grammar of a given language will not only describe a different period from the corresponding missionary grammar, but also a different variety, and this must be taken into account.

1.6.1 What do we want to know?

In this monograph, we first want to know how the Portuguese missionaries used the Greco-Latin framework, and then we attempt to look for signs of the incorporation of non-Western linguistic terminology in the Portuguese grammars in Asia produced by the missionaries.

1.6.1.1 *Phonology and orthography*

How did the Portuguese missionaries adapt the existing letters of the Roman alphabet in their own Romanized systems? In this book more or less the same parameters will be used as summed up in Altman & Zwartjes (2005: 2) and Smith-Stark (2005a: 13). The following will be analysed:

1. Methodology and creativity of the phonological description, particularly when less familiar features are described, such as vowel quantity, tonality, nasalization, glottalisation, etc.
2. Articulatory descriptions and definitions and the creation of a new meta-language
3. Creativity and innovations of individual missionaries, as reflected in their approach, the creation of new symbols, the use of familiar letters with novel values, the creation of special combinations of letters, the use of modified forms of conventional letters, the use of diacritics, etc.
4. Phonological processes
5. Contrastive descriptions, comparisons with other languages,
6. Didactic and pedagogic features
7. Role of the native speaker
8. Observations related to the use of the Latin alphabet

1.6.1.2 *Morphosyntax*

Which parts of speech did the missionaries define and classify?³² It is of particular interest to find out whether they defined new parts of speech, and whether they

32. Partially based on Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo (2007b: 1–2).

used new grammatical terms to deal with unfamiliar linguistic phenomena or whether they used available meta-linguistic terms in a novel way. Particular attention will be paid to the meta-language the missionaries used to divide words into smaller units, such as ‘syllable’, ‘particle’, ‘diction’ (*dictio*), ‘root’ (*radix*) (and eventually the term *thema*, or ‘stem’).³³ We will also look at the presence or absence of inflection and/or affixation,³⁴ descriptions of typological features known in modern linguistics, such as agglutination, polysynthesis,³⁵ incorporation, word- and constituent order, (left or right branching languages), etc. Apart from the traditional morpho-syntactical notions, as ‘nominative’, ‘accusative’, etc. we shall attempt to search for notions used in logic, such as ‘subject’, ‘object’, ‘predicate’ (also Latin *suppositum*, or in Portuguese ‘supposto’). In cases where missionaries used syntactic terms derived from logic, it is relevant to analyse their observations, particularly when the exotic languages they described did not have the nominative-accusative structure that the missionaries were accustomed to in their own European languages. Furthermore, some specific typological features will be applied to the missionaries’ grammars to look for evidence of incorporation in Tupi, topicalisation in Japanese, agreement symmetries and asymmetries in Indo-Aryan languages and in Arabic, noun-class systems in Kipeá-Kiriri and Kimbundu and finally, the tense-aspect-mode (TAM) systems in verbal morphology. It will be impossible to analyse every aspect of every language separately in a study as this, so we will limit ourselves to those instances where linguistic data of these exotic languages clash with the Greco-Latin paradigms.

1.6.1.3 *The lexicon*

The volume and quality of the dictionaries produced by the Portuguese missionaries merit a separate monograph. This study focuses on grammars, but in order to

33. The concept of the root in the Spanish world has been the object of several studies (see Monzón (several publications on grammars of Tarascan composed by Maturino Gilberti (1498–1585) and Juan Baptista de Lagunas [c.1530–1604?]) and Zwartjes (1998 and 2008a). The use of the concept of the root in the Portuguese tradition has not been yet a research topic for a systematic study.

34. Often we read that non-inflectional languages also have their nominal ‘cases’, but gradually we find in linguistic documentation that many languages do not have a system of cases. In the Port-Royal grammar of Antoine Arnauld (1612–1694) and Claude Lancelot (1615?–1695) (1966[1676]: 43), we read even that “It is true that *of all languages, it is perhaps only Greek and Latin which properly have noun cases.*” (English translation Rieux, et al. 1975[1676]: 79).

35. This term was used for the first time by Peter Stephen Du Ponceau (quoted in Wolfart 1967: 157). The tripartite division of isolating, agglutinative, and inflectional was introduced by August Wilhelm von Schlegel, according to Aouroux (2000b: 18). Wilhelm von Humboldt distinguished four types: (1) isolating (“with no grammatical structure”), (2) “agglutinating”, (3) “incorporating”, or “polysynthetic” and (4) “flectional” (Errington 2008: 76).

get an impression of the extent of lexicographical work done by the Portuguese, it is sometimes useful to give a short description of the most important lexicographical works as well. This is particularly relevant when dictionaries include grammatical information in their entries. Such information is given in a separate chapter.

1.6.1.4 *Extra-grammatical information*

As mentioned earlier, grammars and dictionaries produced by the missionaries also contained also information about other aspects of the local culture. In addition to the linguistic analysis, whenever possible we will give a description of the author's educational background, what they knew about grammar, and the kind of sources they had at their disposal, namely classical, Renaissance, or other new-world sources.

1.6.2 What do we have?

Not all the grammars under discussion include information in these four categories. Some missionary sources do not contain anything that can provide information about the sounds of letters; others lack crucial information relating to syntax, for instance, which is important from the point of view of a modern linguist. The larger grammars are probably more likely to provide answers than the shorter works. Grammars that, for a modern linguist, seem to be missing important data could well have been successful for pedagogical purposes at the time. Teaching and learning was not only based on grammars, since the role of the native speaker in a classroom setting was crucial. In this study, both the theoretical aspects as well as practical didactical aspects will be considered. In those cases where there are apparently gaps from the view point of a modern linguist, we will highlight what these sources do offer. These separate snippets of information must not be lost and will play a significant role in our final evaluation and comparison of these Portuguese missionary sources.

It may be helpful to end this introduction with a list of the sources which will be analyzed in this book:

References

- Anchieta, Ioseph de. 1999 [1595]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua mais vsada na costa do Brasil. Feyta pelo padre – da Cõpanhia de Iesv*. Coimbra: Antonio de Mariz. Ed. facsimilar y estudio por Leogário A. de Azevedo. 2 vols. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica [Ed. facsimilar del ejemplar de la Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid, R 8815.] (Marsden 1796: 3)
- Anonymous. 1750. *Gramatica da lingua geral do Brasil. Com hum Diccionario dos vocabulos mais uzuaes para a intelligencia da dita Lingua*. Ms. códice 69 da Biblioteca da Universidade de Coimbra.

- Anonymous. 1778a. *Gramatica marastta a mais vulgar que se practica nos Reinos do Nizamaxà, e Idalxà offerecida aos mvitos reverendos Padres Missionarios dos dittos reinos*. Roma: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide. (Marsden 1796: 81; 129).
- Anonymous. 1778b. *Gramatica indostana a mais vulgar que se practica no Imperio do gram Mogol offerecida aos muitos reverendos Padres Missionarios do ditto Imperio*. Roma: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide. (Marsden 1796: 81; 129).
- Anonymous. [seventeenth century]. *Arte da lingua de Cafre*. Ms. Biblioteca da Ajuda, Lisboa coleção “Jesuitas na Asia” Codex B.B.A. 49, V, 18, fol. 201. Ed. P.P. Schebesta. 1919–1920. *Anthropos* 14–15.764–787.
- Assumpçam, Manoel da. 1743a. *Vocabulario em Idioma Bengalla e Portuguez. Dividido em duas partes dedicado Ao Excellente Rever. Senhor D. Fr. Miguel de Tavora, Arcebispo de Evora do Conselho de Sua Magestade. Foy deligencia do Padre – Religioso Eremita de Santo Agostinho da Congre[ga]ção da India Oriental*. Lisboa: Na Offic. De Francisco da Sylva. Livreiro da Academia Real, e do Senado. (Marsden 1796: 41).
- Assumpçam, Manoel da. 1743b. *Breve Compendio da Grammatica Bengala*. First section of Assumpçam 1743a: 1–40.
- Baptista, Antonio. 1774. *Instituições da lingua arabiga compostas por Fr. . – Religioso da Provincia da Terceira Ordem de S. Francisco de Portugal, e Professor da mesma Lingua no Convento de N. Senhora de Jesus de Lisboa. Para o uso das escolas da mesma congregação*. Lisboa: Na regia officina typografica, Livraria d’Alcobaça.
- Dias, Pedro. 1697. *Arte da lingua de Angola, offerecida a virgem senhora N. do Rosario, Mãe, & Senhora dos mesmos Pretos, Pelo P. – Da Companhia de Jesu*. Lisboa: Na Officina de Miguel Deslandes, Impressor de Sua Magestade. On-line editions: http://143.107.31.150/bibliotecaPdf/bibDig_775.pdf (USP) <http://www.archive.org/details/artedalinguadean00-dias> (Brown University).
- Figueira, Luis. 1621. *Arte da lingva brasilica, composta pelo Padre – da Companhia de IESV, Theologo*. Lisboa: Manoel da Silua. (Marden 1796: 21).
- Figueira, Luis. 1878[1687]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Facsimile edition: Julio Platzmann. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Henriques, Henrique. [Anrrique Anrriquez]. 1982[1549]. *Arte malauar*. Ed. Hans J. Vermeer: *The First European Tamil Grammar. A critical edition by –*. English version by Angelika Morath. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag. [Edition based on cod. 3141, Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa].
- Mamiani, Luiz Vincencio. 1942[1698]. *Catecismo da Doutrina Christãa na lingua Brasilica da Nação Kiriri*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Edição fac-similar. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional.
- Mamiani, Luiz Vincencio. 1877[1699]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica da Naçam Kiriri composta pelo p. – da Companhia de Jesu, missionario nas Aldeas da dita Nação*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Segunda edição publicada a expensas da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Typ. Central de Brown & Evaristo.
- Paz, Francisco da. 1773. *Compendio dos principios da grammatica hebraica, no qual se explicam breve e claramente as regras fundamentais d’esta lingua etc. Para uso das escholas da mesma Congregação* [franciscana da 3ª ordem]. Lisboa: na Régia Ofic. Tip.
- Rodrigues, João. 1604–1608. *Arte da lingoa de Iapam composta pello Padre – Portugues da Cõpanhia de IESV diuidida em tres livros*. Nangasaqui: no Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de IESV. Facsimile edition: Tadao Doi, ed. 1976[1604–1608]. Tokyo: Bensheisha.

- Rodrigues, Ioam. 1620. *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa tirada da Arte Grande da mesma lingoa, pera os que começam a aprender os primeiros principios della. Pello Padre – da Companhia de Iesv Portugues do Bispado de Lamego. Diuidida em tres Livros*. Amacao: no Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de Iesv. (Marsden 1796: 58).
- Sousa, João de. 1795. *Compendio da grammatica arabiga, abbreviado, claro e mais facil para a intelligencia e ensino da mesma lingua, collegido dos melhores grammaticos pelo P. Fr. – Religioso da Congregação da Terceira Ordem da Penitencia de Portugal. Professor, Secretario, e Interprete da dita Lingua, e Socio da Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa*. Lisboa. Na Offic. Da Acad. Real das Scienc.: Com licença de S. Magestade.
- Stephens, Thomas [Thomaz Esteuaõ]. 1640. *Arte da lingoa canarim composta pelo padre – & acrescentada pello Padre Diogo Ribeiro da mesma Cõpanhia E nouamente reuista & emendada por outros quarto Padres da mesma Companhia*. Rachol: Collegio de S. Ignacio da Companhia de Iesv. (Marsden 1796: 20).

CHAPTER 2

The Indian subcontinent

2.1 Introduction

The earliest account in Portuguese of a language from India is not from a missionary source. A companion of Vasco da Gama on his first expedition (1497–1499) compiled a word list of the Malayalam language, containing a hundred items with Portuguese glosses (Percival 1999: 17).

In this chapter five missionary grammars will be analysed in chronological order:

Tamil. [Henriques, Henrique, SJ.] 1549. *Arte malauar*. [Ed. 1982 by Hans J. Vermeer, from cod. 3141, Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa].

Konkani. [Stephens, Thomas, SJ.] 1640. *Arte da lingoa canarim*. Ed. and enlarged by Diogo Ribeiro SJ et al. Rachol, Goa: Collegio de S. Ignacio da Companhia de Iesu.

Bengali. [Assumpçam, Manoel da, OSA.] 1743. *Breve Compendio da Grammatica Bengala*. In *Vocabulario em Idioma Bengalla e Portuguez*, 1–40. Lisbon: Na Offic. De Francisco da Sylva. Livreiro da Academia Real, e do Senado.

Marathi. Anonymous. 1778a. *Gramatica marastta a mais vulgar que se practica nos Reinos do Nizamaxà, e Idalxà*. Rome: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide.

Hindi. Anonymous. 1778b. *Gramatica indostana a mais vulgar que se practica no Imperio do gram Mogol*. Rome: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide.

They describe five different languages still spoken today in the Indian subcontinent: one Dravidian (Tamil), and four Indo-Aryan (Konkani, Marathi, Hindi and Bengali). All the grammars were written in Portuguese. The Tamil grammar remained unpublished until the twentieth century, but the others were printed in or near the period of their composition. The oldest texts of all five are anonymous, but the names of the authors of three are known, two being of Portuguese origin (Henriques and Assumpçam) and the other an Englishman (Stephens), whose printed grammar appeared edited and enlarged by the Portuguese Diogo Ribeiro (1560–1633) and four anonymous Jesuits. One grammar was completed in the 16th century (Henriques), one in the 17th century (Stephens) and three

in the 18th century (Assumpçam and the two anonymous grammars of Marathi and Hindi). Henriques and Stephens were Jesuits, and Assumpçam an Augustinian. It is possible that the two anonymous authors were expelled Jesuits who printed their works at the *Propaganda Fide* press. The works of Henriques and of Stephens antedate linguistic works from other Western missionary traditions written in Latin and English. The grammar and dictionary of Assumpçam and the anonymous grammars of Hindi and Marathi were possibly influenced by earlier works written in Latin, English, Dutch, or other languages, and previous works from other traditions which could have been of any significance in inspiring them will be mentioned. In particular, the two anonymous grammars printed by the *Propaganda Fide* press were published shortly after the *Alphabetum Brammhanicum seu Indostanum* (1771), composed by the Capuchin father Cassiano Beligatti (Cassiano da Macerata, 1708–1791), and published with a foreword by Giovanni Cristoforo Amaduzzi (1740–1792).¹ This work does not belong to the Portuguese tradition, but will be analysed in order to address the question as to whether the Portuguese missionaries used Beligatti's work as their model.

The reception of the Portuguese works and their impact on other traditions has not yet been investigated in a satisfactory way. However, this is not our main objective. As our title indicates, only Portuguese works are analysed, so that the *Grammatica Malabarico-Lusitana* written in Latin by the Jesuit Johann Ernst Hanxleden (1681–1732) is not included here.² Like Thomas Stephens, Hanxleden worked closely with Bernard Biskopinck (1689–c.1750–1759) and Portuguese missionaries (O'Neill & Dominguez 2001: 1.2362), such as Antão Pimentel, who was Archbishop of Cranganor from 1721 until 1751, assisting him in compiling his *Dictionarium samscredamico-lusitanum*, although it is impossible to determine the extent of the Portuguese missionary influence on Hanxleden's work.³

1. Beligatti was a missionary in Tibet, Nepal and Bengal between 1738 and 1756; Amaduzzi was head of the *Propaganda Fide* press.

2. Hanxleden set foot in India in 1700, settling in Goa Major. He was ordained in the Jesuit seminary of Ampazhakkad in Kerala and worked for more than thirty years on the Malabar coast. He also wrote a grammar of Sanskrit (*Grammatica samscredamica*) which the Carmelite Paulinus a Sancto Bartholomaeo (1748–1806) brought back to Rome. Hanxleden's *Grammatica Malabarico-Lusitana* is the first grammar of Malayalam (MS, 17th century; not seen by me; Streit 1929 vol. V: 222).

3. Some Portuguese works from the 19th century are based on earlier descriptions in English and Marathi, as the title of the grammar of Suriagy Amanda Rau (1875) indicates.

2.1.1 Historical background

According to tradition, Christianity was introduced in India by the apostle St. Thomas, who is reputed to have travelled to India in 52 A.D. Since the fifth century there has existed a Christian minority along the Malabar coast, and according to Alden (1996: 42–43; cf. Neill 1984) there were around 30,000 followers of the Syro-Chaldean rite, ordained by the patriarch of Armenia, in the early sixteenth century.⁴ The liturgical language of this community was Syriac, but they used Tamil and Malayalam for daily use (James 2000: 100). The Franciscan mission to India started during the period of the Mongol conquests. John of Monte Corvino (1247–1328) travelled from Tabriz (Persia) to the Mongol court at Khanbaliq (Beijing), accompanied by the Dominican Nicholas of Pistoia. En route, he was delayed in India, where he remained for about one year (Meersman 1962: 2). In 1329, the Diocese of Quilon was established in Kerala, and a Dominican was appointed as its bishop (Meersman 1962: 4). Contact between Europeans and the Christians of India remained infrequent, however, until the beginning of the sixteenth century. The Observant Franciscans founded their first monastery in India in 1518, and in 1539 Goa was officially proclaimed a diocese by the first Franciscan bishop, João de Albuquerque (d.1553). Mylapore fell for a short period under its jurisdiction, until 1557, when Pope Paul IV established the Archdiocese of Goa and the Diocese of Cochin (Meersman 1962: 48).

After the arrival of the Franciscans, the Jesuits set foot in India in 1542, led by the Navarrese Francis Xavier (1506–1552), who visited India during three campaigns along the Fishery, Malabar and Travancore coasts (Alden 1996: 43). The Franciscans concentrated their missionary activities mainly in Mylapore (Meersman 1962: 16). Soon, the Dominicans followed (in 1548), and later the Recollect Franciscans (1566) and the Augustinians (1572). These last were mainly concentrated in and around Chittagong and in 1612 they introduced the Faith in Dacca. Thousands of captured slaves were baptized in these regions and important Augustinian settlements were Balasore (=Baleswar, or Baleshwar), a city in the Orissa state of eastern India, Ossumpur and Rangamati, which is located in the Chittagong division in south-eastern Bangladesh. Later in the 17th century Nagari became an important centre for the conversion of lower-caste Hindus and it was in this context that the dictionary and the grammar of Manoel de Assumpçam were compiled.

In contrast to the situation in Brazil, the Portuguese Jesuits introduced a local press to India at an early stage, so that they could print their religious and linguistic works locally. In fact, the history of the Jesuit presses does not start in Rome,

4. In Gómez Rodeles (1913: 159) the number of St. Thomas Christians is estimated to be about 70,000.

where an edition of Martial's epigrams was published in 1559 and followed by other Jesuit imprints, but three years earlier, in India. João Nunes Barreto SJ (c.1510–1562), patriarch-designate of Ethiopia, and the printer João Rodrigues SJ (not the same person as the grammarian who worked on Japanese and is discussed in Chapter 3.2 below), brought the first press to India, where it was set up in Goa and was used to print texts in Latin and Portuguese (Moran 1993: 145–146). The Jesuits also took their printing-press elsewhere, such as Vaipicota, where it was attached to the College of St. Lawrence (São Lourenço) at Rachol in Salsette, Goa.⁵ It was possibly identical with the press of the College of St. Paulo in the island of Goa, which was moved to Salsette (Priolkar 1958: 17). The *Arte da lingoa canarim* of Thomas Stephens was printed at St. Ignatius (Ignácio) College in Rachol. Other printing centres were Cochin (=Kochi), Ambalacate (=Ambalakattu), Angamale (=Angamali) and Cranganore (=Kodungallur) (Gómez Rodeles 1913: 149).

Goa was an important language centre for the missionaries, who needed linguistic skills for evangelization. Not only languages from India were taught in Goa: at St. Paul's College, two Chinese students were enrolled as novices on language courses. This was, according to Witek (2001: 151–152) "the first continuous Chinese contact [...] that the Jesuits developed". One of these Chinese, bearing the Christian name Antonio, spent seven years in Goa (1544–1551), where he learned Latin. The aim was that he should accompany Xavier on his journey to China (ibid. 152), but after the death of Xavier in 1552, Antonio went to the Moluccas and returned to India in 1556. There he was a catechist for the next four years. In 1578, the Visitor of the Society of Jesus, Alessandro Valignano (1539–1606), met him in Macao (ibid.).

Although the first works printed in Goa had, as we have just noted, been texts in Latin and Portuguese, a considerable number of works were eventually printed in the languages of India, mainly Konkani, Canarese, Marathi, Malayalam and Tamil, and printing was even carried out in Ethiopic.⁶ Translations into Syriac for the use of the St. Thomas Christians are also documented (Gómez Rodeles 1913: 150). According to Vermeer (1982: ix–x) the first book printed in Tamil appeared in Lisbon in 1554, printed in Latin characters (Thani Nayagam 1954: 221). The first steps in developing a local Tamil-language press which would print the language in its own alphabet were taken after the arrival of Alessandro Valignano in Goa in 1574. Valignano was an energetic promotor of language study, who set

5. Salsette, in Portuguese Salsete and in Marathi Sashti, is an island in Maharashtra on India's west coast.

6. António Fernandes's (1570–1642) *Magseph assetat* ("The whip against falsehoods...") which is a refutation of the schismatical Raz Athemateot, revised by Father Luis de Azevedo (fl. 1624) (Uhlig 2003: 418) and printed in St. Paul's College at Goa in 1642 (Gómez Rodeles 1913: 156; Priolkar 1958: 5; Cohen 2009: 134; Sommervogel 1960: 3. 646–648; Uhlig 2007: 3.771).

up six language seminaries for the entire mission territory of Asia: in Japan, the Moluccas, the Fishery Coast, Salsette, St. Thomas, and in Bassein (Witek 2001: 153). The technical work of preparing a press to cast and print from Tamil types was carried out by the Spanish lay-brother Juan (João) Gonsalves SJ, a skilled clock-manufacturer, who prepared the first eight lines of the grammarian Henrique Henriques' Tamil translation of Xavier's *Doutrina Christã* in 1577 in Goa. In 1578 the subsequent lines were prepared in Quilon by the pioneering João da Fária SJ. Another *Doutrina* was published in 1579 in Cochin (Priolkar 1958: 10–11). A series of subsequent publications in Tamil, particularly catechisms, confessionaries and lives of saints, was projected and partially undertaken.⁷ As Vermeer (1982: ix–x) observes, “Tamil became the first non-European language printed in vernacular letters”.

2.1.2 The Indian grammatical tradition

In contrast to the practice in the Americas, in Asia the Portuguese missionaries could benefit from local grammatical traditions, as was the case in Japan and in the Arabic-speaking world.

For instance, as Hauschild (1988: 13–14) observes, the grammar of Sanskrit written by the German Jesuit Heinrich Roth (1620–1668)

uses with perfect familiarity the technical terms of Indian grammar [...] Roth stands entirely within the Indian grammatical tradition, and probably he used “the practical grammar of Anubhūti Svarūpācārya, called the *Sārasvata Vyākaraṇa*, which was in general circulation in Hindustān, Bihār and Benares. [...]. Another candidate, though a less likely one, would be the grammar called *Mugdhabodha*, which was compiled in the second half of the 13th century by Vopadeva, but the usage of which was more common in Bengal... Roth's grammar is a ‘masterpiece’, which does not differ considerably from current grammars, which similarly depend on the linguistic achievements of India's own grammatical tradition.

In Roth's chapter on orthography, we find original metalinguistic terms of the traditional Indian grammatical model. For instance, at the end of the chapter, the names of the Vedic accents are given in the original language: *udātta*, *anudātta* and *svarita* (Hauschild 1988: 14). In the following section, entitled “De Concurrentia et Mutacione [sic] Litterarum”, Roth describes the laws of ‘euphonic combinations of sounds’, better known as ‘sandhi’ (such as *tava + idam > tavedam*). In

7. Valignano (1944[1542–1564]: 353): “Fyzerão tambem neste anno [id est 1557] o Padre Patriarcha, Pe. Francisco Rodriguez e Padre Antonio de Quadros hum confessionario, o qual foy de grande proveyto pera toda a Yndia, porque o mandarão imprimir”. This work has been lost (cf. Wicki 1944: 353).

the second chapter, nominal declensions are presented under their Indian denominations and in the verbal paradigms, the traditional Greco-Latin model has been extended, including tenses such as common perfect, periphrastic perfect, the precativ, the simple and periphrastic future, the conditional and aorist (Hauschild 1988: 15). Under the category of the ‘derivative verbal stems’, Roth describes, among other categories, ‘intensives’, ‘imitatives’, ‘meditatives’ (‘desideratives’), and ‘causatives’ (Hauschild 1988: 16). It is evident that Roth’s grammar is based heavily on the indigenous grammatical tradition, but it is also clear that the traditional Latin grammatical model has been used, since we find typical Latin categories such as the *supinum*.⁸

The Sanskrit tradition was not the only local Indian grammatical and lexicographical tradition in India. There exists an important local pre-Christian ‘grammatical’ tradition in Tamil. One of the most important treatises is the *Tolkappiyam*, which according to some scholars dates back to 1000 B.C. Its first part is on orthography, the second on morphology and the third on literary conventions and usages (Thani Nayagam 1970: 69). We must not exclude the possibility that missionaries collecting their linguistic data in India could in theory have been educated in either of these traditions, and their works may therefore contain exotic features.⁹

2.2 Tamil. Henrique Henriques (or, Anrique Anriquez) (1520–1600)

Henrique Henriques, author of the Tamil grammar which will be discussed below, has been called “the first serious European scholar of any South Asian language”.

2.2.1 The life and work of Henrique Henriques

Henriques was born in 1520 in Vila Viçosa (Évora) from “New Christian” ancestors. It appears not to be known whether his parents or ancestors came from an ex-Jewish or ex-Muslim¹⁰ family, but it is documented that his ‘converso’

8. It would be interesting to determine which Latin grammars were used in Roth’s hometown in Swabia, and at Innsbruck, where he lived before entering the Jesuit order at Landsberg on the Lech in 1639 (Camps 1988: 5). We cannot exclude the possibility that Roth was familiar with the Portuguese linguistic activities in Goa, since Roth started his missionary work in Salsette before he was transferred in 1656 to the Mogor Mission (Srinagar in Garhwal and later in Agra) (Wessels 1924: 199). Nevertheless, there is no evidence for a possible direct influence from Portuguese sources in the work of Roth.

9. See for non-Western grammatical terminology and linguistic theory in missionary grammars Zwartjes (2010c).

10. According to Županov (1999) his parents were converted Jews.

background was an obstacle to entering the order of the Franciscans. Nevertheless, he did enter the order (Valignano, ed. Wicki 1944: 108, note 3) and later in 1545 he entered the Jesuit order in Coimbra where he studied ecclesiastical law (Machado 1965[1741], vol 2: 449). He was sent as an ordained priest to Francis Xavier to the Fishery Coast in south India, east of Cape Comorin (=Kanniyakumari) on the Gulf of Manar, or Punnaikayal (Vermeer 1982: viii; Dahlmann 1891: 10),¹¹ where he worked from 1546 onwards. According to Henriques's letters to Ignatius of Loyola, he learnt the Tamil language in five months, admitting that he still had a foreign accent. It is hard to say exactly when Henriques compiled his grammar, but the sole extant manuscript was completed in 1549. This was shortly after the grammar of Nahuatl (1547) of the Franciscan Andrés de Olmos (c.1480–1568). Henriques' work is therefore the second oldest of the Ibero-Romance linguistic works compiled outside Europe which has survived. Henriques alludes in 1565 to a revised edition, which has been lost (Vermeer 1982: xiii). As early as in 1560, Henriques proposed to establish a Tamil university at Mannar or Punnaikkayal, a project which was realised in the next decade (Vermeer 1982: xiii). As we have seen, it was he who made the Tamil translation of Xavier's *Doutrina Christã* which was printed in 1577. Tamil was not the only language studied by Henriques; it is documented that he also compiled a Konkani grammar, which has been lost.¹² He remained in India until his death in 1600 at the age of 80.¹³

2.2.2 Henriques's Tamil grammar: Authorship and sources

The extant manuscript of the *Arte da lingua malabar* (now Biblioteca Nacional, Lisbon, cod. 3141) does not bear the name of an author, but Thani Nayagam (1954) has identified it with the Tamil grammar written by Henrique Henriques, who mentions a grammar entitled *Arte de gramatica da lingua Malabar* in a letter written to Ignacio de Punicalé in 1550; in the same letter he mentions also a *Vocabulario de mesma lingua* (Machado 1965[1741], vol 2: 449). This theory concerning the authorship of the *Arte da lingua Malabar* has been corroborated by most scholars, including Vermeer (1982) and James (2007: 168).

11. See also Thekkedath (1982).

12. We must not exclude the possibility that this lost grammar could have served as a direct source for Thomas Stephens' (c.1549–1619, see below) work (Valignano, ed. Wicki 1944: 108, note 3; cf. Streit 1928: 145, Vermeer 1982: ix–xiii), although there is no direct evidence to support this.

13. Streit (1928: 167) reports that Henriques writes in 1549 that Paulo de Valle (died in 1552) completed also a grammar of the 'Malabar' language. Paulo de Valle was born at Viseu in Portugal and arrived at Goa in 1548. A week later he travelled to Cochín and later he worked around Cape Comorin. Vermeer (1982: xiv) demonstrated that Paulo de Valle could not have been the author.

As we have observed elsewhere (Zwartjes 2002: 28), Portuguese missionaries probably had access to the first grammars of Portuguese – those of Fernão de Oliveira (1507–post 1581) and João de Barros (1496–1570), published respectively in 1536 and 1539/40 – and we must not exclude the possibility that they were inspired by them. It is not a common feature for Hispanic missionaries to mention other sources than the Latin grammars and dictionaries of Antonio de Nebrija (1981[1481], 1996[c.1488], 1989[c.1495]), and in most instances, missionaries do not mention their sources at all. Neither Barros nor Oliveira appears to be mentioned in the early descriptions of the indigenous languages of Brazil or in Japan, for example. Some scholars observe that Anchieta (for whom see Chapter 4.2.1 below) was probably familiar with Oliveira and Barros (González 1994: 106), assuming that their works were used at the Royal College of Arts in Coimbra and at the Jesuit College of the Society of Jesus in Coimbra. As far as I am aware, Henriques is the only grammarian who mentions João de Barros. At the end of the chapter on orthography, introducing the chapter on the so-called *rudimenta*, we find the following passage:

Para mais facilmente se emtender esta arte ha misterter [sic] conhicimento da arte latina, e os nō souberẽ latim deuẽ de leer por a gramatica portuguesa feita por Yoaõ dBairros. (Henriques 1549: f.6v; Vermeer 1982: 5; cf. Thani Nayagam 1954: 220)

[In order to understand more easily this grammar, knowledge of Latin grammar is necessary and those who do not know Latin have to go through the Portuguese grammar composed by João de Barros.]

Brief as is his mention of Portuguese sources, Henriques seems to have owed even less to the Tamil grammatical tradition, of which no trace is to be found in his grammar. To give an example, grammatical gender according to the Tamil grammarians is based on the signification of words, not (as Henriques stated) on the endings, and Tamil technical terms are not used in his grammar.¹⁴

Fieldwork was more important to him than either Portuguese or Tamil written traditions. In 1548 he writes:

When I came to this coast I wanted to begin to learn the language and to read it. I found it so difficult that I did not believe I could succeed and so I gave it up. ... I always kept a good interpreter ... Then, my interpreter left me in order to take up other business. I determined to learn the language. ... To learn it, I used a grammatical pattern they use in Latin to learn conjugations. In this way I worked to learn this language. I conjugated the verbs. To find the preterites, futures, infinitives, subjunctives, etc. costs me much labour; also to learn the accusatives, genitives, datives, and the other cases. I also had to learn which to place first, if it be the verb, the noun and pronoun, etc. (Quoted after Hein 1977: 134, cf. James 2007: 168)

14. See also Chevillard & Passerieu (1989).

This method reveals a bi-directional approach. Firstly, the starting point is Latin. Tamil equivalents are sought which could best fit as equivalents for the Latin categories. Secondly, the starting point is Tamil. No Latin grammar can tell the learners the typological structure of a Tamil sentence, so that the linguistic information itself taught Henriques how to build sentences. According to Županov (1999) “Sophisticated, speculative Tamil-language treatises such as *Tolkappiyam* and its numerous commentaries were neither accessible to Henriques nor are they useful for teaching or learning the elementary spoken Tamil”.

2.2.3 Henriques’s Tamil grammar and the Tamil language

Before giving an outline of Henriques’s grammar and commenting on some points of interest in its treatment of Tamil, we should comment briefly on what he and his contemporaries meant by *lingua/lengua malabar*, and on what we mean by the Tamil language.

2.2.3.1 *Malabar and Tamil*

Portuguese missionaries applied the term *Malabar* to both Malayalam and Tamil. Their terminology for Indian languages is sometimes confusing: the *Bracmana* tongue did not necessarily mean Sanskrit; at Goa it meant rather Konkani or Marathi, while *Hindostani* applied even to Marathi (Gómez Rodeles 1913: 150). Henriques, however, always refers to Tamil as “*lingua malabar*”.

The Tamil language, which belongs to the South Dravidian linguistic family is, like Sanskrit, a classical language. Today, Tamil is spoken by c. 50 million people. Scholars distinguish between three periods: Old Tamil (300BCE to 700 CE), Middle Tamil (700–1600) and “Modern Tamil (1600 to the present). Strictly following this periodization, we would say that Henriques’s data belong to late Middle Tamil. They certainly show modern features. If we consider the “present tense”, lacking in Old Tamil, there are two different forms, $(k)ki\text{-}r$ and $(k)kin\text{-}r$, the second with the marker *-āninr*, which is lost in Modern Tamil. Henriques gives the form *-quir-*, the only form existing in Modern Tamil.

2.2.3.2 *The structure of Henriques’s grammar*

As Vermeer (1982: xiii) argues, the surviving manuscript is a fairly early version of the grammar. There are blank spaces which indicate that Henriques intended to include more information at a later stage. The opening section on phonology and orthography is relatively short, as is usual at this period. (ff.5r-6v). Henriques considers this opening section as an independent introduction, since he observes that the grammar starts on f. 8r, the paragraphs in which the nominal declensions are exhibited. After the nominal declensions, the paradigms of the following parts of

speech follow: adjectives (ff.26r-27v.), pronouns (ff.30r.-32r) and participles (ff.33r-35r). The largest section of the grammar is devoted to verbal conjugation (ff.37r-142v). The last sections, as usual, deal with syntax. The first (f.150r) has the title, “Rules for knowing how to make sentences in this Malabar language and some examples of sentences” (“Regras pera saber fazer oraçoës nesta limgoa malauar e assi algūs exēplos de oraçoës”) and the second “The construction of this Malabar language” (“A construção desta lymgoa malauar”) (f.155v). Further, a paragraph is devoted to “Some manners of speaking in this language (“Algūs modos de falar nesta limgoa”) (f.157v) and the grammar closes with the phrase

Ainda se hã de acrescêtar alguãs cousas poucas a esta arte malauar; cõtudo, o mais necessario estaa scrito. (f.159v)

[Still some few things have to be added in this Malabar grammar, however, the most important things have been written.]

2.2.3.3 *Henriques’s treatment of Tamil orthography and phonology*

The grammar opens with the alphabet of the Tamil language, “as letras do abece malauar” (f.5r). Vermeer (1982: xvi-xvii) characterises Henriques’s phonological description as “quite exact” although the careless 16th century orthography leads to serious misinterpretation of some verbal forms. There is no complete or systematic description of the entire Tamil phonological system at the beginning of the treatise. According to Vermeer, “the author knows the distinction between short and long vowels in Tamil, but fails to mark the difference which is phonological in Tamil. Only sporadically does he seem to indicate a long stressed *a* in the negative future of verbal forms by an accent *á*, but even such cases are doubtful” (ibid.).

2.2.3.4 *Henriques’s treatment of Tamil nominal declension*

In Tamil, nouns are inflected for case, number, person and gender (Zvelebil 1997: 17; Steever 1998b: 20). The structure of the Tamil inflected noun is as follows:

Stem + Number + Oblique + Case. (Krishnamurti 2003: 29)

Henriques distinguishes five declensions for Tamil, following the Latin model. His criteria for classification are partially semantic and partially morphophonemic.¹⁵ In his paradigms, the noun has also the five Latin cases (James 2007: 170). James concludes that “The Tamil cases Henriques identified by their equivalent Latin

15. The first declension is divided in two (masculine and feminine) endings in *-an*, plural *-ar* (“dividese ã duas, para homes, e para molheres, e os dos homẽs se acabaõ ã *æn* e no plural ã *ær*”), the nouns of the second declension end in *-e*, *-i*, *-ai*, of the third in *-m* with the singular oblique stem in *-tt-*, the fourth in *-a* with a euphonic increment *-v-* before singular inflections, and the fifth in *-u*.

names do to some extent equate in function to the corresponding Latin cases” (ibid.: 171).

Henriques gives us the following description of the morphological process of the formation of nominal cases:

Notese que os genetiuos em todas as declinações, assi do symgular como do plural, são semelhâtes aos nomenatiuos acrecentando esta palaura *vrhæia* ... (f.13r)¹⁶
[Notice that the genitives in all the declensions, singular and plural, are the same as the nominatives, incrementing the word *vrhæia*.]

This claim that the shape of the nominal stem remains invariable is in fact mistaken: just as in Latin the shape of the oblique cases can be different from the nominative (as in *rex, regis; sermo, sermonis*), stem changes do occur in Tamil, e.g. nominative *maram* (“tree”), accusative *marattai*. Stem changes even occur in the genitive.

Tamil distinguishes two numbers, singular and plural. The singular number is marked by the absence of any suffix of the plural, of which there are several: *-kal*, *-r*, *-ār*, *-mār*, *-ir* and *-ar* (Andronov 2004: 60). Henriques gives the plural marker *-gal* (8v), as in *topi* (“barreite”)/*topigal* (also *topiyæl*); *cal* (“pee”)/*calgal*; in the fourth declension this marker is written as *-cal* (*jraia* (“Rey”)/*jraiical*). Some nouns have the marker *-ar*, as Henriques observes (f.22r), but since he does not distinguish between long and short vowels, he is unable to distinguish between *-ar* and *-ār*. His comments must in fact refer to *-ār*, which he says is used for nouns used with “honor”, men and women, or those who have a “rational soul” (“quall he por onrra, e isto nos nomes dos homens ou molheres, digo dos que tem alma Racional”): in a modern grammar, we likewise read that the marker *-ār* is “joined to the nominative of masculine and feminine nouns, primarily kinship terms, caste names, proper names, and pseudonyms” (Andronov 2004: 61).¹⁷ In Dravidian languages, plurality is obligatorily marked for human nouns, but is not for non-human nouns (Steever 1998b: 21). Henriques observes this feature of Tamil using the following words:

Notese que nesta lingua não acostumaõ tamto de vsar do plural como no latim e portuguez, vt. aquele homẽ tem muitos fanois, *auænucu meta fanal vndu* (f.25r)
[Notice that they are not so accustomed to use the plural as in Latin and Portuguese, as in ‘that man has many fanams’ *auænucu meta fanal vndu*.]

16. See also f. 23v.

17. Henriques gives a definition of the concept ‘racional’: “Auemdo ya dito do[s] verbos das noue conjugações, hase de saber que, quando nesta lymgoa se fala dos cousas que nõ tẽ alma Racional, como cais, caualos, gatos, etc., e taõbem de cousas jnaminadas [sic], como tone, champa, aruores e de quaisquer cousas semelhantes, vsaõ doutra maneira de falar, e o mesmo se usa, quando se fala dos mininos amtes que tenha uso de Razão, para o quall se note as Regras seguintes” (f.120r).

Gender is not treated very systematically by Henriques. In most Dravidian languages the distinctions are made on criteria such as human (or animate) and non-human (inanimate) nouns. Animate nouns are often further divided into masculine and feminine. In Henriques' terminology, the words *masculino* and *femenino* are used and in addition he establishes the categories of the 'cousas racionais' versus 'cousas jrracionais' (ff.25v-26r) or 'cousas 'jnaminadas [sic]' (f.27r). Henriques also deals with the dichotomy 'nomes abstractos' versus 'outros nomes que não são abstractos', which are treated separately (f.27r).

In Tamil, gender may be manifested in pronominal choice, nominal derivation and personal endings of verbs (Steever 1998b: 21). Henriques exhibits the following pronominal paradigms (only the nominative and genitive forms singular are given here):

nan ('eu') *enurhæia* ('de mĩ'), etc.
ni ('vos') e se he honrrado *nir*, *vnurhæia* ('de vos'), etc.
auæn ('aquelle'), *auæn vrhæia* ('daquele'), etc.
auær ('aquelle, quamdo he homẽ onrrado')
 Para as molheres: *auæl*. (f.31r)

If we analyse the Portuguese translations, it seems that here there is no clear-cut distinction between personal ("eu", "vos"), demonstrative ("aquelle", "este") and possessive pronouns ("sinificação de *meus*"), which is quite usual in missionary grammars of this period. However, the Tamil is quite clear. When Henriques translates *auæn* as "aquelle", he gives correctly the meaning of the distal pronoun ("he, there"), opposed to the proximal pronoun *ivan* ("he, here"). The pronominal system has inclusive and exclusive forms: the first person singular is *nān*, the first person plural exclusive *nānkal* ("we without you") is used when excluding the person(s) addressed and the first person plural inclusive is *nām* ("we and you") when the addressee is included (Andronov 2004: 110). In Henriques's grammar the forms of the first person plural inclusive and exclusive are given, but he does not give any definition or clear examples to distinguish them. He explains the use of honorific forms in greater detail. As the equivalent for the Portuguese demonstrative "este" he gives *juæn*, which is the proximal pronoun and for the Latin possessive pronouns "*meus, mea, meu[m]*" he gives *coladu*. Compared with the great number of folios which present verbal morphology, the section on pronouns is very short and shows important shortcomings; as we shall see, missionary linguists dealing with the languages of Brazil also found 'exotic' pronoun systems challenging.

At the end of the chapter, a section on the participles in *-avan* is appended – a departure from the canonical order of Latin school grammar – and the reason for dealing with them at this particular place is explained as follows:

Os participios dos verbos teñ muita semelhança cō este pronome *auæn* e por isso se poẽ aquí logo cō os pronomes, ou para melhor dizer, se declinaõ por o dito pronome *auæn* para hos homẽs, e se he omrrado *auær*, e se he molher *avæ*l ... (f.33r)
 [The participles of the verb show a great resemblance with this pronoun *auæn* and therefore they are dealt with together with the pronouns, or in other words, they are declined by the pronoun *auæn* for males, if it is respectful *auær* and if it is a woman *avæ*l...]

This account is fairly clear and correct, and we find almost verbatim the same explanation in Andronov (2004: 248): “Participial nouns of the commonest type are obtained by attaching the remote personal pronouns of the third person, that is *avan*, *ava*l, etc.” The tenses of the participles are ‘present’ ‘preterite’ and ‘future negative’ which all have masculine, masculine honorific (“homrrados”) and feminine forms. The examples are translated into Portuguese by a relative pronoun:

Participio de presente

<i>Vichuuadiquirauæn</i>	o que cree ou o que crer [“he who believes”]
<i>Vichuuadiquirauæ vrhæia</i>	do que cree (33r.)

We may finally note that the chapter on the noun in Da Costa’s grammar of ante 1673 (see Section 2.2.5 below) is different from that of Henriques. In the first place he suggests only one declension for Tamil, which has four different varieties based on stem changes. More strikingly, he extends the Latin paradigm of the cases, giving three morphologically different forms for the ablative, as well as ‘other cases’ (‘outros casos’) (James 2007: 171–172), the *ablativus quietis* (‘stative’), *ablativus instrum[entalis]* (‘instrumental’) and the *ablativus social[is]* (‘sociative’). This goes beyond the analysis of Henriques; as James (2007: 173) observes, da Costa’s description is in fact the “first extant analysis of the Tamil ablatives by a European”.

2.2.3.5 Henriques’s treatment of the Tamil verb

Dravidian verbal inflection distinguishes morphologically the verbal categories of mood, tense, aspect and polarity (affirmative and negative). According to Vermeer (1982: xviii), Henriques “has certainly not always understood the morphology” of the Tamil verb, “but the variety of forms is impressive”.

In Tamil a clear distinction is made between finite verbs, marked by tense and subject-verb agreement, and non-finite verbs, not marked in such a way. Finite verbs mark the end of the sentence; all other verbs must be non-finite (Steever 1998: 113). Henriques’s description demonstrates his understanding that the distinction between the categories ‘verbos pessoais’ and ‘impessoais’ is relevant for Tamil.

He divides the Tamil verb into nine conjugations, basing his classification partially on morphological and partially on phonological criteria. These are, following the analysis of Vermeer (1982: xviii–xix):

1. verbs in *-i/-ai/-u* + voiceless tense formatives, infinitive in *-kka*
2. verbs in *-a*
3. 3.1 verbs in *-r/-r̥/-t/-t̥*
4. 3.2. verbs in *-l*
5. verbs in *-u* + voiced tense formatives, preterite in *-nt-*, infinitive in *-kka*
6. 5.1 verbs in *-ll̥u*
7. 5.2 verbs in *-(t/r)u*, preterite in *-nt-*, infinitive in *-a*
8. verbs in *-y*
9. verbs in *-tu*
10. verbs in *-u* + voiced tense formatives, preterite in *-t-*, infinitive in *-a*
11. verbs in a nasal consonant (*-ŋ/-n*).

Different modern analyses identify fewer or more conjugational patterns than his.¹⁸ What is clear and important is that this system is not derived from any Portuguese model; Henriques attempts to shape a system which was designed specifically for Tamil. A second important point is made by Vermeer (1982: xix): that Henriques's declensional classification is easier to learn from a didactic point of view than those of modern grammars.

Henriques exhibits the verbal conjugations on fol. 37r., and these extensive paradigms occupy the largest section of the grammar (up to f.142v, where the paragraphs on syntax start). It is remarkable that the present tense is absent in the paradigm of the first conjugation, where only the 'preterito', 'futuro' and 'jnfinitiuo' (f.37r) are given; in the second, third and fifth to ninth conjugations we find 'preterite', 'futuro', 'jnp(er)atiuo', 'futuro negatiuo' and 'jmfinitiuo', and in the fourth we find only 'preterito', 'futuro', 'jmp(er)atiuo' (f.38r). In fact, the 'imperative' and 'infinitive' are not 'tenses' in the strict sense, so if we eliminate them from the paradigms, only three 'tenses' remain in Henriques' verbal system, 'present', 'past' and 'future', which are exactly the three simple tense-forms in Tamil, as described in modern grammars, such as Steever (2005: 61).¹⁹ A terminological innovation by Henriques is the dichotomy 'tempos affirmatiuos' and the 'tempos negatiuos' (f.46v.). Dravidian languages distinguish positive and negative both in finite and non-finite forms. Positive forms are not marked, and are recognizable by the absence of a negative suffix (Andronov 2003: 188). Another terminological 'extension' is the introduction of the categories of 'futuro jmterrogando' and 'futuro mandatiuo'.

18. In modern grammars, seven morphophonemically distinct conjugational patterns are distinguished (Steever 1998b: 113), as in Arden (1942), but the *Tamil lexicon* (1924–1939) distinguishes thirteen different conjugations (cf. Subrahmanyam 1971: 102).

19. Steever (2005: 61) observes that there are also at least three "complex tenses, all of which are expressed by modal and nonmodal auxiliary verb constructions".

After the nine conjugations and the formation of ‘tenses’, Henriques starts with the present tense on fol. 41r., which is unusual seen from the perspective of traditional Greco-Latin grammar.

Tamil does not distinguish morphologically between active and passive voices. On the semantic level, verbs can have an active and passive meaning, but the form of both is the same (Andronov 2004: 209). Henriques was aware of this difference between Tamil and Latin (or Portuguese), as we can read in the following citation:

... se saibe que nesta limgoa nō ay passiuua que propriamente se possa dizer passiuua, mas ai modo de falar ãe alguã das conjugações... (129r).

[... it is known that there is no passive properly which can be called ‘passive’ in this language, but there is a manner of speaking in one of the conjugations...]

There is a special section devoted to causative formations, although Henriques does not label them as such. All of the Dravidian languages show a variety of causative formations, and in Tamil the causative can be morphologically realised by means of suffixation or periphrasis. When the causative construction is morphological the markers *-vi-/(p)pi-* are suffixed to the verbal base (Krishnamurti 2003: 283); and when the construction is periphrastic, one of the three causative verbs *ceyya* (‘to do’, ‘to make’), *paṇṇa* (‘to make’) or *vaikka* (‘to place’) is used (Steever 2005: 102). Henriques does not give his readers very much theoretical background information, but his section includes periphrastic as well as morphological causatives. In his examples, Henriques gives causative/non-causative pairs which are clear for learners of Tamil:

Cheiyren quer dizer: ‘fazer’;²⁰ *cheiyuiquiren*: ‘faço fazer’; *ariquiren*: ‘espanco’. *Aripquiren*: ‘faço espancar’; *viziren*: ‘auano’, *vizuuiquirẽ*: ‘faço auanar’; *corquirem*: ‘emfio’, *corpiquirẽ*: ‘faço emfiar’: e assi ãe, todas as conjugações. E notese que quando assi se cõpoẽ estes verbos, sempre se reduzẽ a primeira conjugação:

poRupiquiren, *poRupichen*, *porupipen* [sic], *poRupi*, *porupiuũgo* [sic], *poRupien*, *poRupica*; e assi todos os outros das outras conjugações. E vsaõ muito deste modo de cõpoer os que bẽ sabẽ falar. (f.55r)

[*Cheiyren* means: ‘to make’, *cheiyuiquiren*: ‘I cause someone to make’; *ariquiren*: ‘I dissipate’. *Aripquiren*: ‘I cause something to dissipate’; *viziren*: ‘I agitate’, *vizuuiquirẽ*: ‘I cause someone/something to agitate’; *corquirem*: ‘to traverse’, *corpiquirẽ*: ‘I cause someone to traverse’, and so in all the conjugations. And notice that when these verbs are placed together, they are always ‘reduced’ to the first conjugation:

poRupiquiren, *poRupichen*, *porupipen* [sic], *poRupi*, *porupiuũgo* [sic], *poRupien*, *poRupica*; and the same in all the other conjugations. And those who know to speak well use frequently this manner of compounding.]

20. It has to be observed that *facere facere* (FF) is used as a specific metalinguistic innovation in the missionary grammars of the Philippine languages in the Spanish tradition, and is even used by Oyanguren de Santa Inés in his Japanese grammar (Zwartjes 2009). See also the chapter on Rodrigues and Ridruejo (2004).

It is remarkable that Henriques does not follow the convention of the grammars of this period and an overview of all the parts of speech at the beginning of his grammar is missing. The major part of his work is devoted to the verbal conjugations, and it is surprising that nothing is said about postpositions, conjunctions and interjections, and very little about adverbs. A possible explanation is that the grammar was not finished and perhaps Henriques intended adding such information in a later stage. However, an explanation may be found in the Tamil language itself. Dravidian languages lack adverbs in general, and usually the equivalents of Portuguese ‘adverbs’ are expressed in auxiliary compound verbs and lexical compound verbs (Steever 1998b: 113). It is not impossible that Henriques decided not to devote too many pages to this part of speech, since he understood that they were less important in Tamil than in Latin or Portuguese. However, in comparison with other grammars, we would expect at least some elementary observations about (the lack of) ‘prepositions’ or the treatment of ‘postpositions’, ‘suffixes’, or any post-positive particles.

2.2.3.6 *Henriques’s explicit comparisons between Tamil and Portuguese*

Henriques’s grammar is practical and motivated by its usefulness as a didactic tool. It does not contain very much theory, nor typological observations about the language, and Tamil is not compared systematically with other languages.

Only sporadically does the author compare Tamil with his own native tongue (“a nossa lingua”) or with Latin. One set of instances, comprising a remarkable didactic feature of Henriques’s grammar, is found in an example where he translates a Tamil phrase into Portuguese (“nossa lingoagẽ”), using a word-for-word translation (“palaura a palaura”). The result is ungrammatical in Portuguese: “mais que Joane Pedro he forte” (f.157v), which is given with the purpose of better explaining the word order in Tamil. In the same section, other close translations are given, such as “de Pedro junto yndo elle logo ca vir dize” (f.158r), “os homes a mĩ bẽ nõ tratẽ aynda que deus a mĩ bẽ tratara (f.158v), “a jgreia porque vas nã” (f.159r) and “a jgreia vas nã o porque” (ibid.), demonstrating how a Tamil sentence is construed.

One of the scarce observations on typology is Henriques’s conclusion that Tamil has ‘many compounds’ in the verbal system:

E notese que nesta lingua vsã de muitas compusiçãos, ã os verbos e quãdo se compoẽ huũ verbo cõ outro, sempre se cõpoẽ este tempo e adiãte lhe acrescetaõ os demais:

‘venho’	‘vou’	
<i>vamduuirhugiren</i>	<i>poivirhugiren</i>	etc.
et sic in numera verba [sic]. (f.48r)		

[And it has to be noticed in (constructing) the verbs, many compounds are used in this language, and when one verb is put with another, they are always

compounded by the ‘tense’ (‘tempo’) and to these the other (‘tenses’ = ‘personal endings’) are suffixed.

‘I come’	‘I go’	
<i>vamduuirhugiren</i>	<i>poivirhugiren</i>	etc.
et sic in numera verba [sic].]		

What Henriques means is that in compounds the tense marker comes at the end. *Vantu* + *irukkireen* is the present perfect and means “I have come”. The auxiliary *irukkireen* has tense markers, and the past-tense suffix in *vantu* does not determine tense. So, if two verbs are compounded, there is only one ending for tense and one for person. Henriques describes here a characteristic feature of the Tamil verbal system: a relatively elaborate system of auxiliaries, compared with Portuguese or Latin. In SOV-languages, such as Tamil, auxiliaries precede auxiliaries (Steever 2005: 35). Although the description of auxiliaries of Henriques is far from complete, his observation has its own importance. Steever (ibid.) observes that “Missionary grammarians identified a number of auxiliary verbs. As their ends were largely practical, they provided lists and examples of auxiliary verbs, not the necessary and sufficient conditions that a modern linguist would seek”. This claim about the Protestant grammarians also applies to Henriques’s description of the ‘compound’ verbs, in his essentially practical grammar. Nevertheless, seen in a chronological perspective, it has to be stressed that Henriques identified some auxiliaries in Tamil, and that he also concluded that the use of auxiliaries is a characteristic feature of the Tamil language. In his example, Henriques demonstrates that the verbal forms *vamduuirhugiren* (= *vantu irukkirēn*) and *poivirhugiren* (= *pōy irukkirēn*) are both ‘compound’, or ‘composite’ (‘compusição’), forms construed with the same auxiliary.

2.2.3.7 Henriques’s treatment of Tamil word order

Tamil, like all Dravidian languages, is a language of the SOV-type, head-final and left-branching (Steever 1998b: 30; Krishnamurti 2003: 29). Genitives in possessive constructions precede their head nouns and complement clauses precede matrix clauses (Steever 2005: 34). Henriques treats this typological feature of the language in detail:

Quando nesta limgoa fallaõ em suas oraçoẽs, o nomenatiuo se poẽ primeiro e o verbo se poẽ deRadeiro de tudo (f.155v)

[When they speak in this language in their sentences, the nominative is put first and the verb at the end of all.]

The positions of the other parts of speech are described as follows:

Se a de ter haverbio, o averbio se poẽ logo amtes do verbo, os accusatiuos ou datiuos no meio da oRaçaõ; e quando he oRaçaõ que yumtamente a de leuar datyuo

e acusatiuo, pola maior parte se põe primeiro o datiuo que o acusatiuo (ibid.)

Emxêplo:

Da azinha quatro fanoes a Joane,

Ni joanicu nalla fanā chardicu curhu.

Ni esta é nomentiuo; *curhu*, que esta no fym, he o verbo; *chardicu*, que esta amtes do verbo, he adverbio; *joanicu* he datiuo; *nalla fanā* ou *nalla fanatæi*, que [tãbê se] pode dizer, como acima esta dito na Rega dos nomes, folhas 26, he acusatiuo.

[If there is an adverb, it has to be placed before the verb, the accusatives or datives in the middle of the phrase, and when the phrase has a dative and an accusative together, almost always the dative has to be put before the accusative. *Ni* is in the nominative, *curhu*, which is at the end, is the verb; *chardicu*, which is before the verb, is an adverb; *joanicu* is dative, *nalla fanā* or *nalla fanatæi*, which also can be said, as explained above in the Rules of the nouns, f. 26, is accusative.]

This section describing word order is probably one of the briefest of all the grammars studied in this monograph, but it is fairly correct. Almost half a millennium later, Andronov describes Tamil word order in very much the same terms:

In an emotionally neutral and semantically isolated sentence the predicate occupies the final position. The subject precedes the predicate being moved off by the secondary parts of the sentence toward its beginning. The direct object immediately precedes the predicate, the indirect object preceding the direct one.

(Andronov 2003: 411)

2.2.3.8 *Henriques's treatment of agreement in Tamil*

Unlike Hindi, Marathi and Konkani, there is no trace of ergativity in Dravidian languages (Masica 1991: 342). The predicate can agree with the grammatical subject in number, gender and/or person when both the subject and the predicate distinguish all these grammatical categories, and singular subjects can take verbs in the plural in cases of high respect (Andronov 2004: 352–4). Henriques decided not to discuss agreement phenomena in any detail, although in most missionary grammars this topic is usually included in a final chapter or paragraph concerning syntax or ‘constructio’.

2.2.3.9 *Henriques's treatment of variation within Tamil*

Henriques does not supply much information concerning linguistic varieties, but sporadically he observes that some forms are less used (“nõ se usa muito” f.140v; “pouco se usa” f.141r). Henriques’s grammar is predominantly descriptive, although there are some prescriptive observations about more “elegant forms”, such as:

nan vichuuaditen, também se acaba é *chen*; *nan vichuuadichen*, mas em tem he may's elegamte [sic]; eu cri (45r.)

[*nan vichuuaditen* which also ends in *chen*; *nan vichuuadichen*, but in *tem* is more elegant.]

ou cheiuẽ, que he futuro, he como quẽ diz: ‘eu cri’; e se acrecêtaõ o *cheiuẽ*: ‘eu crerei’; e he modo elegante de falar. (f. 54v.)

[or *cheiuẽ*, which is future, is as if one says ‘I believed’/‘I have believed’, and when incremented with *cheiuẽ* ‘I shall believe’ it is the elegant way of speaking.]

Henriques distinguishes between the language of the educated and the more popular registers. Forms of colloquial speech are on occasion contrasted with the language of “Those who speak well”. (“E vsaõ muito deste modo de cõpoer os que be sabẽ falar”) (f.55r.), and on the other hand, Henriques sometimes refers to “those who know little” (“O jmfinitiuo se forma ab jmperatiuo addita ca: *vichuuadi* – *vicuuadica*. Os que pouco sabem dizẽ *vichuuadicha*”) (f.69v)²¹ or “os que muito sabẽ” is opposed to “o comũ falar” (f.92v). Tamil is diglossic so this is probably what Henriques was trying to explain. According to Vermeer (1982: xx), Henriques has the tendency to use more literary forms in the declension of nouns and spoken Tamil is more recorded in the tense-formation of the several conjugations.

2.2.3.10 Henriques’s meta-language

Henriques uses often bilingual Portuguese-Latin terminology. Sometimes entire “code-switching-like” descriptions, switching between Portuguese and Latin, as occurs in the grammar of Anchieta (see the chapter on Brazil):

O nomenatiuo do plural se acaba ã *iael* e ã *gal* e alguã vez ã *ær*, vt in nominibus prime declinationis, e alguã vez ã *cal*, vt jn quarta declinatione et in aliquibus nominibus quinte (f.24r).

[The nominative of the plural ends in *iael* and in *gal* and sometimes in *ær* as occurs in the nouns of the first declension, and sometimes in *cal*, as occurs in the fourth declension and in some nouns of the fifth.]

dos participios ja esta dito aomde se falou dos pronomes, ut *ideo sufficit* (f.47v).

[this has been said about the participles when we talked about the pronouns, as is sufficient.]

mas nos verbos da 2ª cõjugaçaõ *formatur a praeterito nẽ: pesinẽ, pesi* (f.47v.)

[but in the verbs of the second conjugation, it is formed by the preterite *nẽ: pesinẽ, pesi*.]

e tomaõ esta letra d *propter mala[m] dissonãtia[m]* (f.19; cf. f.58r.)

[and they take this letter *d* for reasons of bad dissonance.]

tempos que se formaõ do presẽte e do preterito, vt *jnferibus videbitur* (f.120r)

[tenses which are formed from the present and preterite, as will be seen below.]

There is a lack of consistency in terminology when suffixes, particles, or morphemes are described. Henriques does not use a term for root (“raíz”), or stem, but he frequently uses the verb “acrecentar” when a certain element is suffixed to the

21. Colloquial registers have a higher degree of palatalised forms than in literary Tamil.

lexical stem. Instead of the “root”, Henriques uses the “nominative” as the base to which elements can be suffixed:

..nomenatiuos, **acrecentando** esta palaura.... (f.13r.)

[... nominatives, augmenting this word....]²²

Notese que algũs nomes destas declinações, principalmente da 1^a e da 2^a, **acrecentaõ** esta particula *ar*, o quall he por onrra, e isto nos nomes dos homens ou molheres, digo dos que tem alma Racional. (f.22r.)

[Notice that to some nouns of these declensions, particularly those of the first and second (declension), the particle *ar* is augmented, which is an honorific, and this (occurs) in nouns of men and women, that is to say, those who have a rational soul.]

According to Henriques's terminology, a noun has ‘endings’ (“terminações” f.23v) and the verb has ‘tenses’ (“tempos”). However, *tempo* is not always used *strictu sensu* to designate the tenses of the verb – present tense, future tense, and so on – but also in a more amplified sense, designating any ‘ending’, i.e. as a synonym for “terminações”. So, a verb has ‘tenses’ which can be formed by suffixing (“acrecentar”) ‘particles’ (“particulas”) and ‘adverbs’ (“adverbios”). A suffixed element may simply be called a ‘syllable’ (“silaba”): “*vichuuaditalũ*: acrecentamdo esta silaba um a *vichuuadital*, quer dizer: ajmda que crea” (f.47r). Apart from ‘particles’, ‘syllables’ or ‘adverbs’ the more neutral word ‘palaura’ (‘word’) is also used when formative entities in compounds are described:

vichuuaditu jrucachole. He o mesmo tempo *vichuuaditu*, acrecẽtamdo estas duas palauras *jruca chole*. E esta palaura *iruca* he o jmfinitiuo deste verbo *jruquirẽ*. Esta palaura *chole* he huã palaura que se acostuma acrecentar ao jmfinitiuo de que adiante se falara. Tudo yunto quer dizer: ‘auẽdo crido’. (f.48v.)

[*vichuuaditu jrucachole*. This is the same tense as *vichuuaditu*, incremented by these two words *jruca* [and] *chole*. And this word *iruca* is the infinitive of this verb *jruquirẽ*. This word *chole* is a word which usually is joined to the infinitive which will be spoken of below. All together it means: ‘having believed’.]

Henriques uses the verb “descender” for “derive” or “form”:

... dos futuros affirmatiuos descẽde huũs verbos os quais descẽdẽ ã todas as noue cõjugações e quasi ã todos os verbos que vaõ por ellas ... (f. 54v)

[some verbs are derived from the future affirmatives, from which they are derived in all the nine conjugations and almost all the verbs which belong to these conjugations.]

22. Cf. f.24r. *et passim*.

Characteristic of many missionary grammars are the so-called approximative translations or metalinguistic terms:²³

vichuuaditadinale. – He o mesmo tēpo *vichuuadita* *acrecêtando adinale*, que he averbio, que quer dizer: *dali*. **He quasi como** *vichuuaditaducōdu*, vt: ‘De crer nos demonios lhe ueio o mal’, *peæi vichuuaditadinale avænucu polangu vandidu*. (f.49v., emphasis is mine)

[*vichuuaditadinale*. – This is the same ‘tense’ as *vichuuadita* incremented by *adinale*, which is an adverb which means ‘through that’.²⁴ This is almost as *vichuuaditaducōdu*, vt: ‘evil comes to him who believes in demons’ *peæi vichuuaditadinale avænucu polangu vandidu*.]

... *aquelle jrūdu* he deste tēpo que parece **quasi gerūdio**.²⁵

[... and that *jrūdu* is of this tense and this seems a ‘quasi-gerund’.]

These examples of Henriques’s meta-language show him naming and explaining Tamil grammatical features, not those familiar from the grammar of Portuguese. The Portuguese grammar of Barros (that of Álvares had not yet been published) could be helpful for those who did not know Latin, and as we saw in Section 2.2.2 above, Henriques did mention it. His reason for doing this was probably that he did not want to lose too much time in the classroom with ‘Donatus’-like questions and answers or with definitions of the several parts of speech and their sub-categories and ‘accidents’. His aim was to start directly with the Tamil language, and those who did not remember the grammatical definitions could consult Barros outside the classroom in their own time, if they wished. This possibly explains why in the Tamil grammar few definitions are given. Nevertheless, definitions are sometimes given, such as:

Segēse as conjugações dos verbos pessoais e chāmase pessoais, porque tem numero e pessoas. (f.41r)

[(Below) follow the conjugations of the personal verbs, called ‘personal’ because they have (inflect according to) ‘number’ and ‘persons’.]

The definition of the ‘personal verbs’ could have been inspired by Barros’s grammar, where it is argued: “Repârtem mais os latinos os seus uerbos, em pessoâes e

23. This strategy was often applied by historians, travellers, biologists, anthropologists, etc. when they ‘discovered’ exotic nature and other realities in the New World. See for instance Gonçalves and Murakawa (2009: 241–242) analyzing the implicit lexicographical theory of Fernão Cardim (1540/1548?–1625), a Jesuit missionary working in Brazil.

24. Composed of *adin* + *aale*. *Adu* is neuter singular and *aal* is the instrumental case (Achuthan Menon, personal communication, May 2008).

25. A comparable treatment of “quasi-categories” can be found in the Kiriri grammar of Mamiani (1877[1699]: 94), where a definition is given of the “quasi adverbios” or the ‘semi-pronombres’ in Meso-American grammars (cf. Zwartjes 1998).

impessoáveis” (Barros 1971[1540]: 18) and Barros’ definition of the ‘verbo pessoal’ is very similar to what we read in Henriques: “Verbo pessoal e aquelle que tem numeros e pessoas” (Barros 1971[1540]: 18), although similar definitions can be easily found elsewhere.

2.2.4 The reputation of Henriques’s work

The grammar of Henriques has been generally neglected in studies and monographs dedicated to Dravidian languages. For instance, Krishnamurti (2003: 17) mentions only the name ‘Anrique Anriquez’, who was, according to him, a “Jewish Portuguese missionary of the Jesuit order” but his grammar is not analysed at all in his monograph. Krishnamurti’s paragraph (2003: 30) with the title “Dravidian studies, past and present” starts with Caldwell’s grammar (1856). It is difficult to understand why he ignored Henriques’ work, which was available at that time, since Vermeer had published it in 1982.

Likewise, in Steever (2005: 40–41) we find a short section entitled “Missionary grammar and comparative philology”, where there is only some mention of the Lutheran missionaries Johann Philipp Fabricius (1711–1791) and Christian Breithaupt’s (d.1783) *A grammar for learning the principles of the Malabar language* (1789[1778]).²⁶ Steever mentions also George Uglow Pope’s (1820–1908) *A handbook of the Tamil language* (Madras, 1855), and other 19th-century grammarians. No mention is made at all of Henriques, or of one of Tamil’s greatest grammarians, Constanzo Giuseppe Beschi (1680–1746).

2.2.5 Other Tamil grammars

Four other early grammars of Tamil are known to have existed, though one of these is now lost, and one other has never been published.

Streit (V, 1929: 211) reports another grammar of Tamil compiled in the 17th century by Gaspar de Aguilar SJ, described as *Arte Tamul, sive institutio grammaticae Malabaricae, idiomate lusitanico ex maiori Opere P. Casp. D’Aguilar Soc. Jes. Confecta, quod ex praefatione patet*. It has no entry in Machado, but is also mentioned by Sommervogel (1890, vol. I: col. 82), and Dahlmann (1891: 11) mentions a copy in the 1720 catalogue of Zacharias Conrad Uffenbach’s (1683–1734) library at Halle. This work has apparently been lost.

Antão de Proença SJ (1625–c.1666) composed a Tamil dictionary (discussed further in the appendix to the present work), to which a grammar is appended,

26. These authors also compiled a dictionary entitled *A Malabar and English Dictionary*, published in 1779 with a new edition thirty years later, and translated the Bible into Tamil.

arranged by Balthazar da Costa (c.1610–1673) (Sommervogel 1890, vol. 6. col. 1241; Gomes Rodeles (1913: 165).²⁷ Fr. Proença was born at Ramella in 1625, entered the Society on July 13, 1643, went to the Madura Mission in 1647, and died at Tociam on December 14, 1666. He used earlier language studies of Ignacio Bruno (1585–1659), Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656) and Manoel Martins (?1597–?1656). His *Vocabulario* was further revised by Fathers Anthony Pereira, Valerian Catáneo, John de Maya and other missionaries. James (2000: 96) mentions also an unpublished manuscript:

Bearing the name of the Carmelite Paulo Francisco de Noronha (1780–1848), there exists an undated 72-folio manuscript entitled *Grammatica inedita da lingua tamil...*, held by the State Central Library, Panaji [MS M15] comprising a copy of da Costa's *Arte tamulica...*, followed by a Tamil dialogue (*Confessionario tamulico...*) between a penitent and a confessor, and an eight-folio Tamil-Portuguese glossary, entitled *Significação de todas palavras que estão no confessionario po mayor commodidade dos que começam aprender a lingoa* [The meanings of all words in the Confession, for the greater convenience of those who are beginning to learn the language] of the words appearing in the preceding dialogue text. The glossary consists of 833 one-to-one equivalents...

Krishnamurti (2003) mentions Bartholomeus Ziegenbalg (1682–1719), a German Protestant missionary, whose *Grammatica Damulica* (1716) in Latin was the first grammar of Tamil printed by a Westerner.

A 19th-century Tamil grammar in Portuguese was written by Benjamin Francisco de Amaranate (1812–1879) (Moorty 2006: 186).²⁸

2.3 Konkani. Thomas Stephens (Thomaz Estevão 1549–1619)

2.3.1 The life of Thomas Stephens

According to J. Saldanha (1912), Thomas Stephens, also known in India as Padre Estevão, Estevam, or Padre Busten, de Bustoa, Buston, De Bubston, was born in about 1549 in Bulstan, Wiltshire. Being a Catholic, he left England for Rome where he finished his novitiate at the Society of Jesus in 1575 (Streit 1928: 259). He sailed from Lisbon to Goa, where he spent the rest of his life working among the Brahman Catholics of Salsette, in the College of Espirito Santo, Todos os Santos and Santo

27. We have not seen the original edition. The grammar (MS M34, State Central Library, Panaji) remains unstudied and unpublished, as James observes (2007: 173, note 9). Our description here is based on James (2007: 171–173).

28. For a select chronological list of missionary grammars of Tamil, see James (2007: 188–190).

Ignácio, usually called the College of Rachol in the Jesuit documents (Alden 1996: 47), which was mentioned above (Section 2.1.1) as the location of a Jesuit printing-press. The College of Salsette, where Konkani was taught, was one of the three main administrative, religious and educational centres of the Catholics in India, together with Pulicat on the Fishery Coast, a centre of Tamil instruction, and a third in Bassein where the Jesuits taught Gujarati (Alden 1996: 47). Stephens learned Hindustani as well and mastered Marathi, Konkani and Sanskrit. He was author of the *Doutrina Christã em lingua Bramana-Canarim*,²⁹ printed in 1622 at the College of Rachol, a Christian work in the Marathi language and Nagari character (Streit 1928: 260), and other religious works, notably a Christian epic (or *Purāṇa*) in Maratha, *Purana Christão*, “which combines Vedic content and style with Christian inspiration” (Tanner 2011: 192).

In 1580, Stephens wrote *Arte da lingoa Canarim*, whose original manuscript has been lost. The only known printed version appeared twenty-one years later after his death in 1640, published in Rachol, revised by five Jesuits, of whom only the name of Diogo Ribeiro is given.³⁰ Streit (1928: 260) mentions a reprint of Stephens’s grammar printed in Goa in 1857 (cf. Lopes 1969: 145).

Two centuries before William Jones’s (1746–1749) famous talk of 1786 (see Section 1.3 above), Thomas Stephens had already observed the similarities between languages in India, Latin and Greek. In 1583, he wrote: “Many are the languages of these places. Their pronunciation is not disagreeable and their structure is allied to Greek and Latin” (cited in M. Saldanha 1936: 719).³¹

2.3.2 Other early grammars of Konkani and neighbouring languages

Apart from Stephens’s work, there were further Portuguese grammars of the languages of this region. From a letter of the Jesuit Lourenço Peres we know that a grammar was written in 1560 by a brother from St. Paul College.³² An anonymous *Arte Canarina na lingoa do Norte* was composed in the 17th century by a

29. Cf. Lopes (1969: 145). A second edition was published in 1945 (Lisbon, Agência Geral das Colónias). See also Chandra Prasad (1980: 22).

30. Diogo Ribeiro also compiled a dictionary of Konkani, entitled *Vocabulario da lingoa Canarim* (Ribeiro 2005[1626]).

31. Later, the Jesuit Ignazio Arcamone (1615–1683) also observed that Konkani is similar to Latin, in his *Janua Indica sive pro Concanica et Deccanica Lingua, Manuale Indis ingressuris per-opportunu Indiae candidatis Sociis dedicat* (in the National Library of Lisbon; not seen). I am grateful to Pratapananda Naik for this reference (paper presented at the Sixth International Conference of Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo, 2010).

32. Pratapananda Naik, paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics.

missionary, possibly a Franciscan or a Jesuit working in Thaná, on Salsette island (M. Saldanha 1936: 719). This work follows the structure of Stephens's grammar ("ordenado pelo mesmo plano e sistema" Saldanha, *ibid.*).

It was first printed in 1858, in Nova Goa (Streit 1929, vol. 5: 235; Lopes 1969: 146; M. Saldanha 1936: 721).³³ It was the first grammar of "concânico de norte" or "marato colonial de Baçaim, Bandorá e Bombaim", which we might call Marathi rather than Konkani.³⁴

Gaspar de São Miguel (c. 1595–1647) composed a study of Konkani called *Sintaxis copiozissima na Lingoa Bramana e Pollida*, of which there is an undated manuscript in the library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.³⁵ Two other works may be derived from São Miguel's, the *Gramatica da lingua bramana que corre na Ilha de Goa e sua comarca* and the *Syntaxis copiosissima na lingua bramana e pollida*, of which the latter consists of 39 folios and presents 205 grammatical rules (M. Saldanha 1936: 721).

The Franciscan missionary Christovam de Jesus completed a manuscript entitled *Arte gramatical da lingua camarina* in 1635, which is possibly the same as his *Gramatica da lingua Bramana ordenada pello Pe Fr. Christovão de Iesus*, which comprises 42 folios. Like the Bengali grammar discussed in Section 2.4 below, this grammar starts directly with the nominal declensions and describes the colloquial language as it was spoken in Bardes.³⁶ Dahlmann (1891: 16) also mentions other Franciscans, such as Manuel Banha (compiler of a dictionary of Konkani), Lado and Manuel Baptista (authors of a catechism in Konkani), Amador de Santa Anna (translator of the *Flos Sanctorum*) and the Carmelite Francisco Xavier de Santa Anna, who is supposed to have composed an improved version of the grammar of Stephens.

In Cunha Rivara (1958[1858]: 224), another source is mentioned, entitled *Grammatica ou Observações Grammaticaes sobre a lingua de Concana*, and extant only in manuscript. The name of the author is omitted, but he was probably the Italian Carmelite Francisco Xavier (or Xaver), missionary in Kanara, Archbishop of Sardes. To the *Grammatica* a vocabulary is attached entitled *Diccionario da*

33. I have not yet been able to consult this edition.

34. Baçaim = Bassein; Bandorá is a town in North Goa district in the state of Goa; Bombaim = Mumbai/Bombay.

35. José Pereira discovered the manuscript (which I have not seen), and published it in 1968. The section dealing with syntax is the fullest treatment of standard Konkani syntax, so far we know, according to Naik (2010).

36. Machado (1965[1741], vol 1: 579); Cunha Rivara (1958[1858]: 223); Streit & Dindinger (1931: 212, no. 728); Meersman (1960: 45); M. Saldanha (1936: 722). According to Meersman (1960: 45) Christovão de Jesus wrote his grammar after 1637–1638.

Lingua Concana, a Portuguese-Konkani dictionary with a great number of Italian words and phrases.

2.3.3 The Konkani language

Konkani is an Indo-Aryan language spoken in Goa, in the coastal North Kanara District of Karnataka State and also in Mangalore in South Kanara. The language is now commonly written in the Devanagari, Kannada and Malayalam scripts. The Latin script was generally used by the Portuguese missionaries. No trace has been found of an alleged earlier literature, since it was supposedly destroyed by the Inquisition. According to Miranda (2003: 731), Konkani is divided according to religion and caste; this author distinguishes five major dialects.³⁷

Three terms were used in the colonial period to denote Konkani: *Marathi*, *Brahmana* and *Canarina* (Meersman 1960: 45). Meersman, citing Dalgado, explains the meaning of the term *lingua canarina/Canarim*:

Em rigor Canarim è o habitante do Canara. Mas os Portuguezes desde principio applicaram erroneamente a denominação ao povo de Goa, que geograficamente é concani, etnicamente é indo-aria e glotologicamente é indo-europeu.

[Strictly, *Canarese* is an inhabitant of Kanara, but the Portuguese applied the term erroneously to the people of Goa, which is geographically Konkani, ethnically Indo-Aryan and linguistically Indo-European.] (cited in Meersman 1960: 45, note 25).

This is potentially confusing. Konkani is one of the three principal languages of Kanara, the other two being Kannada and Tulu. Thomas Stephens uses the term *lingua canarim* in the title of his grammar, but might also be taken to mean Kannada, which (like Tulu) is a Dravidian or a non-Indo-Aryan language. The confusion can be explained by the fact that Konkani was also written in Kannada characters at that time. Later, when the Portuguese realised that the language usually written in these characters was not Konkani but a Dravidian language, the term *canarim* was already commonly used (Miranda 2003: 732). Stephens also uses the term *marata concânico* (M. Saldanha 1936: 717) for the language spoken in Bassein, Bandora and Mumbai/Bombay, suggesting that like the anonymous author of the *Arte Canarina na lingoa do Norte*, he sees Konkani and Marathi as a continuum.³⁸

37. These are (1) Goa Hindu Konkani, spoken all over Goa; (2) Southern Saraswat Konkani, spoken by the Saraswat Brahmins of the coastal districts of Karnataka, and of Kerala; (3) Bardes Christian Konkani, spoken in Bardes and Tiswadi, the northern part of the Old Conquests; (4) Saxtti Christian Konkani, spoken in Saxtti and Mormugao, the southern part of the Old Conquests; (5) Karnataka Christian Konkani, spoken in the coastal districts of Karnataka (Miranda 2003: 731).

38. For other examples of the use of the term *Konkani* for a form of Marathi, see Masica (1991: 17; 434–435); Pandharipande (1997: xxxix; 2003: 699; 726).

But he does not see them as identical, for he notes that in the Canarim language there exist some ‘marasta’ loans (‘algũas palauras marastas’, 1640: 4v).

Saldanha (ibid.) distinguishes two varieties of Konkani, ‘forma de falar plebeia (‘canarim’) and ‘língua canarim brámana’ which was more prestigious. The latter was the variety described by Thomas Stephens. Stephens himself does not supply many details concerning regional varieties in his grammar of Konkani, although Brahman/non-Brahman differences must have existed. According to Miranda (2003: 757) “it is not suprising that non-Brahman variants are not recorded in these works. Even until recently, only Brahman variants were used in writing by Hindus and Christians of all castes”.

2.3.4 Stephens’s Konkani grammar

Stephens’s grammar starts with several ‘Licenças’, signed in Goa in 1639, one by Esteuaõ da Cruz, another by Antonio de Faria Machado and Iorge Secco de Macedo. From Manoel Barradas’ hand follows an ‘aprouação dos Superiores’ and some additional remarks concerning pronunciation. A relatively long section (3 pages) is devoted to the ‘Erratas’. After these introductory section the grammar begins with another title page with minor differences from the first title page (instead of ‘nouamente reuista & emendada’ we find here only ‘nouamente reuista’). Stephens’s grammar contains three parts, (1) the alphabet (“letters that correspond with the characters of the country”), accents and pronunciation (1r-7r); (2) the eight parts of speech (7r-77v); and finally (3) syntax (77v-103v). It is difficult to determine which Latin grammar Stephens, Ribeiro and the four anonymous Jesuit fathers used as their model. In any case, there are no indications that the grammar of Manuel Álvares was used extensively, since no clear correspondences have been found.

2.3.4.1 *Stephens’s treatment of phonology and orthography*

As we saw in Section 2.1.1 above, in Goa and Quilon, the pioneers Gonsalves and Faria developed their printing press in the local script. Thomas Stephens had wanted to have his work published in Devanagari script, but his grammar was printed in a romanisation. We quote from a letter of Stephens to his superiors in Rome, written in Salsette in Goa on December 5th, 1608:

Before I end this letter I wish to bring to Your Paternity’s mind the fact that for many years I have very strongly desired to see in this Province some books printed in the language and alphabet of the land, as there are in Malabar with great benefit for that Christian community. And this could not be achieved for two reasons; the first because it looked impossible to cast so many moulds amounting to six hundred [in his grammar we read “pouco menos de sete centos” (1640: 1v)], whilst

the characters are syllables and not alphabetic, as our twenty-four in Europe. The other because this holy curiosity could not be put into execution without the order and concession of the Provincial, and they have so many things to look after that they have no time to attend to this, let alone more to take it in hand. The first difficulty has its remedy in that these moulds can be reduced to two hundred. The second will vanish if Your Paternity thought fit to write to the Father Provincial, recommending that he may do it if he feels that it will be for the greater glory of God, and edification and benefit of this Christian community. (cited in Priolkar 1958: 13–14)

The casting of Devanagari types did not take place, and in his grammar, Stephens used the Latin alphabet, given as follows:

a, a, b, bh, c, ch, chh, d, dh, dd, ddd, e, gue, gh, h, i, y, κ, l, lh, llh, ll, m, mh, nnh, nn, o, p, ph, q, qh, qhh, r, rh, s, sh, t, th, tt, tth, u, uh, z, y, z, zh. (1640: 1v)

This did, as he pointed out, have disadvantages: the Indians “include in their characters many letters we do not have in our Europe” (“os Índios tẽ encerradas em seus caracteres muitas letras, q̃ nos não temos em nossa Europa”). If we wish to “declare” with our letters, we are therefore forced to make use of accents (diacritics), and geminates and aspirations (1640: 1v). Moreover, knowing the orthography he presents is, according to Stephens, not enough for learning the pronunciation:

Pera apronuniação não basta saber a orthographia. He necessario ouuir as vozes, q̃ se proferẽ, & a tentar como se proferẽ pellos q̃ sabẽ bem fallar... (1640: 4r)

[For the pronunciation, it is not enough to know the orthography. It is necessary to hear the sounds they produce and to attempt to pronounce them as they are pronounced by those who know how to speak well.]

In order to give readers of his grammar the best possible understanding of Konkani phonology, Stephens then explains some points in detail. He begins with the retroflex phonemes /l/ /d/ and /t/, which he represents as geminate *ll*, *dd*, *tt*.³⁹

Todas as vezes q̃ ouuermos de pronũciar dous .ll. doues .nn. dous .dd.; ou dous .tt; ou esta letras dobradas venhaõ no principio da dição, ou no meo as auemos de pronũciar ferindo cõ aponta da lingua do Ceo da boca, no tempo de as exprimir. (1640: 2r)

[Always when we have to pronounce two l's, two n's, two d's, two t's or geminate letters at the beginning or in the middle of the word, we have to pronounce them touching the tip of the tongue against the roof of the mouth while we produce them.]

39. These consonants are also called ‘cerebral’ consonants, as in Maffei (1886: 3). In fact, using geminates the opposition between real geminates and the use of retroflex consonants is neutralised (for instance /mãlo/ ‘floor’ = *mallo*; /mãllo/ = ‘beaten’; Masica 1991: 153).

Stephens's description of the retroflex consonants is clear and complete, since both the tongue tip is mentioned as the active and the hard palate as the passive articulator. It compares well with that of Cassiano Beligatti's *Alphabetum Brammhanicum* (1771) in which we find the explanation that "the twisted tongue slowly touches the palate".⁴⁰ Indeed, even in modern phonological manuals, we find almost verbatim the same definitions, as in Laver (1994: 141), the only difference being that instead of "ceo da boca" Laver is more precise, using the term 'post-alveolar or palato-alveolar' place of articulation (1994: 216).

In modern Konkani, the aspirate and non-aspirate contrast is not only found in all stops and affricates, but even in the non-retroflex nasals, laterals, flaps and glides (Masica 1991: 103). The only exception is the voiceless labial stop, which does not have its aspirate counterpart (Miranda 2003: 738). This quite unusual feature of Konkani posed a descriptive challenge. Stephens uses the metalinguistic term *aspiração*, pl. *aspirações*, for aspiration and aspirated phonemes. He includes the contrast *p/ph* in his alphabet, but he remarks that ⟨ph⟩ does not represent the voiceless aspirated labial stop ⟨ph⟩ but the voiceless labiodental fricative /f/:

Inda que nesta lingua não ha propriamête f. como tudo seguindo-se na dição depois do nosso p.h. forma apronunciação de f. como ouemos em, phalla, phatti, & outros. (1640: 2v)

[Notwithstanding, there is no proper *f* as everything which follows in a word after our *ph* forms the pronunciation as *f* as we have in *phalla*, *phatti* etc.]⁴¹

Beligatti was to note that Konkani aspirates are articulated with "some force" (1771: 17; cf. Bhatia 1987: 59).

Often in romanised Konkani texts, the Portuguese ⟨x⟩ is used to indicate the palatal fricative /ʃ/, as in Saxtti (/saʃti/), which is not found in Stephens's alphabet. Nevertheless, Stephens explains that the letter ⟨x⟩ is found frequently in many words of this language, particularly in initial position, as in *xastra*, 'aley', *Xara*, 'cidade'. It is remarkable that Stephens believes that in Portuguese the digraph ⟨sh⟩ is used for the palatal fricative, which is not correct in Portuguese but this description does make sense for English, Stephens's native language: "& outros vocabulos

40. According to Bhatia (1987: 59), Beligatti's work was published in 1761, but the edition I consulted in the Library of the University of Leiden is dated 1771, and there appears to be no record of an earlier one.

41. It is not uncommon that missionary grammarians point at differences between the labiodental phoneme /f/ represented as ⟨f⟩ and the aspirated voiceless labial stop /p^h/. Lagunas (2002[1574]: 146) is aware of the difference: "Phi es pronunciada por los griegos del mismo modo que debería ser pronunciada por nosotros, no como la pronunciamos ahora, esto es, como F Latina". ("Phi is pronounced by the Greeks in the same way as it should be pronounced by us, not as it is now pronounced, that is, like Latin F"). (cf. Monzón 2005: 73, where mention is made of Errandonea (1945: 73), and the influence from Nebrija's *Introductiones*).

Table 2.1 Vowels of modern Konkani

	Front	Central	Back
High	i, ĩ		u, ũ
High-mid	e, ě	ə, ẽ	o, õ
Low-mid	e, ẽ	ʌ, ȁ	ɔ, ȣ
Low		a, ȁ	

ficando algũ modo de pronunciaçaõ do nosso Portuguez de, *sh*, com aspiraçãõ (1640: 3r).

Stephens uses also two different characters, the ⟨a⟩ ‘grego’, and the ⟨a⟩ ‘latino’ respectively, for two different vowels. The first is described by Stephens as “a ‘short a’ (a breue) to be pronounced between *a* and *o*, even when it has a long accent” (“*v breue porq̃ cõmũmente assy he, tẽ apronũciaçaõ mea entra a, e, o, ainda q̃ as vezes tẽ accento lôgo*”) (1640: 2r).⁴² So, in Stephens’s romanisation, an attempt is made to extend the Latin system of five vowels by adding a letter from the Greek alphabet. This does not do full justice to the richness of the Konkani vowel system.

Diacritics used by Stephens are a so-called “pontinho” which is used for the ‘long accent’ (‘accento longo’, 1640: 4r) and the “sinal ȁ” which is used for the final long ⟨a⟩ (1640: 4r). The Portuguese term used by Stephens for *tilde* is ‘til’ (1640: 6r-v).

Stephens uses the Portuguese graphemes for the aspirate and non-aspirate velar stops (⟨c⟩ before *a*, *o*, and *u*; and the digraph ⟨qu⟩ before *e*, and *i*). He informs his readers that he uses the ⟨k⟩ in his dictionary in order to avoid any possible confusion between the different values of ⟨c⟩ in most Romance languages.

2.3.4.2 Stephens’s treatment of Konkani nominal morphology

In modern reference grammars, Konkani nouns show a three-gender system (masculine, neuter and feminine) and two declensional classes (some loans form a separate declensional class; cf. Miranda 2003: 741).⁴³ As in other Indo-Aryan languages, there are several layers of ‘case-like’ functions; one is inherited from inflectional material from Middle and Old Indo-Aryan, a second consists of

42. Oliveira also made the same distinction, with the only difference that the first is called a ‘pequeno’ with a pronunciation with the mouth more opened (“a boca mais aberta que das outras vogaes”) and the *a* grande “com a mesma forma da boca” (Oliveira 2007[1536]: 177; f. 8v). In Oliveira’s grammar we find the vowels α, a, e, ẽ, o, ω, i and u, which is discussed by Barros, who followed the Italians Claudio Tolomei (1492–1555) and Benedetto Varchi (1503–1565) (cf. Buescu 1971: xxix).

43. The first class has endings indicating gender: ɔ (masc.) ẽ (neut.) and i (fem.), while nouns of the second class generally end in a consonant, with some masculine nouns ending in *-i* and *-u* and neuter nouns ending in *-ĩ* and *-ũ*.

‘agglutinative suffixes’ or ‘analytic particles’, and a third of ‘quasi-analytic’ elements (Masica 1991: 231). In nominal morphology a distinction is made between oblique forms, used before postpositions, and ‘direct’ forms; both of these ‘cases’ have singular and plural forms.

The existence of declensional classes did not in itself pose a descriptive challenge for Stephens. Rather than two, however, he distinguishes six declensions for Konkani (1640: 7r), plus a class of nouns which are labelled as ‘invariable’ (‘indiclinaueis’) – a somewhat paradoxical element in a treatment of ‘declensions’. The distinctions he makes are partially based on gender and partially on the endings. Stephens does not reserve a special declension for nouns ending in a consonant; his main distinction is based on the formation of the ‘genitive’ or oblique form. The reason why he did not reserve a separate declension for nouns ending in a consonant is that when writing Konkani in Kannada script some rules of this script do not apply to Konkani: Konkani words may end in a consonant, while in Kannada a word always ends in an *a* (Maffei 1886: 3).

Stephens was aware of the fact that there is actually only a distinction between two morphologically different forms of the noun: the direct for the nominative and accusative, i.e. ‘cases’ without postpositions, and the oblique which is used when postpositions are attached. Here, he saw a parallel between Konkani and Latin. He argues that as in Latin, all oblique cases in Konkani are derived from the genitive and not from the nominative.⁴⁴ To explain this, he cites Latin *sermo* (nominative), *sermonis* (genitive): just as the Latin accusative singular *sermonem*, and other inflected forms have the stem *sermon-*, so postpositions in Konkani nominal morphology all follow a distinctive oblique form of the noun. But having said this, he decided to follow the Latin model for describing cases, which has the consequence that some forms can be found for different cases although they are morphologically identical.⁴⁵ The ‘cazos obliquos’ are, Stephens writes, ‘similar’ (‘semelhantes’) to the ‘cazo recto’, ‘increased’ by the ‘particulas postpostas’ of the genitive, *cho*, *chi*, *chê*; the particle *ca* for the dative and *no* for the vocative, and *na*, *russy*, *muny* (‘contemplatiuo’) and ‘many others’ for the ablative (1640: 6v). There seems to be no distinction between the terms ‘postposição’ and ‘particula dos cazos’ in Stephens’s description, but there is still no consensus about the interpretation of these categories (Masica 1991: 233).

44. In Maffei (1886: 9) we still find the same description.

45. Maffei (1886: 10) distinguishes eight cases, nominative, original, dative, accusative, vocative, instrumental, first locative (English ‘in’) and second locative (English ‘upon’). “The ‘original’ case is the ‘pure stem from all other cases derive” (*idem*: 11).

Following the declensions, polite forms are described, such as the particles *sri*, and *Aho* which is used when ‘pessoas muyto graues & autorizadas’ are addressed (1640: 16v), or the ‘letter o’ when ‘gente baixa’ are addressed.

In Miranda’s (2003: 743) description, the personal pronoun has five cases, nominative, accusative/dative, agentive/instrumental, genitive and superessive, and two numbers (singular and plural); and the third person has three genders (masculine, feminine and neuter). Stephens only describes three cases, nominative, dative and ablative (1640: 22r), which correspond with Miranda’s nominative, dative/accusative and superessive. As we have seen, Stephens narrowly follows the Latin case system. Morphologically identical forms often belong to more than one case. Unlike in the nominal paradigms, Stephens decided not to treat the dative and accusative separately in his paradigm of the pronouns, which are used as ‘substantives’. Having an identical form, he labelled both as a ‘dative’ (*maca* which corresponds with Miranda’s *mha-ka*, = accusative/dative). When pronouns are used as ‘adjectives’ (*to*, *ho*, *zo*, translated as ‘demonstratives’ ‘aquelle’, ‘este’, ‘ipse’ (1640: 23v–24v), Stephens gives all six Latin cases, nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, vocative and ablative, and again we find – as in the paradigms of the noun – an identical form for the nominative and the accusative (*to*, *ti*, *tē*) and a second form for the other oblique cases (*tea*, *tie*, *tea*). The first and second person adjectival forms are used instead of genitives (Masica 1991: 251).

2.3.4.3 *Stephens’s treatment of Konkani verbal morphology*

Tense and aspect in Konkani are described as follows by Miranda (2001: 745): when the imperfect marker *t* is added the imperfect base of the verb is formed, while the perfect marker *-l* is attached to the root for the formation of the perfect base. The non-past marker is *-(a)l*, the past imperfect marker *-al* and the past perfect marker *-l*. The present and non-present endings are added to the imperfect or perfect base after the tense-aspect marker (Miranda 2001: 746). There are different endings in the non-present tenses according to person, number and gender of the subject of the verb. Under certain conditions, an agentive marker is used after the subject in perfect verb forms (Miranda 2003: 745–746).

Stephens starts with the active forms of the verb, followed by the ‘neuter’ verbs and the ‘negative’ forms, which have their own conjugations (“que he geral em todos os verbos, & tē sua propria conjugação”, 1640: 31r). Thereafter, he describes the ‘defective’ and ‘irregular’ verbs. According to Stephens, there is no passive derived from the active, but passives are formed with other means (“quando quere-mos fallar pellos passiuos, vsamos de outros remedios” (1640: 31v). Finally, Stephens deals with the causative verbs (“Hai hũa specie de verbos, q̃ são como

causatiuos, q̃ se fazẽ doutros collocando sempre *ai* antes do *tã*, como *dhāuatã* corro, *dhāaitã* faço corer...; (31v)”⁴⁶

Stephens (1640: 32r ff.) exhibits an ‘extended’ paradigm of the ‘tenses’, two different forms for the imperfect and three for the perfect tense. His paradigm is as follows:

Indicatiuo presente	
<i>Hāua soditã</i>	‘Eu busco’
Preterito imperfecto	
<i>Sodĩ</i>	‘Eu buscaua’
Ovtro preterito imperfecto	
<i>Soditalõ, lĩ, lẽ</i>	‘Eu buscaua’
Preterito perfeito 1.	
<i>Hauẽ sodilo, ly, lẽ</i>	‘Eu busquei’
Preterito perfeito 2.	
<i>Hauẽ sodilalo, ly, lẽ</i>	‘Eu busquei’
Outro preterito perfeito 3.	
<i>Hauẽ sodila, lia, lã</i>	‘Eu busquei’
Preterito plusquã perfeito	
<i>Hauẽ sodilalo, ly, lẽ</i>	‘Eu buscara’
Futuro	
<i>Sodina</i>	‘Eu buscarei’
Imperativo, optativo, subiuntivo presente, etc.	

Konkani has three different forms in the ‘imperfect tense’ according to gender (masculine, feminine and neuter, for each person). Stephens describes this feature as follows: “quando em qualquer pessoa se achaõ tres terminações, a primeira se-rue pera o masculino, segunda pera o feminino, Terceira pera o neutro” (32v). The form which Stephens classifies as “outro preterito imperfecto” (*soditalõ*) is translated as the first ‘preterito imperfecto’ (Portuguese imperfect “eu buscaua”). *Soditalo* and *sodilalo* are also classified as participles, the first as “participio do presente” (“o que busca”), and the second as “participio do Preterito” (“o que buscou”) (38r) and also as “Futuro em Rus” (“ha de buscar”, “quer buscar”). When combined with the verb ‘to be’ (*asa*), periphrastic constructions can be formed (“se cõjuga as vezes cõ o verbo assã, q̃ tambẽ se conjuga pellos tẽpos, que a oração pedir” (38r). The first ‘preterito perfeito’ (*Hauẽ sodilo, ly, lẽ*) is translated with the Portuguese ‘preterite’ “Eu busquei”. This form corresponds with Maffei’s “past tense” (Latin “amavi”; Italian “amai”) (1986[1882]: 88). The second ‘preterito perfeito’ *Hauẽ sodilalo, ly, lẽ*

46. More details can be found on fol. 102v., where other synonyms are given of ‘causativo’: “mandativo” and “effectivo”.

and the third (*Hauē sodila, lia, lā*) are also translated as “eu busquei”. In fact the second “preterito perfeito” and the “plusquamperfeito” are identical forms in Stephens’s paradigms. The third perfect preterite corresponds with Maffei’s “perfect tense” (“I have loved”, Italian “ho amato”) (1986[1882]: 88).⁴⁷

Following the paradigms of the conjugation of the verb, the substantive verb *assā* (‘estou’) is explained. This verb is used in periphrastic constructions and Stephens makes it obvious that it is also needed for the formation of the negative verbs. In modern Konkani, the negative particle *nhāy* and also a negative verb *na* is used for the negation of the verbs. The verb *na* has evolved from the older negative particle *nā* with the verb *as-a*.⁴⁸ Stephens explains the use of ‘to be’ for the negation as follows:

O verbo substantiuo *assā*, & o neutro passiuo, *zatā* fio, ambos irregulares se poē necessariamēte neste lugar & precedē o verbo negativo, o qual sē este dous não se pode formar, como depois se vera. (1640: 43v.)

[The substantive verb *assā* and the neuter passive *zatā* fio, both irregular, are necessarily treated in this place, preceding the (section on) the negative verb, which cannot be formed without these two, as will be seen later.]

....

Verbo negativo.

Com este verbo junto, & cō o verbo *assā* se conjugaō todos os verbos negativos... (46v)

[Negative verb.

Together with this verb and with the verb *assā* are conjugated all the negative verbs...]

2.3.4.4 Stephens’s treatment of Konkani syntax. Word order and agreement

Konkani has the usual SOV word order of the Southern Indian continent, probably an areal feature influenced by Kannada. There is no separate chapter devoted to word order in Stephens’s grammar. On the other hand, the topic of agreement is discussed in detail.

Several parts of speech can agree in gender and number in a Konkani sentence, and Stephens’ first rule in his chapter on syntax deals with agreement in

47. Maffei distinguishes three future tenses, the “first absolute future”, a “second future” and the “contingent future”. According to him (1986[1882]: 89), the latter is “frequently used” whereas the second is “seldom used”. The forms of Stephens resemble most Maffei’s “second future”: Stephens: *Sodina. Sodissy, sodita*, pl. *sodū, sodixatha, sodity* (Maffei: *-an, -či* or *-ši, -it /-at*, pl. *-uñ, -čāt* or *-šāt, -tit* (ibid.). In modern grammars of Konkani, these endings are labelled as “subjunctive endings” (Miranda 2003: 746). Future forms are in fact based on the imperfect participle (imperfect base + non-past marker + non-present endings) (Miranda 2003: 748).

48. Reduced to *ah-a* or *a-a* in some dialects (idem: 752).

number and gender between adjective and noun: “A adjectiuo concorda cõ o substantiuo ã cazo, genero & numero vt *baro manussu*, bom homẽ” (1640: 77v). Further, Stephens deals with adjectives which govern certain cases or nouns with postpositions (1640: 78r).

The next rule is the agreement in gender and number between the relative and the antecedent (1640: 78r). Relatives can be expressed (“expresso”) or “tacit” or (“occulto”) (ibid.) and sometimes the pronouns *ho*, *hy*, *hẽ* can have the “force” (“força”) of relative pronouns.

2.3.4.5 Stephens’s treatment of ergativity

Like Hindi and Marathi (see Sections 2.5.2.5 and 2.6.3.8 below), Konkani is a split-ergative language. Perfect transitive verbs take an ergative construction and intransitive verbs do not. The subject of an ergative construction takes an ‘agentive’ marker and does not rule verbal agreement. The direct object rules verbal agreement in number and gender. Stephens gives the following description of verbal agreement with the direct object:

Nos preteritos, nos verbos actiuos & em algũs outros tempos delles deriuados concordaõ as taes terminaçoẽs cõ o paciente que he couza buscada, & naõ cõ o agente tirados os futuros inuariueis que careçẽ das formas. (1640: 32v)

[In the preterite tenses, in the active verbs and in some other tenses derived from them, such endings agree with the patient, which is the thing to be searched, and not with the agent, leaving apart the invariable futures which lack such forms.]

And in the chapter on syntax, Stephens explains this feature again:

Todos os preteritos perfeitos dos verbos actiuos, & algũs outros tempos, & diçoẽs dos mesmos actiuos concordaõ cõ o paciente, ã genero & numero a maneira dos passiuos no latim, & tẽ o agente em Ablatiuo cõ a postposiçaõ *na* pera o singular, & *ny* pera os nomes Pl. *ou hauẽ, tuuẽ tannẽ*, &c. pera os q̃ nascẽ dos pronomes & seruẽ aos verbos, vt *hauẽ yecu vara maguilo*. ‘Eu pedy hum pardao’. (1640: 93v)

[All the preterite perfects of the active verbs and some other tenses and ‘dic-tions’ (‘expresions’) of the same active verbs, agree with the patient in gender and number in the same way as passives in Latin, and it has the agent in the Ablative with the postposition *-na* for the singular and *-ny* for the plural nouns, or *hauẽ, tuuẽ tannẽ*, etc. which derive from the pronouns and serve for the verbs, as *hauẽ yecu vara maguilo*. “I asked for a pardon.”]

After having explained the rules for verbal agreement with the direct object of transitive verbs, Stephens argues that “neuter verbs” agree with the agent. (“Os verbos neutros concordaõ sempre com o agente” (1640: 96r). In fact Stephens understood perfectly how split-ergativity worked, and he was able to give practical rules for his learners, albeit without introducing any innovative terminology.

2.3.4.6 Stephens's metalanguage

As in many other grammars, Stephens uses the term 'postposição' ('postposition') instead of 'preposition', but he does not distinguish clearly between 'postposition' and 'particle'. The semantic concepts of 'agent' ('agente') and 'patient' ('paciente') are frequently used (1640: 17r *et passim*).

2.4 Bengali. Manoel da Assumpçam (fl. 1743)

2.4.1 Manoel da Assumpçam and his grammar

Manoel da Assumpçam was born in Évora, Portugal, where he entered the Order of the Augustinians. He lived in Nagri (Gazipur) where he wrote a Bengali vocabulary. He brought the manuscript to Lisbon in 1737, and in 1743 the work was published as a book of 592 pages, printed by Francisco da Sylva, 'Livreiro da Academia Real, e do Senado', with the title *Vocabulario em Idioma Bengala e Portuguez. Dividido em duas partes*. It is the first dictionary and grammar in Latin script of the Bengali language.⁴⁹ It includes a grammar with the title *Breve Compendio da Grammatica Bengala* (1–40); a *Vocabulario, 1ª parte: Bengala-Portuguez* (41–306); and a second part, *Portuguez-Bengala* (307/592), the last part of which (571–592) comprised semantically arranged word-lists for instance of the "dias de lua" ("days of the moon"), "nomes numerais from 1–1000" ("numerals"), "nomes dos sete planetas" ("names of the seven planets"), "livros dos gentios, que contem as Seitas, Leys, e Sciencias" ("books of the pagans containing the sects, laws and sciences), "atributos de Deos" ("attributes of God") and "nomes que tem alguma semilhança na pronunciação" ("nouns that have a certain similarity in pronunciation"). This work is not mentioned by Simão Cardoso (1994), nor by Fonseca (2006). According to Machado (1965[1741]: vol 3.183–184), Manoel da Assumpçam also completed a catechism in 1743 (but in Lopes (1969) the year of publication is 1735) with the title *Doutrina christãa. Ordenado por modo de Dialogo em Idioma Bengalla, e Portuguez*, published in Lisbon. Assumpçam became in 1742 Rector of the church of St. Nicolao of Tolentino in the so-called Reyno de Bengala (Machado 1965[1741], vol. 3: 183–184; Streit & Dindinger 1931: 223; Lopes 1969: 150). The place and date of his death are unknown.

49. In Priolkar (1958: 52) we read that the English Orientalist and philologist Nathaniel Brassey Halhed (1751–1830), inspired by Sir William Jones, decided to study Oriental languages. He travelled to Bengal, where he composed *A Grammar of the Bengal Language*, printed at Hoogly in 1778 (Marsden 1796: 129). This work, which is not a missionary grammar, was the first book printed in Bengal with Bengali movable types (Candra Sena 1954[1911]: 717).

2.4.2 The Bengali language

The ‘lingua bengal(l)a’ was, we read in Assumpçam, one of the languages spoken in the Imperio do Graõ Mogol. (Assumpçam 1743: “Censura do R.P. George da Apresentação”). Today the Bengali-speaking area is politically divided between the Indian state of West Bengal, and Bangladesh. Bengali is written in a variant of the Devanagari script, but Assumpçam represents the language only in a romanised system. Bengali (or Bangla) belongs with Assamese and Oriya to the branch of Eastern Indo-Aryan languages. A relatively high percentage of its vocabulary is borrowed from Sanskrit and since Bengal belonged to the great Moghul Empire, Bengali has also been influenced by Persian and to a lesser degree Arabic. Assumpçam’s work is written in the 18th century which falls under the period of Middle Bengali (1400–1800), when Persian influence was most prominent. In New Bengali (since c. 1800), the shortening of verbs and pronouns has been characteristic, e.g. *tahar* → *tar* “his/her”; *koriyachhilô* → *korechhilo* “he/she had done”. Assumpçam gives both equivalents for Latin ‘*illius*’: *thar/tahar* (Assumpçam 1743: 7) but the old form *coriasilam* (1743: 18) is used, which demonstrates that at this time the process of shortening had not begun or was not yet complete.

In the grammar we occasionally find information about language variation. On the one hand, the author mentions that there is a ‘vulgar style’:

Na lingua Bengala vulgar não se uza de plural, assim como em muitos idiomas. (1743: 11)

[In the vulgar Bengali language the plural is not used, as occurs in many languages.]

This colloquial style is contrasted with the more prestigious style of the Brahmins (‘Bramenes’):

Porém na lingua Bengala politica, que falaõ os Bramenes, tem os nomes plural, e se declinão como os pronomes. (1743: 12)

[Nevertheless, in the sophisticated Bengali language spoken by the Brahmins, the nouns have plural and they are declined as the pronouns.]

Some information is also included with regard to diaphasical varieties, since the forms of address by children to adults are described as well as the forms used by adults when speaking to children:

Aqui se deve advirtir a diferença, que vay de *tui* a *tomi*; porque *Tui*, dis relação a palavra Portugueza *tu*; e *Tomi* dis relação a palavra Portugueza, Vm. Desta uzaõ os menores quando fallaõ com os mayores; e daquella uzaõ os mayores, quando fallaõ com os menores. (1743: 23)

[Here, the difference must be observed that it goes from *tui* to *tomi*, since *tui* corresponds to the Portuguese ‘tu’ (“you”) and *tomi* to Vm (=Vossa mercê, “you

[honorific/polite form]”). The latter is used by minors addressing adults and the former when adults address minors.]

There are also sometimes remarks on different registers or styles. According to Assumpçam (1743: 36), there are in Bengali some words which are used only for reasons of ‘elegance’; such words formally do not have a meaning, or “mean almost nothing”.⁵⁰

According to Assumpçam, the Bengali language is not one of the ‘matrix’ languages, since it is developed from Hindi and Sanskrit. So, it is not ‘regular’, and it does not correspond entirely with Latin:

Como esta lingua Bengalla não he matrix, mas consta de Industana, e Sanserest, não he regular, nem corresponde em tudo à Latina. (1743: 38)

[As the Bengali language is not a matrix language – it is constituted from Hindi and Sanskrit – it is not a regular language and by no means corresponds to Latin.]

This implies, interestingly, that a more ‘regular’ matrix language of the Indian sub-continent might correspond with Latin. As for Bengali, in principle it ‘follows the Latin rule’, but not entirely. Assumpçam observes that the Bengali language has its shortcomings although only ‘partially’ (“em parte”):

Dos Rudimentos, se deve seguir a regra dos Latinos; não em tudo por ser esta lingua Bengala defectuosa mas em parte. (1743: 21)

[In (studying/describing) the *Rudimenta* one has to follow the Latin rule, although not completely, since this Bengali language is partially defective.]

He also (1743: 32) compares Bengali with Hebrew and Aramaic (Chaldaic); unlike Latin, these languages do not have ‘gerunds’ and ‘supines’. However, there are not many references to other languages than Latin and Portuguese, and more often Bengali is compared with these Western languages.

Similarly to the anonymous grammarian of Marathi (see Section 2.5.2.4), the Augustinian observes that both Bengali and his native tongue Portuguese are pro-drop languages:

A primeira, e a segunda pessoa muitas vezes não se poem clara na oração, assim como na nossa lingua Portugueza, e Latina. Exemph: ‘faço o que quero’; *Ze Chai, taha Cori*. O exemplo està naquella v. *Chai*, e *Cori*, que estão na primeira pessoa, entendendo-se o nominativo *Ami*. (1743: 22)

[The first and second persons are often not expressed overtly, as in our language Portuguese and as in Latin. Example: “I do what I want”: *Ze Chai, taha Cori*. The example is in *Chai*, and *Cori*, which are in the first person; the nominative *Ami* (“I”) is understood.]

50. “Tem esta lingua Bengalla algumas palavras, que só por elegancia se metem na oração sem de si significarem formalmente couza alguma, ou quasi nada” (Assumpçam 1743: 36).

Actually, pro-drop languages cannot only omit the first and second person of the personal pronoun, but also the third person. The reason why these authors only ascribe pro-drop to the first and second person has a long history, dating back at least to Priscian, according to whom the first and second persons are definite (*finit[a]e*), “because they are present and evident (*praesentes enim demonstrantur*”, while the third person is ‘indefinite’ (*infinite*) and “generally requires a pronoun to specify it” (*tertia [persona] uero infinita est; itaque eget plerumque pronomine, ut diffiniatur*).⁵¹ Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages are generally pro-drop languages and in fact, all the free pronouns occur mainly in contrastive and emphatic contexts, as in Portuguese or Spanish. The encounter of missionary linguists with pro-drop languages of Africa is discussed in Chapter 5 below.

2.4.2.1 *Bengali and Portuguese*

Around the Bay of Bengal, Portuguese was the *lingua franca* which was particularly used as a vehicular language between the Europeans and their domestics, while Persian was the language of intercourse with the native courts. Even among servants of the court in Calcutta, Portuguese was more commonly used than Bengali in the period the grammar was written (Candra Sena 1954[1911]: 703). However, Assumpçam believed that missionaries were obliged to learn the language of the natives, as we can read in the prologue where the author cites the words of the missionary priest João Baupista that “a missionary who does not know the language of his sheep, cannot be a missionary, and he is in deathly sin and to him the final absolution cannot be given when he has not learnt the language: *By no means is he to be absolved*” (*“o Missionario, que não sabe a lingua de suas ovelhas, não pode ser Missionario; e está em peccado mortal, e que se lhe não deve dar a absolvição sem primeiro a aprender; Nullo modo est absolvendus”*) (Assumpçam 1743: “Prologo al leitor”). In the same prologue we read that Portuguese was the language spoken by the majority who also knew Bengali, and that a smaller minority did not speak Portuguese and missionaries had to take care for them as well:

E se disseses, que nos Bandéis⁵² a onde pertendes parroquiar, a mayor parte da gente falla Portuguez, te respondo, que essa mayor parte tambem entende

51. Porter (2002), cf. ed. Keil (Lib. XII: 578–580; 585).

52. “Fala-se acima de Bandéis, onde missionavam os padres agostinhos. A língua portuguesa era aí língua compreendida da maioria da população. Eram cinco esse *bandéis* ou feitorias – que isso significa aquele vocábulo persiano – situados nas margens do Ganges, a saber o bandel de Ugolim, português; o de Chinsura, holandês, o de Chandernagor, francês; o de serampor, dinamarquês; e o de Calcutá, inglês” (Lopes 1969: 151).

Bengalla; e que a menor parte, que não sabe Portuguez, tambem são tuas ovelhas, que se lhe não deres o pasto espirital, que es obrigado, padeceram eternamente... (Assumpçam 1743: “Prologo al leytor”).

[And if you say that in the ‘Bandeis’ (=‘feitoria’, or ‘trading post’) where you wish to serve as a priest, the majority of the people speak Portuguese, I answer that that majority also understand Bengali, and that the minority who do not know Portuguese are also your sheep who will suffer eternally if you not give them the spiritual pasture, which is an obligation.]

2.4.3 The grammar

Assumpçam’s grammatical compendium resembles Pedro Sánchez’s Latin grammar (2008[1610]), since (1) both grammars start directly with the declensions of the nouns, and (2) a section on orthography and phonology is missing, (3), the layout of both grammars is almost identical, particularly in the first chapter of the declensions. The description of the adjective is printed in italics in both, the paradigms are very similar, (4) the pronouns follow the same order, *ego*, *hic*, *iste*, *ille* (‘eu’, ‘este’, *ille*, *ipse*) and (5) a vocabulary is appended. Nevertheless, other grammars may follow the same order. In sum we can conclude that there are more differences than coincidences.

The *Breve Compendio da grammatica bengala* of Assumpçam does not have an introductory chapter on orthography and phonology. It begins directly with four nominal declensions (1–4), followed by paragraphs on the adjective nouns, (4–5) and on the pronouns, which the author subdivides into ‘pronomes prometivos e demonstrativos’ (5–9). The term ‘prometivo’ is a curiosity and as far as I recall, does not occur in any other grammar I have consulted. Assumpçam observes that there are no possessive pronouns in Bengali and the genitives of the ‘prometive’ nouns replace them. A further paragraph treats the relative, interrogative and ‘partitive’. On folio 12, the paradigm of the ‘substantive verbs’ is exhibited where the Portuguese verbs ‘ser’ and ‘estar’ are translated. The only conjugation of the ‘adjective verbs’ (‘unica conjugação dos verbos’) follows after the ‘substantive verbs’ (17–21). The verbal paradigms are followed by a chapter on syntax (21–40) divided into 53 paragraphs, which is actually the half of the grammatical *Compendio*, proportionally much more elaborate than many others of the period.

2.4.3.1 *Assumpçam’s treatment of orthography and phonology*

As we have explained, Assumpçam’s grammar and dictionaries of Bengali are the first publications dealing with this language in Latin script. Assumpçam explains to his readers why he decides to write the language in romanisation despite the advantages of the local script:

O alfabeto desta lingua consta de tantas letras, quantos são os modos de pronunciar as palavras da lingua Bengalla; e com as Portuguezas se não pode escrever bem; pelo que será muito conveniente aprender a escrever estas letras para se entender com mais fundamento esta lingua.

... Entre os mesmos naturaes ha muita diferença na escriptura, porque huns uzaõ de humas letras, outros de outras, sem até agora se poder assentar na propriedade de algumas letras, que facilmente se confundem com outras; e só se distinguem por huma quasi insensivel diversidade na pronuncia de algumas palavras.

... Finalmente os Bramenes, que dizem foraõ inventores deste alfabeto, erraõ nos principios... (1743: 38–39)

[The alphabet of this language has as many letters as there are ways of pronouncing these words in Bengali, and with Portuguese letters they cannot be written properly, thus, it will be very convenient to learn to write these letters for understanding each other more fundamentally.

.... Even among the natives there is a large difference in writing, because some use some letters, and others use others, so that up to now the propriety of some letters cannot be determined and letters are easily confused and some words are distinguished in pronunciation only by an almost imperceptible difference.

... Finally, the Brahmins, who are said to be the inventors of this alphabet go astray in their principles...]

As in other Indo-Aryan languages, in Bengali aspirated and unaspirated, dental and palatal phonemes are in phonemic contrast and nasalisation is phonemic (Thompson 2006: 730). Assumpçam does not give any description of these characteristics in his grammar. He usually uses the letter ⟨h⟩ for aspirated consonants, and marks the distinction between dental and palatal sounds by using a geminate ⟨-tt-⟩ for the dental plosive. He does not have a consistent system to distinguish retroflex plosives.

Unlike the author of the Hindi grammar of 1778, Assumpçam hardly uses diacritics, except the circumflex over the vowel. Implicitly, we can conclude that this diacritic stands for a short vowel, since we find this symbol in the ‘second declension’ to which the nouns ending in a short *o* belong (‘nomes acabados em *o* breve’). In the paradigm, such a noun is romanised as *Brormô*. Assumpçam also employs a circumflex written underneath the vowel, as for instance in the vocative *q Brormq* and in the nominative and accusative of the word *Camq* (‘serviço’), accusative *Camere*, v. *Camoque*. He is quite inconsistent using the subscript circumflex, since he uses the same vowel *o* with the circumflex below *q* as the short *o* (*q* breve 1743: 37). He employs the acute accent almost exclusively on final vowels, as in the ablative case of the second declension *Brormeté*, *Cormeté*, *Papeté*. (1–4). What he does not attempt to do is render the seven-vowel system of Bengali – /i, e, æ, a, ɔ, o, u/ – with seven distinct graphemes. Nor, in general, does he try to develop a more elaborate romanisation system with an exact one-to-one relation between

phonemes and graphemes, nor a consistent system of accents for suprasegmentals, such as word stress.

2.4.3.2 *Assumpçam's treatment of nominal declension*

Nouns in Bengali have no grammatical gender. In the classification by Thompson (2006: 731) four cases can be distinguished, nominative, genitive, object, and locative. The locative case has a locational reading only for inanimates (Dasgupta 2003: 364). Plural markers for animate and inanimate nouns are distinct from one another. All case endings are put in the final position, e.g. *meye* (“girl”) > *meye-ṭi* (“the girl”) > *meye-ṭi-ke* (“to the girl”) (Thompson 2006: 731).

Assumpçam distinguishes four nominal declensions based on their morpho-phonetic appearance, i.e. according to their formation of the genitive case. The nouns of the first declension have a vowel-ending and a genitive in *-r* (“acabaõ em letra vogal aqual se acrecenta no Genitivo a letra R, v.g. *Lohá, Lohar*”) (Assumpçam 1743: 1). Learners may have been confused by the fact that the next two declensions end in vowels too. Those of the second declension end in the ‘short o’, and have the genitive ending in *-er*. (“os nomes acabados em o breve; e no genitivo mudaõ o O: em *Er*., como v.g. *Brormô*, ‘Deos’). Those of the third have a final long o, and have a genitive ending in *-r* (“acabaõ em O. longo, e no genitivo se lhe acrecenta a letra R, v.g. *Oxuxtto* (‘Doença’), *Oxuxttor*). To the fourth declension belong all those nouns ending in a consonant, with a genitive ending in *-er* (“todos os nomes acabados em letra consoante; e no Genitivo se lhe acrecenta a sylaba *Er*, como v.g. *Morod* (‘male’), *moroder*). In fact, all genitives in Bengali are marked with /r/ or /er/, and although the /er/ ending assimilates to the preceding vowel in several cases, Assumpçam’s system of declensions is an unnecessarily complex way of describing the language.

Each declension of the noun has the following cases in the paradigm of Assumpçam: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative and vocative. Assumpçam does not give the necessary details when concluding that in Bengali the plural is not used: “Na lingua Bengala vulgar não se uza de plural, assim como em muitos idiomas” (Assumpçam 1743: 11). To be more precise, only animate nouns (and personal pronouns) inflect for number, whereas human and non-human classifiers, such as /*gulo*/ are used to indicate definiteness and plurality in other cases (Dasgupta 2003: 365–367). For Bengali syntax, the consequence is that there is no number and gender agreement.

2.4.3.3 *Assumpçam's treatment of verbal morphology*

Assumpçam (1743: 17–19) generally follows the canonical categories of ‘Latin tenses’ and in the left-hand columns he gives the Portuguese forms, which seems to have been the starting point for the translation into Bengali in the right-hand

columns of his paradigms. In some cases, two Bengali equivalents are given for the same Portuguese form. Six tenses are distinguished (for reasons of space, we give here only the first person singular of the finite forms):

Prezente indicativo	[Present, indicative	
‘Eu faço’	<i>Ami cori</i>	“I make”
Imperfeito	Imperfect	
‘Eu fazia’	<i>Ami coritam</i>	“I made”
Preterito perfeito	Preterite perfect	
‘Eu fiz’	<i>Ami coriassi</i>	“I made/have made”
Outro preterito perfeito	Another preterite perfect	
‘Eu fiz’	<i>Ami corilaõ</i>	“I made/have made”
Preterito plusquam perfeito	Preterite pluperfect	
‘Eu tinha feito’	<i>Ami coriasilam</i>	“I had made”
Futuro perfeito	Future perfect	
‘Eu farei	<i>‘Ami coribó</i>	“I shall make”]

The two tenses ‘preterito perfeito’ and the ‘outro preterito perfeito’ (“the other preterite perfect”) are both translations of the Portuguese ‘eu fiz’. In the notes following the paradigm, we find only some rules about the formation of these different tenses, but nothing is said about their meaning. A beginner had to guess what the exact difference was between these two ‘preterite perfect tenses’. If we compare the tenses of Assumpçam with a modern grammar, for instance J. Anderson’s (1962), the first ‘preterito perfeito’ *coriassi* (‘eu fiz’) corresponds with *kariyā-chi* (“I have done”) which is labelled as “perfect tense” while Assumpçam’s (1743: 18) ‘outro preterito perfeito’ *corilaõ* (‘eu fiz’) corresponds with Anderson’s preterite tense *kar-ilām* (“I did”) (Anderson 1962: 16). Assumpçam’s (1743: 17) ‘imperfeito’ *coritam* (‘eu fazia’) is not classified as an ‘imperfect’ tense by Anderson, but he translates the form *kar-itām* as “used to do” or “would do”, calling it the “frequentative or conditional tense”. In Dasgupta’s (2003: 369) classification this form is labelled Past Habitual. Dasgupta’s account of the tense-aspect system is as follows: “The Present, Past, Future tenses interact with moods, namely the Imperative and the unmarked Indicative, and with aspects, namely Simple, Progressive, Perfect, Habitual” (ibid.). The following forms can be formed of the verb *ken* “to eat”.

Pres Simple	<i>kini</i>
Pres Prog	<i>kinchi/kinitechi</i>
Pres Perf	<i>kinechi/kiniyāchi</i>
Past Simp	<i>kinlām/kinilām</i>
Past Prog	<i>kinchilām/kinitechilām</i>
Past Perf	<i>kinechilām</i>

Past Hab	<i>kintām/kinitām</i>
Fut Simp	<i>kinbo/kinibo</i> . (Dasgupta 2003: 369)

Assumpçam's six forms can all be identified in Dasgupta's model, except for the two forms *kinchi* and *kinlām* (Present Progressive and Past Simple).

2.4.3.4 *Assumpçam's treatment of syntax*

In Bengali the historical ergative which exists in many other Indo-Aryan languages is replaced by a nominative/accusative construction (Masica 1991: 343–344). The passive does not exist, according to Assumpçam, and is substituted by the active:

Na lingua Bengala não ha Verbos passivos, e por esta causa mudaõ sempre a oração pela activa; v.g. 'Eu sou amado', dizem; 'outra pessoa me ama': *Ar zone amare doea core*. (1743: 30)

[In the Bengali language, there are no passive verbs and therefore they transform a sentence into the active, e.g. (instead of) "I am loved"; they say: "another person loves me": *Ar zone amare doea core*.]

Assumpçam's observation is correct: in Bengali there are no passive forms of the verb which are morphologically marked, as in Latin, though an equivalent of the passive can be formed using verbal nouns combined with the verb */hoya/* 'to be', 'to become'.⁵³

In most Eastern Indo-Aryan languages plural suffixes are optional. Plural verb forms in Bengali are not used for marking plurality, but rather they express honorificity (Masica 1991: 225–226). Assumpçam was aware of this feature: "O plural dos nomes Bengalas não se uza, porque he o mesmo, que o singular" (1743: 2).⁵⁴ He observes that a plural form ending in the 'letter A' is used, although not frequently, and it is only used in the more prestigious literary registers ("lingua Bengala politica", 1743: 12): here, he is presumably reporting cases of the honorific plural without seeing that they have honorificity in common.

2.4.3.5 *Assumpçam's treatment of word order and agreement*

In Bengali, the default word order is SOV in non-interrogative clauses (Masica 1991: 364). As in most Indo-Aryan languages, non-topicalised noun phrases are generally left-branching (Modifier + N). In the following example, Assumpçam gives a characteristic example of a modifying genitive phrase on the left of the noun:

53. Anderson (1962: 26) describes two passive constructions, of which the first is borrowed from Hindi and the second is an impersonal construction; these hardly invalidate Assumpçam's point.

54. Cf. "Na lingua Bengala vulgar não se uza de plural, assim como em muitos idiomas" (1743: 11). [In the Bengali vernacular plural is not used, as in many other languages.]

com a graça de Deos Recebi a Ley de JESUS Christo. *Poromexorer crepatè, Christor Xastro paiassi*. O exemplo està em *Poromexorer* genetivo do nome *crepa*, e em *Christor*, genetivo do nome *Xastro*: se deve advertir, que quasi sempre se poem o genetivo do possuidor antes do nome ou cousa possuida, como se vè no exemplo, aonde o genetivo de posseção *Poromexorer* està antes da cousa possuida *Crepatè*. (1743: 27–28)

[By the grace of God, I received the Law of Jesus Christ: *Poromexorer crepatè, Christor Xastro paiassi*. The example is in *Poromexorer* genitive of the noun *crepa*, and in *Christor*, genitive of the noun *Xastro*: It must be observed that almost always the genitive of the possessor is placed before the noun of the possessed, as can be seen in the example, where the genitive of possession *Poromexorer* is placed before the thing possessed *Crepatè*.]

2.5 Marathi (Anonymous 1778a)

In 1778, a 45-page grammar in Portuguese of Marathi was published at the press of the *Propaganda Fide* in Rome, entitled *Gramatica marastta a mais vulgar que se practica nos Reinos do Nizamaxà, e Idalxà offerecida aos mvtos reverendos Padres Missionarios dos dittos reinos*. A second edition was printed in Lisbon by the Impressão Regia in 1805. The anonymous author was possibly a Portuguese Jesuit living in Rome after his expulsion from Portugal, although this cannot be proved by evidence.

2.5.1 The Marathi language

Marathi is one of the major Indo-Aryan languages spoken in western and central India. Its neighbours to the north are Indo-Aryan languages such as Gujarati and Hindi, and its neighbours to the south include Dravidian languages such as Telugu and Kannada, which have influenced its syntax. It is written in the Devanagari script with some additional characters. According to Pandharipande, three stages can be distinguished in the development of Marathi. The oldest texts date from AD 1117, and Middle Marathi extends from about 1300 to 1800, followed by the modern language. Pandharipande (2003: 699) distinguishes six mutually intelligible major dialects.⁵⁵

As noted in Sections 2.3.2 and 2.3.3 above (cf. also Section 2.2.3.1), there is some confusion in the application of the language-names *Konkani* and *Marathi*,

55. These are (1) *Konkaṇī*; (2) *Konkaṇī Deśī* (Konkan in the Maharashtra state, not the language as spoken in Goa); (3) *Kkāndeśī* in (Khandesh); (4) *Deśī* (Desh and Marathwada); (5) *Varhāḍī* (Varhad); (6) *Nāgpurī* (Varhad, Vidarbha).

and the word *bramana* might be applied by early writers to both the languages which are now respectively given those names: for instance, Thomas Stephens described the language of his *Purana Christão*, which is Marathi, as *lingua bramana marastta*. Northern Konkani and south-western Marathi are closely related, and indeed, since *Marathi* is etymologically derived from *Mahārāṣṭrī*, ‘the language spoken in Maharashtra’, and Konkani is spoken in parts of Maharashtra, there are evident reasons why Konkani might be called Marathi and vice versa.

2.5.2 The 1778 Marathi grammar

According to Pandharipandē’s periodization (although he does not analyse this grammar directly), the anonymous grammar must describe Middle Marathi.

Because Marathi is so widespread, a first question to ask about this grammar is where it was written. The only geographical indication of this work is in the reference of the title to the kingdoms of Nizamaxà and Idalxà. Place names which occur in the examples of the grammar are not very specifically linked to these kingdoms, since we find examples where place names are used from other regions (Mumbhay, Sashatta (Salsette), ‘ilja de Caranja’, Reino do Mogor, Maratense, Cambay, Bengala, etc.) (Anonymous 1778a: 17). Nizamaxà is the Portuguese romanization of the name of the Nizām Shāhī dynasty (1490–1633) which ruled the territory in the northwestern Deccan region, between the states of Gujarat and Bijapur. The rulers of the ‘Ādil Shāhī (“Idalxà”) dynasty governed the Sultanate of Bijapur in the western area of the Deccan region of southern India. The Sultanate was absorbed by the Mughal Empire in 1686. Thus both dynasties had already been ruled by the Mughals for over a century when the grammar appeared in 1778. The anonymous Marathi grammar was published in the same year as the anonymous grammar of the ‘lingua indostana’, the language spoken according to the title in the kingdom of the ‘Gram Mogol’, who governed a great part of what is now northern India and Pakistan, i.e. the Deccan region, Rajasthan, Punjab and Kashmir, from 1526 until 1858.

In the grammar nothing is explained about the language itself, nor its dialects and there are no observations concerning Brahman versus non-Brahman registers.

2.5.2.1 The grammar’s treatment of Marathi phonology and orthography

Like the anonymous grammar of Hindi discussed in Section 2.6 below, this Marathi grammar begins directly with the alphabet: in the column on the left side the consonants with the five vowels, *ba, be, bi, bo, bu/ca, ce, ci, co cu*, etc., and in the column on the right side, the aspirated and retroflex consonants in the corresponding combinations, such as *bha, bhe, bhi, bho, bhu/dha, dhe, dhi, dho, dhu/ddha, ddhe, ddhi, ddho, ddhu/dda, dde, ddi, ddo, ddu*, etc. In other cases we find on the left a

consonant combined with a short vowel, such as *la*, *le*, *li*, *lo*, *lu* and on the right *lâ*, *lê*, *lî*, *lô*, *lû*, where the circumflex is used to indicate long vowels.

The section on phonology and orthography is extremely short. On less than one page, six phonological rules are given. The only detailed description is of the articulation of the retroflex consonants, which can be pronounced when curling the tip of the tongue while it touches the roots of the upper teeth. Here follow all the rules given by the anonymous author:

- A letra *â* com o accentto em sima tem o som gutural, e se pronuncia com a boca semi aberta.
- As silabas *bba dba* [sic] &c, que vão na columna direita atraz se pronunciaõ com o som duro.
- As sillabas *ddha dda tta rrha* para pronunciar se deve dobrar a ponta da lingua, fazendo tocar as raizes dos dentes de riba.
- A letra *a* he breve, e não se pronuncia clara estando no mejo de alguma palavra, salvo se tiver algum accentto por sima.
- Em qualquer palavra a ultima letra não se pronuncia claramente, se não quando houver algum accentto por sima da dita letra.
- As letras *a e i o u y* são longas; nos casos obliquos a ultima silaba he longa. (Anonymous 1778a: 4)
- [– The letter *â* with the accent over it, has a guttural sound and is pronounced with the mouth half-open.
- The syllables *bba, dba*, &c. which appear in the right column are pronounced with a hard sound.
- To pronounce the syllables *ddha dda tta rrha* the tip of the tongue has to be ‘doubled’ (‘curled’, ‘folded’), while touching the upper teeth.
- The short *a* letter is not pronounced clearly, when it occurs in the middle of a word, except when it has an accent over it.
- In whatever word, the last letter is not pronounced clearly, except when it has an accent over it.
- The letters *a e i o u y* are long; in the oblique cases the last syllable is long.]

The most noteworthy point here is the description of the passive articulator of the retroflex consonants, which is more detailed than Stephens’s. He, as we noted in Section 2.3.4.1 above, uses the term “ceo da boca”, which is rather vague, whereas here we read “as raizes dos dentes de riba”, which is much closer to the modern concept ‘alveolar’. (As we observed earlier, the place of the passive articulator is in fact postalveolar or palato-alveolar.)

2.5.2.2 *The grammar's treatment of Marathi nominal morphology*

Marathi nouns have three genders, masculine, feminine and neuter, and two numbers, singular and plural. In the analysis of Pandharipande (2003: 702), there are eight cases, which are expressed by case-suffixes and postpositions. In Marathi as in Konkani, there are two forms of the noun stem, one which stands by itself as the nominative, and an 'oblique' form which is followed by case-suffixes and postpositions.

In the anonymous grammar, five declensions are distinguished, which are determined by the form of the genitive ("As Declinações são sinco, e se conhecem pelo Genitivo", 1778: 5). Only six cases are distinguished: no mention is made of the locative or the instrumental. The so-called 'augment', i.e. the vowel which is added to the basic noun stem to give the 'oblique' form of the stem, is not commented on: here it is possible to compare Stephens, whose comparison between Latin inflections such as *sermo/sermonis* and the augmented 'oblique' stems in Konkani (Section 2.3.4.2 above) is perhaps an example of the potential fruitfulness of analogies with Latin.

The anonymous author uses the term 'particulas demonstrativas' for the markers of the oblique cases. The marker of both the dative and the accusative is *-lā*, and he explains that this can be either a preposition/postposition or a particle, i.e. a case-marker:

umas vezes he particula, e outras vezes he proposição, ou postposição: quando he particula demostra o caso Dativo, ou Accusativo, que ordinariamente vem atrás dos Verbos neutros, v. gr. 'escrevo esta carta a Pedro', *Pedrulā levitam*, e activos v.g. 'amo a Deos', *Parmeshorālā lekitam*. (Anonymous 1778a: 33)

[Sometimes it is a particle, and other times a 'proposition', or a postposition. When it is a particle, it indicates the dative, or accusative case, which usually comes after the neuter verbs, v.gt. "I write this letter to Pedro" *Pedrulā levitam*, and after active verbs, v.g. "I love God", *Parmeshorālā lekitam*.]

In the paradigm of the first four declensions, the ablative is said to be marked by the form *passuna*. In the fifth declension we find two different markers for the ablative, *passuna* and *-xim* (*guru* 'mestre' – abl. *guruxim/vhasta* 'cousa' – abl. *vhas-tu passuna*). In the paragraph dealing with postpositions, we find the translation 'por causa' and 'por respeito', a word which governs the ablative ('pede Ablativo') (*Pessawā passuna*, 'por causa do Ministro'). *Xim* is translated as 'com' ("with"), a postposition that governs the ablative ('pede ablativo, ut *Pedruxim halūm vim* 'com Pedro.') (anonymous 1778a: 32). The anonymous author explains in a paragraph on the ablative (1778a: 6–7) that this case usually has a 'postposition' but that sometimes this 'postposition' is lacking, particularly in the nouns of the first declension. According to the author, it is more 'elegant' ("para maior elegancia") to

express the final vowel changing of the *a* into an *e* and the plural in *im* “in a more elegant way”.

After the paragraph on nominal declension, there follow sections on the numerals, the comparative and superlative, which are expressed lexically in Marathi, or in the words of the anonymous grammarian:

Neste Idioma os Adjectivos não formão Comparativos, nem Superlativos, mas usase de alguns Adverbios competentes, como se dirà na Sintaxe em seu proprio lugar. (Anonymous 1778a: 15)

[In this language the adjectives do not form comparatives, or superlatives, but some suitable adverbs are used, as will be said in the chapter on syntax in its proper place.]

2.5.2.3 *The grammar's treatment of Marathi verbal morphology*

Firstly the ‘substantive verbs’, i.e. the verbs meaning ‘to be’, are given, divided in two different paradigms, depending on the two main translations of the Latin verb *esse* in Portuguese, ‘ser’ and secondly, ‘estar’. In most missionary grammars, first the paradigms are exhibited, followed by a section or paragraph with the rules for the formation of the different tenses. In this grammar we see the opposite. After the ‘substantive’ verbs, a paragraph entitled “Formações dos Verbos” follows, explaining the rules of the formation of the tenses (Anonymous 1778a: 23). It is only after these rules that a chapter follows entitled “regras geraes para o conhecimento dos preteritos dos verbos” with a list of seventeen different verbs (1778: 24) and eleven irregular verbs.

After these introductory paragraphs, the conjugation of the verb *Lekawam* (‘amar’) is given. The tenses of the indicative are (for reasons of space, only the first person singular is given here):

Presente	<i>my lekitum</i>	‘eu amo’
Preterito imperfeito pouco uzado	<i>my lekim</i>	‘eu amava’
Preterito imperfeito mais uzado	<i>my lekita houtum</i>	‘eu amava’
Preterito perfeito	<i>myzuna lekilam</i>	‘eu amey’
Futuro	<i>my lekina</i>	‘eu amarei’
Imperativo	<i>leka tum</i>	‘ama tu’

The periphrastic construction of the ‘preterito imperfeito mais uzado’ is not explained at first. Later, however, the author deals with the ‘Verbo incoativo’ (1778: 27) where the form *My lekita haim* is translated as “eu estou amando” (“I am loving”) and the form *My lekita houtum* as the imperfect of this ‘inchoative’ verb, translated as ‘eu estaua amando’ (“I was loving”). In Marathi, as in Hindi, the verb can be followed by the auxiliary verb *as* ‘to be’ in order to express the perfective aspect.

Various ‘tenses’ of this auxiliary verb can be used in order to express imperfect and perfect aspects. The form *My lekita haim* expresses the progressive aspect in the present tense, and the term ‘incoativo’ corresponds roughly to ‘progressive’. There are many other aspectual features of Marathi still missing from the anonymous grammar, such as the ‘habitual’, ‘ingressive’, ‘terminative’, and ‘iterative’ aspects, which are generally expressed by auxiliary verbs. No distinction is made between tense and aspect, as we may expect in grammars of this period. But although the anonymous author does not give clear definitions of the complete Tense-Aspect system of Marathi, it is obvious that he tried to give a solution of the asymmetries encountered between the Latin categories and the reality of the Marathi verb.

After the paragraph on the ‘verbo incoativo’ the anonymous author treats a “defective impersonal verb, derived from the same active verb *lekawam* with the meaning of ‘to be able’” (“verbo defectivo impessoal derivado do mesmo verbo activo *Lekawam*, com a significação de ‘poder’ *Magiana lekavhatè* ‘pode ser amado por mim’”) (1778a: 29).

2.5.2.4 *The grammar’s treatment of Marathi syntax, word order and agreement*

The paragraph on syntax is relatively short (1778a: 36–38). The author offers a rationale for this in a preliminary remark, observing that this grammar is made for those who know Latin:

Como esta Gramatica seja feita para os que sabem o Latim excuso de expôr as regras do Sintaxe, porque este Idioma segue as mesmas regras da Gramatica Latina, somente farei de algumas couzas remarcaveis. (Anonymous 1778a: 36)

[As this grammar is made for those who know Latin, I refrain from exhibiting [all] the rules of syntax, since this language follows the same rules as Latin grammar; I will only comment on certain noteworthy matters.]

Firstly, the rules for agreement in gender, case and number between the adjective and substantive are given (1778a: 36). Some observations follow concerning the comparatives and superlatives and the last section of the paragraph deals with the verb. The first rule concerns the ‘substantive verb’, which earlier in the grammar is translated into Portuguese as ‘ser’ and ‘estar’, two of the three most important meanings of Latin *esse*. The third meaning of the Latin verb *esse* is ‘ter’ (“to have”), when the possessor is in the dative (*puero liber est* “to the boy [there] is a book” i.e. “the boy has a book”). In Marathi, the same construction can be used, and the anonymous author gives the example *Malà buka hay*, translating this as “Tenho fome”, literally “There is hunger to me”, i.e. “I am hungry”. One important syntactic rule on which he does not comment is that the overt copula agrees with the noun of possession (Pandharipande 1997: 230; idem 1990: 161–162).

Generally speaking, in Marathi word order does not play a role in determining grammatical relations (Pandharipande 1997: 273). Syntactic relations are expressed by case-suffixes and postpositions. The unmarked word order is Subject-Indirect object, Direct object, and Verb. Adjectives precede or follow the noun depending upon their attributive or predicative function (Pandharipande 1997: 138). In the anonymous grammar there are no examples of minimal pairs illustrating attributive versus predicative functions, but the author remarks that it is more ‘elegant’ when the genitive is placed before the noun (“Para maior elegancia, o Genitivo se deve antepôr ao Nome que o faz hir ao Genitivo”) (1778a: 6).

Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages are generally pro-drop languages and in fact, all the free pronouns occur in contrastive and emphatic contexts only. The anonymous author documents this feature of Marathi:

Advirtase que a primeira, e a segunda pessoa não se exprime claramente na oração, se não quando significaõ dezejõs encontrados [sic].⁵⁶ (Anonymous 1778a: 37)
[Notice that the first and second person are not expressed clearly (overtly) in the sentence, unless it has the meaning of “encountered (“contrary”) desires”.]

Apparently, Pandharipande (2003) did not consult this missionary grammar, since he claims that “Old, as well as modern, grammars do not discuss the obligatory vs. optional status of pronouns”.

A final observation (‘Advertencia’) deals with deferential forms of pronouns and the verb, and it is remarkable that this topic is treated in the chapter on syntax, where we least expect it:

Neste Idioma, assim a voz, como por escrito, não se usa da palavra ‘vossa mercê’, como no Portuguez, mas sempre se usa, e se trata por segunda pessoa; mas com esta diferença; se se falla com pessoa inferior usa-se da segunda pessoa singular, v.gr. ‘tu estàs bom’, *Tum bharà haissa*.

Fallando-se pois com pessoa de respeito, ou de igual esfera, uza-se da segunda pessoa do Plural, v.g. ‘Vos estais bom’, *Tumy bharè ha*, pondo taõbem o Adjectivo no Plural.

Se a pessoa, que responde for nobre, se responde por primeira pessoa do Plural: ‘Nos estamos bons’ *Amy bharè haum*; se a pessoa fôr de humilde nascimen-to se responde por primeira pessoa do Singular, ‘eu estou bom’ *My bharà haim*. (Anonymous 1778a: 38)

[In this language, both in speech and in written forms, the word ‘vossa mercê’ (“honorific you”) is not used as in Portuguese, but it is always used for the second person, with the difference that when an inferior person is addressed, the second person singular is used, e.g. “you are good” *Tum bharà haissa*.

56. Probably, the ‘encontrados’ is an error. The word ‘contrarios’ is much more appropriate in this context. (Cf. Pedro Dias: “contrarios desejos” in Section 5.3).

Addressing a respected person or one of the same status, the second person plural is used, as in “you are good” *Tumy bharè ha* putting the adjective also in the plural.

If the addressed person is noble, in the answer the first person plural is used: “we are good” *Amy bharè haum*, and if the person is of a humble lineage, the answer is in the first person singular, “I am good” *My bharà haim*.]

As Pandharipande (2003: 704) explains, in modern Marathi, “plural forms of the pronouns are used to express politeness or respect [...] the second person plural pronoun *āpaṇ* (compared to *tumhī*) has been traditionally used to express a higher degree of respect towards the addressee” (see also Pandharipande 1997: 383–384).⁵⁷

2.5.2.5 *The grammar’s treatment of ergativity*

Marathi has split-ergative patterns of agreement in the perfective tenses, and nominative/accusative patterns in non-perfective tenses.⁵⁸ The agreement markers for person, number and gender are different in different tenses. Intransitive verbs in the past tense agree with the subject, whereas transitive verbs in the past tense agree with the direct object. (Pandharipande 2003: 706). Although it is anachronistic to use the term *ergativity* in the context of missionary grammars, it will be obvious from the following citation that the author was fully aware of this feature of the language studied. Actually we expect such rules in the chapter on syntax, but he already gives this crucial information earlier:

O preterito perfeito toma o genro do seu Accusativo, e que quando o Accusativo for femenino o dito Preterito se conjuga do modo seguinte: *Myzuna lekily*, *Tuzuna lekilissa*, *Teazuna lekily*. (Anonymous 1778a: 26)

[The perfect preterite takes the gender of its accusative, and when the accusative is feminine, such preterite is conjugated as follows: *myzuna lekily*, *tuzuna lekilissa*, *teazuna lekily*.]

In this example, there is agreement with the direct object, which is feminine and the verb does not have any subject/agent marking. The anonymous author also devotes a paragraph to this phenomenon in his final section on syntax:

No Preterito perfeito, e plusquam perfeito dos Verbos Activos, o Verbo concorda em genro com o seu caso, isto he com o seu Accusativo, porem, em numero, e pessoa concorda com o seu Nominativo, v.g. ‘Eu formei hum corpo, e tu cometeste hum pecado’, *Myzuna yeca currha garrhily*; *Anim tuzuna yeca douxa garrhilas*, està *gharrhily* na terminação feminina, porque o seu Accusativo *currha* he de genro

57. However, in contemporary India, the use of *tumhī* is becoming more prevalent for expressing deference than *āpaṇ* (ibid.).

58. Comparable patterns of ergativity can be found in unrelated languages, such as Georgian.

feminino, e està *garrhilass* na terminação masculina, porque o seu Accusativo *douxha* he de genro masculino. (1778a: 37)

[In the preterite perfect and pluperfect of the active verbs, the verb agrees in gender with its case, which is with its accusative; nevertheless, in number and person it agrees with its nominative, vg. “I have shaped a body, and you committed a crime” *Myzuna yeca currha garrhily*; *Anim tuzuna yeca douxha garrhilas* this *gharrhily* is with a feminine ending, since its accusative *currha* is of feminine gender, and this *garrhilass* has a masculine ending, since its accusative *douxha* is of a masculine gender.]

2.6 Hindi (Anonymous 1778b)

A second anonymous grammar was published by the press of the *Propaganda Fide* in the same year 1778: *Gramatica indostana a mais vulgar que se practica no Imperio do gram Mogol offerecida aos muitos reverendos Padres Missionarios do ditto Imperio*.⁵⁹ At 160 pages, it was considerably longer than the Marathi grammar discussed above. Its anonymous author, like that of the Marathi grammar, was perhaps an expelled Jesuit.

2.6.1 Previous grammars of Hindi by Europeans

At the time of the publication of this grammar, there already existed some grammars written by Westerners. In 1698, the Dutchman Jona Josua Ketelaar (1659–1718), who was born in Germany with the name Kettler, composed a ‘Hindustani’ grammar which until 1930 was considered to have been lost (Vogel 1935). David Mills republished Ketelaar’s work at Leiden in 1743 in an adapted form, following the principles of Latin grammar, under the title “De Lingua Hindustanica” in his *Dissertationes Selectae* (455–488).⁶⁰ Ketelaar was not a missionary and his work was written for communicative and commercial reasons, although his work also contains religious texts, such as the ten commandments.⁶¹ In 1772 George Hadley (d.1798), a British military officer in the East India Company, completed a

59. Like the Marathi grammar, it was reprinted at Lisbon by the Imprenta Regia in 1805 (Streit & Dindinger 1931: 233, no. 793).

60. For a more detailed description of this grammar see Bhatia (1987: 35ff.). Ketelaar’s manuscript is preserved in the Dutch Royal Archives in The Hague and has been recently published by Bhatia & Machida (2008).

61. Ketelaar’s work was composed almost simultaneously with another Dutch source, Joannes Ruëll’s (c. 1660/63–1701) *Grammatica off Singalëse Taal-kunst* of which there is a MS copy from Kampen of 1700 and a version printed at Amsterdam in 1708 (Marsden 1796: 59; cf. Zwartjes & Pytlowany 2011, forthcoming b).

Hindustani grammar (Hadley 1772) (Marsden 1796: 129), six years before the anonymous Portuguese grammar appeared. Another officer in the East India Company, Captain James Fergusson, published a dictionary of this language in 1773 (Marsden 1796: 129), which also contains a brief grammatical sketch (Friedlander 2006).

In these works, as in the *Grammatica Indostana*, all examples from Hindi are given in romanised script. However, in 1771, Cassiano Beligatti's *Alphabetum Brammhanicum* was printed at the *Propaganda Fide* Press. It was the first work ever printed in which vernacular words were printed in movable type in Hindi characters (Devanagari and Kaithī; cf. Bhatia 1987: 58). It is discussed further below.

2.6.2 The language

Hindi and Urdu are different literary styles, based on the same Indo-Aryan sub-dialect. Colloquial Hindi is often described as a mixed language spoken in the Delhi area. Urdu is the style written in a modified Perso-Arabic script, framing its high-prestige lexical borrowings mainly from Perso-Arabic, while Hindi is the style written in Devanagari script, borrowing its higher lexicon from Sanskrit (Bhatia 1987: 9). The name 'Urdu' was not used in the period of the missionary grammars under study, and began to be used only around 1800. Texts written in Urdu before this date were often called 'Hindi', with the meaning 'language of India', an adjective of Perso-Arabic origin. For the British administration, Urdu and Hindostani were equivalent (Masica 1991: 27–29). The term indostano/Hindustani is used both by the Portuguese and English, and more recently by Gandhi, who attempted to use this less ethno-religiously loaded term, since Urdu is generally associated with Muslims, and Hindi with the Hindu population. The national language of India according to the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution of 1950 is Hindi, written in Devanagari script (Shapiro 2003: 256). In official Pakistani documents, the term Hindustani has disappeared, although it remains the term used in the South Asian diaspora, in Surinam for instance. The grammatical tradition of Hindi finds its origins in Western grammars. Since Hindi was considered "the language of the uncultured", there is no trace of any grammatical treatise describing Hindi from the local tradition, since this was specifically developed in order to describe the high-prestige Sanskrit.

2.6.3.1 *The grammar's view of the Hindi language*

When the anonymous author of the Hindustani grammar characterises the 'lingua indostana' he is fully aware of the Perso-Arabic influence, which is particularly evident in the 'guttural pronunciation' of the language:

A lingua Indostana, a qual he a mais commua em toda a penilha da India, e mais-simamente he intelligivel no vastissimo Imperio do Mogol; he composta das linguas Gentilica, Persiana, e Arabica, motivo porque hajan-se palavras gutturaes, que dependem de saber dobrar a lingua. (Anonymous 1778b, 'Advertencia aos que lerem': 3)

[The Hindustani language, which is the most common in the entire Indian Peninsula, is understood to a greater extent than any other in the very vast Moghul Empire. It is composed of the pagan languages, Persian and Arabic, which explains why it contains guttural words, which depend on knowing to fold the tongue.]⁶²

According to the anonymous author, the 'mixed' nature of this language explains why he does not always give fixed rules: "mas porque esta lingua se compoem de muitas linguas, não podemos assinar regra certa, nem pella terminação da palavra, nem pella significação" (1778b: 10).

Not only one standard language is described, but we also find observations concerning more colloquial forms or pronunciation, characterised as 'vulgar' or 'erroneous'. In this grammar, mention is made of the co-existence of a large number of regional varieties, but the pronunciation in Delhi is the most correct ('acertada'), according to the view of the anonymous author:

Muitas palavras ha, que se pronunciaõ erradas mas são taõ frequentes da vulgaridade, que muitos não entendem as verdadeiras. [...] Ainda aos mais intelligentes parecem novos alguns Vocabulos, quando os ouvem, pella diversidade da pronuncia, ou vicio, que custuma haver de huãs terras para outras: Eu accomodeime à pronuncia de Deli, he a mais acertada, e por isso nem sempre pareça erro, ainda que alguns ignorem o significado de algumas dicçoens. (Anonymous 1778b: 5)

[There are many words which are pronounced erroneously but they are so frequently used in vulgar speech that many do not understand the real (correct) ones. Even for the most intelligent people some words seem to be new, and when they hear them, due to the diversity of pronunciation, or vice, which usually exists from one territory to another. I accomodate myself to the speech of Delhi, which is the most correct one, and therefore it does not seem always an error, even when some people do not know the meanings of some words.]

2.6.3.2 *The structure of the grammar*

The anonymous Hindustani grammar does not supply much detail concerning pronunciation, but the use of diacritics is fairly sophisticated, compared to other grammars from the Portuguese tradition of this period. Only two pages (4–5) are

62. There is some confusion in the quotation about 'guttural sounds'. The velar fricatives of Arabic loans are certainly 'guttural', but the folding of the tongue appears to be a reference to cerebral or retroflex sounds, which are typical of many languages of the Subcontinent and not of Arabic or Persian.

devoted to diacritics (“As figuras dos acentos”). In contrast to most missionary grammars, the anonymous author “reduces” the Hindi language into nine parts of speech: ‘Articelo’, ‘Nome’, ‘Pronome’, ‘Verbo’, ‘Participio’, ‘Adverbio’, ‘Conjugação’, ‘Proposição’ and ‘Interjeição’. Traditionally, most grammars distinguish between declinable and undeclinable parts of speech. Unlike others, our anonymous grammarian separates the article, noun, pronoun, verb and participle from the other parts of speech, since they are ‘subject to gender’ (‘sugeitas aos generos’ 1778b: 6). The declensions are shown on pages 6–20, with the verbal paradigms on pages 20–32. The participle, adverb, conjunction, ‘proposition’ and interjection are treated on pages 33–37, followed by some “necessary observations or rules for the instruction of beginners” (“advertencias necessarias ou preceitos para instrução dos principiantes”). These include topics which would traditionally be dealt with in a separate chapter on syntax, such as gender, number and case agreement between the adjective and the substantive (37); word order between the possessor and the possessed (38–39); a note on the final position of finite verbs which follow the ‘infinitive’ (*châhanâ* = ‘querer’); some paragraphs including causative verbs and others, such as “to say” (‘dizer’), “to ask” (‘pedir’), “to command” (‘mandar’), “to make/do/ cause” (‘fazer’), “verb of ‘to oblige’” (‘verbo de obrigar’), “to eat” (‘comer’), “to join” (‘ajuntar’) (39–44); and the “construction of the passive verbs”, the “neutral verbs”⁶³ “to come” and “to go” (‘vir’ – ‘ir’), “to live” (‘viver’), and the auxiliary verb *hôna* “to be” (‘ser’ and ‘estar’) (46–49). The grammatical compendium closes with eight numbered rules bearing on varying topics, such as the use of honorifics:

O falar com gente de pouca sorte se deve dizer, *tu* ou *tem*, v.g. *tu câr*, ‘faze tu’, *temggâyâ*, ‘tu foste’. O falar mais grave, e com os graves se deve dizer, *tôm*, ‘vos’ e o verbo no plural, v.g. *tôm carò*, ‘vos fazei’. Também os graves, com os graves não dizem, Os que querem fallar mais grave com os graves, onde ha de ir, *tôm*, ‘vos’, dizem *kaâ saêb*, ‘senhor’... (Anonymous 1778b: 50)

[Speaking with people with a low (social) status, one must say *tu* or *tem*, e.g. *tu câr*, “(you) make”, *temggâyâ*, “(you) have been”. Speaking more seriously with gentlemen one must say *tôm*, “you (honorific)” and the verb must be in the plural, e.g. *tôm carò*, “you (honorific) make”. The gentlefolk among themselves do not say Those who want to speak more seriously to gentlemen, must say *tôm*, “you”, they say *saêb*, “sir”...] ⁶⁴

Finally, a short section is appended entitled “Hindustani phrases” (“Frazes Indostanas”) (52–54), followed by the numerals (55–60) and a thematically arranged

63. ‘Neuter’ means usually ‘intransitive’ in missionary grammars.

64. As Ketelaar had explained earlier (cited in Bhatia 1987: 37), the honorifics are expressed using the plural forms of the pronouns, whereas the singular forms are used to address speakers who are younger than the speaker.

vocabulary (60–135) (see the appendix to this volume), which are often divided in two sections, substantives and verbs.

It is remarkable that the anonymous author developed an elaborate system of ‘particles’: ‘Particulas locaes’, ‘de tempo’, ‘quantidade’, ‘qualidade’, ‘similhança’, ‘amplificativas’, ‘minorativas’, ‘exhortativas’, ‘interrogativas’, ‘prohibitivas’, ‘dubitativas’, ‘affirmativas’, ‘de juramento’, ‘negativas’, ‘de dificuldade’, ‘de dezejo’, ‘congregativas’, ‘comparativas’, ‘de excesso’, ‘de excepção’, ‘condicionaes’, ‘ordinativas’, ‘demonstrativas’, ‘accidentaes’, ‘de chamar’, ‘separativas’, ‘pessoas’, ‘augurativas’, ‘imprecantes’, ‘de acçoens’, ‘silenciarias’, ‘gaudiozas’, ‘dolorozas’, ‘de temor’, ‘laudativas’, ‘de refutar’, ‘irrezivas’, ‘de indignação’, ‘reprehensivas’, ‘de ironia’, ‘rogatorias’, ‘de rir’, ‘copulativas’, ‘dijuntivas’, ‘oppositivas’, ‘continuativas’, ‘cauzaes’, ‘de exclamação’, ‘de saudar’, ‘de despedir’.

2.6.3.3 *The grammar’s treatment of Hindi phonology and orthography*

In the “Advertencia aos que lerem” (1778b: 3) the anonymous author explains that the European alphabet is not sufficient or adequate for the expression of the sounds of spoken Hindi, since it does not have the appropriate letters which can express ‘those guttural words’ (“aquellas palavras gutturaes”) and the “various curls of the tongue” (“diversas dobraduras da lingoa”), i.e. the characteristic retroflex consonants of this language. The opening section of the grammar is dedicated to the diacritics.

- Λ quando não quero dilatar na pronuncia alguã vogal v.g. *tô*, enão *tò*.
- \ quando o vogal necessita dese dilatar, v.g. *Mâr*, enão *Mâr*.
- quando e necessario que duas vogaes, se pronunciem, como se fossem huã sô, v.g. *Baêtth*.
- / quando he necessario que a letra consoante no meyo, ou no fim da dicção se exprima v.g. *Bap Nenānvê*.
- v quando he necessario abreviar a syllaba, sobre, que cahe, v.g. *Bòhôt*.
- = quando convem pronunciar a letra *r* dobrada, mas sem aspereza, v.g. *Parhû*.
- .. quando a letra *g* se deve ferir como *j*, v.g. *ġi*. (1778b: 4–5)
- [_Λ when I do not want to lengthen any vowel in the pronunciation e.g. *tô*, and not *tò*.
- \ when a vowel has to be lengthened, e.g. *Mâr*, and not *Mâr*.
- when it is necessary to pronounce two vowels as if they were only one, e.g. *Baêtth*.
- / when it is necessary for the consonant in the middle or at the end of the word to be expressed, e.g. *Bap Nenānvê*.
- v when it is necessary to shorten a syllable on which it falls, v.g. *Bòhôt*.

- = when it is convenient to pronounce the letter *r* double, but without roughness,⁶⁵ e.g. *Parhū*.
- “ when the letter *g* has to be pronounced as *j*, e.g. *ġi*.]

This romanisation system is relatively elaborate, as long as the vowel system is concerned. It may draw on that of Captain Hadley, who introduced the five symbols ⟨Λ⟩, ⟨|⟩, ⟨˘⟩, ⟨˘˘⟩ and ⟨^⟩. In Hadley's system, the symbol ⟨Λ⟩, when placed underneath the letters, is used as a unitary vowel within a syllable, ⟨|⟩, is used for syllable boundaries, and the last three symbols mark syllable length and accentuation. As Bhatia (1987: 73) observes, Hadley perceived a long vowel as an accented vowel, so the use of these symbols is far from consistent.⁶⁶

A much more detailed and more complete contemporaneous description of the Hindi alphabet and sound system and the romanisation of Hindi is undoubtedly Beligatti's *Alphabetum Brammhanicum seu Indostanum Universitatis Kasi* (1771). Since this work was printed just a few years earlier at the same press as the anonymous Portuguese work, a comparison between the two seems tempting. The preface of the *Alphabetum* is written by Giovanni Cristoforo Amaduzzi, who also wrote the preface of Beligatti's *Alphabetum Tangutanum sive Tibetanum*, published by the *Propaganda Fide* Press in 1773.⁶⁷ As Bhatia (1987: 58) observes, Beligatti's works contain “a complete account of the then existing knowledge regarding Indian languages”.⁶⁸ Beligatti compares the Hindi phonemes and graphemes with

65. *Aspereza* is derived from Latin *asper* ‘rough’; cf. the use of *asper* in *spiritus asper* ‘rough breathing’ (in the description of ancient Greek), and the discussion of Anchieta's use of *aspero* in Chapter 4 below.

66. This is a very common phenomenon among English speakers meeting Indian languages.

67. The copy I consulted at the Library of the University of Amsterdam contains several alphabets: *Alphabetum Graecum coum oratione Dominicali, Salutatione Angelica, Symbolo Fidei, & Praeceptis Decalogi* (1771), *Alphabetum Hebraicum addito Samaritano et Rabbinico cum oratione Dominicali, Salutatione Angelica, & Symbolo Apostolico* (1771), *Alphabetum Ibericum, sive Georgianvm, cum oratione Dominicali, Salutatione Angelica, Ecclesiae Sacramentis & Operibus Misericordiae Latina & Iberica lingua compositis Characteres Georgiano impressis* (1629), *Alphabetum Tangutanum sive Tibetanum* (1773), *Alphabetum Persicum cum oratione Dominicali et Salutatione Angelica* (1783), *Alphabetum Grandonico-Malabaricum siue samscredonium* (1772). In Marsden's (1796: 3) catalogue the following alphabets of Amadutius are also included, all printed by the *Propaganda Fide* Press: *Alphabetum veterum Etruscorum* (1771), *Alphabetum Armenum* (1784) and *Alphabetum Aethiopicum sive Geez et Amharicum* (1789). The phonological material in these works has not been studied systematically.

68. Beligatti (1771: vii) sums up the following languages: “lingua popularis (Bekà Boli/lingua Universitatis Kasi sive Benarès vocatur), Bengalensis, Tourutiana, Nepalensis, Marāthica, Peruana, Singalaea, Telugica, Tamulica tum quae Nagri dicitur, tum Nagri Soratensis, ac quinetiam Balabandū, Devanagaram, Grantham, & ceterae huiusmodi, quae litterarum ductibus tum & dialecto dnmtaxat [sic] inter se different.” In his introduction to Beligatti's work, Amadutius

those of other languages, such as Italian, French, Greek and Hebrew, as was done in other *Propaganda Fide* grammars and dictionaries.⁶⁹ Often Arabic and Persian equivalents are used in his descriptions of pronunciation.⁷⁰ Amaduzzi, citing the Benedictine historian and orientalist Maturin Veyssière de la Croze (1661–1739), explains in his prologue to Beligatti's works that there are many Persian and Arabic loans in Hindi ("ceterum cum Indostana Dialectus multis scateat vocabulis Persicis, ac Arabicis", xiii), which is also recognised by the anonymous author of the Hindi grammar written in Portuguese, who informs his readers about the Arabic loans in Persian and Hindi, particularly loans related to medicine.⁷¹ The high esteem of Arabic in Persian is compared with that of Latin in European languages:

Escrevo muitas palavras Arabicas, principalmente as que pertencê à Medicina, por serem uzaues aos que falaõ Perciano, assim porque estes as tem, como próprias, como porque uzaõ da língua Arábica, *inter loquendum*, como nōs da latina. (1778b: 5)

[I write many Arabic words, particularly those which belong to the field of Medicine, as they are common to those who speak Persian and, since this language possesses them as if they are its own (words), because they use the Arabic language, in their speech, as we do Latin.]

The section on orthography and pronunciation of the Portuguese anonymous grammarian is relatively short, but as we have demonstrated, there is an extensive use of diacritics in the romanised script.

The phonological system in Hindi is quite complex. For instance, there are minimal pairs between dental plosives which are non-aspirated and aspirated,

mentions other scholars, such as Johann Friedrich Fritz (fl. 1748), Benjamin Schultze (1689–1760) and Justus Lipsius (1547–1606).

69. For instance that of Dominicus Germanus (1636), as Tomassino (2009 ms) demonstrates: "ش 'šin', [ʃ], "Schin, Sc, sch. r o m a n o o todesco». Anche nella *Tabula alphabeti arabici* di Domenico Germano 1639 l'araba ش 'šin' è identificata come romana, (13)v: «Scin alla Romana, sch alla Tedesca, X alla Spagnuola, ch alla Francese, s₃ (sic) alla Boema e Polaca. Ammette più presto la fatha a, che la chesra e» e così nella traduzione latina della *Tabula*, subito successiva, (14)v: «Scin R o m a n o r u m, Sch Germanorum, X Hispanorum, Ch Gallorum, Sz Boemorum et Polonorum. Gaudet magis phata a, quam dzamma o»

70. Hinc pronunciationis consonantium in particolari regulas tradit, ac aequipollentiam simul earundem exponit cum litteris Latinis, Graecis, Hebraecis, & Arabicis (1771: x).

71. There are other contemporary missionary sources which dealt with the influence of Arabic in Persian and Turkish, as for instance Johannes Baptista Podestà's (1625–1688): *Divino favente* ... (1669). The same author wrote a trilingual Arabic-Persian and Turkish *Cursus grammaticalis linguarum orientalium, arabicae scilicet, persicae et turcicae*. (1687–1703). See also Zwartjes (2008a: 414); Jeremiás (1999: 282) and (Zwartjes 2011 in preparation b) analysing the Turkish grammars of Jean-Baptiste Holdermann (1694–1730) and Juan Antonio Romero.

Table 2.2 Consonants in Híndi (Shapiro 2003: 259)

	Dental	Pre-palatal (retroflex)
PLOSIVES		
Voiceless, non-aspirated	t	ʈ
Voiceless aspirated	th	ʈh
Voiced, non-aspirated	d	ɖ
Voiced, aspirated	dh	ɖh
NASALS		
FRICATIVE, sibilant, voiceless	s	ʂ
TAP	r	
FLAPS		
Non-aspirated	ɾ	
Aspirated	ɾh	

voiceless and voiced, and even between pre-palatal retroflex and non-retroflex (dental), as the following table demonstrates.

As we may expect, no the values of all these phonemes are described in detail. If we compare the anonymous grammar to Beligatti's description, we can hardly find any information concerning the retroflex consonants, except for the observation that the learner must know "how to curl the tongue" ("saber dobrar a lingua") (Anonymous 1778b, 'Advertencia aos que lerem': 3), and the claim that this kind of sound originates in Arabic. The author's reference to "aquellas palavras gutturaes" made by "dobraduras da lingua" is in fact rather unusual. Although many different sounds might be called 'guttural' in this pre-modern period, the word was generally used for the velar nasal (/ŋ/) velar occlusive (/k/ or /g/) or the velar fricative (/x/), and not primarily for any sounds which are produced "doubling the tongue", which must be a description of the retroflex consonants, such as /ʈ/, /ɖ/, /ʂ/.⁷² The anonymous author is not able to separate typical Arabo-Persian phonemes from those which are characteristic of Indo-Aryan languages. Guttural sounds are usually associated in the period with the 'gentíos', the speakers of languages of low prestige. Pure languages do not have them, though they may be contaminated through contact with "barbarous" tribes.⁷³ Unlike the Portuguese anonymous grammarian, Beligatti gives us a fairly detailed and correct description of how to

72. The velar nasal was, for instance, called guttural in de la Mata's description of Cholón (cf. Alexander-Bakkerus 2005b: 186–187), and the velar occlusive in Alonso de Huerta's grammar of Quechua.

73. See for instance Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1738, ed. Zwartjes 2009: 54, 'preludio al lector') where the pronunciation of Chinese is described. The 'tones' and 'guttural' sounds do not have a Chinese origin, but they were borrowed from the Tartars, according to Oyanguren.

pronounce retroflex consonants. The pre-palatal voiceless and non-aspirated plosives have to be pronounced as the dental and non-aspirated voiceless plosive /t/, but with the following difference:

Ta, aliter quam per *t*, haec a nobis latinis explicari nequit, nec describi potest; quamvis longe sit diversa, eiusque pronunciationem assequi necessarium sit profertur *lingua paululum inversa, & palatum leniter percutiente*, quo *blese*⁷⁴ pronunciatur, quod sane per usum assequeris. Respondet ط *tta* vel ت *te* Arabum. (Beligatti 1771: 29)

[*Ta*, different from *t*: this letter cannot be explained by our Latin (letters), nor can it be described. Since it is totally different, it is necessary to follow the pronunciation of it with the tongue a little bit reversed, and hitting the palate softly by which it has to be pronounced gently, something you certainly will acquire by use. It corresponds with ط *tta* or ت *te* of the Arabs.]

Beligatti's articulatory description is very detailed and clear: the reversed tongue slowly touches the palate. Although the anonymous Portuguese does not give such a detailed articulatory description, he may have seen Beligatti's grammar, since both authors associate the typical pronunciation of retroflex consonants of Hindi with the use of emphatics in Arabic, although they do not seem to know the difference between the minimal pairs of Arabic "plain" and emphatic consonants.

If the Portuguese author did see Beligatti's work, he probably did not use it extensively.⁷⁵ He does not seem to have a clear idea of the opposition between aspirated and non-aspirated phonemes, described fairly correctly by Beligatti. In his words, to the "normal" [t] "aspiration has to be added" ("eodem modo effertur addendo illi aspirationem" (29). Again, Beligatti compares the aspirated sound with Arabic, arguing that this letter (*tha*) is almost the same as the Arabic letter ت, which is an approximate description, since this consonant is an interdental voiceless fricative /θ/ ("quasi ت *the* Arabum")⁷⁶ (29). As we noted at Section 2.3.4.1, Beligatti remarks that spirants are articulated with "some force" (cited in Bhatia 1987: 59).⁷⁷

74. Possibly, Beligatti consulted Western grammars of Arabic. *Blaesum* means 'mispronouncing one's words through a speech defect, drunkenness, etc. stammering'. The term is used for Arabic (ذ) and (ط) (both 'D bleso', according to Baptista), whereas Erpenius uses the term not only for (ذ) but also for (ت) (*T Blaesum*). The occlusive ت is never called 'blaesum', so it can be a misprint. Apparently, Beligatti did not know the difference between ط and ت (see also Chapter 7).

75. For instance, in the paragraphs dedicated to the numerals, both authors use an entirely different romanisation system: see the chapter "Modo de contar/Tārāh gēnnēki" (p. 55).

76. In Classical Arabic ت represents the voiceless interdental fricative, whereas in Farsi it represents [s]. Arabic loans in Persian and Hindi were adapted phonologically.

77. The description of aspirated consonants in terms of "force" has a long tradition, see for instance Priscians' *Excerptiones* who uses the terms "minus/plus sonet" ("uttered less forcefully/uttered more forcefully", in Porter (2002: 50–51). The idea of "force" is also reflected in other grammars, such as Gilberti's grammar of Purēpecha (1987[1558]: 110r) that it is necessary "to

Apart from his brief remarks on retroflex and aspirated sounds, the pronunciation of consonants is hardly described by the anonymous author. The pronunciation of the palatal (affricated) approximant /y/ is explained as follows: “Uzo desta “ quando a letra g se deve ferir como j, v.g. *gĩ*” (4). This observation could have been inspired by Beligatti’s description of this consonant: “Notandum insuper, litteram *gia* quandoque *ja*, non *gia* proferri, quod maxime evenire solet, quando cum aliis consonantibus copulatur, v.g. *kanja* virgo nubilis” (Beligatti 1771: 18).

2.6.3.4 *The grammar’s treatment of nominal declension*

There are two grammatical genders in Hindi, masculine and feminine, and two major declensional types can be distinguished. Hindi nouns have different forms for singular and plural, and two cases can be distinguished through affixation, the direct and oblique cases (Shapiro 2003: 262). Postpositions are used for several different functions, such as direct object, agent, indirect object, and locus. The anonymous author does not offer any originality in his approach to nominal declension, apart from some less common terms such as ‘nomes diminutos’ as a synonym of ‘nomes deminutivos [sic]’ (1778b: 9). There are some rules dealing with gender (“regras geraes para conhecimento dos generos”) (1771: 10) followed by a paragraph about declensions where the author distinguishes eight different types, four masculine and four feminine, depending on the endings.

2.6.3.5 *The grammar’s treatment of verbal inflection*

The Hindi verb has three aspects, which are marked morphologically: habitual, progressive (also called continuous), and perfective. ‘Tenses’ are mainly formed by combining the stem of the verb with the copula *honā* (‘to be’) which occurs in four ‘tenses’: present, past, presumptive and subjunctive (Shapiro 2003: 266).

The presentation of the verbal paradigms of the anonymous grammar of Hindi is more or less the same as that of the anonymous of Marathi. The verb is first divided into ‘substantives’, ‘active’, ‘passive’, ‘neuter’ and ‘impersonal’ verbs (Anonymous 1778b: 21). Before the paradigms are shown, the author starts with a paragraph entitled ‘Formação dos Verbos’. Since the verb ‘to be’ is classified by the anonymous author as a ‘verbo auxiliar’ (24),⁷⁸ this verb comes before the

let out your breath abundantly from the depths of your chest” (“menester es sacar el huelgo abundantamente del profundo del pecho”, cf. Smith-Stark 2005: 32).

78. The concept of ‘auxiliary verb’ has been introduced by Jean Pillot (born between 1510 and 1515, d. 1592) in his *Gallicae Linguae Institutio* (1561); (cf. Kukenheim 1932: 227; Brøndal 1948: 27). Two Portuguese grammars before the anonymous (1778b) appeared include the concept of ‘verbo auxiliar’: Jerónimo Contador de Argote (1676–1749) (1725: 63) and António José dos Reis Lobato (d. 1804) (1770: 60) (Schäfer-Priess 2000: 198).

conjugations of other verbs. The reason for treating this verb first, is explained above: the verb ‘to be’ serves as an auxiliary verb for the formation of the ‘tenses’.

The term ‘stem’ is not used in any of the Portuguese grammars of Indian languages in this early period, but the anonymous author explains that the imperative is the root (‘raiz’) (ibid.) from which derivations of the Hindi verb are formed. He goes on to state that the present tense is formed using the participle joined to the ‘substantive verb’ ‘to be’, e.g. *martā* with *hū* makes *martāhū* (“prezente formase do participio acabado em *tā*, ajuntandolhe o Verbo substantivo *hū*, v.g. *martā* com *hū* fica *martāhū*. ..”), and that the imperfect is formed correspondingly, with the imperfect of the verb *hū*, which is *tha* (“O preterito imperfeito formase do 3. presente, acrescentandolhe o imperfeito do Verbo *hū*, que he *tha*, v.g. *martā* com *tha* fica *martathā*”). The other ‘tenses’ he identifies are ‘preterito perfecto’, ‘plusquam perfeito’, ‘futuro’, ‘futuro mandativo’, ‘prezente do conjunctivo’, ‘plusquam perfeito condicional’ (Anonymous 1778b: 22–23). A ‘mandative’ is also identified by Henriques (Section 2.2.3.5 above) and Stephens (Section 2.3.4.3 above), but a treatment of a ‘pluperfect conditional’ is not found elsewhere in the Portuguese corpus.

2.6.3.6 *The grammar’s treatment of adverbs*

Adverbs in Hindi are not marked morphologically. In many cases, the concepts expressed by adverbs in languages such as English and Portuguese are expressed by postpositional phrases involving *se*, such as *xuśī se* ‘happily’ (*xuśī* = ‘happiness’; Shapiro 2003: 266). The author of the anonymous grammar describes the adverb astonishingly accurately, particularly when compared with modern definitions, such as Shapiro’s, which are almost identical:

Os advérbios de que uzamos na lingua Portuguesa, v.g. ‘amorosamente’, ‘alegremente’, ‘affavelmente’, explicaõ nesta lingua com ablativos dos nomes, que tem o tal significado, com a proposição, *sē sō, seti*; e dizem a fim, *pêârsē*, ‘amorosamente’, ou ‘com amor’, *côxalisē*, ‘alegremente’, ou, ‘com alegria’, *melansarisē*, ‘affavelmente’, ‘cortezemente’ ou ‘com affabilidade, e cortezia’. (1778b: 33–34)

[The adverbs we use in the Portuguese language, such as “lovingly”, “lightheartedly”, “kindly”, are explained by the ablatives of the nouns in this language, which have such meaning with the ‘proposition’ *sē, sō, seti*; (joined) to the end (of the word): *pêârsē*, “lovingly”, or “with love”; *côxalisē*, “lightheartedly”, or, “with joy”, *melansarisē*, “kindly”, “politely” or “with kindness and politeness”.]

2.6.3.7 *The grammar’s treatment of the article*

The anonymous author is not the only pre-modern grammarian to consider the article (‘artículo’) a separate word-class. In the grammatical sketch which forms part of his dictionary of 1773, James Fergusson also classifies Hindi words into nine classes: article, noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb, conjunction, interjection and ‘case’. The anonymous author classifies the parts of speech into ‘artículo’,

‘nome’, ‘pronome’, ‘verbo’, ‘participio’, ‘adverbio’, ‘conjugação’, ‘proposição’ and ‘interjeição’. Since the Portuguese grammar appeared five years later than Ferguson’s, we must not exclude the possibility that the latter inspired the former. Nevertheless, it is also true that there are some differences between their classifications. According to Ferguson, two classes of articles can be distinguished, one as in English (*a, an, the*) and the second class, labelled as ‘pronominal articles’, corresponding to what we call today demonstrative pronouns, such as *this, that* (cited in Bhatia 1987: 78–79). Bhatia criticises Ferguson for sticking too close to the English word classes and not deciding to postulate a separate subclass of pronouns, labelled as ‘demonstratives’ (Bhatia 1987: 95). We do not find any evaluation in Bhatia of the treatment of the ‘artículo’ in the Portuguese grammar of Hindi, where a distinction is made between finite and indefinite articles (‘finito’ versus ‘indefinito’). The text is as follows:

Do Articulo.

Articulo he huã parte da Oração, que distingue os cazos, e numeros, e a significação da voz declinavel. He de dois modos a saber, finito, e indefinito. Articulo finito, he aquelle, que rende a significação indefinita, ou indeterminada.

O articulo finito tem variação, ou declinação, em ambos os numeros, e he common para o genero masculino, e femenino. (Anonymous 1778b: 6).

Sua declinação.

Nom. ‘Este’, *Yè, t, ennè*;

Gen. ‘Deste’, *Es, kà, t, ki, t, kê....*

[...] O articulo indefinido não tem Nominativo, nem Vocativo; tem ambos numeros.....

Declinação do Articulo indefinitivo

Singular

Gen. Do, da, de,

Gen. *Kà, ki*

Dat. A, ao, aa

Dat. *Cũ, cõ,*

Acc. A, ao, aa,

Acc. *Cũ, cõ, tai*⁷⁹

Abl. Do, da, de,

Abl. *Sẽ, sũ ...* (1778b: 7)

[On the Article.

The article is a part of speech, which distinguishes the cases, numbers and the signification of the declinable word. There are two classes, the finite and the indefinite. The finite article is that which renders an indefinite meaning, or indeterminate meaning. The finite article has variation, or declension in both numbers, and is common to the masculine and feminine gender.

79. Observation (1778b: 8): O articulo *Cũ, cõ, tai*, tambem tem força da propozição, para o articulo *Sẽ, sũ*, tem força de propozição de, como diremos no seu lugar.

Its declension:

Nom. “this”, *Yè, t, ennè;*

Gen. “of this”, *Es, kà, t, ki, t, kè.....*

... The indefinite article does not have a nominative, or vocative, but has both numbers

Declension of the indefinite article

Singular

Gen. ‘of the’

Gen. *Kà, ki*

Dat. ‘to the’

Dat. *Cũ, cõ,*

Acc. ‘the’

Acc. *Cũ, cõ, tai*

Abl. ‘of the’

Abl. *Sẽ, sũ ...]*

It is noteworthy that the contracted forms of the Portuguese preposition ‘de’ and the definite articles ‘o’ and ‘a’ are labeled as ‘partículas’⁸⁰, while the same term is used for the preposition ‘de’ without the article (cf. 1778b: 38). The distinction ‘finito’ versus ‘indefinito’ does not correspond with the dichotomy definite ~ indefinite (Portuguese ‘o’, ‘a’, versus ‘um’, ‘uma’). Instead, the ‘artículo finito’ (translated into Portuguese as ‘este’ which is a demonstrative pronoun) is used to distinguish number and gender, while the ‘artículo indefinitivo’ (or ‘indefinito’), whose Portuguese equivalents are ‘do’, ‘da’, ‘a’, ‘ao’, etc., also marks case:

.. este artículo indefinitivo faz distinguir o genero, o numero, e o cazo em todos os nomes; porque o *ka, kè*, serve para o mascul. o *ki* serve para o femin. O *ka, kè* serve para o numero plural; e todos tres distinguẽ o genitivo. (Anonymous 1778b: 8)

[... this indefinite article serves to distinguish gender, number and case in all the nouns; because *ka, kè* serves for masculine, *ki* for feminine. *Ka, kè* serves for the plural number, and all three distinguish the genitive.]

The postpositions *kā, ke, kī* are particularly used in possessive constructions (X *kā/ke/kī* Y = ‘X’s Y’); the postposition *ko* in Hindi is a marker for the indirect object and under some conditions for the direct object (Shapiro 2003: 262–263). The anonymous author’s description is almost the same as Shapiro’s: “*Cũ, Cõ... servẽ para dativo, e accusativo*” (1778: 8).

2.6.3.8 *The grammar’s treatment of agreement and word order*

Generally, Hindi is typologically of the SOV type, although it is not always a purely left-branching nor right-branching language (Shapiro 2003: 271). This is what the anonymous author explains to his readers about the alternative word orders

80. “Os genitivos do sobre ditto Articolo são como as onzas partículas dos, das, de, que nesta lingua sempre se pospoem, concordando en genero, e numero com a voz, sobre que cahe, como se vê nos exemplos: ‘a espada de Rey’, *Bàdxà ki trabar...*”.

bètti Pedrùki versus *Pedrùki bètti* or *ggèllè jôruôke* versus *jôruôke ggèllè*, after giving the first of each pair as an example of a point about the marking of possession:

Exemplo: ‘a filha do Pedro’, *bètti Pedrùki*; ‘as queixas das mulheres’ *ggèllè jôruôke* ... advirtase, que a ordem do falar ou collocação nos exemplos sobre ditos não he tão ordinaria; porque o melhor modo de dizer, e mais ordinario he por primeiro o genitivo, depois as particulas, *ke, ka, ki*, depois a couza pertence ao genitivo, v.g. *Pedrùki bètti, jôruôke ggèllè, Pàdxàka hoacaôm, &c.* (Anonymous 1778b: 38–39)
[Example: ‘the daughter of Peter’, *bètti Pedrùki*; ‘the complaints of the women’ *ggèllè jôruôke* ... it must be observed, that the order of speaking, or the collocation of the above-mentioned examples is not the usual one, since the best way of speaking, is to put the genitive first, followed by the particles *ke, ka, ki*, after the thing the genitive belongs to, such as *Pedrùki bètti, jôruôke ggèllè, Pàdxàka hoacaôm, &c.*]

2.6.3.9 *The grammar’s treatment of agreement and ergativity*

Like Konkani and Marathi (see Sections 2.3.4.5 and 2.5.2.5 above), Hindi is a split-ergative language, where verbs with endings of the perfective aspect do not agree with the subject but with the direct object. In Hindi, perfective tenses co-occur with a subject in the oblique case, to which the ergative postposition *-ne* is attached (Shapiro 2003: 268). The anonymous author decides to interpret the ergative construction with *-ne* as a passive:

Os preteritos perfeitos, e plusquam perfeito querem os casos dos verbos passivos a saber, accusativo com a proposição, *nè*, que vale tanto, como a proposição *per*. E por isso quando dizemos, ‘eu fiz este serviço’, não diremos, *mem quia*, se não, *memnè quia cà*, ou *memnè quia tha*, ‘eu tinha feito’. Nos mais tempos, e modos da voz passiva, não se uza da proposição, *ne*, antes por ella se conhece quando a linguagem falla do preterito, e por ella se distinguem outros tempos, gue [sic] são semelhantes. (Anonymous 1778b: 46)

[The perfect preterite and pluperfect require the cases of the passive verbs, that is, the accusative with the ‘proposition’ *-ne*, which has the same value as the ‘proposition’ *per*. And therefore, when we say, “I did/have done this service”, we will not say *mem quia*, but *memnè quia cà*, or *memnè quia tha*, “I had done”. In the other tenses and moods of the passive voice, the proposition *-ne* is not used but rather instead of this [proposition] the language uses the preterite and by this other tenses are distinguished, which are similar.]

As Masica observes (1990: 341), it is not appropriate to call this construction a ‘passive’ since its active counterpart does not exist.⁸¹ Although the counterpart of this so-called ‘passive’ is non-existent, the anonymous author has succeeded fairly

81. See for a similar approach Mamiani’s description of ‘ergativity’ in Kipeá-Kiriri in this volume (5.2.7.2).

well in his treatment of the ergative pattern of Hindi and its consequences for verbal agreement. The description of this *-ne* construction is an accomplishment of significant importance since it is prior to John B. Gilchrist's (1759–1841) *A Grammar of Hindoostanee Language* (1796).⁸² Gilchrist's description of the ergative is praised by Bhatia, who concludes that "Rapid progress was registered in every aspect of Hindi grammar.... The path for future research was prepared by their inclusion of such new topics as causative and compound verbs, the passive, prosody and the ergative *-ne* construction". In contrast, in his final evaluation of the anonymous *Grammática Indostana*, Bhatia (1987: 91–92) casts doubts on the originality of this work, concluding that "the grammar makes use of earlier works; for example, the discussion of Hindi nouns is heavily dependent upon David Mills's (1692–1756) version of Ketelaar's grammar (1743) (Bodewitz 1994–1995). From the perspective of the development of Hindi grammatical thinking, this work does not contribute to the existing knowledge of the time...". Although Bhatia admits that the treatment of the verb by the anonymous Portuguese "is more advanced than some other contemporary grammatical works – at least much better than that of Hadley", the treatment of ergative constructions and its consequences for verbal agreement is not mentioned. The anonymous grammarian of the *Grammática Indostana* already described the ergative (or 'psuedo-passive') construction prior to Gilchrist in 1778 and his description is fairly correct.⁸³

2.7 Conclusion

In modern studies generally, missionary descriptions of Indian languages are neglected: the cases of Tamil (Section 2.2.2.2 above), and of the identification of the "*-ne* construction" in Hindi (Section 2.6.3.8 above) are typical. In this chapter, we have suggested some of the reasons for seeing the missionary grammars of the Portuguese tradition as interesting, and indeed innovative. Some questions remain to be answered.

The first is whether there exists a genetic relationship between the grammars written in Portuguese in South Asia. Assumpçam's grammar does not exhibit any

82. Marsden (1796: 23). See the study by Steadman-Jones (2007).

83. Yates (1827: 12) introduces the 'instrumental case' for the Hindi noun. The 'case marker' *-ne* is described as follows: "The instrumental case is always used instead of the nominative, before intransitive verbs in the perfect tense or its formatives: the nominative case to the verb follows, and the verb which succeeds, though active in termination, is passive in its signification; as *ādmī ne arz kī* "by the man a request was made", or "the man requested" (Yates 1827: 12, cf. Bhatia 1987: 125). Duncan Forbes in his *A Grammar of the Hindustānī Language* (London, 1846) classifies *-ne* as an agentive marker and not as an instrumental marker (*apud* Bhatia 1987: 130).

resemblance to those of Henriques and Stephens, but shares some features with the anonymous grammar of Hindi. The two anonymous grammars of Marathi and Hindi were published in the same year and shortly after Assumpçam's work on Bengali, but these two texts do not follow the same model. The grammar of Marathi devotes special paragraphs to what is called 'articles', whereas the Hindi grammar includes a considerable part of the vocabulary to a great number of 'particles', covering all kinds of word classes, such as adverbs, interjections, and so on. In neither work is much theoretical background information provided, but the extension of the metalinguistic terminology of the subclasses of the 'particles' in the vocabulary of the Hindi grammar demonstrates that the anonymous author tried to shape the linguistic data into a more refined model.

Probably one of the most important shortcomings of all Portuguese sources analysed in this chapter is the inadequate transcription system which leads to many misreadings and misunderstandings. The role of native-speakers was essential for the acquisition of a good pronunciation.

The treatment of orthography is generally totally different. In some grammars it is hardly described, and the knowledge available in Europe of that period, as reflected in Beligatti, is not used at all in the anonymous Portuguese grammars. There is no clear link between the South Asian grammars and the Latin grammar of Álvares, as is the case in Brazil (see Chapter 4 below), but Assumpçam's grammatical compendium resembles Pedro Sánchez's Latin grammar. Nevertheless, other grammars may follow the same order. In sum we can conclude that there are more differences than coincidences.

There is not much evidence for establishing any relationship between the works written in Portuguese in South Asia. This allows us also to conclude that these linguistic documents are 'creative' and 'original'. In the case of the Hindi grammar, it might be possible to trace some influence from non-Portuguese sources, particularly English. It is not our objective, however, to address the impact on the Portuguese of non-Portuguese works.

Some phonological descriptions are fairly correct, particularly certain articulatory definitions of retroflex consonants. The use of diacritics in all the grammars under study is either totally absent or limited, which can lead to confusion for the learner of these languages. Morphologically, the approaches are, as we may expect, based on the Latin model, but we have illustrated that 'new tenses' were created, although they are not often labelled with new technical terms. The treatment of auxiliaries is generally fairly correct, although incomplete in all the grammars studied. On the syntactic level, the descriptions of agreement symmetries and asymmetries and split-ergative constructions are original. This aspect is, according to our view, the most important contribution of the grammars concerned to the history of linguistics.

Most of the works studied do not excel on the level of language theory, since they were mainly written for didactic purposes. Assessing the didactic value of works is also a task which is still in its infancy. How can we measure the didactic value of these works, without measuring them according to the standards of our modern theories concerning language acquisition and language instruction? Which teaching methods were appreciated at that time and which were not? These questions still have to be answered, though our final assessment of the didactic value of these works is, tentatively, generally positive. We have not found any citation or reference in the Portuguese grammars in India to works written by their colleagues in the same region, so we have no direct evidence of how the priests evaluated the didactic aspects of earlier works, as happens often in the Americas and the Philippines, where new works were created, when previous works were considered too extensive or too confused.⁸⁴ Complementary information could probably be derived from correspondence between missionaries and their superiors.

84. The following citation is illustrative: “Mucho hicieron los Antiguos, pero mucho dejaron de hacer. Mucho alcanzaron; pero mucho se les perdió de vista. Mucho aclararon; pero mucho dejaron en confuso. Mucho acertaron; pero no lo acertaron todo, y por esso los Modernos son precisados á trabajar en el Examen de las Lenguas, y para poder discernir lo verdadero de lo falso de ellas, es necessario desmembrar las proposiciones, y desmenuzar las palabras, reduciendo unas, y otras á sus principios; y lo que entonces se halláre ser verdadero, seguirlo, y lo que no, desecharlo...” (Ortiz 1740: ‘Al lector’). [The ancient grammarians did a lot, but much they have not done. They achieved a lot, but much was left unperceived. Much was clarified, but much was left confused. They have solved a lot, but not everything, and therefore the Modern grammarians are compelled to scrutinize the languages, and in order to distinguish between the true and the false, it is necessary to decompose the propositions, and break up the words, ‘reducing’ one and the other to its principles (‘roots’), and what is then found to be real, they follow up on, and what is not, they reject.] Recently, Klaus Zimmermann presented a lecture (IVth workshop sobre Linguística Missionária, Rio de Janeiro, May, 2011) on the anonymous *Luces del otomí* where previous grammars are discussed (Cárceles, Urbano, Neve y Molina, etc.).

CHAPTER 3

Missionary linguistics in Japan

This chapter deals with a single grammar, that of João Rodrigues (1562–1633), of which a first edition was published as *Arte da lingua de Iapam* in Nagasaki in 1608, and a second, substantially revised edition was published as *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa* in Macao in 1620.¹

3.1 Introduction

In 1542 or 1543 Europeans arrived in Japan. The Catholic mission began in 1549 with the arrival of the Jesuit leader Franciscus Xavier (1506–1552), who continued the activities he had been undertaking in India, Malacca, Amboina (Ambon), the Moluccas (Malukas) and the outskirts of the Chinese Empire since 1542 (Alden 1996: 43). According to João Rodrigues, in c.1549–1550 Franciscus Xavier wrote the first catechism with the help of a Japanese native called Anjirō (Schurhammer 1928: 65).² The Jesuit Visitor Alessandro Valignano (for whom see 2.1.1 above) wrote in his *Historia del principio y progreso de Jesús en las Indias Orientalis* that “to speak or write Japanese other than in the accustomed manner is impolite and invites ridicule, just as if we were to speak Latin backwards and with many mistakes” (1944: 152–153; cf. Cooper 1971: 127). He recommended that “newcomers from Europe should devote at least eighteen months to the study of Japanese, so that they might obtain a good grasp of it” (Cooper 1971: 127). Jesuit missionaries began to produce studies of the Japanese language in c.1552, when Duarte da Silva (1536–1564) is supposed to have written a grammar, *Arte da Lingua Japoneza*, and a dictionary, *Vocabulario da Lingua Japoneza* (Streit 1928: 380), which have both been lost. It has been suggested that this pioneering grammar “did not follow the order of Latin” (Moran 1972: 39). It was completed before the Jesuits started to use the grammar of Manuel Álvares (first published in 1572) in their Latin education; the adaptation of this grammar for Japanese use is discussed at Section 3.2.3.1 below.

1. This chapter was completed during my fellowship in 2010 at the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, funded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS).

2. This, the *Dochirina Kirishitan*, is not a mere translation from the Portuguese original, but has to be studied as a unique and autonomous work.

Duarte de Silva's work was followed up in 1564 by João Fernandes (Juan Fernández, 1526–1567), who was responsible for the catechism of the inhabitants of Ichibu, an important early Christian centre on the island of Ikitsuki (Ribeiro 2006: 50). Luís Frois's (1532–1597) edition of Fernandes's manuscript was used for teaching Japanese before Valignano introduced the Jesuit press in Japan (Moran 1972: 37; Dahlmann 1891: 6). It has been reported that Fernandes finished this grammar within six months and that it included morphology and bi-directional Portuguese-Japanese and Japanese-Portuguese wordlists, but unfortunately, this work has been lost as well (Debergh 1982: 31). It is documented that Fernandes was able to present a lecture in Japanese about the creation of the universe (López Gay 2003: 94). Probably, apart from the pioneering work of Duarte da Silva and João Fernandes, other grammars or linguistic manuscripts circulated in the second half of the 16th century (Moran 1972: 37). In the annual reports of the Jesuits of 1585, the production of dictionaries and grammars in the Colleges of Funai and Arima is documented (Debergh 1982: 31). Alessandro Valignano brought the press to the Jesuit college at Kazusa in the Nagasaki prefecture in 1590 with "carved wooden types", possibly manufactured in Macao (Moran 1993: 155), starting with printing in *katakana* (one of the two syllabaries); *kanji* characters have been available since the start of printing. From the printing of the confessionary *Salvator mundi* (1598) onwards, metal Japanese types were used. In the same year, the dictionary called *Rakuyōshū* (see below) was printed in *kana* and in the Chinese/Japanese *kanji* characters.

3.2 The activities of João Rodrigues (1562–1633)

3.2.1 His life

João Rodrigues was born in 1562 in Sernancelhe, Beira, Portugal.³ At the age of fifteen, he reached Japan. By this point, there were approximately – according to the Jesuit chroniclers – 100,000 Christians in Japan (Schütte 1968: 429; Cooper 2001: xvi). Soon he was a recognized fluent speaker of Japanese. This fluency explains why he was called Rodrigues Tçuzu (Tçûzzu or Tsuji), which means the "interpreter".⁴ It came at a price: since Rodrigues left Portugal when he was still very young, his abilities in writing Portuguese were limited, as he admitted himself:

3. According to others he was born in Alcochete, but Sommervogel (1890, vol. 6.1970–1971) demonstrates that this was another person with the name João Rodrigues Girão (Giram). There were in fact three missionaries with the name Rodrigues in this period: João Rodrigues, the author of the two grammars, João Rodrigues Girão, and Francisco Rodrigues.

4. /zzu/ and /zu/ signify different phonemes in Jesuit orthography for Japanese. /zu/ is correct (Toyoshima, personal communication).

As you know, I came from Europe as a child and was brought up in these parts among wilds and forests of these nations, so I possess neither style in our Portuguese language nor method of writing briefly what is necessary ... Although I have not an elegant style ... I am doing History, and later someone who has style will arrange it.⁵

He entered the service of Otomo Yoshishige (1530–1587) – the Jesuits called him “Don Francisco Otomo Sorin”, which means “the old king” – the *daimyo* of Bungo. Rodrigues worked as a confidant and interpreter between the Japanese *daimyos* Toyotomi Hideyoshi (1593–1598) and Tokugawa Ieyasu (1542–1616) and the Portuguese (Boxer 1967: 195). When the Japanese authorities started to persecute the Christians in 1614, Rodrigues was forced to leave his second homeland, Japan, after having lived there more than thirty years. He spent the rest of his life in Macao, Canton, Nanking, and Peking. In 1633, he died in Macao where he was buried in front of the altar of St. Michael in the Jesuit church (Moran 1972: 19).

Rodrigues had taught Latin, and apart from Portuguese and Japanese, he also knew Spanish. He was able to translate Chinese letters into Spanish, as the following citation from Moran (1993: 184) demonstrates: “In November 1599, when an embassy from Tokugawa Ieyasu is to leave Nagasaki for the Philippines in a few days’ time, and Father João Rodrigues is being asked to translate the official letters written in Chinese, into Spanish”. As established by Boxer (1967: 194), “when the Spanish friars from the Philippines settled in Kyoto in 1593, Valignano states categorically that the local Jesuits gave their unwelcome colleagues a printed grammar and dictionary”, but Rodrigues informs his readers that his work was the first printed grammar of the Japanese language, although he tells that he made use of some notes by other missionaries:⁶

... muyto tempo ha que os Superiores da mesma Companhia de Iapão desejauão q se ordenasse, & imprimisse hũa Arte pera cõ mays facilidade aprêderem a lingoa desta nação nossos Padres, & Irmãos, que de Europa, & da India vem a trabalhar nesta vinha do Senhor; mas o graue peso da cõuersam, & as cõtínuas occupações dos sujeytos q nisto poderam entender não deram lugar a se effeytuar mays cedo. ... no que me ajudey de algũas annotações, que acerca desta materia algũs Padres nossos tinham feyto, & andauão escritas de mão ... (Rodrigues 1604–1608: ‘Proemio’, no numbered folios)

[... for a long time past the Superiors of the same Society in Japan have been wanting to comission and to have printed a grammar, so that our Fathers and Brothers who come from Europe and India to work in this vinyard of the Lord may learn the language of this nation more readily. But the heavy pressure of the work of

5. Rodrigues’s letter to Nuno Mascarenhas of November 1627 (IN.2.40), quoted in Moran (1972: 20); cf. Toyoshima 2005: 274.

6. Moran (1993: 156) explains why these words are ambiguous.

conversion and the fact that those subjects who were competent in this matter were constantly occupied, provided no opportunity for the project to be carried out earlier. ... For these, I have made use of some notes which some of our Fathers had put together in hand-written form about these matters.] (Transl. in Moran 1972: 303)

From the examples and comparisons in his grammar we know that he probably had some knowledge of Italian, too. In a passage of his *Arte grande* he even seems to have had some knowledge of a language from Goa, India, possibly Konkani or Tamil:

Do modo infinito

O modo infinito Iaponico não tem proprias vozes, mas suprese por muytos circûloquios, & modos de falar que pera isso tem, conuem a saber, por certas particulas juntas ao indicatiuo: ... tambem o presente do Indicatiuo, o qual admite todas as particulas dos nomes articulares. & sendo hũa soo serue a todas as pessoas do singular, & do plural: o que não sabemos auer *ẽ outra lingoa se não em certa nação da India, que tudo fala por Infinito com certas particulas*: toda via apontarey aqui os modos que respondem ao Infinito latino, & ao da nossa lingoa Portuguesa. (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 21r-v; my emphasis: OZ)

[The infinitive in Japanese does not have proper endings, but they are substituted by many circumlocutions and ways of speaking, being certain particles joined to the indicative ... also the present of the indicative which admits all the ‘articular particles’ (vid. *infra*) and being one word [‘voz’] it serves to all the persons of the singular and plural, *something that does not exist in another language, except for a language in a certain Indian nation, where they express everything using the infinitive with certain particles*: Anyway, I shall write down here the moods which correspond to our Latin or to our Portuguese infinitive.]

3.2.2 His work

Before we discuss his grammar, we should mention the other works by or attributed to Rodrigues. He composed the work *Historia da Igreja do Japão* (“History of the Church in Japan”),⁷ whose original has been lost, but a copy made in Macao during the 1740s has recently been discovered and translated into English (Cooper 2001). This historical work includes important sections devoted to the Japanese language, the Chinese and Japanese characters and their writing styles, and the

7. See for more details Moran (1972: 29). The book does not only deal with the Christian church in Japan, as the title indicates. The annex “Bispos da Igreja do Japao” covers that part. The book includes also a scholarly study of Confucianism, Shintoism, Buddhism, and Taoism, where not only the missions in China are described but also those found in China, Siam, Cambodja, Korea and Vietnam (Annam). For a Japanese translation, I refer to Tadao Doi (*Iwanami Shoten*, 2 vols. 1967 and 1970).

manner of printing (*op. cit.* 330–338). A work on the geography of Asia and a treatise on Christian terminology in Chinese, comparable to the *Tractatus copiosissimus contra Praxes Matthaei Ricci et Sociorum eius Sectatorum, inter quos P. Rodericus de Figueredo*, completed in 1618, may be attributed – according to Sommervogel (1890: 3, col. 726) – to Rodrigues. According to the Jesuit historian Daniello Bartoli (1608–1685), author of *Dell’Historia della Compagnia di Giesu: La Cina, Seconda Parte* (1660) and *Terza parte dell’Asia* (1663), Rodrigues also composed a catechism “against the errors of the Bonzes” around 1613 (Moran 1972: 33), but there is no evidence of the existence of these works. Finally, a major Japanese-Portuguese dictionary of about 30 000 entries, the *Vocabulario da lingoa de Japam* (1603), has been attributed to Rodrigues; as we explain in Section 2 of the appendix to the present volume, this attribution is mistaken.

The first edition of João Rodrigues’s grammar of Japanese is entitled *Arte da lingoa de Iapam ... diuidida em tres livros*. Its title-page imprint identifies it as having been printed at Nagasaki, in the Jesuit college, in 1604, but in the colophon we read that the work was completed in 1608. There are two extant printed copies – one in the Bodleian Library and the other in the private collection of the Earl of Crawford – and a handwritten copy in Rome (Moran 1972: 25). It has been argued, even by the author himself, that this grammar was too long, containing too much material which was not relevant for the practical teaching of the Japanese language. This monumental work contains several untranslated examples in Japanese, which apparently were directed towards the more advanced learners of Japanese.

After the beginning of the persecution in 1614, linguistic studies of Japanese were continued outside Japan, particularly in Macao and Manila, where missionaries took care of the Japanese convert refugees. The press which had been used in Japan was brought to Macao after the persecution of Christians had begun and the printed books of the Christians burnt (Moran 1993: 145). It was in Macao that a second, heavily revised, edition of Rodrigues’s grammar appeared in 1620. In this second edition, Rodrigues’s main purpose was to publish a more accessible textbook for beginners, as indicated in the title: *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa tirada da Arte Grande da mesma lingoa, pera os que começam a aprender os primeiros principios della*. Two printed copies are extant, one in the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London, and the other in the Biblioteca de Ajuda in Lisbon. There is also a handwritten copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, with an imprimatur dated 1720: this may indicate, as Moran (1972: 27) argues, that in 1720 there were plans to reprint the grammar, but it may possibly be a simple mistake for 1620 (Toyoshima, personal communication, March 2009).

According to Boxer (1967: 196–197) only 100 copies of the *Arte breve* were printed, but he concludes that this version of the grammar is “technically a much better work. The dross and prolixity have been pruned away, and the author

formulates his method more concisely and clearly”. This positive evaluation is in agreement with the original objectives made explicit by Rodrigues. He explains in the prologue of the first edition that Japanese is a ‘strange and wandering tongue’ (“lingoa estranha, & peregrina” 1604–1608: “Advertencias” unnumbered), which explains why the first edition may be ‘a little bit more diffuse in its explanations’. For that reason, Rodrigues promised the reader a more concise version of this grammar (Boxer 1967: *ibid.*). In the prologue of his Macanese edition he explains why a second edition was needed:

Na arte grande, que compus da lingoa Iapoa, que anda empresa, fui algum tanto extenso na declaração de muitas cousas assi pera melhor se entenderem as principaes difficuldades desta lingoa, por ser seu uso muy vario, & a collocação das partes da oração contraria a das nossas linguas de Europa ... Mas porque aos que começam a aprender esta lingoa pode causar confusam a variedade de preceitos, & regras, que ali se dam, pareceo necessario, como na mesma arte prometemos, & agora de nouo ordenou o Superior, fazer este breue extracto da arte grande, que sirua aos principiantes como de introduçam pera a mesma arte, a qual depois de ouuido este Compendio podera melhor servir a todos. Alguns lugares, que ali pareciam a alguns hum pouco escuros, se declaram melhor neste Compendio ... (1620: “Ao leitor”)

[In the large grammar of the Japanese language, which I wrote and which was printed, I set out at length many things, in order to make more readily intelligible the main difficulties of this language, which is very complex in its usage, with the order of the parts of speech the reverse of that of our European tongues ... But because the variety of precepts and rules there given may be confusing for those who are beginning the study of this language, it seems necessary to make this short extract from the large grammar – in the grammar we promised to do this, and we have been told again to do so by the Superior – to serve beginners as an introduction to that grammar, which will be of more use to everyone after the perusal of this compendium ... (Translation by Moran 1972: 48)

The works of the Portuguese Jesuits, including the Japanese-Portuguese *Vocabulario*, have been studied extensively by scholars working on the history of Japanese and its local varieties, since these texts are almost unique sources for the study of 16th–17th-century Japanese, but – as far as we have been able to determine – there are no recent monographs written in a European language dealing with the Japanese grammars of Rodrigues in the context of the history of linguistics.

3.2.3 Sources of Rodrigues’ grammar

3.2.3.1 *European sources*

The pioneering linguistic studies of Duarte de Silva, João Fernandes and Luís Frois could have been available to Rodrigues when he studied Japanese, but the names

of these pioneers are never mentioned in his grammars, although he refers to earlier grammarians as ‘nossos primeyros Padres’, not always without criticising them.⁸ In the foreword of his *Arte Grande*, Rodrigues explains that he “has made use of some notes which some of our Fathers had put together in handwritten form about these matters...” (“no que me ajudey de algũas annotações, que acerca desta materia algũs Padres nossos tinham feyto, & andauão escritas de mão..” (Rodrigues 1604–1608: ‘proemio’, no numbered pages).

Rodrigues was inspired – particularly when writing his first edition – by the Japanese edition (1594) of the Latin grammar of Manuel Álvares, but it is not improbable that he was familiar with earlier editions of Álvares’s grammar, possibly the *editio princeps*, which was published in 1572.⁹ Rodrigues does not only mention the name of Álvares, but also that of Antonio de Nebrija. He cites literally in Latin from these sources:

... E péra melhor se entender do rayz a natureza destes verbos, apontarey aqui do Padre Manoel Alvarez & do Antonio o que apontão a cerca dos Verbos neutros, onde diz assi: *Verba neutra à grammaticis in tria genera diuiduntur: alia sunt, quae actionem significant, Vt ‘Ambulo’, ‘curro’. Alia, que [sic] passionem ab alio, Vt. ‘Vapulo’, ‘fio’, ‘exulo’. Alia quae nec passionem, nec actionem. Vt, ‘Sedeo’, ‘sudo’, ‘sto’, ‘algeo’, quæ ab alijs supina, à nonnullis absolutiua, ab alijs verò dispositiua appellantur.* (Rodrigues 1604–1608 f.69r)¹⁰

[And in order to better understand by heart the nature of these verbs, I write down here what Father Manuel Álvares and Antonio (de Nebrija) have written concerning the neuter verbs, where it is expressed as follows: “Neuter verbs are divided by the grammarians into three genders, some signify an action, as the verb *Ambulo* (“I walk”), *curro* (“I run”), others signify the passion from the action, as *Vapulo* (“I am beaten”), *fio* (“I am created”), *exulo* (“I am banished”) and others do not signify action, nor passion, as *sedeo* (“I sit”), *sudo* (“I sweat”), *sto* (“I stand”), *algeo* (“I am cold”), which are call ‘supines’ by some authors, whereas some others call them ‘absolutives’, or ‘dispositives’.]

The grammar of Álvares was a great succes in the education of the Jesuits, particularly in regions other than the Spanish territories.¹¹ Álvares shows some interest in languages other than Latin and Greek; in his grammar we find a cross-linguistic

8. For instance, he does not agree with the description of the adjective, as provided by his predecessors (1604–1608: 61v).

9. See Sommervogel (1890) for the great number of reprints and editions.

10. In Álvares (1972 [1572]: 53r) we do not find the same definition: “[Verbum] neutrum est, quod, m, vel, o, literis finitum ex se passium personale non gignit, vt ‘Sum’, ‘Sto’, ‘Seruio’, neque enim dicitur ‘Stor’, aut ‘Seruior.’”

11. The Spaniards prescribed the Latin grammar of Nebrija, although it is known that reprints of Álvares were used also in New Spain (Esparza Torres 2007).

comparison between three Semitic languages, which illustrates the broadening of language studies during the Renaissance:

Hebraei, Chaldei, & Syricum coniunctio careat eum ex indicatio adhibitis certis particulis, l, ex infinito praefixis certis literis, seu praepositionibus supplent. (Álvares 1594: 20r)

[The Hebrews, Chaldeans and Syrians do not have the subjunctive and they express it by certain particles from the indicative, or by certain letters from the infinitive, or they substitute it by prepositions.]

This emerging engagement with languages which were structurally very different from Latin and Greek may have made his grammar a particularly fruitful source for missionary grammarians like Rodrigues.

The Japanese Amakusa edition of the grammar of Álvares generally follows the same structure as the first edition of 1572, but there are some significant differences: the editors of the Japanese version adapted the grammar for Japanese students, offering bilingual Latin-Japanese paradigms, although this was not always done systematically throughout the whole grammar, as occurs in other editions of the grammar for local use.¹² Latin paradigms are frequently given without accompanying Japanese equivalents, particularly in the paradigm of declensions (e.g. ff. 6–12). In the chapter on verbal conjugations, Japanese translations are much more frequently given, and these sections are predominantly contrastive in nature. The editors attempted to solve translation problems, particularly when Japanese equivalents were lacking:

Vtimur particula, *To*, in tertia persona Imperatiui, quia communiter caret propria voce Iapponica. (Álvares 1594: 13v)

[We use the particle *to* for the third person imperative, since generally this Japanese form is missing.]

Sometimes, complete sentences are given in Japanese and it is remarkable that these examples serve to explain Japanese particles; we do not expect this in a Latin grammar, since such comments were apparently not relevant for the teaching of Latin.¹³ As noted by Boxer (1967: 195) – but without specifying the examples – there

12. As occurs, for instance, in Italy. See the edition printed in Genua (Dominici Peri, 1648), cf. Franciscus Caballus's edition *Emmanuelis Alvares e Societate Iesu de Institutione Grammatica pro Illyricis accomodata* (Roma, 1637; Marsden 1796: 19).

13. For instance: "Particulae, *De*, et *Nite*, alicui nomini substantiuo, aut adiectiuo sociatae, praesentis, aut imperfecti cōiunctiuo vim habent, vt *Mutçuno cunino nuxi nite daimiō nari...* &c." (Álvares 1594: 15r). A similar example can be found on folios 18r–v, where the use of pronouns is explained in the paragraphs on the verb.

are “a few quotations from the Confucian Analects and some *monogatari*”.¹⁴ There are more examples that illustrate that the Japanese version was not only composed for the Japanese to learn Latin. For a native speaker of Japanese, it would be useful to learn how the Latin *Imperativi modi tempus praesens* is translated into Japanese, but it is evident that the editors had also non-native speakers of Japanese in mind, which explains why information is given of how the examples could be translated in an “elegant” (*eleganter*) way. In the Amakusa edition, the grammar of Álvares is not longer a monolingual work designed simply for the teaching and learning of Latin.

The structure of the Amakusa edition is more or less identical to that of the edition of 1572, as we can read in the ‘admonitio’ (“what concerns the order of the book as it is edited by the author, nothing has changed”) (*ordine quo liber ab auctore editus est, nihil immutato*). The adaptation of the original version for local use makes this edition unique, compared to the other re-editions. Not only are Classical authors from Western Antiquity cited, but also Classical and contemporary Japanese works and pedagogical manuals, such as the *Dōji-kyō* and *Jitsugo-kyō* (Debergh 1982: 32). The Amakusa edition of the Latin grammar differs also from the original text, since references to Sino-Japanese Classical literature are interspersed in the text. On folio 18v, we find a citation where the editors added the reference “*Rongo*, lib. 8”;¹⁵ on f. 20v, we find the reference *monogat.*, or *monog.* (22r), and on the same folio (f. 22r) “*Feiqe lib. 4.*” (cf. f. 23r). The first edition of Rodrigues’s Japanese grammar mentions *Rongo* as well, but in his *Arte breve* the sources are usually not given, although *Rongo* is mentioned four times (Moran 1972: 56).

Here follow some parallels between Rodrigues and Álvares:

– *The noun*

Álvares (Amakusa, 1594: 70r)	Rodrigues (1604–1608: 59)
<u>Substantivum</u>	<u>Nome sustantivo</u>
Substantivum nomen est quod per se in oratione esse potest.	Nome substantiuo de Iapão he aquella, que porsí pode estar na oração.
<u>Adiectivum</u>	<u>Nome adiectiuo</u>
Adiectivum est, quod in oratione esse non potest sine substantiuo aperte vel occulte ...	Nome adiectiuo he aquella, que na oração actualmente sempre está junto com algum substantiuo, ou se entende, ou se comprehende no (?) modo de falar (129–130)

14. Boxer took his information almost *verbatim* from Satow (1976[1888]: 26).

15. The *Vocabulario Português* translates *Rongo* as “Nome de hum liuro da China que trata de cousas moraes” (f.212v). This work is used for interpreting the Analects of Confucius.

– *The relative (noun)*

Álvares (Amakusa, 1594: 71r)	Rodrigues (1604–1608: 142)
Relatiuum est, quod nomen antecedens in memoriam reducit: id duplex est substantiae, & accidentis.	Relatiuo he aquelle, que traz à memoria o nome antecedente. Iste he de duas maneyras, ou de nome substantiuo, ou de nome adiectiuo ¹⁶

– *The pronoun*

Álvares (Amakusa, 1594: 72v)	Rodrigues (1604–1608: 145)
Pronomen est, quod loco nominis positum, certam finitamque personam adsignificat.	Pronome he aquelle, que se poê em lugar do Nome, & significa pessoa certa, & determinada.

In a couple of cases, Rodrigues' treatment in the first and second editions of his grammar may be compared:

– *The interjection*

Álvares (Amakusa, 1594: 75r)	Rodrigues (1604–1608: 163)	Rodrigues (1620)
Interiectio est pars Orationis, quæ varios animi affectus indicat.	A interjeição he hũa parte da oração, que mostra varios affeytos interiores, como sã Alegria, tristeza, dor, temor, ira, admiração, & outros semelhantes, & destas he abūdante a lingoa Iapoa.	varios affeitos interiores do animo, como sam alegria, tristeza, dor, temor, ira, admiraçam, etc. (same m grande abundancia, arte grande)

– *The conjunction*

Álvares (Amakusa, 1594) 75v–76r	Rodrigues (1604–1608) 164–5	Rodrigues (1620)
Coniunctio est pars Orationis, annectēs, ordinānsque sententiā. Copulatiuæ, disjunctiuæ, aduersatiuæ collectivæ, sive illatiuæ, siue rationales, causales, expletivæ, præpositiuæ, siue principes sunt, quæ in Oratione præeunt., subiunctiuæ, communes	Ha diuersas especies de Conjunções como no Latim. Copulatiuæ, adverstivæ, causales, collectivæ, inceptivæ orationis, expletivæ, condicionales, subiunctivæ.	copulativas, aduersatiuas, causaes, colectiones, inceptivas, outras que servem de encher a oraçam (condicionaes, subjuntivas)

16. Cf. Barros: “Aquela parte que fáz lembrança de algum nome que fica atrás, e este tal se chama antecedente”. Barros (1971[1540]: 301). [That part which ‘brings back to mind’ a certain noun which stays behind, and such a part is called antecedent.]

As has been postulated in the introduction of this study, the main reason why modern linguists seem to ignore these pre-modern missionary sources is that in them, the Greco-Latin model was superimposed on languages which are typologically different from Greek or Latin. It is obvious that the grammars of Rodrigues were following the Greco-Latin model; however, Rodrigues was fully aware of this problem, since he informs the readers explicitly that he decides to deviate from the canonical order. He adds two parts of speech to the traditional eight from the Latin model (including the article and the particle). He also realized that it would fit better for didactical reasons to explain the use of ‘certain particles’ at an early stage, i.e. at the beginning of the grammar. In order to understand the mechanisms of verbal ‘conjugations’ it would not make any sense to start explaining the ‘particles’ after the eight traditional parts of speech:

Tem esta lingua certas particulas, das quais postoque não he este seu proprio lugar, toda via pareceo bem pollas aqui, peraque os que aprêdem começam a vsar dos verbos juntos com ellas, por serem muy ordinarias, & necessarias. Deyxando o demais pera seu lugar, estas particulas se conjugão como verbos por todos os tempos & modos, hūas polla primeyra coniugação, outras polla segunda, & algūas polla 3. juntas aos verbos fazem com elles hūa composição, & assi suprem todos os tempos, & modos do verbo a que se ajuntão. (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 10r)

[This language has certain particles which I want to put here so that those who learn begin to use the verbs together with these particles, since they are common and necessary, although this may not be the appropriate place to put them. Leaving the rest for the place they belong, these particles are conjugated as verbs by all the tenses and moods, some for the first conjugation, others for the second, and some for the third. Joined to the verbs they make a compound form, and by this way, all the tenses and moods of the verb to which they are attached, are substituted.]

In sum, it is obvious that Rodrigues used Álvares as his model, but changed the canonical order when necessary. Apart from Nebrija and Álvares, no references are recorded in Rodrigues’s grammars to the works of João de Barros and Fernão de Oliveira. Although evidence is missing, we can not exclude the possibility that Rodrigues could have had the chance of seeing them.¹⁷

3.2.3.2 *Japanese sources*

Rodrigues also used works from the Japanese tradition. This was many centuries old when he encountered it. The first dictionary of the Japanese tradition – the Chinese-Japanese character dictionary *Shinsen jikyō* (“Compilation of ‘letters’

17. According to Maruyama (2004), his ‘innovative’ description of the categories ‘artigo’ and ‘particula articular’ could have been inspired by these Portuguese examples, which will be discussed later.

recently collected”) – had appeared at the end of the 9th century (Mills 1967: 297; Eschbach-Szabo 1989: 460). Studies of classic texts such as the poem-collection *Manyōshū* were under way by 951. These poetical treatises played a prominent part in Japanese philology. No native grammars in the Western sense, i.e. covering the whole range of phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax (morphosyntax), were produced in this early period, but in these poetical works literary analysis and stylistics are interspersed by comments on aspects of grammar.

In Rodrigues’s treatment of the parts of speech, three different models are used, two ‘exo-grammatical’ (i.e. following the dominant Latin model, which was not developed for Japanese) and one ‘endo-grammatical’ (i.e. seen from the perspective of Japanese):

1. the traditional division of eight parts of speech from the Latin grammars,¹⁸
 2. his own ‘expanded’ system of ten parts of speech,
 3. the division into three parts of speech according to the Japanese classification.
- Japanese meta-linguistic terms are used and explained by Rodrigues:

Os Iapões diuidem as partes da oração em tres, de bayxo das quais comprehendem as demais, conuem a saber, Verbo¹⁹; *Tenifa*, l. *Teniuofa*, l. *Sutegana*, l. *Voquiji*, de bayxo da qual comprehendem, os artigos dos nomes, & todo o genero de particulas assi dos tempos & modos dos verbos, como todas as de mais. Porem falando propriamente, & em rigor as partes da oração Iapoa são as oito acostumadas da lingua latina: mas pera mais clareza da Syntayxis [sic], os dividiremos em dez que são as seguintes: Nome, Pronome, Verbo, Participio, Posposição, Aduerbio, Interjeição, Conjugação, Artigo, Particula. (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 58r-v)

[The Japanese divide the parts of speech in three parts, to which belong all the others, as the verb: *Tenifa*, l. *Teniuofa*, l. *Sutegana*, l. *Voquiji* to which the articles of the nouns belong and all the particles of the tenses and moods of the verbs, as all the others. However, when speaking more properly and more accurately, the parts of speech in Japanese are the eight usual parts of the Latin language, but for more clarity of syntax, we divide the parts of speech in ten parts, which are the following: Noun, pronoun, verb, participle, postposition, adverb, interjection, conjunction, article and particle.]

And in another section of his grammar dedicated to the tenth part of speech, the ‘particle’, we read:

18. Nomen, Pronomen, Verbum, Participium (declinantur), praepositio, aduerbium, interiectio, coniunctio (declinationes sunt expertes). (Álvares 1972[1572]: 47v; 1594: 70r).

19. Here, as Debergh (1982: 39) suggests, something must be missing in the original: the sense must have been “the verb; the noun; and the particle, the last of which may be called *tenifa*, *teniuofa*, *sutegana*, or *voquiji*”. As it is, the passage is rather puzzling.

Esta parte da oraçam, he aque mais se estende que todas as de mais, por que a todas pertence, & com todas se ajunta. E como ja serem dito os Iapoes de baixo deste vocabulo, *Tenifa*, 1. *Tenivofa*, comprehendem toda a sorte de particulas, os casos, ou artigos dos nomes, as terminações dos verbos de todos os modos, & tempos, &c. porque em seu modo de escreuer, escreuem hũa letra, ou figura que significa hum nome, ou verbo, & pera mostrar o caso em que esta o tal nome, ou o tempo, ou modo em que esta o verbo, escreuem junto da quella letra com *Catacana*, ou *Cana*, se he nome, os artigos, *Va*, *No*, *Ga*, *Vo*, *Ni*, *Nite*, *Toxite*, &c. & se he verbo, escreuem as syllabas, ou terminações do verbo, *Ru*, *reba*, *raba*, *To*, *Zu*, *Zaru*, &c. E assi das de mais particulas. Estes artigos, & terminações que de fora acrescentão junto da tal letra, chamão, *Tenifa*, *Tenivofa*, *Sutegana*, *Voquiji*. (1604–1608: 149r) [This part of speech is the one that extends the most, since it belongs to all of them and it is linked to each one of them. As I have already mentioned regarding the word *Tenifa*, 1. *Tenivofa*, the Japanese combine together all the particles, cases, or articles of the nouns, the endings of all moods and tenses of the verbs, etc., since when they write, they write a letter or figure that means a name, or verb, they write it by that letter with *Catacana* or *Cana*, if it is a name, the articles *Va*, *No*, *Ga*, *Vo*, *Ni*, *Nite*, *Toxite*, etc. if it is a verb, they write the syllables or the endings of the verb *Ru*, *reba*, *raba*, *To*, *Zu*, *Zaru*, etc. The same goes for all the other particles. These articles and endings which are added to the characters are called *Tenifa*, *Tenivofa*, *Sutegana*, and *Voquiji*.]

In his second edition Rodrigues gives a tripartite division of the parts of speech using Japanese terms (cf. Maës 1982: 19):

As Iapoens comprehendem todas as partes da oraçam da sua lingua de baixo de tres palauras: a primeira he, *Na*, que sinifica nome; de baixo do qual comprehendem todos os nomes substantiuos, as conjunçoens, interjeiçoens, preposições, ou posposições, & quaes quer outros vocabulos que tem propria letra que nam sam verbos. A segunda he, *Cotoba*, que sinifica, verbo (naõ fallando lato modo, em quanto quer dizer palaura, mas propriamente) de baixo da qual se comprende toda a sorte de verbos assi substantiuos, como todos os de mais, & os verbos adiectiuos. A terceira, he, *Te*, *Ni*, *Fa*, ou, *Te*, *Ni*, *Vo*, *Fa*, ou *Sutegana*, ou *Vokiji*, de baixo da qual comprehendem os artigos dos casos dos nomes, como sam, *Va*, *Ni*, *Vo*, *Voba*, & todo o genero de particulas, assi dos tempos, como todas as de mais de qualquer sorte, que sejam, que nam tem letra propria, mas sam da lingua Iapoa natural, *Vt*, *Mo*, *Nimo*, *De*, *Nite*, &c. (Rodrigues 1620: 52r–v)

[The Japanese perceive all the parts of speech of their language as falling in the realm of three words: the first is *Na* which means ‘noun’, which encompasses all the substantive nouns, conjunctions, interjections, prepositions or postpositions and any other words which have a proper letter which are not verbs. The second is *Cotoba*, which means ‘verb’ (not in the broad sense meaning ‘word’, but more properly), to which all sorts of verbs belong, such as the ‘substantive verbs’, and all the others, such as the ‘adjective verbs’. The third is called *Te*, *Ni*, *Fa*, or, *Te*, *Ni*, *Vo*,

Fa, or *Sutegana*, or *Vokiji*, to which the case-articles of the nouns belong, such as *Va*, *Ni*, *Vo*, *Voba*, etc. and all sorts of ‘particles’ of both the tenses and all the others which have a proper letter, but which are natural of the Japanese language, e.g. *Mo*, *Nimo*, *De*, *Nite*, &c.]

Schematically, the following distinctions have been made, interpreted in modern terminology:

- *teniwoha* (= *tenifa*, *tenivofa*) relational/functional elements,
- *na* concrete nouns,
- *kotoba* (verbs and adjectives)²⁰

As Rodrigues explains, the term *teniwoha* is etymologically the juxtaposition of the postpositions *te* + *ni* + *wo* + *ha*. The treatise *Teniha taigashō* (end of the 14th century) is one of the earliest sources to classify these postpositions in a systematic way (Eschbach-Szabo 1989: 461). In the 15th century, *Kotoba* included verbs and adjectives (today *yōgen* “variable words”). According to Maës (1982: 20), the Japanese system was originally bipartite (*tenioha/kotoba*), although there are also other sources which tend to use the dichotomy *tenioha/na*. Rodrigues’ tripartite division seems to be a combination of both dichotomies (Maës 1975c: 70; 1982: 20). In the 16th and 17th century a different division was adopted in Japanese linguistic theory from Chinese; i.e. the dichotomy *shizi/xuzi* (plain versus empty characters) (Maës 1982: 21).²¹ We can conclude that the work of Rodrigues is an important and unique source, antedating part-of-speech theories of posterior works.²² Maës explains in his publications clearly the treatment of *tenioha* in the Japanese tradition.²³

Rodrigues also uses Japanese terminology when he displays the ‘tenses’ of the verbs in Japanese:

... preterito, presente, & futuro, que elles sinificam por estes tres vocabulos, *Quaco*, *ghenzai*, *mirai*. (Rodrigues 1620: 16r)

20. Cf. Chaudhuri (2010: 531).

21. According to John Considine (personal communication, April, 2011, *okiji* are Chinese particles which are not read aloud when text in Chinese characters is read as Japanese.

22. For the remarkable influence of Dutch grammatical theory on Japanese grammatical treatises of the *rangakusha* (‘hollandologues’) see Maës (1975b) and (1975a: 77ff.).

23. More complex and comprehensive theories describing the parts of speech were developed in the 18th century by Kamo no Mabuchi (1697–1769), Motoori Norinaga (1730–1801) and Fujitani Nariakira (1738–1779), who classified the words in Japanese according to their grammatical functions. We could not find any information related to the terms *sutegana* and *okiji*. The *Vocabulario* does not supply additional details, since it only contains entries for *tenifa* (‘modo de falar conforme, ou contra as leis da grammatica’) (f.254v) and *na* (f.172v) (only in the non-metalinguistic meaning: ‘nome’), while no entries are included for *sutegana* and *okiji*.

[preterite, present, and future, which are signified by these three terms *Quaco*, *ghenzai*, *mirai*.]

In Rodrigues' texts we find references to Japanese literary works, some written by Christians and others by native Japanese literati. One of the main sources mentioned is the *monogatari*. An abridgement of the *Heike Monogatari* was appended in the 1593 edition of the *Esopu no Fabulas* or *Fables of Aesop*, printed in Amakusa with a preface signed by Fucan Fabian (Boxer 1967: 193). Rodrigues gives his readers the name of the author of the *monogatari* in his first edition, commenting on an example in the chapter on the verb:

Aguenaide gozaru, Mosanaide gozaru, Aguenandaru, &c. São pouco vsados: pos-to que algũas vezes se acham nos Monogataris do Irmão Yôfo [=Yoho] Paulo. (Rodrigues 1604: 26r; cf. Moran 1993: 186)

[*Aguenaide gozaru, Mōsanaide gozaru, Aguenandaru*, &c. They are not commonly used, although sometimes they can be found in the *Monogatari* of Brother Yôfo [=Yoho] Paulo.]

In the first edition of his grammar, Rodrigues advises the learners of Japanese to read the *monogatari*, but in the second edition, the *Arte breve*, he recommends the study of more prestigious texts than those which were composed by non-native Jesuits. The Classical canon has to be studied through texts as *Genji-Monogatari* ("The Tale of Genji", written almost entirely in *hiragana* (plain *kana* script)²⁴ between c.1001–1010), *Ixe monogatari* and others (1620: 1r) (Shibatani 1999: 127). In his second edition, Rodrigues dismisses the reading of the *monogatari* produced by the missionaries:

Quanto aos liuros, q̃ an de aprender, ham de ser do estillo da escritura, & de au-tores classicos antigos estimados entre os Iapoês por seu elegante estillo, em q̃ esta todo o primor, elegancia, & propriedade da lingoa Iapoa, pellos quaes ainda os mesmos Iapoês pera se perfeiçoarẽ aprendẽ de proposito. E por isso os liuros, per q̃ an de aprender por nenhum modo ham de ser liuros nossos transferidos na lingoa Iapoa ainda q̃ sejam de escritura, por ser a frase impropria accomodada aos nossos conceitos, nẽ menos dialogos feitos no estillo da pratica, quaes sam os que andam impressos com titulo de *Monogatari* da pratica, & muito menos liuros Iaponicos classicos reduzidos pellos nossos Iapoens em estillo de pratica para os Europeos aprenderem a lingoa, como sam, *May* da pratica, *Feikemonogatari* da pratica impressos ã nossa letra, & dialogos feitos no estillo da pratica, & os liuros Iaponicos da escritura cõuertidos no mesmo estillo. (Rodrigues 1620: 4r-4v)

[As to the books to be used in learning, they should be in the literary style, by old classical authors highly esteemed by the Japanese for their elegant style, in which

24. Both *katakana* and *hiragana* are *kana*-syllabaries, opposed to the Chinese *kanji* characters (Shibatani 1999: 129).

is all the beauty, elegance and correctness of the Japanese language. The Japanese themselves make a point of learning from these in order to perfect themselves. So the books to be used in learning should on no account be our books translated into Japanese, not even if they are literary in style, for the phrasing is not correct, being altered to suit our concepts; even less should they be dialogues in colloquial style, such as those printed under the title of *Colloquial Monogatari*; and much less should they be classical Japanese books transposed into colloquial style by our Japanese Jesuits so that the Europeans can learn the language, such as the colloquial *May* and the colloquial *Feikemonogatari*, written in our letters, and dialogues composed in colloquial style, and Japanese books in written style put into the same (colloquial) style.] (Translation by Moran 1972: 297, cf. Moran 1993: 157)

The classical *monogatari* (“tales”), written in a high-prestige register, were adapted into colloquial Japanese and also entirely new colloquial *monogatari* were composed, both these kinds of colloquial texts belonging to the language curriculum of the Portuguese missionaries. As Moran (1993: 235) observes, these tales have been lost, except for the colloquial Amakusa version of the *Heike Monogatari*. They also survive in quotations of Rodrigues (1604–1608), the Japanese-Portuguese *Vocabulario*, the Spanish translation of this *Vocabulario* printed in Manila in 1630 prepared by Tomás Pinpin and Iacinto Magaurlua, and in the grammar of the Franciscan priest Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688–1747), who used mainly the Manila version of the *Vocabulario* as the source for his grammatical examples and word lists (Zwartjes 2009a; 2010b). In the cited fragment, mention is also made of the *mai*, which is a narrative genre usually accompanied by a dance.²⁵ There were probably adapted versions developed only for foreigners in the colloquial style, but there are no extant texts of these versions (Moran 1993: 234) – making the quotations from them by Rodrigues all the more important. The *Heike monogatari*, printed at Amakusa in 1592–1593, is still extant; probably this book was brought to Manila after the expulsion of the Christians from Japan (Moran 1993: 157).²⁶

Another important source from which Rodrigues extracted his examples is the *Rakuyōshū*, or *Ra cu yo xu sive Dictionarium Japonicum; Characteres habet hinc*

25. The definition in the Japanese-Portuguese dictionary is “historias antigas, como romances pera se cantarem, & bailar” (1603–1604: 149v).

26. It is not impossible that this work was still in use in the Philippines in the 18th century, when the Spanish Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés wrote his grammar. Japanese was still being taught by missionaries to novices, since they were motivated by the desire to return to Japan, or for the practical purpose of teaching Japanese to those priests who took care of the Japanese Christian minority in Manila, who settled there after the expulsion from Japan. In Taiwan, Japanese was also taught after the expulsion and before the conquest of the Dutch.

Sinicus, illinc Iapponicus (Marsden 1796: 76). This work was studied in Europe by Joseph Scaliger (1540–1609) as early as 1605, seven years after its publication in Japan, perhaps at Nagasaki or Amakusa (cf. Satow 1976 [1888]: 34–35). Possibly, the native friar Vicente Tōin or Hōin was the author of this work (Debergh 1982: 35). As Bailey observed (1960–1961: 300), the *Rakuyōshū* can be characterised as a “dictionary of characters” and not as a “dictionary of words”: it is a tool for learning the equivalences between Chinese characters and spoken words rather than for learning the meaning of words. The work also contains information on history and geography. One of its novelties is that pronunciation marks are added to certain *kana* syllables (*handakuon*), denoting the changes in pronunciation known as *nigori* (Boxer 1967: 195).

The *Rakuyōshū* is divided into three books. The first part was completed in 1598, and comprises 62 folios. This is the *Rakuyōshū* proper, being a list of Sino-Japanese characters (*kanji*) and their compounds. These characters might be read aloud in a standardized reading pronunciation of Chinese which the *Rakuyōshū* calls *coye* (*koe*, modern Japanese *ondoku*), or might be translated into Japanese, a practice which it calls *yomi* (modern Japanese *kundoku*). The *Rakuyōshū* uses the Japanese syllabary to indicate how each character would sound in *coye/ondoku*, its *on*-reading, and in *yomi/kundoku*, its *kun*-reading (Debergh 1982: 34). The Japanese syllabary has a conventional order (called *iroha* after the names of the first three characters), and the order of the *kanji* characters in this section depends on the order of the syllabic transcription of their *on*-readings. They appear with *coye* to their right and *yomi* to their left. The second part comprises 27 folios. It is a list entitled *Irohajishū*, in which the *kanji* characters and their compounds are arranged in the order of the syllabic transcription of their *kun*-readings, with *yomi* to their right and *koe* to their left. At the end of the *Irohajishū*, a list of hundred professions of Japanese government and administration and their Chinese equivalents (*Hyakkan narabi-ni Tōmyō no taigai*) is included, with an appended list of the Japanese provinces (Debergh 1982: 35). The third part, the *Shōgokuhen*, is dated 1599 and covers 19 folios. It is a list of the *kanji*, arranged in twelve thematic categories, such as astronomy, geography, human beings, etc., which are subdivided in a total of 105 subcategories, such as ‘sun’, ‘moon’, ‘earth’, ‘water’, ‘fire’, etc. Every *kanji* is accompanied by its *coye* and *yomi* written in *kana*. We cannot exclude the possibility that the compilers of the *Rakuyōshū* had been inspired by Chinese dictionaries written by Europeans (Bailey 1960–1961: 323).²⁷

27. These earlier lexicographers include the following. (1) Juan Bautista de Jesús, who was ordained as Dominican in Mexico in 1560, worked as a missionary in the Philippines (Streit 1928, vol. 4: 364), and composed the *Arte de la lengua Mandarin* (date unknown). (2) The Augustinian Martín de Rada (1533–1578), who was member of the expedition of Miguel López de Legazpi (1502–1572) to the Philippines and authored the *Arte y Vocabulario de la lengua China*, 1569.

Japanese phonological terminology is also used by Rodrigues in his descriptions of regional differences, for instance the meta-linguistic term *firogaru*, a technical term which is also recorded in the Japanese-Portuguese dictionary:

Firogari, ru, atta. ‘Alargarse’, l, ‘estêderse’. Permet. *Cuchiga firogaru*, l. *suboru*. ‘Abrirse a boca, ou fecharse na pronunciação dalgũas palavras’ ... (Anonymous 1603–1604: 65r)

[*Firogari, ru, atta.* “To open”, or “to extend”. *Per metaphoram: Cuchiga firogaru*, l. *suboru*. “to open the mouth”, or “to narrow [the mouth] in the pronunciation of some words”.]

Rodrigues: abrindo demasiadamête a boca, dando certo sonsonete alto. (1604–1608: 169v; see also 175v)

[opening the mouth too much, producing certain high harsh sounds.]

Rodrigues gives four technical terms for the different ways of pronouncing: *cai*, *gõ*, *xei* and *dacu*. “The first (*cai*) means *firaqu* (“opened, extended, widened, pronouncing the õ with opening the lips”). The second (*gõ*) means *auasuru*, *suboru*, *subaru*²⁸ (“to join, to be narrowed, to be restricted, that is to say to pronounce the circumflex ô and the long û closing the lips or bringing them together in a rounded shape”). The third (*xei*) means *sumu* or *sumi* (“to be clear or pure, that is to say pronouncing the syllable naturally, without any change or alteration from one to another”). The fourth (*dacu*), means *nigoru* or “to be clouded”, that is to say, “pronouncing the syllable with its change from one into another” (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 175r–v; Moran 1973: 64).

Further, Rodrigues extracts his examples from a great number of other Japanese sources. In most cases he gives the exact references in his *Arte Grande*, whereas he omits them more frequently in his *Arte Breve*. Rodrigues quotes from the following sources: *Rongo*, *Foxxinjũ*, *Feique monogatari*, *Xõzonno Mai*, *Canxõjono vta*, *Xidano Mai*, *Voisagaxino Mai*, *Queõque monogatari*, *Ibuquino Mai*, *Esopo*, *Curamaide no Mai*, *Iitgoqueô*, *Gojõ*, *Satocudari*, *Foccocu vochi*, *Sentença*, *Prouerbio*, *Catechismo*, *Euangelio* (Moran 1972: 56).

(3) Domingo de Nieva (1563–1606), another Dominican missionary in the Phillipines and author of the *Dictionarium Sinicum* (date unknown) (cf. Streit 1928, vol. 4: 364). (4) the Dominican Juan Cobo (?–1592), who preached among the Chinese in the Philippines and who also visited Japan in 1592, before his murder in Taiwan or in its vicinity in 1592 after a meeting with Hideyoshi on behalf of the governor of the Philippines (Borao 2000: 104); he was the author of the *Arte de las letras Chinas, distinguidas in quatro classes: generalísimas, generales, especiales, é individuales*, ca. 1592 (Streit 1928, vol. 4: 472). And finally, we can mention the anonymous works *Vocabulario chino* (c.1592) and the *Lingua Sinica ad certam revocata methodum* (c.1592) which could have been sources circulating at that time in the Far East.

28. Rodrigues seems not to make any distinction between the two concepts of ‘ô suboru’ and ‘ô subaru’.

3.3 The Japanese language as described by Rodrigues

3.3.1 Language variation: Coye and yomi

Rodrigues explains in his long and highly informative prologue to his *Arte Breve* the opposition between *coye* and *yomi*, which was earlier developed in his *Arte Grande* (1604–1608: 186r–v). He distinguishes the following categories:

1. Pure *Yomi* sem mistura de *coye*/natural/natiua, (sua poesia)
[without mixture of *coye*, i.e. ‘natural’, ‘native’, as in their poetry.]
2. Pure *Coye* o qual usam os Bonzos quando rezam
[used by the bonzes when they pray.]
3. Mixed *misturada de Yomi & Coye*
[mixture of *yomi* and *coye*.]

The variety of Japanese as described by Rodrigues belongs mainly to the third type, but often information is given concerning the other styles. The distinction between the literary style (“estilo de escritura”) and the colloquial style (“fallar comum”) is depending on the following criteria:

- the endings of the words (“as terminaçoens das voces”)
- the tenses and moods of verbs (“os tempos & dos modos dos verbos”)
- the variety of particles (“variedade de particulas”).

He explains the difference between *coye* and *yomi* as follows.

3.3.2 Geographical distinctions

Rodrigues not only informs his readers about diglossia in Japan, but also makes references to geographical variation. The information given is not an unbiased representation of the linguistic facts: his descriptions are often marked by judgments about language variation.²⁹ According to Rodrigues, the language of Miyaco (‘the capital’, i.e. Kyoto), also called *Cami*, as spoken by the *cugues*, or nobles, is the

29. This occurs frequently in the Spanish tradition, where we find two different approaches, one which is mainly prescriptive, based on *auctoritas*, and the other which is predominantly based on language usage (*uso común*) (cf. Zwartjes 2000c). Alonso de Molina (c.1514–1585) – to mention one example – informs the learners of Nahuatl in one of his dictionaries (2001 [1571]: ‘prólogo, aviso segundo’) that first the translation is given into the dialect used in Tetzcuco and in the city of Mexico, where the language is at its best “donde mejor y mas curiosamente se habla la lengua”, and in the second place other varieties are given from other provinces. (“y al cabo se pōdran los que se vsan en otras provincias, si algunos ouiere particulares” *ibid.*, E. Hernández 2001: 28).

Table 3.1 Differences between coye and yomi as identified by Rodrigues

Coye	Yomi
– (propriamente a Sinica)	(natural Iapoa)
– voz ou vocablo Sinico.... Sinico pronunciado com algũa alteraçam por causa de pronunciaçam Iapoa (1620: 1r)	interpretaçam & sentido do vocabulo (=Coye na lingoa Iapoa) (<i>ibid.</i>)
– mesma ordem na colocaçam das partes	– ordem contraria
– primeiro lugar as particulas aduersatiuas	– primeiro o verbo
– segundo as negatiuas	– segundo as aduersatiuas
– as que sinificam differença de tempo futuro	– acabando por onde começou o periodo, ou oraçam do Coye
– segue o verbo	
– no cabo os casos do verbo	
[–(Chinese proper)	–(Natural Japanese)
– a Chinese word Chinese pronounced with a certain variation caused by the pronunciation of Japanese	–interpretation and meaning of <i>coye</i> in the Japanese language
– same order of the parts of speech	– opposite order (opposed to Chinese)
	– the verb comes first
– adversative particles in initial position	– adversative particles in the second position
– on the second place the negative particles	
– particles which mark the (difference) of the future tense	
– the ‘cases’ of the verb at the end	– ending the clause or sentence with what is in initial position in <i>coye</i> .]

best.³⁰ However, one has to be cautious, since even the pronunciation of certain syllables by the *cugues* can be incorrect (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 169r–169v). The pronunciation of *Ximo* “and other areas” is not only different, but generally considered “incorrect” (1604–1608: 175r).³¹ *Cami* refers to the Northern territories and includes the *gokinai*, the five home provinces; *Ximo/Shimo* is the name for the

30. “Syntaxis ha a composição certa, & ordenada das partes da oraçam entre si: aquella se deve ter por certa, & ordenada neste lingoa, da qual usaram os autores graves, antigos, & modernos, que na lingoa de Iapão falam, ou escrevem pura, & elegantemente, & o modo corrente de falar aprovado, & recebido em todo Iapão da gente grave, & entendida em suas letras, mayormente a lingoa de Miaco usada dos Cugues, entre os quaes se conserva a pura, & elegante lingoa, & modo de pronunciar de Iapão” (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 83r). The *Vocabulario* translates *cugue* as “Familias dos nobres que serve(m) ao Dairi (1603–1604: 63v) (Dairu = Paços del Rei. As vezes se toma pello memso rei (1603–1604: 70r, cf. Atsuko Tashiro 2004: 210).

31. The vernaculars of Fijen, Figo and Chicugo are labelled as “sonsonete muyto roin”, that of Chicujen-Facata as “grande abuso” and *Ximo* as “algum tanto bayxa”, etc. (See Atsuko Tashiro 2004: 216).

Southern regions, particularly the island of *Kyushu* (Debergh 1982: 28). Rodrigues does not only make the distinction on the level of phonology, but also mentions differences on the level of the lexicon. The Japanese dialects in some kingdoms have different words (“vocabulos”) and particular ways of speaking (“modos de falar proprios de alguns reynos”). Rodrigues gives the Japanese term *Cuni quiōdan* for the use of the regional vocabulary of particular kingdoms (Moran 1973: 65).³²

In other occasions, Rodrigues uses the word “improprio” opposed to “proprio” which demonstrates the prescriptive character of the major part of his observations concerning geographical varieties (cf. the ‘harmful’ pronunciation: “na pronunciaçam com certo sonsonete muyto roim”, 1604–1608: 170r). He even describes the “interlanguage” of learners of Japanese who have a pronunciation which is not free from “barbarisms”, or in his own words, who speak “aportuguesadamente” (1604–1608: 169r).³³

Rodrigues often highlights differences between women’s and men’s speech (“usam as molheres”; “usam os homens falando com molheres” (1604–1608: 169v), as occurs also in the *Vocabulario* (see Debergh 1982: 36).

He is also aware that language variation has to be explained with reference to differences between social classes.

... nesta lingua, da qual vsaraõ os autores graues, antigos, & modernos, q̃ na lingua Iapoa fallaõ, ou escreuẽ pura, & elegantemẽte conforme ao modo corrente & aprouado de fallar recebido em todo Iapam da gente graue, & entendida em suas letras, principalmente a lingua da corte vsada entre os *Cughe*, os quaes conseruam a pura & elegante lingua, & modo natural de pronunciar Iaponico, & nam qual quer modo de fallar, de que alguns dos naturaes vsam impropriamente em diuerfos Reinos, & lugares que tem varios abusos, & modos de fallar improprios, que nesta lingua sam vicio, & barbarismo. (Rodrigues 1620: 59v)

32. For more details, see Atsuko Tashiro’s table (2004: 214–215, Table 3) that gives a detailed analysis of references to regional varieties in the *Arte Grande* of Rodrigues: Chugocu, Bungo, Fijen-Figo-Chicugo, Chicujen-Facata, Ximo, Bijen, Mi(y)aco, Goquinai, Quantô-Bandô. The references are used for different purposes and deal with language variation on different levels, phonetical-phonological, and morphological.

33. According to Rodrigues, the Japanese language has three ‘virtudes, ou propriedades. s. que seja emmendada, clara & ornada’, and three ‘vicios contrarios a estas tres propriedades. s. ser barbara, ou rustica, ou pera os nossos aportuguesada: escura & sem ornamento’ (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 168r). Alonso de Molina also discusses the same phenomenon: “Donde se pone, lo mesmo, o, idem [despues del romance] se ha de entender, que los naturales no tienen otro vocablo proprio en su lengua, sino que vsan del mismo que nosotros tenemos a la letra: y otras vezes de nuestro romance y su lengua forman sus nombres o verbos, variando o mudando algo del romance nuestro y su lengua, o mezclando el vn lenguaje con el otro. Exemplo. *Nino calça-scopina*, que quiere dezir ‘descalçome las calças’ (Molina 2001[1571] ‘prólogo, aviso octavo’).

[... in this language we should regard as certain and correct the usage of weighty authors, ancient and modern, who speak or write pure and elegant Japanese in the way approved and received in all Japan by men of standing familiar with their literature, and especially the language of the Court used by the nobility, among whom the pure and elegant language and the natural way of pronouncing Japanese is maintained; and none of those ways of speaking improperly used by some of the local people in various provinces and parts of Japan, where various abuses and incorrect ways of speaking are found, and in this language these are vicious and barbarous.] (Translation by Moran 1972: 61; cf. also Rodrigues 1604–1608: 168r)

3.3.3 Diachrony: The ‘old language’ and the concept of *auctoritas*

As explained earlier, Rodrigues’s grammars are predominantly prescriptive. He therefore had to engage with the question, familiar in the early modern period, of the sources of linguistic authority. This had already been discussed by sixteenth-century European writers. Cristóbal de Villalón (c.1505–c.1558) balanced “la auctoridad de los sabios” and “la costumbre y uso común” in the title of his *Arte o gramática para saber hablar escribir en la lengua castellana; colegida de la auctoridad de los sabios, conforme a la costumbre y uso común de la lengua no corrompida* (Villalón 1971 [1558]). Sánchez de las Brozas (“El Brocense”, or Sanctius, 1523–c.1600) likewise stated that *auctoritas* in itself is not sufficient, if it is not based on language usage: “Auctoritas vero ab usu sumpsit incrementum: nam si ab usu recedat, auctoritas nulla est” (Sanctius 1587: 7r).³⁴ He added, quoting Seneca, that the grammarians – not the authors – are the ‘custodes’ of language (1587: 7v). In the work of Oliveira we can trace influence from Quintilian. He establishes that language is a gift of God, but every particular language is made by human beings (“os homens fazem a língua a não a lingoa, os homens”; Oliveira 2007 [1536]: 86; Torres & Assunção 2007: 57). So, he continues, the Greek and Latin languages were crude in their primitive state, but human beings make languages perfect (“E é manifesto que as línguas grega e latina primeiro foram grosseiras, e os homens as poseram na perfeição que agora têm”; Oliveira 2007 [1536]: 86–87). Contrary to those who attempt to search for an ‘authority’, others argue that grammatical rules must be based on language use (*costume*), which means that a grammar must be descriptive and not prescriptive (“As regras ou leys que digo são como disse anotações do bô costume” (*idem*: 42) (cf. Santo Thomas 1994 [1560], vol. 2.30).

Like their counterparts in Europe, missionaries were prepared to distinguish good and bad usage. Even European languages without a long written tradition might be compared favourably to Latin, as Basque was by Manuel de Larramendi

34. Sanctius follows Quintilian (Breva-Claramonte 1983: 32).

(1690–1766).³⁵ When the Europeans set foot in Japan, they were able to see Japanese as superior in some respects to Latin and Greek, as we can read in a letter written by Lourenço Mexia (the Japanese language is, in fact, generally labelled as ‘difficult’, but also as ‘copious’ and ‘elegant’).³⁶ It is remarkable that we find almost *verbatim* identical descriptions in other continents as well, as in the writings on Guaraní of the Jesuit Pedro Lozano (1697–1752).³⁷

So, like Latin, the languages encountered by the missionaries could be spoken well or with barbarisms. The words of Juan Gomez Brizeño, the author of the “aprobación” of the Maya grammar of San Buenaventura, exemplify this approach:

... pues con facilidad la podrán aprender à hablar, como para los Oriundos, y Naturales della, pues con este Arte corregiràn los barbarismos, que no se pueden escusar à quien sin Arte la habla (San Buenaventura 1684: Aprobacion del Br. Juan Gomez Brizeño, examinador en lengua Yucatheca).

[... so they will learn it to speak with ease, as for the autochthonous and natural (native speakers of) it, since with this grammar the barbarisms will be corrected, which cannot be an excuse for the one who speaks without grammar.]

It follows that it was not uncommon for missionaries to attempt to establish a linguistic norm, to which they usually gave a special prestige. The best candidate for such a high-prestige register was often called “the old speech”, as in the manners of the *huehuetlahtolli* or “Plática de los Viejos” (“didactic discourse or Orations of the Elders”) (Sullivan 1974: 80; Maxwell 1992), used by the Aztecs in the education in

35. “Véase ahora la limpieza con que el bascuence forma estos tiempos: qué raíces tan seguras! Qué reglas tan ciertas! Qué variedad hermosa de inflexiones! Compárese todo esto con lo que se vé en otras lenguas y hará mas apreciable. [...] Otros que han estudiado mal ó bien la gramática latina, piensan que esa ha de ser la regla de todas las demás gramáticas: de donde nace que piden unas raras puntualidades en bascuence y otras lenguas comparadas precisamente con el latin; y no reparan que pidiéndoseles al trocado, otras cosas que se hallan en el bascuence y demás lenguas no se encuentran en el latin. V.g. tres números tiene el griego; pues búsquelos en latin; tres segundas personas tiene el bascuence; pues búsquelas en latin; dos pretéritos perfectos de indicativo; pues búsquelos en latín, y así de otras innumerables cosas” (Larramendi 1886[1729]: 43).

36. For its difficulty, cf. the opinion of Valignano that it would take at least six years before a newcomer could understand confessions in Japanese, and fifteen years before he could preach even to the Christians (cf. Moran 1993: 180). For its copiousness, cf. “[La lengua japonesa] he a mais grave e copiosa que creo ha, porque em muitas cousas excede a grega e latina” (*Cartas* II: 123v), cited in Alonso Romo (2003: 13).

37. “Es sin controversia de las mas copiosas, y elegantes, que reconoce el orbe, y que con razon puede competir con las que tienen mas fama, quando en sentir de varones peritos en ambos Idiomas, cede en poco al griego, y se aventaja a otros muy aplaudidos, causando admiración, que en tanta barbarie, como era la de la Nacion Guaraní, cupiesse tan admirable artificio...” (Lozano 1970[1755], I: 259; cf. Zwartjes 2007e: 64).

rhetorical training. Training in good speech was an important aspect of Aztec education, as the following citation from the Florentine Codex of Bernardino Sahagún (1499–1590) illustrates: “he who did not speak well, who did not greet people properly, they pricked [them with maguay thorns]” (Sullivan 1974: 83). The linguistic data gathered by the Mexican missionaries were extracted from the high-prestigious eloquence of their informants, who were generally priests, militaries, administrators or wealthy merchants who themselves enjoyed the status of nobles (Sullivan 1974: 85).³⁸

Propriety did not always imply a conservative variety or “old speech”. It might be a normal feature of the usage of a community. So, Augustín de la Magdalena (?–1689), author of a Tagalog grammar, explains in his prologue that the native inhabitants of the Philippines speak ‘with elegance’, although they are not able to give rules for their own language. The same applies to native speakers of Spanish:

Los naturales la hablan con elegancia y propiedad, no pueden dar reglas de ella, como nosotros no podemos dar reglas generales de la Española. (Magdalena 1679: prologo)

[The natives speak it with elegance and propriety; they are not able to give rules of this language, as we are not able to give general rules for the Spanish language.]

Andrés de Olmos (c.1485–1571) made a similar argument. He believed that the study of Latin has to be based on *auctoritas*, i.e. the scriptures of the Classical authors. Learners of Nahuatl, however cannot recur to the “*escrituras de los sabios y antiguos*”, which justifies the reason why Olmos decides to write a grammar:

La orthographia y manera de escriuir y pronunciar suelese tomar de las escrituras de los sabios y antiguos donde las ay; pero en esta lengua que no tenia escritura, falta esta lumbré y ansi en ella hemos de andar adeuinando; pero pondre aqui lo que me parescere acerca de la orthographia y pronunciacion. Y si quadrare podrase poner en uso para que en todos aya conformidad en el escriuir y pronunciar de aquí adelante. (Olmos 1993[1547], vol. 2.173)

[It is used to derive orthography and the manner of writing and pronouncing from the scriptures of the wise and ancient people where they are, but in this language which does not have a script, this light is missing and so we have to wander and guess in this language, but I shall put here what seems to me (appropriate) with respect to orthography and pronunciation. And if it fits well one will put it into practice so that there will be conformity in the way of writing and pronouncing from this moment on.]

Let’s return to Rodrigues. Learners of Japanese had an advantage over learners of Tagalog or Nahuatl: they had classical literary texts available to them, and Rodrigues

38. “...como oy día la hablan los viejos que tienen mas noticia de la lengua” (Reyes 1976[1593]: prólogo, iii).

advised his learners to study these texts. He compared the learning of Japanese with that of Latin:

nenhum he bom, & perfeito latino, se sò aprender por liuros de autores modernos por elegantes que sejam, se o nam beber nas fontes dos autores antigos, a quem era aquella lingoa natural (1620: 5r)

[no Latin is good or perfect if it is learned from modern authors, however good they may be, unless the student drinks also at the springs of the ancient authors to whom that language was native.] (Translation by Moran 1972: 70)

Doi (cited in Moran 1972: 78) argues that Rodrigues shows a tendency to equate elegant speech with the old, and the vulgar with the new, sharing this attitude with the Japanese intellectuals in his time. This is not entirely in agreement with several passages of Rodrigues. Often, he writes, the 'old' style is not the only prestigious language, but the style of modern authors can be prestigious as well.³⁹ In the *Arte grande*, Rodrigues shows his preference for the literary rather than the colloquial style, the classical rather than the contemporary (as Moran 1972: 78–79), but it is evident from the following citation that not only the written style of the ancient authors (*autores antigos*) but also both the written and the spoken language of modern authors can serve as examples for the 'elegant' style, as long as the moderns speak or write in agreement with the rules of syntax of the literary style:

Syntaxis he a cõposiçam certa, & ordenada das partes da oraçam entre si: & aquella se deue ter por certa, & ordenada nesta lingoa, da qual vsaram os autores graues, antigos, & modernos, que na lingoa de Iapão falam, ou escreuem pura, & elegantemente (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 83v)

[Syntax is a certain and an organised composition of the parts of speech between each other, and it is required that one must use syntax which is certain and organised in this language, of which many serious authors, ancient and modern, who speak or write the Japanese language in a pure and elegant style.]

Rodrigues certainly does condemn the colloquial style of the text-books written by non-native Christians (Moran 1972: 79):

Os Iapoës, como també os Chinas [sic], não escreuê suas escrituras, liuros, & cartas como a frase commum, & estillo vulgar cõ q̃ fallam, nê fallaõ cõ o estillo cõ q̃ escreuê. (Rodrigues 1620: 1v)

[The Japanese, like the Chinese, do not write their writings, books and letters in the ordinary language and common style in which they speak, nor do they speak in the style in which they write.] (Translation by Moran 1972: 71)

39. Quintilian and Sanctius both emphasise the *vetustas* ("antiquity") and *consuetudo* ("usage") (Breva-Claramonte 1983: 32).

Here, he refers to China. In fact, we find a different approach in the Dominican tradition. In Francisco Varo's (1627–1687) grammar of Chinese we read that contemporary “vernacular novels” (*siàoxuě*) are the most appropriate texts for the learning of the Chinese language, just as the works of Cicero and Virgil are the most appropriate for the learning of Latin:

Con solas las reglas que da Nebrixa para aprender la latinidad, no se haze uno grande latino; tiene necesidad de Çiçeron y Virgilios sin tener primero las reglas de Nebrixa, no se forman latino. Assi mesmo sepa sy este el Ministro primero en las reglas y advertencias de este breve tratado, y despues entre en los Çiçerones que son en China los libros que llaman Siào xuě. (Varo 2000[1703]: Ia-Ib)

[in studying Latin, one knows all the rules of Nebrixa, that still does not make him a great Latinist. He needs Cicero, Virgil, etc. for that. However, even if he has Ciceros and Virgils, without first mastering the rules of Nebrixa he will not make a Latinist. In the same way the minister should first know the rules and monitions of this brief work, and thereafter he should be exposed to all those [modern-day] Ciceros who in China are in fact the books called *siàoxuě* [“vernacular novels”] (translation by Levi & South Coblin, Varo 2000[1703]: 5–7; cf. South Coblin 2000: 549–550).

Finally, as we have seen, Rodrigues stated that the usage of courtiers provided a norm of purity and elegance for the spoken language. He aimed at teaching the language of the elite, and for the conversion and teaching of Christian faith, knowledge of the principles of Confucian thought and the literary style of the Japanese was indispensable.⁴⁰

3.3.4 Christian terminology: Loans from Latin and Portuguese

The study of Christian terminology in Japanese is not the main scope of this study, since much research has already been done.⁴¹ The basic debate among missionaries seeking to explain Christian concepts to speakers of Japanese can be stated simply. On the one hand, when the first catechism was composed by Anjirō, the translation adopted many Buddhist terms to express Christian concepts.⁴² On the other, Balthazar Gago (1515–1583) argued that Japanese translations caused serious misunderstandings and claimed that a ‘non-translation’ policy was

40. Unlike the Dominicans and the Franciscans, the Jesuits attempted to teach the language of high prestige, in China *guanhua* and in Japan the language of the court whereas Dominicans also described other local languages, as has been recently demonstrated in several studies by Klöter.

41. I particularly refer to Schurhammer (1928: 98) and Higashibaba (2001).

42. Anjirō used in his translation, for instance, *dainichi* (*Mahāvairocana*), *jōdo* (“Pure Land”), *jigoku* (“hell”), *ten'nin* (“heavenly persons”), *tamashii* (“souls”) (Higashibaba 2001: 9).

necessary.⁴³ The question in front of Rodrigues was, therefore, whether to adapt native vocabulary or import words from European languages into Latin.

He observed that the translation of Christian terminology into Japanese can be difficult, since this language lacks the adequate terms, so that new ones have to be ‘invented’.⁴⁴ The best way is to borrow loans from Portuguese, since according to Rodrigues, the pronunciation of the two languages is quite similar, but sometimes, he acknowledges, words must be borrowed from Latin. In both cases, the loans are adapted to Japanese phonology (cf. Section 3.4 below). Rodrigues gives practical rules in his grammar concerning the correct spelling of such neologisms:

Do modo de introduzir algvns vocabulos nossos na
lingoa Iapoa de que carecem & de como se deuem pronunciar.

Porque na lingoa de Iapam faltam algũas palauras pera explicar muytas cousas nouas, que o sagrado Euangelho traz consigo, he necessario ou enuentar de nouo, o que em Iapam he difficil, ou tomalas da nossa lingoa corrompendo a conforme melhor cayr, na pronunciaçam de Iapam ficando como naturais. E porque a lingoa Portuguesa, combina muyto com a Japoa, em muytas syllabas & na pronunciaçam, comũmente della se podẽ tomar os taes nomes, posto que tambem alguns se tomaram da latina. Estes nomes ou sam que pertencem a Deus, aos sanctos, ou às virtudes, & a algũas outras cousas de que carecem. (1604–1608: 179r)

Notase, que posto que os Iapoens pronunciam toda a sua lingoa com syllabas simples, de hũa consoante, & hũa vogal, v.g. ‘Padre’, dizem, *Patere*, ‘Trindade’, dizem *Chirindade*, ‘Natal’, *Nataru*, ‘Ecclesia’, *Yequerejia*, &c. Todauia, quando escreuermos em nossa letra os taes nomes he bom esreuelos a nosso modo, & nam ao seu. (1604–1608: 179v)⁴⁵

[About how to introduce some of our words

which they lack in the Japanese language and how to pronounce them.

Since in the Japanese language some words are lacking it is necessary – in order to explain many novel things which the Holy Bible brings – to invent novel words (in Japanese), which is difficult in that language, or borrow them from our language, adapting them whenever necessary to the pronunciation of the Japanese, as being natural. And since the Portuguese language has many coincidences with the Japanese language in the pronunciation of many syllables, they can borrow such

43. Gago explains: “For example, if we use their term *jūmoji* to explain the cross, since it means the number ten [in Japanese which is written] in the shape of cross, a simple person seems to think cross and the letter are the same”. Consequently, when they read from the text, they had to explain phrase by phrase, or word by word, or even change the words” (cited in Higashibaba 2001: 8–9).

44. Missionaries in China had exactly the same problem (cf. Brockey 2007). Nicholas Trigault (1577–1628) became depressive because his translations were denied, and ultimately he committed suicide (Klöter, personal communication).

45. Cf. Satow (1888: 11).

nouns easily (from Portuguese), since some of them are also taken from Latin. These nouns refer to God, the Saints, the virtues and some other things they lack. ... Notice that the Japanese pronounce their whole language with simple syllables, consisting of a consonant and a vowel, e.g. instead of 'Padre' they say 'Pateré', instead of 'Trindade', they say 'Chirindade', 'Natal', 'Nataru', 'Ecclesia', 'Yequerēja', etc. Nevertheless, it is good to write these words in our way, when we write such words in our letters, and not in theirs.]⁴⁶

3.3.5 On the best way of learning Japanese

Missionary grammarians did not aim at redefining theories of language, but in any linguistic data collection, an explicit or implicit theoretical assumption is always present. Missionary grammars and dictionaries provide insight into the application of ideas about language and these texts clarify the explicit or implicit theories of pedagogy and language instruction of that period. In most missionary grammars, not much is said explicitly about didactics; however, in this respect Rodrigues is extremely informative, although such observations are not unique.⁴⁷

46. The use of loans is part of the translation theory of Rodrigues: "No explicar & traduzir a nossa lingua na Iapoa, pera goardarem a tresladaçam fiel, nam se deue traduzir frase por frase, palaura por palaura, nem vsar na lingua de Iapam de nossas metaforas, por que isto faz a oraçam barbara, & obscura, & o tal modo de explicar he muyto errado, pois cada naçam tẽ varias metaforas, & modos com que explica os conceitos: pello que no traduzir hũa lingua em outra pera que fique clara, & elegante ..." (1604–1608: 171r–171v). Compare also Molina about the bi-directionality of translation practices: "Lo tercero haze dificultad y no pequeña tener nosotros muchas cosas que ellos no conocian, ni alcançauan: y para estas no tenian ni tienen vocablos propios: y por el contrario, las cosas que ellos tenian de q̃ nosotros careciamos, en nuestra lengua, no se pueden bien dar a entender, por vocablos preciosos y particulares: y por esto assi para entender sus vocablos como para declarar los nuestros, sō menester algunas vezes largos circûloquios y rodeos" (Molina 2001[1571]: 'prólogo').

47. One of the few authors who devotes a separate paragraph to didactics is Ludovico Bertonio in the fourth "anotación" of his vocabulary (2006[1612b]: 40–42). Like Rodrigues, Bertonio wrote an *arte breve* and an *arte grande*: in his case, of the Aymara language. His didactical method is comparable to that of Rodrigues. Bertonio has the opinion that the most important aspect of learning Aymara is the desire of the "salvación de los indios". In the second place, it is necessary to study his *arte breve* in order to learn the declensions and conjugations. The next step is the construction of sentences and the catechism "tomando los vocablos y modo de hablar que se van topando y comenzar a hablar algo aunque sea tartamudeando". Furthermore, three steps must be taken: (1) "estudiar con cuidado el *arte grande*", (2) "construir cosas algo más dificultosas como son sermones, ejemplos y otras cosas que hay en esta lengua, traducidas, y compuestas con mucha propiedad de los mismos indios", and (3) "venir a la práctica sujetándose al trabajo de la composición". For a study on the pedagogical theories (implicit or explicit) dealing with Spain see Sánchez Pérez (1992). A comprehensive study on the theories and practices of missionary sources has still to be written.

Rodrigues gives guidelines for learning Japanese in his introduction, and from these it is possible to develop a general theory of language instruction. These guidelines were developed completely independently from the works of Álvares. Rodrigues describes two different ways of learning: the first one is based on continuous contact and conversations with native speakers, and the second on the study of written grammars with the help of teachers, just as if students were studying Greek or Latin. Rodrigues' methodology was possibly inspired by the Jesuits in China, who acquired the Chinese language by the "total immersion in a foreign environment, which led to developing a more natural speaking ability" (Brockey 2007: 254). The method of Rodrigues was mainly aimed at teaching and learning in a classroom setting, but in Macao, the situation was different, according to Brockey (*ibid.*), since the China mission "never received enough recruits to warrant the type of classroom teaching that Rodrigues prescribed". If this is true, the teaching practices might have been different in the two grammars (as explained earlier, the first edition was published in Japan and the second in Macao), but Rodrigues does not seem to have adapted his didactic method to the new situation in Macao.

Rodrigues continuously emphasizes that teachers must be well educated and that they must have a command of the following: *lingoa* [language]; *elegancia & propriedade* [elegance and propriety]; *bom estilo* [good style]; and *modo de pronunciar propria & naturalmente* [natural way of pronouncing]. This last point is vitally important when learning Japanese. Rodrigues observes that:

Pouca lingoa com boa pronunciaçam monta mais, q̃ muita com o pronunciar improprio. (1620: 5v)

[a little of the language with a good pronunciation goes further than a great deal with a bad one.] (Translation Moran 1972: 62)

As Álvares does in his grammar, Rodrigues continuously refers to classical authors. He appends a list of book titles which are considered to be appropriate for improving and practicing reading Japanese. Additional texts, he notes, must be composed by native speakers and never by Europeans. Japanese translations from European languages have to be banned from the teaching programme ("por nenhum modo ham de ser livros nossos transferidos na lingoa Iapoa"), since they do not produce appropriate expressions "frase impropria accomodada aos nossos conceitos").

3.4 Phonology and orthography

As has been stated in the general introduction, this monograph is not a study on historical linguistics. In this section on orthography and phonology we are not aiming at the reconstruction of the phonemic value of every grapheme of Rodrigues' romanisation system, for details of which I refer to the excellent comprehensive

study of Moran (1972). Of course, Rodrigues' romanisation system gives often crucial information concerning the variety of Japanese as it was spoken in the beginning of the 17th century.⁴⁸ Here, only the most important sections of Rodrigues on orthography and phonology will be selected. There are some differences between the romanisation of Japanese in the two grammars and the one used in the *Vocabulario* and other *Kirishitan* works in Roman script (cf. Moran 1972: 57). We shall not deal with these differences and below we shall describe briefly the phonological description of the *Arte breve*.

Rodrigues stresses the importance in language teaching of religious instructions and unambiguous romanisation. As occurs in India, missionaries who came from other nations than Portugal usually develop a romanisation system which is based on Portuguese. Rodrigues is aware that learners of Japanese who were not familiar with Portuguese spelling conventions and pronunciation would have difficulty with passages in which these conventions are used as a guide to the pronunciation of Japanese.⁴⁹ Therefore, he explains to the reader that where possible, he has used spelling conventions based on those of Latin, in the second place Portuguese, and when necessary, Italian and finally Castilian.

E por quanto os nossos Padres & Irmãos Europeos q̃ vem a Iapão, sam de varias naçoens, & cada hũa dellas tem particulares orthographias pera sua lingua, & as vezes a mesma syllaba, que hũa pronuncia de hum modo, fs. liquide, a outra a pronuncia de outro, non liquide, donde vê que quando acham escrita a lingua Iaponica em nossa letra, lem & pronunciam corruptamente as syllabas Iaponicas, como se tem visto por experiencia de muitos annos, teue se particular cuidado nesta vltima ortographia, de euitar estes inconuenientes emmendendo algũas syllabas, em que alguns dos Europeos erram na pronunciar. E por que a latina he comum a todas as naçoens, essa seguimos em geral, & o que falta à latina tomamos, ou do Portugues, que tem muitas syllabas semelhantes às Iapoas, que algũas terras de Europa nam tem, ou do Italiano, ou finalmente do Castelhana. (1620: 6r)

[Our Fathers and Brothers from Europe who come to Japan are from various countries, and each of these countries has its own way of spelling its own language, so that it can sometimes happen that the one syllable, which one country pronounces in this way, e.g. liquid, another country pronounces differently, e.g. not liquid. The result is that when Japanese is written in our letters they read and pronounce the Japanese syllables wrongly, as we have seen in the course of many years of experience. We have been especially careful, then, with this most recently adopted spelling, to avoid these unsatisfactory points, and have altered some

48. For example, Rodrigues gives us information about the palatalisation of initial /s-/ (i.e. [se] ~ [ʃe] transcribed as ⟨sa⟩, ⟨xi⟩, ⟨su⟩, ⟨xe⟩, ⟨so⟩, a phenomenon that still exist in some dialects (Shibatani (1999: 128)..

49. Similar observations are recorded elsewhere, as in British North America: “the missionary’s mother tongue is mirrored by the representation of the respective language” (Nowak 2000: 977).

syllables which are mispronounced by some Europeans. In general we follow Latin, it being common to all countries, and what we cannot take from Latin we take from Portuguese, which has many syllables like the Japanese ones and which some European countries do not have, or from Italian, or finally from Spanish.]

Rodrigues not only compares the sounds of Japanese with Latin, Portuguese, Italian and Castilian, but even refers to Old Spanish:

Nam tem em sua pronunciaçam, *Sa, So, Su*, brando como no Latim, & Portugues, como sam, *Casa, Cesar, Caso, summa*, mas somente, *Ça, Ço, Çu*, como no Portugues, ou Castelhana antigo, *Çapato, Caçar, Moço, Almoço, Doçura ...* (1620: 12r)
[In their pronunciation they have no *Sa, So, Su*, soft as in Latin and Portuguese, in e.g. *Casa, Cesar, Caso, Summa*, but only *Ça, Ço, Cu*, as in Portuguese or old Spanish *Çapato, Caçar, Moço, Almoço, Doçura ...*]. (Translation Moran 1972: 96–97)

Non-native speakers will learn to pronounce Japanese erroneously, if they are not familiar with the correct romanisation as proposed by Rodrigues. For those ‘foreigners’ he gives some extra rules:

E nisto o Portugues tem muita confusam no escreuer; por onde os estrangeiros cometem erros, & se habituam mal no pronunciar estas lingoas, dizendo em lugar de, *Ke, Ki, & Ghe, Ghi, Que, Qui, Gue, Gui*, liquide. (1620: 10v)
[Portuguese are very confused as to how to write this, with the result that foreigners make mistakes and get into bad habits in the pronunciation of this language, saying the liquid sounds *Que, Qui, Gue, Gui* instead of *Ke, Ki*, and *Ghe, Ghi* (= /k^we/ instead of /ke/; /k^wi/ instead of /ki/; /g^we/ instead of /ge/; /g^wi/ instead of /gi/).] (translation Moran 1972: 94)

Rodrigues gives the following letters of the alphabet for the romanisation of Japanese.

Letras do nosso Alfabeto que seruem pera escreuer a lingua Iapoa.

A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, V, X, Y, Z.

As vogaes sam *A, E, I, Y, O, V*

Os ditongos. *Ai, ei, iy, oi, ui, oo, õ, eô, ô, iû, û*

As cinco vltimas, respondem, *oo, ou, uu*

Carece sua pronunciaçam da letra *L*, & tambem de, *R*, dobrado, & os Chinas ao contrario tem, *L*, & nam tem, *R*. (1620: 9v)

[*A B C D E F G H I K M N O P Q R S T V X Y Z*

The vowels are *A E I Y O V*, the diphthongs *Ai, ei, iy, oi, ui, oo, õ, eô, ô, iû, û*, the last five of these being equivalent to *oo, ou, uu*. They lack the latter *L*, and also double *-R*, in their pronunciation, while the Chinese on the contrary have *L* but no *R*.] (Translation Moran 1972: 90)

Table 3.2 “Syllables” in Japanese according to the romanisation of Rodrigues

Ba	Be	Bi	Bo	Bu	Ca	–	–	Co	Cu
Ça	–	–	Ço	Çu	Cha	–	Chi	Cho	Chu
Da	De	–	Do	Du	Fa	Fe	Fi	Fo	Fu
Gha	Ghe	Ghi	Gho	Ghu	Ga	–	–	Go	Gu
Gua	Guai	Guan	Guat	Guõ	Gia	–	Gi	Gio	Giu
Ia	Ie	Ii	Io	Iu	Ka	Ke	Ki	Ko	Ku
Kia	Kiô	Kio	Kiu	Kiũ	Ma	Me	Mi	Mo	Mu
Na	Ne	Ni	No	Nu	Nha	–	–	Nho	Nhu
Pa	Pe	Pi	Po	Pu	Qua	Quai	Quan	Quat	Quõ
Ra	Re	Ri	Ro	Ru	Sa	–	–	So	Su
Ta	Te	–	To	Tçu	Va	–	–	Vo	–
Xa	Xe	Xi	Xo	Xu	Za	–	–	Zo	Zu
Ya	Ye	Yi	Yo	Yu					

He then tabulates all the consonant-vowel combinations which will be encountered: “Syllabas, com que em nossa letra se escreue toda a palaura Iapoa sem ser necessaria outra algũa”.

Rodrigues establishes that there are more coincidences between Japanese and Portuguese, than between Japanese and Spanish. An example, in Portuguese /ɔ/, the long low mid back vowel, and /o/, the long high mid back vowel, are in phonemic contrast when they are stressed. In the Japanese variety of the period and in the region Rodrigues lived, three different mid back vowels are in phonemic contrast: /o/ (short mid back vowel, spelt as ⟨o⟩), /ɔ:/ (long low mid back vowel, spelt as ⟨õ⟩) and /o:/ (long high mid back vowel, spelt as ⟨ô⟩).⁵⁰ He uses Portuguese examples:

As syllabas acabadas nos ditongos, õ, ô, û, se pronuciam como no Portugues [sic], fs, õ, longo, como com dous, oo. Vt. ‘Minha auõ’, ‘capa de dô’, ‘Enxõ’, ‘Põ’, com a boca, & beiços abertos, ô, circumflexo, como com as duas vogaes, o, u, com a boca hum pouco fechada ajuntando os beiços em roda, com no Portugues ‘meu auõ’, ‘Bôca’, ‘Môcho’, ‘Côrho’; û, longo, como com dous, uu, como no Portugues, ‘Crû’, ‘Nû’, ‘Perû’, ‘Mêrû’, etc. (1620: 12r)

[The syllables ending in the diphthongs õ, ô, û, are pronounced as in Portuguese, i.e. long õ as if with two Os, as in ‘Minha avõ’, ‘capa de dô’, ‘Enxõ’, ‘Põ’, with the mouth and the lips open; circumflex ô, as if with the two vowels O and U, with the mouth somewhat closed and the lips rounded, as in the Portuguese ‘meu avõ’,

50. It is unclear just how long, or in what areas, speakers maintained the distinction of long open [ɔ:] versus long close [o:] that the Portuguese of the late 15th century spelled as ⟨õ⟩ versus ⟨ô⟩ (cf. Martin 1987: 44).

‘Bôca,’ ‘Môcho,’ ‘Côrpo’; long û, as if with two Us, as in Portuguese ‘Crû,’ ‘Nû,’ ‘Perû,’ Mèrû.] (translation Moran 1972: 97)

As this citation demonstrates, Rodrigues does not only describe the articulation of sounds, but also comments on suprasegmental phonemes (long ~ short). In his *Arte grande* a more detailed description is given:

Todas as syllabas longas por quanto se compoem se duas breues, ou valem duas, ou porque gastam dous tempos, tem cada hũa dellas dous accentos, s. ou ambos direitos, – –, ou direito & agudo, – /, ou dereito & graue – \, ou graue & agudo \ /, ou agudo & graue, / \, o que tudo mostraremos por exemplos, *Quiô*, i. ‘Liuro’ se pronuncia, *Quiôô* ... (1604–1608: 174r)

[All the long syllables are composed by two short syllables, either because they have the value of two, or because they take up double the amount of time. Either both with the straight – –, or straight and acute, – /, or straight and grave – \, or grave and straight \ /, or acute and grave, / \, which we all shall demonstrate with examples, *Quiô*, i. ‘Book’ is pronounced as *Quiôô* ...]

Here, Rodrigues deals with difficult material. First, the phonemic interpretation of long vowels has been one of the controversial issues in Japanese phonology (see for more details Shibatani 1999: 161–162). Second, in Japanese, tone has phonemic value. For instance, as Shibatani observes:

In the Kyôto dialect, for example, the segmental form *hasi* has three pitch patterns each associated with a distinct meaning: *hasi* with HH is ‘edge’, *hasi* with LH is ‘chopsticks’, and *hasi* with HL is ‘bridge’. In certain dialects not only the level tones H and L, but also a contour tone H-L is observed ... However, the Japanese accental system is characteristically distinct from prototypical tone languages of the Chinese type. In this type of language, it is necessary to specify the tone for each syllable. If a word has two syllables, each syllable needs to have a tone specified for it; there is no way of predicting the tone of each syllable of a word or phrase from something else. This is not the case for Japanese. In the majority of Japanese dialects, given diacritic accent markers and a set of rules, the pitch of each syllable of a phrase can be predicted, thereby making the specification of the pitch for each individual syllable unnecessary (Shibatani 1999: 177).

Rodrigues did not feel the necessity to describe the tones in Japanese, but he clearly saw that the use of diacritics were necessary in order to avoid ambiguities in their romanisations.

Other phonological observations by Rodrigues include the point that /d/ and /g/ were pronounced as [ʰd] and [ʰg], which demonstrates that he perceived the process of pre-nasalisation (cf. Martin 1987: 22). Commenting on the problems presented when European loanwords (including Christian names) are used in Japanese, he noted that in Japanese a word usually ends with a vowel or with the

consonants *-n* and *-f* and that the liquids ⟨l⟩ and ⟨r⟩ are absent, as are such consonant sequences as those in ‘*ipse*’, ‘*tactus*’, and ‘*opto*’. The syllables *Di* and *Ti* do not occur. In all these cases, Japanese phonological rules had to be understood so that a proposed European loanword which would violate them could be adapted (Rodrigues 1604–1608: 179r–v).

The grammar contains several examples of assimilation, or *sandhi*. Only a few are selected here (for others, see Rodrigues 1620, f12r–v):

Quando as syllabas terminadas em, *Di, ei, ij, oi, ui*, & *Ich*i, numeral, se seguem as letras *C, Ch, F, K, Q, S, T, X*, o, *T*, vltimo, & o, *Ich*i, se mudam nas letras, *Cc, Cch, Pp, Ck, Cq, Ss, Tt, Xx*. E assi se deue prouunciar [sic], & escrever [sic]. Vt, *Faccot*, por *Facucot*, *Tecqua* por *Tetqua*, *Fackei*, por *Fachikei*, *Beccacu* por *Betcacu*, & do mesmo modo *Micca, Xucke, Xuxxi*, ... (1620: 11r)

[When the letters *C, Ch, F, K, Q, S, T, X* follow syllables ending in *Di, ei, ij, oi, ui*, and *ichi*, (the numeral), the final *T* and the *ichi* change into the letters *Cc, Cch, Pp, Ck, Cq, Ss, Tt, Xx*, and are to be pronounced and written in this way: *Faccot* for *Facucot*, *Tecqua* for *Tetqua*, *Fackei*, for *Fachikei*, *Beccacu* for *Betcacu*, and in the same way *Micca, Xucke, Xuxxi*, ...] (translation by Moran 1972: 94)

Quando depois da letra, *N*, se seguirem as syllabas *Ya, ye, y, yo, yu*, se deuem pronunciar como, *Nha, nhe, nhi, nho, nhu*, posto que no escreuer pera distinçam da palaura se escreuem, *ya, ye*, & c. Vt., *Sanya*, se pronuncia, *Sannha, Xinnhō, Guennhe fōin, Xennho, Cannhō, Bequennha*. i. *Xinyō, Guenye, Xenyō, Canyō, Bequenya*, &c. (1604–1608: 177v)

[When after the letter *N* the syllables *Ya, ye, y, yo, yu* follow, they must be pronounced as *Nha, nhe, nhi, nho, nhu*, even though their written form is *ya, ye*, etc. For instance, *Sanya* is pronounced as *Sannha*, and *Xinnhō, Guennhe, Xennho, Cannhō*, and *Bequennha* are the spoken forms of *Xinyō, Guenye, Xenyō, Canyō, Bequenya*, etc.]

Japanese pronunciation is according to Rodrigues not difficult, compared to Chinese. Particularly for a Portuguese native speaker, the ‘aspirated’ or ‘guttural’ sounds of some European languages could be difficult to pronounce.⁵¹ The interdental fricatives and consonantal clusters also were considered as difficult

51. See for an illustrative description of the pronunciation of the Germans, Italians, French, Spaniards, etc. in the 16th century the *Alabanças* of Rafael Martín de Viciania (1502–1582): “y assi se ha de entender, que la naturaleza, y propria virtud de la tierra lo tiene por exemplo, que vno de francia habla frances, Latín o Castellano, *todo es de vn tono, y accento*. Y al Vizcayno, Ethioppe, o Alarbe, esso mesmo les queda siempre de su natural donde quiera que vayan, y hablen otra lengua. Los Orientales tienen la pronunciación en la garganta, como los Hebreos, y Syrios. Los pueblos Mediterraneos tienen la pronunciación en el paladar, como los Griegos. Los pueblos Occidentales profieren su boz, y habla en los dientes en que rebate su boz, y assi vemos que si falta diente, o dientes no hablan tan claro, y distincto quanto hablaban quando tenían todos los dientes: y estos son los Españoles, e Ytalianos. Los Alemanes, y otros pueblos Austriales

(as Spanish ‘Zamora,’ or Dutch ‘herfstseer’). Rodrigues knew also that nasalisation could be difficult for some non-Lusophone Europeans. He explains that such sounds are all non-existent in Japanese:

Falando geralmente, o pronunciar desta lingoa, he mui facil, & muito mais que a de Europa, por que nam tem aspiraçoens, nem modos guturaes, nem falla por entre dentes, ou pello nariz, nem o vso das liquidas, *L, R*, nem consoantes intermedias, vt *ipse, spiritus, ens, mors*, &c. mas vsaõ somête de syllabas soltas, & simplices de consoante, & vogal no fim, vt *Ba, be, Bi, Bo, Bu*, & dalgũas, que fenecem em, *T, & N*, vt, *Ban, Ben, Bin, Bon, Bun, Bat, Bet, Bit Bot, But*. (1620: 12v)

[Generally speaking, this language is very easy to pronounce, much more so than those of Europe, in that it has no aspirations, no guttural sounds, nor is it spoken between the teeth, nor through the nose, nor does it use the liquids *L* and *R*, nor intermediate consonants, such as those in *ipse, spiritus, ens, mors*, etc. but it uses only separate syllables made up of one consonant a vowel after it, e.g. *Ba, Be, Bi, Bo, Bu*, and some ending in *T* and *N*, e.g. *Ban, Ben, Bin, Bon, Bun, Bat, Bet, Bit, Bot, But*.] (translation by Moran 1972: 95–96)

3.5 Morphology

3.5.1 Inflection

Shibatani (1990: 215) distinguishes three major lexical categories for Japanese: nouns, verbs and adjectives. Demonstratives and conjunctions are minor categories.

Most scholars agree that Japanese nouns are not inflected, nominal morphology being determined by the affixation of what are sometimes called ‘case particles’. Verbs inflect, although not with respect to person and number (see below), as do auxiliary verbs, including the copula (Shibatani 1999: 221). Adjectives do not inflect with respect to grammatical gender, number or case: in *kirei da* ‘pretty’, the word *kirei* does not inflect by itself, but the copula *da* does inflect.

3.5.1.1 Nominal inflection and ‘cases’

For Rodrigues, Japanese morphology did not need to be described substantially differently from Latin. His grammars are construed according to the traditional ‘declensions’ of the nouns. Rodrigues is aware that there are important differences between Japanese and Latin; the substantive nouns and the pronouns do not ‘inflect’ by cases, as in Latin, but they are ‘undeclinable’; to these nouns certain ‘particles’ or ‘articles’ can be added, which resemble the Latin ‘cases’. He found this

pronuncian sacando la boz del pecho. Los franceses sacan la boz y palabra del pecho, garganta, y paladar” (Viciana 1574: iii verso).

feature so important that he dealt with it in the first folio of his grammar, explaining it just as modern manuals do (cf. Tsujimura 1996: §1.6):

Os nomes substantiuos & pronomes da lingoa Iapoa assi *Coye*, como *Yomi*, não se declinão por casos como os Latinos, mas são indiclinaueys, & tem certas particulas, ou artigos, os quaes pospostos aos nomes responde aos casos Latinos, a mesma voz serue de singular & de plural, ou se supre com outras particulas ... (1604–1608: 1r; cf. 1620: 13r)

[The substantive nouns and pronouns of the Japanese language, in both *Coye* and *Yomi* are not declined by cases, as the Latin nouns, but they are indeclinable and they have certain particles or articles, which correspond to the Latin cases, when affixed to the nouns, the same ‘root’ (or ‘stem’, ‘base’) serves for singular and plural, or is expressed by other particles.]

In casual speech situations, case particles can often be absent (Tsujimura, *ibid.*). Rodrigues gives a clear account of this phenomenon:

O Nominatiuo sem particula he muyto usado, assi na pratica como na escritura.
[The Nominative without the particle is frequently used without any particle, in practice and in writings.] (*ibid.*)

The usage which Tsujimura associates with ‘casual speech situations’ is condemned by Rodrigues, whose grammar is normative. In a paragraph on the ‘vicious’, he comments that it is ‘blameworthy’ to omit such ‘article-like particles’, as is characteristic for the language of the uneducated and the people of the countryside:

Dos vicios que fazem a oraçam barbara, & rustica.

[...]

2. Deixando algũa cousa necessaria como he o *Tenifa*, l. Particulas articulares, *Va*, *ga*, *no*, *ni*, *vo*, *ye*, &c. ou outra cousa semelhante. (1604–1608: 168r–v)

[On the errors that make the sentence barbarian and boorish.

...

2. Omitting an element which is necessary (in elegant speech), as are the *Tenifa*, or the ‘article-like particles’, *va*, *ga*, *no*, *ni*, *vo*, *ye*, or something else which is comparable.]⁵²

In this quotation, we find both *va* (modern Japanese *wa*) and *ga*. These words are respectively a topic marker and a subject marker – and as such, they posed

52. Toyoshima (personal communication, March 2009) informs me that this observation of Rodrigues is misleading. Ellipsis of *ga* or *wa(fa)* as a case/topic marker was quite common in the *elegant* style of the Japanese in Rodrigues’s time. When *ga* or *wa* are not used as case/topic markers, however, they are not always omissible (in modern Japanese, they are never omissible, except in ‘casual speech’).

descriptive problems.⁵³ In the sentence *taroo ga hon o katta*, “Taro bought a book”, *Taro* is followed by the subject-marker *ga*. In the sentence *taroo wa hon o katta*, “As for Taro, he bought a book”, *Taro* is followed by the topic-marker *wa*. We could say that *-wa* serves as advanced notice of what the speaker will talk about. Rodrigues tried to explain the difference between them as follows:

Va, no Nominatiuo, he denotatiuo, ou demonstratiuo, & tem certa energia como quando dizemos (quanto a fôao, etc). (1604–1608: 1r)

[*Va*, in the nominative, is denotative or demonstrative and has certain energy, as when we say ‘as for so-and-so (Fulano)’, etc...]

This shows an intuitive and quite correct understanding of the status of *-wa* as a ‘topic-marker’, a concept which is found in the terms ‘denotatiuo’ and ‘demonstratiuo’. The accompanying translation does not leave us any doubt (“quanto a ...” [“as for...”]). It is obvious that Rodrigues’s definition is innovative since it includes pragmatic concepts (“tem certa energia” and the verbs ‘denotar’ and ‘demonstrar’ mean ‘to demonstrate’, ‘to display’). He gives more details in his chapter on syntax:

Este, *Va*, em geral tem sentido, de connotar, mostrar, aduirtir, particularizar, & especificar as palauras a que se ajunta (1604–1608: 149v).

[This *wa* generally has the meaning of ‘to mean’, ‘to demonstrate’, ‘to notify’, ‘to particularise’, ‘to specify’ the words to which it is attached.]

Although Rodrigues’s analysis is far from complete, it gives the reader a useful and practical translation. His use of the term ‘nominativo’ in his definition – “*Va*, no Nominatiuo, he denotatiuo, ou demonstratiuo” [“*wa* in the nominative is denotative and demonstrative”] – may seem incorrect, since *wa* can also be attached to nouns which syntactically can have the function of the implied object, as in *hon wa taroo ga katta*, “as for the book, Taro bought it”. The definition does, however, make sense if we compare the use of the term ‘nominative’ in other missionary grammars, particularly of other Asian languages which have similar ways of topic-marking. As Winkler has demonstrated in his study of missionary grammars of the languages of the Philippines and the Marianas (2007), the meaning of the term ‘nominative’ was expanding and must not be interpreted literally, since it often includes pragmatic notions. ‘Nominative’ often means not only ‘subject’ of the clause, but also ‘the element which comes first’. Rodrigues probably did not use the term ‘nominative’ in the strict sense of a case-marker, but in a broader – pragmatic

53. In fact, *ga* posed two sets of problems, for although it is a subject marker in modern Japanese, historically it was a genitive particle, and this explains why Rodrigues also classifies it as a genitive ending (1604–1608: 1r). Since *-ga* can be used as object marker as well (cf. Kuno 1994: 55–56), we find it also in Rodrigues’s paradigm as an accusative marker (*ibid.*). For his readers, it could be confusing that several ‘case-endings’ are given for one particular ‘Latin case’.

– sense, although it is still a case marker, since it appears also in the paradigm as nominative marker, together with *-ga*, *-no*, and *-yori*. Rodrigues probably interpreted *-no* as a stylistic variant of *-ga*; cf. Martin (1975: 660): “The surface-subject marker *-ga* is optionally replaced by *-no* when the sentence is adnominalized...”. *Yori* is in literary Japanese the ablative ‘from’, but it is also used for comparisons. *Yori* also appears in a postadnominal position and can even appear after case markers. Since these case markers can also be optionally omitted (*ibid.*), Rodrigues interpreted *yori* as another nominative case marker.

In the context of linguistic historiography, Rodrigues’ description is significant, since it antedates the first descriptions of the topic particle *wa* in Toganoi Michitoshi’s (1725–1785) *Teniha Abikizuna* (1770) and in Fujitani Nariakira’s (1738–1779) *Ayuhishō* (1778). These authors define the particle *wa* in terms of ‘emphasis’ and ‘separation’ (Shibatani 1991: 96). Diego Collado’s (d.1638) definition is different again, and compares interestingly with that of Rodrigues:

Particula, *va*, postponitur quando quasi reduplicatiue, seu specificatiue volumus explicare rem vel personam significatam per tale nomen; siue sit primæ, siue secundæ, vel tertiæ personæ, v.g. *Và tacùxi và mairànu, ego, vel, quod ad me attinet, non ibo.* (Collado 1632a: 6)

[The particle *va* is used when we want to give a sort of emphatic repetition and specific turn to the person or thing that is signified by such a noun, whether it be the first, second, or third person, e.g., *Vatacuxi va mairanu* “I, as far as I am concerned, will not come”.] (translation by Spear 1975: 111, altered)⁵⁴

It is clear that Collado did not follow Rodrigues, since there is no trace of Rodrigues’s terms ‘denotative’ and ‘demostrative’.

3.5.1.2 *Adjective noun* (“*Nome adiectiuo*”)

According to Martin (1975) “Japanese has two lexical categories that do not occur in English and other European languages. One is the category called in traditional Japanese grammar *keiyoo-doosi* ‘adjectival verb’, and the other is called ‘verbal noun’”. Rodrigues devotes several paragraphs to the former part of speech, deviating from the canonical classifications of the Latin parts of speech. He divides the

54. Spear (1975) translates “when we want to give a sort of reduplicative and specific turn” and “I, or those related to me, will not come”, and explains this in a footnote, claiming that the word *reduplicatiue* is “a grammatical meaning of plural singular, e.g. the singular I with the meaning of myself and those around me”. There are two serious problems here. First, there is no reason to interpret the word ‘reduplicative’ as referring to ‘singular and plural’: it means that the pronoun on its own is used for personal deixis, but when *-wa* is attached, it receives the function of a topicalised entity. Second, the translation of *quod ad me attinet* cannot be right: if *quod* is a pronoun, it is singular, and cannot mean “those”.

category of the “nome adiectiuo” into two subclasses: the ‘real undeclinable adjectives’ (“verdadeiros adiectiuos indeclinaveis”) and ‘certain irregular verbs, such as *sum*, *ser*, *estar*’ (“certos verbos anomalos” *sum/ser/estar*). Rodrigues gives the following definition:

Toda via examinada a cousa, se acha serem verdadeyramente verbos, que em seu significado comprehendem juntamente o nome adiectiuo, & hum verbo substantiuo, pellos quaes verbos se explicã muyto bem os adiectiuos Latinos, & da nossa lingoa. ...

E quãto a serem verbos não ha duuida nemhũa pois tem proprias vozes, & tempos, & modos, & rayzes como qual quer outro verbo pessoal. (1604–1608: 61v)

[Having examined the question, we think that they are real verbs, since they include in their meaning both the adjective noun and the substantive verb, which are explained well by the Latin adjectives and those of our language. And as for being considered verbs, there is no doubt that they have their own words, tenses, moods and roots like any other personal verb.]

Rodrigues’s description of the attributive use of adjectives is fairly detailed and correct. In a modern description we find the following: “These adjectives [i.e. = verb-like adjectivals]⁵⁵ directly occur as predicates and as adnominal modifiers just as verbs do. When used attributively, both adjectives and verbs occur in a relative clause which directly precedes the head noun, without the use of a relative pronoun”. So, for instance, *kono rombun-wa naga-i* “this article is long” shows the predicative construction, and *naga-i rombun* “a long article” shows the adnominal one (Wetzer 1992: 233–234). This is exactly what Rodrigues tells us:

As sylabas vltimas [sic], em que se terminam estes verbos adiectiuos no presente do indicatiuo sam seis, ss. *Ai, ei, ij, oi, ui, na, l, naru* ... o verbo com **supposto** & a oraçam he relatiua ... *Tataiyama* “o monte alto, ou ...monte que he alto ...” As vozes destas seis terminaçoens da raiz nunca se ajuntam a nomes substantiuos. (1620: 14r)

...

Carece esta lingoa dos provocabulos⁵⁶ relatiuos, que respondem a *Qui*, *Quæ*, *Quod*, ‘o que’, ‘o qual’, ‘a que’, ‘a qual’, ‘o que’, ‘o qual’, ‘os que’, ‘os quaes’, &c. & quando a oraçam he relatiua, suprem o relatiuo tacitamente no modo de fallar... Geralmente, quando a oraçam he relatiua, o antecede, ou a cousa referida se pospoem immediatamente ao verbo... (1620: 17v, cf. 1604–1608: 2v)

[The final syllables of these adjectival verbs in the present tense of the indicative are six: *Ai, ei, ij, oi, ui*, and *na* or *naru* ... the verb with subject is a relative clause ... *Tataiyama* ‘The high mountain’, or ‘the mountain is high’. The ‘words’ (‘vozes’) of these six endings of the root are never attached to substantive nouns ...

55. Chaudhuri (2010: 528) distinguishes between “true adjectives” and “quasi=adjectives”.

56. The term *provocabulum* is used by Varro (1958[116 B.C.–27 B.C.]: VIII, 45) and was taken over by Álvares.

...

This language lacks the relative ‘provocables’ which correspond with *qui*, *quae*, *quod*, ‘who’, ‘which’ etc., and when the sentence is relative, the relative (pronoun) is omitted silently. Generally, when the sentence is relative, the antecedent or the thing to which (the adjective) refers is placed directly after the verb.]

Every aspect from Wetzer’s modern definition is present in that of Rodrigues, although the meta-language is not identical.

Syntactically, adjectives are indistinguishable from verbs when used attributively (Wetzer 1992: 234). If we interpret the term ‘nome adjetivo’, there is an inconsistency in Rodrigues’s theory. Nouns are according to him undeclinable (“indeclinaveis”), but these ‘nomes adjetivos’ behave like verbs, which are ‘declinable’ according to his theory.⁵⁷ They have a distinct ‘nature’ compared to ‘nouns’. Rodrigues was aware of this inconsistency, since he admits that these adjectives are not in harmony with – and even repugn – the traditional features of the adjective: “repugna à natureza do Nome” (1604–1608: 61v).

The final aspect which deserves mention in this section is the description of the numerical system. In Japanese, there are semantically conditioned variants of numerals, such as *sannin* (“three [of humans]”), *sanba* (“three [of birds]”), *sanbon* (“three [of cylindrical objects]”), *sanmai* (“three [of thin flat objects]”) (cf. Schachter 1985: 38). Rodrigues is aware that this topic deserves attention, and therefore he devotes an entire chapter to it (the third book 1604–1608: 228 ff.).

Table 3.3 The ‘nome adjetivo’. Rodrigues (1620: 17v) and Wetzer (1992: 233–244)

Wetzer	Rodrigues
1. [adjective] used attributively	1. o verbo com supposto
2. in a relative clause	2. a oraçam he relatiua
3. without the use of a relative pronoun	3. supreme o relatiuo tacitamente
4. which directly precedes the head noun,	4. a cousa referida se pospoem immediata- mente ao verbo... (in this example, <i>yama</i> is the “cousa referida” and the “verb” <i>tatai</i> precedes the head <i>yama</i>)

57. There is a striking parallel in David Zeisberger’s (1721–1808) and Peter S. Du Ponceau’s (1760–1844) description of the adjectives in Delaware: “Of adjectives. There are not many of these, because those words, which with us are adjectives, here are verbs, and although they are not inflected through all the persons, yet they have tenses” (Zeisberger & Du Ponceau 1827: 103, cited in Swiggers 2009).

3.5.1.3 Verbal inflection

Verbal morphology occupies a central place in both editions of the Japanese grammar. Rodrigues treats many morphology-related topics in other sections of the grammar, in those devoted to the particles, or in the paragraphs on the adjectives. The analysis is often so detailed, that it will be impossible to comment on each point in it. In the following section, we focus particularly on the concept of ‘inflection’ and the adaption of the Latin model of ‘tenses’ to the Japanese verb. In the next two short sections, we turn to the topics of honorificity and causatives.

Japanese verbs inflect, although not with respect to person and number. Rodrigues was aware of this feature and warned his learners that this could cause some confusion in ‘ordinary speech’:

He muy cômum nesta lingoa nam exprimir as pessoas, pello que às vezes he difficuloso entender de quem se fala, por hũa soo voz dos verbos seruir a ambos os numeros, & a todas as pessoas, mas entendese conforme ao antecedente, & consequente, ou às honras dos verbos... (1604–1608: 86r; cf. 1620: 18r)

[In this language, it is very common not to express the persons and sometimes it is difficult to understand about whom one speaks; because verbs have only one form (‘voz’) which serves for but both numbers (singular and plural) and all the persons, but they are understood from the context which precedes and follows them, or by the honorifics of the verbs.]⁵⁸

Moods and tenses are described as follows:

Os modos dos verbos, que nesta lingoa tem proprias vozes dos tempos, sam o indicatuiu, imperatuiu, coniunctuiu, condicional, & participio præterito, os de mais modos suprem com as vozes destes, ajūtandolhes certas particulas. Cada modo não tê mais q̃ tres tempos com proprias vozes, que sam, preterito, presente, & futuro, que elles sinificam por estes tres vocabulos, *Quaco, ghenzai, mirai*. (1620: 18r–v)

[The moods of the verbs which have in this language distinct [i.e. morphologically marked] forms of tenses are the indicative, imperative, conjunctive, conditional,

58. Alexander de Rhodes (1591–1660) has a similar definition in his grammar of Vietnamese: “Tunchinica certè lingua, de qua nunc agimus, nullas habet coniugationes, tempora nulla aut modos: sed hæc omnia explicantur, vel per aliquarum particularum additionem, vel **ex antecedentibus & consequentibus ita colliguntur**, ut qui perituiam linguæ habent, benè percipient tempus, aut modum, & numerum, qui significatur in oratione prolata, imò sæpè idem ipsum vocabulum habet significationem nominis & verbi, & ex adiunctis facile potest intelligi an eo loco talis vox sit nomen, aut verbum (1651a: f.1). A similar point was made by Christian Mentzel (1622–1701) in his *Sylloge minutiarum lexici latino-sinico-characteristici* of 1685: “Sic [...] *yen* denotat, verbum, vocem, loquelam, loqui, inquam, etc. quae omnia ex **antecedentibus, et non consequentibus** characteribus sunt haurienda” (cited in Klein 2001: 49).

and preterite participle; the other moods are substituted by these forms, joining certain particles. Each mood has not more than three tenses with their own form, which are preterite, present and future, which they signify with these three terms, *Quaco, ghenzai, mirai*.]

Rodrigues analyses the morphological structure of the verb in detail, isolating first what he calls the ‘root’. In his *Arte breve*, he gives the roots in orderly arranged tables, in which certain ‘syllables’ are suffixed to ‘roots’ in order to form ‘words’ (“raíz + hûas syllabas pera formar as palauras”). The elements which are suffixed to the roots are called ‘increments’ (“faz incremento no verbo”), following Álvares’s grammars. His table is as follows.

Elsewhere, he explains that the segmentation of verbal forms has to begin with the ‘roots’:

... nesta lingua certas vozes, das quaes se formão todos os tempos, & modos de todos os verbos das tres conjugações assi affirmatiuas como negatiuas. A estas vozes podemos chamar verbo simples, idest, por conjugar, que por si não significa em quanto tal; ou rayz & fundamento do verbo, o qual he necessario saber pera

Table 3.4 Conjugation of the verb according to Rodrigues (1620: 19v)

Syllabas finaes	Raizes	Formaçam	Presente	Preterit.	Futuro	Imperat.	Negatiuo
Be,	Curabe	Estas oito, pera o presente mudam o, E, e	Curaburu	Curabeta	Curebeô, Ôzu, ô-zuru	Curabeyo, ei, sai	Curabenu l, curabezu
Fe	Fe	Vru: pera om preterito acrecenta se a	Furu	Feta	Feô, ôzu, ôzu	Feyo, fei, Fesai	Fenu, fezu
Ghe	Aghe	raiz a syllaba, ta. Pera futuro, acrecêtao a	Aghuru	Agheta	Agheô êc	Agheyo, êc	Aghenu, êc
Ke	Todoke	raiz, ô, ôzu, l, ôzuru. Pera o imperatiuo,	Todokuru	Todoketa	Todokeô	Todokeyo	Todokenu
Me	Motome	acrecentaô á raiz, Yo; l, i, l, sai. Pera o	Motomu- ru	Motometa	Motomeô	Motome- yo, êc	Motome- nu êc
Ne	Fane	negatiuo presente, á	Fanuru	Faneta	Faneô	Faneyo	Fanenu
Re	Fanare	raiz acrecentam, Fanaruru	Fanaruru	Fanareta	Fanareô	Fanareyo	Fanarenu
Ye	Ataye	Nu, l, zu.	Atayuru	Atayeta	Atayeô	Atayeyo	Atayenu
... êc							

conhecer por onde as rayzes dos verbos das tres conjugações acabem nestas letras vogaes E, I, Y... (1604–1606: 6v)

[... in this language there are certain elements⁵⁹ by which all the tenses and moods of all verbs of the three conjugations, affirmative and negative, are formed. We can call these elements ‘simplex verbs’ (i.e. ready to have affixes joined to them), since they do not signify so much in themselves, or the ‘root’ or ‘fundament’ of the verb, which is necessary to know in order to know in which vowels the roots of the verbs of the three conjugations end, *E, I, Y...*]

Compared to modern analyses of Japanese verbal morphology, there is something missing here. Shibatani (1999: 224) proposes that the verb is made up as follows: [Root + inflectional ending]_{STEM} (+ Auxiliary) | (+ particle), and Rodrigues does not use the concept of ‘stem’ as opposed to ‘root’. He also misses some points about allomorphic sets of tense markers (for more details see Tsujimura 1996: 40–49). However, there is no doubt that his table was very useful from a pedagogical point of view.

The tripartite division of conjugations which he mentions in the passage quoted above is based on the ending of the roots and the formation of the indicative present. The first conjugation includes roots ending in *-e* with a present in *-uru*, the second has roots ending in *-i* with present tense in *-u*, and the third includes verbs as *narai* (‘to learn’) *-narō*. This division is still made in modern grammars.⁶⁰

On several points Rodrigues deviates from the Latin model, notably when he classifies the verbs according to the different conjugations, all of them subdivided in ‘affirmative and negative forms’:

Todos os verbos desta lingua cômodamente se podê reduzir a tres conjugações affirmatiuas, & tres negatiuas, deixando aparte a cõjugação dos verbos neutros adiectiuos, terminados em *ai, ei, ij, oi, uy, na*, & do verbo *Sōrai, sōrō, l. Soro....* (1604–1608: 6v)

[All the verbs in this language are easily ‘reduced’ to three conjugations, affirmative and negative, leaving apart the conjugation of the neuter adjective verbs ending in *ai, ei, ij, oi, uy*, & the verb *Sōrai, sōrō, l. soro ...*]

The fact that in Japanese, negatives are formed with inflectional endings just like, for instance, imperatives evidently did not confuse him.

59. *Voz* has many different meanings in the work of Rodrigues, as in other classical and renaissance sources. It can be used as a synonym for ‘word’ (‘vocabulo’), ‘diction’ (‘dicção’), but often it means ‘the phonological and/or morphological word’ when it appears in a certain form, with certain endings. It is also used for ‘particles’. Since none of these translations fit well, we prefer to use the word ‘element’.

60. In Maës (1975d: 13) the criteria for the three conjugations are discussed in more detail.

3.5.1.4 *Honorificity*

When describing Japanese, Rodrigues was aware of the importance of the use of honorifics. He introduces an innovating meta-language, such as “particula honorativa”; “particula humiliativa (161r), “verbos honrados”, “grao de honra” (162r) which all are expansions of Latin terminology. Not only does he explain the honorific forms which result from adding suffixes to the noun (or ‘particulas’) when a respected person is addressed, but he also treats the “verbos honrados” in detail. He describes them as follows:

De algvns verbos honrados de sua natureza sem particular, & de outros humildes.

Tem esta lingoa alguns verbos que de sua natureza encluem em si certo grao de honra sem particula honoratiua, os quais seruem soamente pera segundas, & terceiras pessoas honradas. Outros verbos ha que tem certo grao de cortesia, & humildade dos quais usam inferiores respeito de superiores... (1604–1608: 164v)

[On some honorific verbs and their nature without particle and other humble verbs. This language has some verbs which include in them from nature a certain degree of honour without an honorific particle, which serve only for the second and third degree of respectable individuals. There are other verbs which have a certain degree of politeness and humility which use inferiors addressing their superiors.]

Honorificity also plays a prominent role in the third book of the first edition of the grammar, where Rodrigues discusses topics such as the different writing styles (such as *naiden*, *gueden*), forms of address among women, forms to be used by inferiors to superiors, and how to address ecclesiastical ministers.

3.5.1.5 *Causatives*

In modern grammars, there is no consensus about the exact status of the form *-sase*, which is used to show causativity. Some scholars label it as an affix and others as a full verb or a free morpheme (cf. Shibatani 1990: 307). It was certainly observed by Rodrigues. We have discussed the treatment of causatives (*facere facere*) in the Tamil grammar of Henriques, in our chapter on the Indian subcontinent (see Section 2.2.3.5). Rodrigues likewise describes the formation of what he calls the ‘factive-active verb’:

Verbo actiuo factiuo he aquelle, que significa ‘fazer que se faça, ou execute algũa cousa, ou deixala fazer’, & desi não se faz passiuo, & forma-se do actiuo corrente acrescentado à rayz dos da primeyra Conjugação a particula, *Saxe*, aos da segunda tirando o *Nu*, do negatiuo, a particula, *Xe*, & na voz negatiua não deixar atal acção. vt, *aguesaxe*, *Yomaxe*, *Narauaxe*, *Yorocobaxe*, *Aguesaxenu*, *Yomaxenu*, *Narauaxenu*. (1604–1608: 68v)

[The active-factive verb is that which signifies ‘to cause someone to do or to realise something, or let him do it’ and thus, no passive is made and it is formed on the

current active form, augmenting the particle *saxe* to the root of the first conjugation, and *xe* to the second, suppressing the *nu* of the negative; in the negative voice such an action has not to be done. Examples: *aguesaxe*, *Yomaxe*, *Narauaxe*, *Yorocobaxe*, *Aguesaxenu*, *Yomaxenu*, *Narauaxenu*.]

Todo Verbo factiuo que procede dos Verbos actiuos, composto das particulas, *Saxe*, & *Xe*, por fazer fazer, quer accusatiuo, *Vo*, da cousa que se faz, & datiuo, *Ni*, da pessoa a quem se faz fazer a cousa, vt, *Ano fitoni fumiuo cacaxeta*. *Varambedomono monono fonuo yomaxeta*. (1604–1608: 99r)

[Every factive verb compounded by the particles *saxe* and *xe*, which is derived from the active verbs, meaning ‘to cause to make’, requires the accusative *vo* for the thing which is made, and the dative *ni* for the person for whom the thing is caused to make, as in *Ano fitoni fumiuo cacaxeta*. *Varambedomono monono fonuo yomaxeta*.]⁶¹

3.6 Syntax: Word order and agreement

3.6.1 Japanese as an SOV language

Rodrigues reports that Japanese has a ‘reverse word order’ compared to the European languages he came into contact with.

Na arte grande, que compus da lingoa Iapoa, que anda empresa, fui algum tanto extenso na declaração de muitas cousas assi pera melhor se entenderem as principaes difficuldades desta lingoa, por ser seu uso muy vario, & a collocação das partes da oração contraria a das nossas linguas de Europa (1620: ‘Ao leitor’, no numbered pages)

[In the large grammar of the Japanese language, which I wrote and which was printed, I set out at length many things, in order to make more readily intelligible the main difficulties of this language, which is very complex in its usage, with the order of the parts of speech the reverse of that of our European tongues ... (Translation by Moran 1972: 48)

Like many other agglutinative languages, Japanese is a SOV language where transitive sentences normally follow the order S(ubject)-O(bject)-V(erb). Constructions such as OSV are not ungrammatical, while VSO is unacceptable: it is a strict constraint that the verb appears in the final position. It follows that Japanese is postpositional and left-branching, that the verb phrase deletion works backward and that the interrogatives do not have to move to the sentence initial position (Kuno 1994: 4).

61. Cf. *Arte breve*: “todo o verbo actiuo factiuo, por fazer fazer, que procede dos verbos actiuos, quer Accusatiuo da cousa, que se faz, & Datiuo, *Ni*, da pessoa a quem se faz fazer a cousa, vt, *Fitoni kiōuo cakasuru*, *fitoni zaifouo motomesasuru*” (1620: 64r).

According to Rodrigues, word order in Japanese is twofold, depending on the ‘style’. *Coye* is the style which follows the strict ‘Chinese’ order (‘que propriamente he a Sinica, donde vieram as letras, he direita a nosso modo, 1620: 60r), opposed to *Yomi*, which is ‘natural’ for Japanese (que he a propria, & natural de Iapam, tem contraria ordem no fallar, *ibid.*). In *Coye* syntax, the particles are placed in initial position, whereas in *Yomi* syntax, the ‘suposto do verbo’ (the subject of the verb), also often called the ‘nominative’, is in the initial position, which is considered ‘natural’ for Japanese:

A ordem da collocação da lingua, *Yomi*, & *Coye*, he contraria ... poem no primeiro lugar as particulas aduersatiuas quando as ha; no segundo, as negatiuas, & as possessas [sic], as que sinificam differença de tempo futuro; depois seguese o verbo, & no cabo os casos de tal verbo. Mas a lingua *Yomi*, segue totalmente a ordem contraria a esta pondo no primeiro lugar o suposto do verbo, & logo os casos, que o verbo rege; no terceiro lugar o verbo, depois as particulas temporarias, a pos estas, as negativas, se as ha, & finalmene as aduersatiuas acabando por onde começou o periodo, ou oraçam do, *Coye*. (1620: 60r-v)

[The word orders of the *Yomi* and *Coye* languages are contrary: [In *Coye*] they put the adversative particles – if present – in the first place, in the second place come the negatives and the possessives, which mark difference in the future tense, and after these follows the verb, and at the end of the verb, the ‘cases’ of that verb. But: In the *Yomi* language, they follow an order which is totally contrary to *Coye* syntax, putting the subject of the verb in initial position, then the cases which are governed by the verb; in the third position the verb, and then the tense markers, and after them, the negative [markers], if present, and finally, the adversative [markers], closing the sentence with the element by which the *Coye* sentence began.]⁶²

Word order was not studied seriously in the Latin grammatical tradition, neither in the classical, medieval, or renaissance grammars in Europe nor in the New World. Deviant word order was a stylistic phenomenon, which was analysed in the *elocutio* which belongs to the discipline of rhetoric and not grammar. In the Portuguese tradition this is illustrated best in the following citation from Amaro de Roboredo (d. c. 1653):

Põi o Rhetorico no primeiro lugar o caso regido; no Segundo, o Nominativo; no terceiro o Verbo, E se o caso regido for negativo, o collôca no fim. Exemplo.

Grammatico. Virtus occupavit animam

Rhetorico Animam Virtus occupavit.

62. Francisco Varo uses the term “persona que haze” as ‘agent’ which is situated in the initial position, whereafter the verb follows, and finally the “accusativo de persona que padeçe”. Nevertheless, in Chinese, according to Varo, the SVO-order is one possible order of the two alternatives, although another order is much less common. (Varo 2000[1703]: ff.68–69; Breitenbach 2004a: 110–111; 2004b: 166–167).

[The rhetorician puts the governed case in the first position, in the second the nominative, and in the third position comes the verb. And when the governed case is a negative, he puts it at the end. Example:

Grammarian Virtus occupavit animam

Rhetorician Animam Virtus occupavit.] (Roboredo 2007[1619]: f.203).

Rodrigues' investigations of word order were therefore innovative by the standards of the grammatical traditions of Europe.

3.6.2 Japanese as a left-branching language

As we have just remarked, Japanese is a left-branching language: genitives, adjectives, and relative clauses precede the head nouns (Kuno 1994: 6).

Rodrigues describes these features in his chapter on syntax ("Sintaxi breve com alguns preceitos geraes pera comecar a compor"). Rodrigues explains that the possessed comes to the left of the head, the possessor:

Quando na oração ouuer dous nomes substantiuos pertencentes a diuersas cousas, hum delles ha de estar em Genitiuo, com a particula. *No*, *l*, *Ga*, *o qual sempre precede ao outro nome*. (1604–1608: 93v, emphasis is mine)

[If there are two substantives in the clause belonging to different things, one of them has to be in the genitive with the particle *no*, or *ga* which always precedes the other noun.]

Adjectives which are complements of the head noun are also to be put on the left:

Todo o adiectiuo terminado em *No*, *se antepoem aos substantiuos* ficando no mesmo numero & caso de seu substantiuo ... (1604–1608: 87r, with my emphasis added)

[All adjectives which end in *No* are placed before the nouns being in the same number and case as the substantive....]

Other complements of the verbal phrase, such as adverbial subordinate phrases, are also placed on the left, preceding the main clause:

A ordem, & precedencia das orações nesta lingua he determinada, & certa. As orações do conjunctiuo, condicional, potencial, permissiuo, & do modo infinito, & dos gerundios sempre precedem as orações do modo indicatiuo, & imperativo, & optatiuo. (1620: 61r)

[In this language, the order and precedence of the clauses are fixed and certain. The subjunctive, conditional, potential, permissive clauses, clauses with the infinite mood and the gerunds always precede the clauses with indicative, imperative and optative mood.]

In most grammars of this period, we see that in the chapter on syntax, two topics are discussed: agreement (or 'governance') and word order. In Rodrigues' grammars

much attention is given to word-order, and there is hardly any need for explaining the three traditional classes of concord – subject-verb, adjective-noun, and relative-antecedent – which were more relevant topics for those languages where verbs are inflected according to number and person, and where nouns inflect for case, gender and number. Other Jesuit grammarians even concluded that languages in which this kind of concord is unimportant do not have any ‘syntax’: this was the opinion of Antonio del Rincón (1556–1601) and Horacio Carochi (1579–1662) in their grammars of Nahuatl). What they really meant is that if there are no cases, there is no inflection, and if there is no inflection, there is no agreement or ‘concord’, and finally, if there is no agreement, there is no ‘syntax’. Others, like Augustín de Vetancourt (1620–1700) (Smith-Stark 2000), did not agree with this view. As we have seen in this section, Rodrigues was well aware that a language whose syntax is very different from that of Latin is nevertheless by no means a language without syntax.

3.7 Rodrigues as an historian and ethnographer

One of the most noteworthy aspects of Rodrigues’ grammars is the ‘extra-grammatical’ material included. It is obvious that he did not follow any western models as he compiled it. The final sections of both grammars describe a wide range of topics related to Japanese culture, such as poetry, history, money tables, ranks of Buddhist monks, letter-writing, rhetoric and stylistics. Even a list of Emperors is included, together with a table of Biblical figures, such as Adam, Enoch and Abraham (Cooper 2001: xxi).⁶³ Material of this sort was never treated so comprehensively by any other missionary-linguist of this period. Some other missionary grammarians wrote historical works and many wrote letters which have historical importance, but they usually do not include so much detailed information in their grammars. For instance, if we compare the Japanese grammars with the grammars of Henriques or Stephens (2.2 and 2.3 above), we see that in the Indian grammars there is not much information dealing with history and culture of the inhabitants of the Indian continent.

3.8 Conclusion

No scholar would deny that Rodrigues’s data and those collected in the monumental dictionaries are of great importance for the history of Japanese. It is also true that his grammars are among the best ever written in this period, not only in terms

63. Compare the observation of Debergh (1982: 40): “Cette grammaire dépasse son seul aspect traditionnel, elle est comme une encyclopédie”.

of quantity, but also of quality. Rodrigues can be classified among the five best Jesuit grammarians from the colonial period, the four others being Joseph de Anchieta (see Section 4.2.1 below) and three Spanish-speaking grammarians: Ludovico Bertonio (1552–1625; Aymara), Diego González Holguín (1552–1618; Quechua), and Horacio Carochi, whose work on Nahuatl has just been mentioned.

Some modern scholars criticize Rodrigues for having followed the Latin model too strictly, although there is an excuse, as has been posited by Cooper (2001):

Rodrigues was a busy man and may well not have had the time and experience to compose an entirely original work ... it would, of course, have been far more useful to have produced a textbook based not on Latin principles but on Japanese as an entirely different language, requiring an entirely different approach to its study.

It is true that the first book and the first chapters of the second book of the *Arte Grande* follow more or less the Latin grammar of Álvares (1594), but the rest of the grammar is much more the product of his own creativity. As we have demonstrated, it is evident that he at least tried to fit the linguistic data in his Latin framework, but it has to be repeated that one of the main contributions of Rodrigues to the development of the language sciences is that he used this framework in a creative way, expanding the traditional parts-of-speech system from eight to ten, opening new possibilities in order to describe what he called ‘artigos’ and ‘partículas articulares’. Although we find the term *pronomina articularia* in Priscian,⁶⁴ the term ‘partícula articular’ is new. It is also significant that he tried to understand the local grammatical theory; when explaining the tripartite classification of the parts of speech, he distinguished between *teniwoha*, *na*, and *kotoba*, and when exhibiting the ‘tenses’ of the verb he also used Japanese terminology (*quaco*, *ghenzai* and *mirai*), as he likewise used phonological technical terms (*firaqu*, *subaru*, *sumu* or *sumi*, and *nigoru*).

Rodrigues made an in-depth study of the social relations between different speakers and the use of honorific forms, and he described the language of children, women, etc. Some data could have been derived from previous sources, such as the *Vocabulario*, but Rodrigues’s works are the first extant grammars where these sociolinguistic topics are described. Compared with his colleagues Thomas Stephens and Henrique Henriques, this aspect of his work is not insignificant. Stephens and Henriques could have benefited from the local Indian grammatical tradition, but they did not. Unlike other grammars of languages which also had a long literary tradition, such as the Arabic and Indian traditions, Rodrigues cites original works of Classical Japanese literature, breaking any connection with Europe (apart from

64. “Cum apud Graecos quoque isdem vocibus et in articulis et in pronominebus solent uti, ὄς, ῥῖ, ὄ, ex quibus apud nos *hic*, *aec*, *hoc* nascuntur pronomina articularia” (Ed. Keil Lib. XII: 581–582).

the *Fables of Aesop* which have inspired other western grammarians in Europe). In this respect, Rodrigues cannot be criticised too severely – in my opinion – for having made a grammatical description which was ‘blocked’ by an ‘exogenous’ framework which was not developed exclusively for Japanese. The presence of this traditional framework can be traced in almost every section of the grammars, particularly in the chapters dedicated to verbal morphology, but Rodrigues composed an entirely new and original work compared with the standards of his own time. The supposed adherence to Latin categories is a simplification of the facts.

As Maës (1975d: 12) observed, “Il ne saurait davantage être question de parler des erreurs – c’est-à-dire des jugements de grammaticalité erronés – qu’a pu commettre cet érudit (Rodrigues) dans l’ensemble admirablement bien informé, et dont l’œuvre consitue un témoignage de premier ordre sur la situation linguistique au Japon à la fin du XVI^e et au début du XVII^e siècle”.

Missionary linguistics in Brazil

In this chapter four grammars will be analysed. Three are of Tupi language varieties: two of Tupinambá, by Joseph de Anchieta (1534–1597) and Luis de Figueira (1575–1643), and one of the ‘língua geral Amazônica’, preserved in an anonymous unpublished manuscript at Coimbra. The fourth is of Kipeá-Kiriri, by Luis Vincêncio Mamiani (1652–1730). Additional information concerning phonology is taken from the prologues of two catechisms, one written in Tupinambá (Araújo 1618) and one in Kipeá-Kiriri (Mamiani 1698).

4.1 Introduction: Missionaries in Spanish and Portuguese America

The so-called spiritual conquest of the Americas already began during the second expedition of Columbus. In Spanish America, the Franciscans started their mission in the Antilles; the Dominicans settled themselves in the New World in 1508; the Augustinians began their activities in 1531; and in 1568 the Jesuits began work in Peru. The first chair in an Amerindian language was founded in the Cathedral of Lima (1551) and later at the University of Mexico (1580).

In Portuguese America the Franciscans were also the pioneers. However, apart from the isolated cases of the Franciscan André Thévet (1512–1590), the author of the work *Les singularitez de la France antartique* (1558) and *Le Brésil et les Brésiliens*, published in his *La cosmographie universelle* (1575), and the French Calvinist Jean de Léry (1534–1611), who included a bilingual Tupinambá-French dialogue (Dietrich 2000a: 961) in his work *Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Brésil* (Léry 1972[1578]), accompanied by some grammatical and linguistic observations, there is no doubt that the Jesuits are the most important for the study of the indigenous languages in Brazil. The missionaries of the Society of Jesus reached Brazil in 1549, in company with the first governor-general of the country. The Brazilian Jesuit Province was created in 1553 and in 1727 the Province of Maranhão followed (Assunção 2004: 151). In contrast to the situation in most Spanish territories, until the 18th century there were no serious ecclesiastical rivals who could challenge the Jesuit enterprise in Brazil. Although the Benedictines settled in Brazil in 1581, the Franciscans and Shod Carmelites in 1584 and the Discalced Carmelites in 1665, it

was mainly Jesuits who were pre-eminent in educational, evangelical and cultural activities (Alden 1996: 75).

Some of the Brazilian territories of today belonged in the colonial period to the Spanish missions. The Jesuit centres were concentrated along the banks of the Paraná river. Father Manoel de Nóbrega (1517–1570) founded the Jesuit College of Piratininga – today São Paulo – on January 25th, 1554, and soon after, Jesuits founded others in regions which belong today to Uruguay, the Argentine province of Misiones, and various states of Brazil (Leite 1965: 42).

The total number of languages described in grammars in Portuguese America is not as impressive as that we find in the Spanish New World. As far as Portuguese America is concerned, only the descriptions of three different languages have survived, two Amerindian languages (Tupi and Kipeá-Kiriri) and one African (Kimbundu, a Bantu language of Angola, which will be analysed in the next chapter) spoken by imported slaves. Tupi belongs to the family of Tupi-Guarani languages, which were (and still are) spoken from the north of Argentina to French Guyana, and from the Western tributaries of the Orinoco to (formerly) the east coast of Brazil (Queixalós 2006: 252).¹ We must emphasize that there is a significant difference between Portuguese and Spanish America; the Portuguese Crown had no great interest at all in the Brazilian colonies in this early period. There was no local press in Brazil during the first centuries, just as was the case for the Jesuits working in French Canada.² The Portuguese were far more interested in Japan and India, and as we have seen, in those countries, missionaries had the means of printing their works locally.

4.1.1 Missionaries and *lenguas generales*/l^ínguas gerais

The first Spanish missionaries composed grammars of languages which they usually called '*lenguas generales*', which is an equivalent of the Greek term *koinè*. The term appears in the title of Domingo de Santo Tomás' (1499–1570) *Grammatica o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Peru* (1560), and as has

1. According to the classification by Queixalós (2006: 252) the Tupi-Guarani family can be divided into eight subgroups: some of these are Tupi, São Paulo Língua Geral, Tupinamba, and Amazonia Língua Geral. Old Guarani, Kaiwa, Nandeva, Paraguayan Guarani, Mbya, Xeta, Tapiete, Chiriguano, Izoceño and Guayaki are gathered as another subgroup, different from Tupi. The Tupi varieties as described by Anchieta and Figueira are extinct.

2. For starting a local press, a royal licence was required (see Leite 1965: 111). As E. Gray (1999: 33) observes: "The absence of a printing press in New France inhibited missionary activity in the most dramatic fashion; without printing facilities, works as Gabriel Sagard's *Dictionnaire de la langue huronne* (1632) or the many treatments of Native American speech in Jesuit *relations* had to be published in France and rarely circulated in America".

been observed by Cerrón-Palomino (1994: ix-x) José de Acosta (1539–1600) used the term ‘*lengua general*’ as synonym for *lingua franca* (“de uso universal en todas partes”). A comparable status was given to other Amerindian languages, such as Nahuatl or Aymara. So, the language described in an early account of Aymara was the variety which had the highest degree of intelligibility among ‘almost all’ Aymara speaking tribes (“vocablos generales entendidos de quasi todos los Aymaraes”, as cited in Cerrón-Palomino (2000: 76–77).

The Portuguese missionaries had a comparable objective. In order to reach as many Indians as possible, they chose a *koinè*³ or ‘common’ language variant which was super-tribal. In the 16th century the Jesuit Joseph de Anchieta entitled his grammar *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais usada na costa do Brasil* and from the 17th century the term ‘*língua geral*’ (or ‘*língua brasílica*’, cf. Gimenes 1999: 172–174) began to be used for denoting such a *koinè* in Brazil. The meaning of the terms ‘*língua geral*’ and ‘*lengua general*’ is controversial, since there are important differences between Spanish and Portuguese America; and even within Portuguese America, there is no consensus. One difference between the two Americas is that in the Spanish territories the Inca and Aztec empires each had a *lingua franca* (Quechua and Nahuatl respectively). Although the different languages and dialects from the Tupi-Guarani family can be found over a huge geographical area (see for instance Ayrosa 1967: 38–41), there was no large-scale political unity of the sort which might be expected to stimulate any form of linguistic convergence. So, did a certain ‘general language’ already exist as a *lingua franca* of the region before the Europeans arrived, or was such a ‘general language’ the product of European missionary activities? According to Câmara (1979: 105) the ‘*língua geral*’ was not a natural language at all: he labels it as “Jesuit Tupi, sensibly distanced from the natural Tupi languages” (“tupi jesuítico sensivelmente distanciado das línguas tupi naturais”).⁴ It is nowadays generally accepted that ‘*língua geral*’ was “a native language which, adopted by the several peoples who inhabited the colonies, ended up serving as a super-regional (and super-tribal) mode of communication and consequently became an important instrument in European colonization and Catholic evangelizing” (Altman 1999a: 152–154; 1999b: 74–75).

Rodrigues distinguishes three classes of ‘*línguas gerais*’. The first was the ‘*Língua Geral do Sul*’, ‘tupi austral’ or ‘*língua Geral Paulista*’ (São Paulo general

3. It is remarkable that one early writer called this general language ‘grego’. It is not impossible that he meant the Greek *koinè* (quoted from Gimenes 1999: 174). Gimenes gives an informative and useful survey of other terms used in this early period: ‘a *língua principal*’, ‘a *língua dos [índios] do mar*’, ‘a *língua*’, ‘a *língua da terra*’, ‘a *língua brasílica*’, ‘a *língua do Brasil*’, ‘a *língua dos índios*’ (ibid).

4. Compare the awareness in Japan that non-native Jesuit translators wrote in a distorted form of the language, mentioned at Section 3.2.3.2 above.

language, Tupi or Tupiniquim)⁵ which originated from the Tupis of São Vicente whose capital shifted early on from São Vicente to São Paulo dos Campos de Piratininga. This was the language of the ‘bandeirantes’, closely related to Guarani. The second was the ‘Língua Geral’ which originated from Tupinambá, spoken in Rio de Janeiro, Bahía and Espírito Santo. This was the ‘language of the coast’ (‘a língua mais usada na costa’). The third was the ‘Língua Geral Amazônica’ which originated from the Tupinambá of the north, also called ‘nhêngatú’ (=‘the good language’), which still has native speakers today (Rodrigues 2002: 102–103), not only in Brazil but also in Colombia and Venezuela. The use of the ‘língua geral amazônica’, decreasing in the Spanish-speaking nations, is more persistent in the Brazilian territories (Mosonyi 1997: 603).⁶

4.1.2 Missionary linguistics in Portuguese America

The first of the works discussed in this chapter, the grammar of Anchieta, was finished in 1560 or some years earlier, and circulated as a manuscript (Rodrigues 1997a: 373).⁷ So, missionary linguistics in Portuguese America began shortly after its counterpart in Spanish America: the first grammar of Nahuatl had been completed in 1547 by Andrés de Olmos (1491–1571); the first grammar of Tarascan had been published by Maturino Gilberti (1498–1585) in 1558; the first extant Quechua grammar was published in 1560 in Valladolid by Domingo de Santo Tomás (1499–1567/70). Grammars of other South American indigenous languages followed, such as Guarani (Alonso de Aragona, c. 1629, Antonio Ruiz de Montoya, 1640, and Blas Pretovio/Pablo Restivo, 1696); Chibcha (Bernardo de Lugo, 1619); Mapuche or Mapudungun (Luis de Valdivia, 1607); and Yunga/Mochica (Fernando de la Carrera, 1644).

5. For more details on the ethnonyms ‘Tupi’, ‘Tupinakim’, ‘Tupinikim’, see Prezia (2000: 162–169).

6. For more detailed information concerning the Hispanic ‘lenguas generales’ and the Brazilian ‘línguas gerais’, see also Altman (2003: 66–68), Borges (2001), Cruz (2005: 37–52), Dietrich (2000a: 960–961), Drummond (1990: 8), Freire (2003, 2004), Gimenes (1999: 114; 172–177), Navarro (1997: 660), Oesterreicher & Schmidt-Riese (1999: 65; 78), Rodrigues (2002[1994]: 101–102), Schlieben-Lange (1999b: 47–54), Schmidt-Riese (1998) and Zwartjes (2007d: 58–59).

7. According to Navarro (1997: 660), the grammar had been completed between 1552 and 1555. According to Pero Rodrigues, his biographer, the manuscript was completed in six months and the final printed version is the result of more than thirty years of study, and co-operation with others: “Não somente chegou a entendê-la e falá-la com perfeição, mas também a compor a Arte dela. Em espaço brevíssimo de seis meses, segundo daí a muitos anos ele mesmo disse a um padre. Esta arte, pelo tempo em diante, sendo por ele e por outros padres línguas examinada e aperfeiçoada, se imprimiu em Portugal e é o instrumento principal de que se ajudam os nosso padres e irmãos” (Rodrigues, 1605, cited in A. Cardoso 1990: 142–143).

There were always close contacts between the Jesuit missions and we cannot exclude the possibility that missionaries made use of each other's grammars and dictionaries. Nevertheless, the sources written in Spanish fall beyond the scope of this book. The work of Ruiz de Montoya will be mentioned below, but only for the light it sheds on that of Anchieta. José de Anchieta himself was born in Spanish territory (the Canary Islands), but his grammar will be considered as part of the Portuguese tradition, since he wrote it in Portuguese, just as the grammar of Konkani of Thomas Stephens was in Section 2.3 above.

It is documented that Leonardo do Vale (1538–1591) wrote the first, or one of the first, catechisms in Tupi, entitled *Doutrina na Língua do Brasil, quase trasladando a que fez o P. Marcos Jorge de boa memória. Custou muito trabalho mas entende-se que será proveitoso*. The work has been lost, but it is mentioned as early as 1574 (S. Cardoso 1993: 36). Several sources describing Tupi languages and several bilingual Tupi-Portuguese ecclesiastical works have, however, survived. In 1618, the Jesuit Antonio de Araújo (1566–1632) published a catechism, entitled *Catecismo na lingua Brasilica em que se contem a summa da Doutrina Christãa com tudo o que pertence à nossa Santa Fè, e bons costumes composto a modo de dialogos*. A second edition appeared in 1686. This work was translated into several other Amerindian languages, as we can verify in Machado (1965[1741], vol. 1: 207). Johann Philipp Bettendorf(f) (1625–1698), a German-speaking Jesuit, who was born in Luxembourg, published a work in 1687 a work with the title *Compêndio da Doctrina Christãa na Lengua Portuguesa e Brasilica*. Bettendorf studied in Trier and in Italy and he was familiar with the educational system of the universities of Évora and Coimbra (Leite 1965: 53). He served as a rector of the Jesuit Colleges of Maranhão and Pará and was a Superior of the Jesuits of the entire Brazilian mission (cf. Russell-Wood 1998: 155).⁸

Only one grammar of a non-Tupi language has survived, that of Kiriri (see below). It is documented that many other languages were studied and that grammars circulated as manuscripts. One of the language of the Maromomim (or Guarumins, or Indians of Guarulho) written by the Jesuits Manuel Viegas (1533–1608) and Joseph de Anchieta has been lost (Leite 1965: 218).⁹ This language was possibly another branch of the Macro-Jê family, as suggested by Rodrigues (1999: 166). Other grammars are *Arte da lingua dos aroás* (Fonseca 2006: 335) by Antônio Boaventura de Santo, who supposedly also composed a *Confessionario da lingua*

8. Bettendorf(f) was a linguist *avant la lettre*, an architect, and a painter, although his paintings are lost. For more details, see Kohut & Torrales Pacheco (2007) and Zwartjes (2010a).

9. Cf. Dahlmann (1891: 84): “Ein südbrasilianischer Dialekt, die Sprache der Maramonisier, ist schon ziemlich frühe von P. Vega [sic] in einer Grammatik, einem Wörterbuch und einem Katechismus behandelt worden”.

aroá (post 1718) (Cardoso 1994: 227), and João de Jesus' *Arte para os que principião aprender a língua Aroá* (post 1718), both lost.

4.2 Tupi grammars

Given that there are three Tupi grammars from different periods, one from the 16th century, another from the 17th and one from the 18th, we can ask if these sources reveal a certain evolution in their approaches.

4.2.1 Joseph de Anchieta (1534–1597)

4.2.1.1 *Introduction: Anchieta and his forerunners*

José Anchieta was born on March 19th, 1534, in S. Cristóval de La Laguna, Tenerife. His father, Juan de Anchieta, was a Basque from Guipúzcoa. In 1551, he entered the Jesuit order in Coimbra and for reasons of health, he was sent to Brazil (Martins 1954: 9). He arrived in Salvador Bahia in 1553 accompanied by Manoel da Nóbrega (1517–1570), who had begun his mission in Brazil earlier in 1549. With da Nóbrega, Anchieta founded the Jesuit college in São Paulo de Piratininga (Leite & Franchetto 2006: 23) on January 25th, 1554. Anchieta wrote the first grammar of Tupi to be printed, and also composed literary works in Castilian, Portuguese, Latin and Tupi. According to Martins (1954: 9), he authored the dictionary *Vocabulário na Língua Brasileira*, of which there is a seventeenth-century manuscript in the Coleção Departamento de Cultura of the Prefeitura de São Paulo, but this is uncertain.

Anchieta was not the first missionary to learn a local indigenous language in Brazil. Historical sources inform us that António Rodrigues (fl. 1553) was the first, and manuscripts of dictionaries and grammars circulated in his age (Leite 1965: 40). The Portuguese brought orphans from Lisbon to Brazil, where they let them grow up among indigenous children who taught them their native tongues.¹⁰ These orphans were later important informants who taught the local language to the Portuguese priests, and some of them became priests themselves (Leite 1965: 216).

4.2.1.2 *The language described by Anchieta*

There is a disagreement concerning the language described by Anchieta, since he did not give a name to the language. According to Rodrigues (1997) the language

10. This practice began as early as 1550, when seven orphans from Lisbon accompanied the Jesuits, as Manoel de Nóbrega reports in a letter to Father Miguel de Torres, written in 1556 (Assunção 2004: 155).

described by Anchieta was Tupinambá, but Navarro states that it was the Tupi language (1997: 660). The importance of Tupi-speaking tribes in the regions around Bahia diminished after the destruction of 130 tribes by Mem de Sá in 1557. Other Tupiniquim-speaking communities were destroyed in Ilhéus and Porto Seguro. The only surviving Tupinambá-speaking region was the Capitania de São Vicente, while the speakers of the language elsewhere were annihilated in the period between 1557 and 1584 (Rodrigues, *ibid.*). Not only were Tupiniquim-speaking tribes massacred, but also Tupinambá-speaking tribes, speakers of Tamoio and other languages. The consequence of these reductions was that other tribes, such as the Aimoré, established new settlements along the coast, where earlier Tupi-speaking tribes and Tamoios had lived.

Anchieta composed a grammar entitled *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais usada na costa do Brasil*, published in 1595 by Antonio Mariz in Coimbra, of which hundreds of copies are said to have circulated in Brazil (Dahlmann 1891: 64). According to Rodrigues, Anchieta first came in contact with Tupinambá. However, he soon moved to Piratininga, where he lived for eleven years, teaching Latin (Leite & Franchetto 2006: 23). The Tupiniquim variety which was spoken in Piratininga was the Tupi variety he knew best and it was this dialect he described first in the manuscript he completed in 1560 or earlier. The printed version was probably adapted later (i.e. after 1565) to the speech of the Tupinambás of Bahia, Rio de Janeiro or Espírito Santo. According to Rodrigues (1997: 374), the grammar describes the Tupinambá variety, which is evident in the conservation of the final consonants of affirmative verbs.¹¹

Already at an early stage, historians and missionaries established a dichotomy between the general language of the coast, *língua geral*, and other indigenous languages (Mariani 2007: 31). In the 16th century, the Jesuit Fernão Cardim (1540/1548?–1625) devoted a chapter in his *Tratados da terra e gente do Brasil* to the linguistic situation in Brazil.¹² He pointed out the unity of the language of the coast:

Em toda esta provincia ha muitas e varias nações de diferentes linguas, porém huma é a principal que comprehende algumas dez nações de Indios: estes vivem na costa do mar, e em uma grande corda do sertão, porém são todos estes de uma

11. Anchieta's poems were likewise composed in the variety of the coast (Martins 1954: 13–14).

12. Cardim studied in Coimbra and was secretary of the Jesuit Visitador, Cristóvão de Gouveia (1542–1622; for him, see Alden 1996: 252–254), with whom he visited Brazil in 1583 (Assunção 2004: 158). He was rector of the College of Bahia between 1590 and 1593 and later from 1607 to 1625. He was also rector of the College of Rio de Janeiro. An English version of this work was first published anonymously in England – where Cardim lived in prison until 1604 – with the title *A Treatise of Brasil, written by a Portugall which had long lived there*, by Samuel Purchas (c. 1575–1626) in 1625. For Cardim as a lexicographer, see Gonçalves & Murakawa (2009).

só língua ainda que em algumas palavras discrepão e esta é a que entendem os Portuguezes. (Cardim 1978[1584]: 121)

[All over this province there are many and various nations with different languages. One, however, is the major language spoken in some ten nations of Indians: they live along the coastline, and in a large area of the heartland, yet they all speak a single language although some words do not match, and this language is the one the Portuguese understand.] (Translation by Mariani 2007: 31)

He characterizes it favourably:

(a língua da costa) é fácil, e elegante, e suave, e copiosa, a dificuldade della está em ter muitas composições.¹³ (Cardim 1978[1584]: 121, cited in Mariani 2007: 30)

[(the language of the coast) is easy, and elegant, and smooth, and varied, the main difficulty being its many compositions. (Translation by Mariani 2007: 31)]

The speakers of this language were allies of the Portuguese, and all other nations, called ‘tapuyas’, were their enemies. This explains why Portuguese writers usually had a negative attitude toward the languages of the tapuyas:

Todas estas setenta e seis nações de Tapuyas que têm as mais diferentes, são gente brava, silvestre e indomita, são contrarias quasi todas do gentio que vive na costa do mar, vizinhos dos Portugueses ... D’estes [tapuyas] ha muitos christãos ... e somente com estes Tapuyas se pode fazer algum fructo; com os demais Tapuyas, não se pode fazer conversão por serem muito andejos e terem muitas e diferentes linguas difficultosas. (Cardim 1584: 121)

[All the seventy-six Tapuya nations, that speak the most different languages, are brave people, wild and savage, have quite different attributes as compared to the people who live on the coast, neighbors of the Portuguese ... Among these [Tapuyas] there are many Christians ... and only to these Tapuyas can some good be done: with the rest of the Tapuyas, conversion is not possible since they are true rambles and have many different and difficult languages.] (Translation by Mariani 2007: 31)

The characterization of the language of the *tapuya* tribe of the *aimorés* is illustrative:

E são estes aimorés tão selvagens ... a sua fala é rouca da voz, a qual arrancam da garganta com muita força... (Gabriel de Sousa 1587: 79, quoted in Mariani 2007: 31)

13. It is noteworthy that Henriques describes Tamil similarly, although missionaries describing African languages are inclined to label the languages they studied as ‘difficult’, ‘imperfect’ and ‘savage’. Tagalog and Japanese (cf. Section 3.4 above) had likewise been labelled as ‘easy’ by those who had come into contact with Chinese. The latter was seen as a particularly difficult language, due to the complexity of its system of tones: “El dialecto Nison, ô Japòn es dialecto, que procedió del Imperio Chinico ... es mas puro, menos difcil, que los dialectos Chnicos, pues estos con el dominio Tartaro han dejado introducir en sus dialectos distintas voces, tonadas, guturales, &c.” (Oyanguren 2009[1738]: Preludio al lector).

[And these Aimorés are so savage ... their speech is hoarse in voice, which they utter from their throat with great force.] (Translation by Mariani 2007: 31)

In historical sources, mention is made of women's speech, which particularly deserves attention:

... [os tupinambás] Têm muita graça quando falam, mormente as mulheres; são mui compendiosas na forma da linguagem, e muito copiosas no seu orar.
 [(The Tupinambá Indians) have a special flair when they speak, especially the women; they are very brief and direct in their speech, and truly devoted in their prayers.] (Gabriel Soares de Sousa 1587: 302, quoted in Mariani 2007: 29)

4.2.1.3 *The structure of the grammar*

The grammar is divided into sixteen chapters. Compared with the grammar of Figueira – and several others described in this monograph – Anchieta pays marked attention to orthography and phonology. Not only are the three first chapters devoted to phonology, but we find many observations concerning morphophonemic rules in all the other sections of the grammar.

The grammar follows the canonical order: phonology/orthography, then morphology, starting with the noun, whereafter the pronouns and the verbs are detailed. It is remarkable that – apart from the noun, the pronoun and the verb – the only canonical part of speech which is treated indepently in a separate chapter is the preposition (=postposition) (Chapter X). Chapters XII–XVI are all related to the verb.¹⁴ The remaining parts of speech, such as participles, adverbs, interjections and conjunctions are not explained in separate chapters or paragraphs. This is, as we shall see in Sections 4.2.1.5 onwards, because these categories do not correspond very well to the facts of Tupi grammar. There is no separate final chapter devoted to syntax, word order, or 'agreement', a group of topics which is often followed by sections on *syntaxis figurata* and/or prosody. On the other hand, we see throughout the grammar that syntax is dealt with in almost every section. In many titles of chapters and paragraphs of the grammar, we find the words 'composição', and 'construção'. The author has decided not to split up his grammar into two sections, one devoted to the 'rudimenta' and another to 'constructio' of each separate part of speech. When Anchieta starts his section on the noun, some crucial differences with Latin are mentioned, but immediately a section follows entitled "Da composição dos nomes". The same occurs in Chapter V devoted to the pronoun. After some paradigms, a section follows entitled "Construção deste Pronomes". Tupi typology forced Anchieta to present both aspects simultaneously, since in

14. X. "Das preposições", II [sic] (=XI) "De sum, es, fui", XII. "Dos verbos neutros feitos activos", XIII. "Dos activos feitos neutros", XIII [sic]. "Da composição dos verbos", XV. "Da repetição dos verbos", XVI. "De algus verbos irregulares de Aê".

Tupi it does not make sense to learn the verb first, and then the personal prefixes in a separate chapter: Anchieta was aware of this didactic problem.

A relatively high number of titles and subtitles cover topics which can be linked to Tupi morphosyntax exclusively. Following this strategy, Anchieta's approach is apparently different from that of traditional grammar. It is obvious that in Anchieta's view, many Latin categories were un-Tupian; it was more appropriate to create titles related to Tupi morphosyntax. Nevertheless, it is also obvious that the Latin tradition is always present.

The authors of the first Portuguese grammars, Oliveira and Barros, often mention classical grammarians, such as Quintilian, but Anchieta never does. Anchieta was a well-educated Latinist, and we might expect such references to authors from Antiquity, but apparently he decided not to include these, which corroborates the fact that he was fully aware of that he was composing something innovative and different (cf. Drummond 1990: 10).

4.2.1.4 *Phonology and orthography*

Generally, historians and grammarians of the colonial period who comment on the language of the Tupinambás follow the strategy of searching in the phonological repertoire of the language under scrutiny and of summing up those 'letters' which are 'lacking'. Pero de Magalhães Gândavo's (c.1540–c.1580) frequently quoted comment on the Tupinambá languages is illustrative in this context:

... a lingua deste gentio toda pella costa he hũa, careçe de tres letras -S- não se acha nella *f* ne *l*, ne *r*, cousa digna despanto por q̃ assy não tem *fê*, ne *lei*, nem *Rei*, & desta maneira viue, sem justiça desordenadamente. (Gândavo 1980[1576], quoted in Mariani 2007: 28; cf. Navarro 1999: 46).

[... the language of all the Indians along the coast [is one that] lacks three letters: there is no *-f-*, nor *l*, nor *r* something that causes perplexity because here there is neither faith [Fé], nor law [lei], nor King [Rei], and, in this way, they live without justice in a disorderly manner.] (translation by Mariani 2007: 29)

The grammar of Anchieta opens with a similar, but less ideologically inflected, observation:

Nesta lingua do Brasil não ha *f*. *l*. *s*. *z*. *rr*. dobrado nem muta com liquida, vt *cra*, *pra*, &c.

[In this language of Brazil, there is no *f*, *l*, *s*, *z*, or geminate *rr*, nor voiceless with liquid as *cra*, *pra*, etc.]

Rodrigues reconstructed the phonological system of Tupinambá vowels as follows:

Table 4.1 The vowels of Tupinambá (16th century), according to Rodrigues (1958, cited in Cruz 2005: 54)

Oral			Nasal		
front	central	back	front	central	back
i	ĩ	u	ĩ	ĩ	ũ
e		o	e		õ
	a			ã	

The pronunciation of most vowels did not cause any problem since Anchieta considered them not really different from the Portuguese vowels, except the oral, high, central non-rounded vowel /i/ (Rodrigues 1999a: 110–111; Schmidt-Riese 1998: 323), which must be pronounced as an ‘*i*-aspero’ (“com a garganta”), according to Anchieta. At the end of the word, it can be also written as ⟨g⟩ (“in fine acabandose a dição”) (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 6r). Anchieta labels this vowel as ‘*i*-aspero’ in order to distinguish it from /i/, which he calls the ‘*i*-lene’ (high-front). Anchieta gives some minimal pairs in order to demonstrate the difference between them: the word “*i*” means “water” when it is pronounced with an ‘*i*-lene’, whereas it means (Latin) *is*, *ea*, *id* when it is pronounced with an ‘*i*-aspero’ (1999[1595]: 6v). The ‘*i*-aspero’ should, he writes, be distinguished orthographically from the /i/, using a ‘jota subscrito’, but in fact, such a distinction is not made visible: early modern Portuguese printing houses had a character ⟨ę⟩ but not an ⟨i̇⟩.¹⁵

The term Portuguese term ‘lene’ is from Latin *lene*, which means ‘slowly’, ‘quietly moving’, ‘gentle’, ‘light’, ‘lacking intensity’, ‘mild’, or ‘weak’. When applied to sounds it can mean ‘striking gently on the ear’, ‘melodious’, or ‘soft’, opposed to *asper* which means ‘disagreeable to the touch’, ‘rough’, ‘harsh to the ear’, ‘shaggy’, or ‘coarse’. In grammatical terminology the words *spiritus asper* and *spiritus lenis* are used for the symbols over the vowels (and the consonant p) denoting aspiration, or the absence of it. These words are the translations of the Greek terms δασὺ πνεῦμα (= *spiritus asper* ‘rough breathing’) and ψιλὸν πνεῦμα (= *spiritus lenis* ‘smooth breathing’) respectively.

Tupi has the following consonants, according to Rodrigues:

The three nasal consonants have pre-nasalised allophones: [mb], [nd] and [ŋg]. The pronunciation of the Tupi consonants is generally not complicated for a native speaker of Spanish with a thorough knowledge of Portuguese, which explains why Anchieta decides not to give a comprehensive list with all the letters of the alphabet

15. Before 1494, several vowels were distinguished in Toscan by diacritics: e^ˆ (=ę); ê (=e); o (=o) ô (=o) (*Regole*, c. 1 A. cited in Kukenheim 1932: 37).

Table 4.2 The consonants of Tupinambá (16th century), based on Rodrigues (1958) and Cruz (2005: 54)

	Labial	Dental/alveolar/ Alveopalatal	Velar	Glottal
Voiceless stop	p	t	k	ʔ
Fricative	β	s		
Nasal	m	n	ŋ	
Trill		r		
Approximant	w	y		

with the corresponding rules for their pronunciation. The use of the graphemes <ca>, <co>, <cu>/<ga>, <go>, <gu> versus <ce>, <ci>/<ge>, <gi> are described as follows:

Ca, Co, Cu, pronúciáose sem zeura; como no Portugues, carne, corpo,
 ..Aliter hão de ter zeura para que soe, vt ça, ço, çu ...
 Ce, Ci, hão se de pronunciar, como que tuesem zeura como no Portugues, cera,
 cidra...
 Ga, Go, Gu, promnunciáose como no Portugues, gato, gota, gula, ...
 Ge, Gi, pronuciáose como no Portugues, gesto, gibão... (Anchieta 1999[1595]:
 4f-5r).
 [Ca, Co, Cu must be pronounced without cedilla¹⁶, as in Portuguese, *‘carne’*, *‘corpo’*,
 In the other cases, it must have a cedilla so that it sounds like *ça, ço, çu* ...
 Ce, Ci must be pronounced as if they had a cedilla as in Portuguese, *‘cera’*, *‘cidra’*...
 Ga, Go, Gu, must be pronounced as *‘gato’*, *‘gota’*, *‘gula’* in Portuguese, ...
 Ge, Gi, must be pronounced as *‘gesto’*, *‘gibão’* in Portuguese.]

For a beginner, the opening section of the grammar might have been complicated or confusing, since Anchieta’s way of presenting rules could appear unsystematic. After the short list of the letters of the alphabet, Anchieta explains that the pronunciation of the Pitiguares of Paraíba up to the Tamôyos of Rio de Janeiro is not the same as that of the Tupis of São Vicente. We would expect such background information in a prologue, and from a methodological point of view it is not clear why the author decides to introduce aspects of language variation in a grammar which apparently attempts to describe just one ‘general language’, as spoken along the coast (*‘a lingua mais usada na costa’*).

The first chapter bears the title “das letras”, and the second “Da orthographia ou pronunciação”, but in fact we find also rules concerning pronunciation in the

16. For the history of the ‘cedilha’ goes back to the 13th century (Fr. *cédille*, Sp. *cedilla*/*cerilla*, etc.) (cf. Kukenheim 1932: 48–51). I have not found the term ‘zeura’ in other sources, probably the same as the ‘zeburá’, a synonym in Old Portuguese for ‘virgula’, ‘senal’ (Silva 1831: 2.905), cf. Barros (1971[1540]: 49r; 388): “As vergas sam éstas zeburas, ao módo de Gregos”.

first chapter on 'letters', and the value of the "letters *Ca, Co, Cu/Ga, Go, Gu*" is also explained in the second chapter. A beginner familiar with Latin grammar will not expect in this section of the grammar a sub-paragraph entitled "Nos praeteritos", a topic usually described in the chapter devoted to the verb, as occurs in the third chapter "De accentu", where a paragraph is included with the title "Do cremento", in which morphonological processes are explained in a novel way. When the learner arrives at the third chapter on nouns, he already has an impression of the language, which is far from uniform, according to Anchieta:

Isto das letras, orthographia, pronunciação, & accentu, seruirem saberem pronunciar, o que acharem escrito, os que começam aprender: mas como a lingua do Brasil não está em escrito, senão no continuo vso do falar, o mesmo vso, & viua voz ensinará melhor as muitas variedades que tẽ, porque no escreuer, & accentuar cada hum fará como lhe melhor parecer. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 9r)

[This treatment of letters, orthography, pronunciation and accent will serve the person beginning to learn how to pronounce what he finds as written text, but as the language of Brazil is not a written language, the continuous speech usage, usage itself, the living voice will teach the many varieties (of the language) more properly, because every individual does what he thinks is best in his writing or accentuating.]

From a descriptive point of view, the three chapters on phonology and orthography have almost nothing in common with traditional Greco-Latin grammar. In fact, Anchieta attempts to describe some important morphophonetic rules and his description is generally fairly precise. One of the topics which caught our attention is the phonological process of pre-nasalisation and the allophones [m], [p] and [mb].

P. M. mb. Muitas vezes se vsão hũa por outra desta maneira, q̃ as dições in principio tomadas absolute se pronunciação com m. vel mb vt *Mó* vel *mbó*, *Manus*. Praecedente o genitiuo, ou adiectiuo mudase em P. vt *Pedro pó*, *Petri manus*, *Xépò*, *mea manus*. Excipe, *mbaê*, que nunca se muda, vt. *Xémbaê*, *mea res*, *Pedro mbaê*, *Petri res*. Da mesma maneira o P. in medio dictionis, fica em mb: posto absolute in principio vt *Abá*, acabome, *Mbába*, acabamiento, pro *Paba*. Conforme a isto nunca se pronuncia B. in principio dictionis sem m. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 2r-v)

[P, M and MB are often used the one instead of the other, in such a way that the ⟨p⟩ in initial position taken 'absolutely' (=after a pause) is pronounced as *m* as in *Mó* or *mbó*, 'hand'. If there is a preceding genitive the adjective is changed into *P*, e.g. *Pedro pó*, *Petri manus*, *Xépò*, 'my hand'. Except *mbaê*, which never changes, e.g.. *Xémbaê*, 'my thing', *Pedro mbaê*, 'Peter's thing'. In the same way the *P* in the middle of the word becomes *mb*; placed 'absolutely' at the beginning of the word, as *Abá*, 'I finished', *Mbába*, 'finish' instead of *Paba*. Conforming to this, the initial *B* is never pronounced in the middle of the word without *m*.]

4.2.1.5 *The concept of ‘case’ as applied to Tupi*

Tupi nouns lack grammatical gender and are not inflected according to the canonical Latin cases. Anchieta describes the lack of cases as follows:

Os nomes não tem casos nẽ numeros distinctos saluo vocatiuo, com esta differença, a saber, q̃ os que tem accento na vltima, nada mudão, vt *abá*, em todos os casos. Os que tẽ na penultima perdem a vltima vogal no vocatiuo, vt *tuba*, *túb*, *xérúba*, *xérúb*, vel *xérup*, *xéaira*, *xerair*, vel *xerait*. (Anchieta 1990[1595]: ff.9–10)

[The nouns do not have different cases and numbers, except the vocative, which has the following difference: those (vocatives) which have a stressed final syllable do not change, as *abá*, in all cases. Those which have the penultimate stressed, lose the final vowel in the vocative, as in e.g. *tuba*, *túb*, *xérúba*, *xérúb*, or *xérup*, *xéaira*, *xerair*, or *xerait*.]

According to Anchieta, the fact that nouns lack number explains why the third person of the verb has the same form for singular and plural:

As pessoas que varião os verbos são seis, a terceira [sic] he a mesma no singular, & plural, porque os nomes não tem numeros. (Ancheita 1999[1595]: 20r)

[There are six persons which cause variation in the verb; the third person is the same in the singular as in the plural, since nouns do not have numbers.]

In a great number of missionary grammars we can also read that nouns are not inflected, but – probably for pedagogical reasons – the Latin ‘cases’ are displayed in paradigms with all the corresponding Latin nomenclature. This occurs – just to mention one example – in the Spanish-language Guaraní grammar of Ruiz de Montoya:

N[ominativo].	Abaré	‘Sacerdote’
G[enitivo].	Abarambaê	‘Cosa del Sacerdote’
D[ativo].	Abare upé	‘Para el Sacerdote’
Ac[usativo].	Abaré	‘Al Sacerdote’
V[ocativo].	Abaré	‘Sacerdote’
Ab[lativo]	Abaregui	‘del Sacerdote’
Abarepípe	‘con el Sacerdote’	
Abarépe	‘en el Sacerdote’	
Abarérehé	‘por el Sacerdote’	

(Ruiz de Montoya 1994[1640]: f.2)

Ruiz de Montoya explains that the ablative case is formed by addition of the ‘post-positions’ *gui*, *pípe*, etc. His methodology of constructing a case-based paradigm is only partially reasonable. The cases identified by their equivalent Latin names do to some extent equate in function to the corresponding Latin ‘semantic cases’ (the cases which are governed in Latin by prepositions), but do not cover the

‘syntactic’ cases (such as the use of the nominative to indicate the subject, and the accusative to indicate the direct object).

Anchieta’s methodology is different from that of Ruiz de Montoya. He decides not to offer a case-based paradigm in the chapter on the noun, since he could not find any explicit syntactic ‘cases’ which are morphologically marked in Tupi. Since he could only find equivalents of the ‘semantic’ cases and of the Latin prepositions, he deals with them in the corresponding chapter on ‘postpositions’ (cf. Rodrigues 1997: 381).

4.2.1.6 *The pronouns*

Anchieta describes the pronominal system of Tupi as follows:

Yxê, endê, peê sempre são substantivos, seruem de supostos em todos os tempos que tem artigos, vt

Yxê açô	eu vou
Endê ereçô	tu
Peê peçô	vos (11v.)

[Yxê, endê, peê are always substantives serving as subject in all the tenses which have ‘articles’, as in:

Yxê açô	‘I go’
Endê ereçô	‘you’
Peê peçô	vos.]

He explains in another section of his grammar that so-called ‘articles’ are to be distinguished from another series of ‘pronouns’. The first person (y)xe- is used as a prefix of the verb as subject of a transitive verb (‘yxê orô-jucá’ “I kill you”) and also as first person direct object of the form ‘xe-jucá’ (“[they] kill me”, opposed to the prefix *a-* which marks the first person subject of ‘a-jucá’ (“I kill him”).

He is, of course, using the term ‘article’ in a special sense. In Tupi, there are neither definite nor indefinite articles, so in the description of Tupi, the ‘superfluous’ term ‘articulus’/‘artículo’ could be put to another use without ambiguity. When Anchieta attempted to find equivalents in Tupi for the pronouns of Portuguese or Latin, he realised that pronouns are present in Tupi with the meaning *relative pronouns*, following Priscian’s classification, but also that something less familiar needed to be explained:

Todos os ver. Actiuos, & muitos neutros se conjugão com estas pessoas, as quaes chamamos articulos á differença das pessoas expressas, que são os pronomes, com os quaes se conjugão muitos verbos neutros, & não com os articulos, mas na mudança, & variação do fim seguem a conjugação por que não ha mais que hua... (Anchieta 1990[1595]: 20v.)

[All active verbs and many neutral ones are conjugated with these persons, which we call ‘articles’, in contrast to the persons expressed by personal pronouns, which many neutral verbs are conjugated with, and not with the ‘articles’, but with change and variation at the end of the word, they follow the conjugation because there is no more than one.] (Translation by Bossong 2009)

In fact, Anchieta is establishing here the difference between those verbs which are ‘conjugated’ with ‘articles’ from a second category of verbs which are ‘conjugated’ with pronouns (see also Altman 2007).

As Bossong (2009) has recently demonstrated, the formal distinction which Anchieta makes on the morphological level is

prefixes	→	<i>articulos</i>
proclitics	→	<i>pronomes</i>

Bossong goes on to argue that Anchieta “is also more or less aware of the semantic difference between Active and Stative”, although he does not mention any semantic criterion: he simply says that some ‘neutral’, i.e., intransitive, verbs take proclitics, some prefixes, whereas all ‘active’, i.e., transitive, verbs take prefixes. This is indeed a possible definition of duality in the Tupi-Guaraní verbal system, although a very rudimentary one.

Anchieta does not use the terms ‘inclusivo’ and ‘exclusivo’ in his paradigm of the pronouns (‘pronomes’), but uses the verbs ‘excluir’ and ‘incluir’.¹⁷

Orê, yandê, são também adiectiuos, noster, a, um, differem nisto que Orê, exclue a segunda pessoa cõ q[ue] se trata, vt *orê oroçô*, nos imos, & tu não, *orêmbaê*, nossas cousas & não tuas, pore, *yandê*, inclue a segunda pessoa vt *ya ndêyaçô*, nos imos, & também *yandêmbaê*, nossas cousas, & tuas também. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 12r.) [Orê, *yandê*, are also adjectives (*noster, a, um*), with the difference that Orê excludes the second person addressed, as in *orê oroçô*, ‘we go, & and not you’, *orêmbaê*, ‘our matters & and not yours’, but *yandê*, includes the second person, as in *ya ndêyaçô*, ‘we go, & and you too’ *yandêmbaê*, ‘our matters, & and also yours.’]

17. In fact, we find the same in the Quechua grammar of Santo Tomás (1994[1560]: 9r); whereas in the Anonymous grammar of the same language, the terms ‘exclusivo’ and ‘inclusivo’ are used (Anonymous 2009[1586]: 5r). It is difficult to say whether the authors of these grammars could have influenced each other; it is also possible that these terms were developed independently from each other. The following citation from an unrelated grammar from the Philippines surely does show the independent development of this concept: “Plural. Tayo nosotros: atin, ... Y tambiẽ ay otro Plural, q[ue] dize assi. Camí: nosotros... Entre los quales dos plurales ay esta diferencia que aquel primero se vsaquando aquel o aquellos con quien hablamos los queremos incluir en aq[ue]llo de q[ue] hablamos. Empero el segũdo es al contrario, pues antes denota q[ue] aquellos con quien hablamos, no se comprehendem en aquello q[ue] dezimos, ni habla dellos” (Blancas de San José 1997[1610]: 8).

As this extract suggests, the analysis of Tupi pronouns does not fit easily in the traditional model, since they can have several equivalents in Portuguese or Latin: ‘pronoun’, ‘adjective’, and ‘possessive pronoun’.

4.2.1.7 *Nominal and verbal inflection*

In most chapters of this study, separate paragraphs are devoted to nominal and verbal inflection. This distinction is problematic when applied to Tupi for several reasons. As Queixalós (2006: 251–252 = 2001b: 7) points out, the distinction between verbs and nouns can in theory be made on several levels: on the *semantic* level (more or less the distinction between ‘entities’ and ‘events’, the *formal* (explicit morphological material, for instance ‘gender-class’ and ‘time-aspect’), the *pragmatic* (some classes of roots are more appropriate than others for ‘introducing manipulable participants’ and others are more appropriate for ‘reporting events’), and that of *function* (the distinction between argument and predicate).

In grammars of the Greco-Latin tradition, the distinction between noun and verb is clear-cut and only the ‘participle’ is able to share some features of both categories:

Table 4.3 Definitions of the noun, verb and participle. Donatus, Priscian and Álvares (cited in Schäfer-Priess 2000: 305 and 307)

Donatus	Priscian	Álvares
<i>Nomen</i> : Pars orationis cum casu corpus aut rem proprie communiterve significans.	<i>Nomen</i> : Nomen est pars orationis, quae unicuique subiectorum corporum seu rerum communem vel propriam qualitatem distribuit	<i>Nomen</i> : Nomen est pars orationis, quae casus habet, neque tempora adsignificat
<i>Verbum</i> : Pars orationis cum tempore et persona sine casu aut agere aliquid aut pati aut neutrum significans	<i>Verbum</i> : Verbum est pars orationis cum temporibus et modis, sine casu, agenda vel patiendi significativum	<i>Verbum</i> : Verbum est pars orationis, quae vocibus addita, earum significationem explanat, ac definit.
<i>Participium</i> : Pars orationis partem capiens nominis, partem verbi; nominis genera et casus, verbi tempora et significationes, utriusque numerum et figuram	<i>Participium</i> : Participium est igitur pars orationis, quae pro verbo accipitur, ex quo et derivatur naturaliter, genus et casus habens ad similitudinem nominis et accidentia verbo absque discretionem peronarum et modorum	<i>Participium</i> : Participium est pars orationis, quae tum casus, tum tempora habet

In Tupi, however, the situation is very different. As Queixalós (2006: 252) observes, “Predicative function cannot be taken as a serious criterion for distinguishing between nouns and verbs”.

In fact, Anchieta even deviates from the traditional distinction between ‘nominal’ and ‘verbal’ morphology. Instead of the usual term ‘case’, or ‘*terminação*’, he decides to use the term ‘*cremento*’. Such ‘increments’, or augments, are not only attached to verbs but to nouns as well:

Do Cremento

Cremento, ha não somente nos verbos, mas tãbem noutras partes de oração porque todas se podem coniugar, como verbos. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 7r-7v)

[Of the increment

There exists the ‘increment’, not only in the verbs, but also in other parts of speech, because all can be conjugated as verbs.]

What Anchieta explains is that in Tupinambá, as in other Tupi-Guarani languages, there exist nominal tenses. Nouns do not have “cases” as in Latin, but can have “endings” which also can be attached to verbs, and can have tenses:

Em todos os nomes ha præterito, que he, *ôera*, vel *uêra* & futuro, *âma*, ut *mbaê* cousa, *mbaêpoéra*, cousa que foy, *mbaêráma*, cousa que ha de ser (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 33r)

[All the nouns have preterite, which is *ôera*, or *uêra* & future, *âma*, as *mbaê* “(some)thing”, *mbaêpoéra*, “(some)thing that has been”, *mbaêráma*, “(some)thing that will be”.]

Anchieta makes two other noteworthy points about verbal morphology. First, the main dichotomy of the Tupi verb is, according to his paradigms, that between affirmative and negative verbs.¹⁸ Second, he reports an important difference between Latin and Tupinambá. The traditional four tenses are not distinguished morphologically in Tupi:

O presente do Indicativo, posto que inclue em si os quatro tempos, contudo mais propriamente significa o pretérito perfeito. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 21; cf. Almeida 1999: 113).¹⁹

18. In early-modern grammars of Turkish a similar distinction is made (cf. Holdermann [1730] and Romero [1799]).

19. Cf. Ruiz de Montoya (1994[1640]: 18): “El presente de indicatuiuo incluye en si los quatro tiempos, presente, preterito imperfecto, perfecto, y plusquamperfecto: y assi se habla en comun, sin particula alguna, coligiendose de los antecedentes el tiempo de que se habla, como cuehe ayu, ayer vine, oyeáhá, oy fuy Pero sino se colige, se vsa de vnas particulas, ò de aduerbios, los quales, y los tiempos, à que siruen, son los siguientes”.

[The present indicative, since it includes the four tenses, signifies more properly – with all the other tenses, the preterite perfect.]²⁰

4.2.1.8 Nouns, ‘adjectives’, and ‘adverbs’

Dietrich (2000b: 255) postulates that Tupi-Guarani languages generally lack the category of adjective, which is a characteristic feature of languages which, like Tupi, have an active structure. He postulates that there are only two lexical categories for Tupi-Guarani, verbs and substantives. The adverb is thus not a lexical category either. Stative ‘verbs’ such as *asy* (“to be ill” in Guarani) correspond to adjectives when used predicatively. This helps to explain why Anchieta (1999[1595]: 10v) does not deal with adjectives in detail.

Two aspects of Anchieta’s treatment of the noun are noteworthy. First, he remarks that nouns serve also as ‘adverbs’:

Os mesmos nomes, seruem por aduerbios, mas na construção se conhecem, vt *catú*, bom, & bem, *poxí*, mau, & mal, & estes comummête se postpoem, vt *Aicó-catú*, viuo bem, *Aicópoxi*^, viuo mal.

[The same nouns serve as adverbs, but in construction they are known as *catú*, “good” & “well”, *poxí*, “bad”, & “badly”, and these (nouns) usually follow the word (they modify), e.g. *Aicócatú*, “I live well”, *Aicópoxi*^, “I live badly”.]

Here, he gives in his translation the Portuguese adverbs “bem” and “mal”, but he also gives the ‘adjectives’ “bom” and “mau”. This means that according to him ‘nouns’ serve as adverbs, but also, although implicitly, as adjectives. Second, he observes that nouns are “conjugated” as verbs (“not declined”). Nouns can “include” in them the copular verb “to be” (*sum es fui*):

Os nomes conjugados como verbos incluem em si o verbo *sum es fui*, em duas significação, *s[cilicet]* *ser*, & *ter*. Para a significação de estar ha verbos particulares, & proprios, ‘estar sentado’, ‘deitado’ ‘andando’. Quanto a primeira significação, *ser*, cõ adiectiuos ou substantiuos *catú*, bom:

<i>xecatú</i>	eu sou bom.	<i>naxecatúi</i>	não sou bõ.
<i>ndecatú</i>	tu.	<i>nandecatúi</i>	tu não.
<i>Ycatú</i>	ille	<i>nicaiúi</i>	elle não.

Plural In Omnibus temporibus...

(Anchieta 1999[1595]: 46r; cf. González Luiz 1994: 111).

[The conjugated nouns as verbs include in them the verb ‘to be’ (*sum es fui*), meaning two different things, namely ‘to be’ and ‘to have’. With the meaning ‘to be’ there

20. The lack of Tupi equivalents – consisting of morphologically different forms of the verb – was documented earlier by Jean de Léry, as the following fragment reveals: “Pour les autres temps, on doit prendre seulement les adverbess, ci-après déclarés. Car nul verbe n’est autrement décliné qu’il ne soit résous par un aduerbe, tant au préterit présent, imparfait, plus-que-parfait, indéfini qu’au futur ou temps à venir” (Léry 1972[1578]: 250; English version, see: 1990: 93).

are particular and proper verbs: ‘to be sitting,’ ‘to be lying,’ ‘to be walking.’ With respect to the first meaning ‘to be,’ with adjectives or substantives *catû*, bom:

<i>xecatû</i>	I am good.	<i>naxecatûi</i>	I am not good.
<i>ndecatû</i>	you.	<i>nandecatûi</i>	you not.
<i>Ycatû</i>	he	<i>nicaiûi</i>	he not.

Plural: In all tenses...]

Anchieta obviously concluded that in Tupi, there is no clear-cut distinction between the noun and the adjective.

4.2.1.9 Syntax

Tupi exhibited no ‘concord’ or ‘agreement’ of the sort which is so important in Latin, where inflectional morphology is crucial and there is agreement in number between the verb and the corresponding noun in the nominative case (cf. Section 3.6 above). Anchieta was fully aware of this difference, since he decided not to include a separate chapter on this topic at the end of the grammar, as would be usual at this period. Since there are no ‘cases’ in the Latin sense, Tupi does not distinguish subjects and objects morphologically, and so there may rise ‘ambiguity’ (‘amphibologia’) in the interpretation of who is the agent and who the patient; or put in the words of Anchieta:

Sendo o terceira [pessoa] nominatiuo, & accusatiuo, ainda q[ue] pode auer algũa amphibologia, cõtudo pella materia q[ue] se trata cõmunẽte fica claro, como de cousa animata com inanimata, oude mayor qualidade con menor²¹ vt. Pedro come pão ... claro esta que pedro ha de ser nominatiuo de qualquer maneira que se ponha, vt *Pedro oû miapê*, *pedro miapê oû*, *Pedro oû*, *pû Pedro miapê*. E por aqui se entendera o mais. *Pedro pirâ oû*, ‘Pedro como peixe’, *Pedro jagoára ojucâ*, ‘Pedro matou a onça’. (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 36v)

[If the third [person] is nominative and accusative, although there can be some ambiguity, it is generally clear according to the context, from an animate being to an inanimate one, or from something of higher to lesser quality, for example, Peter eats bread, drinks plants, fells trees, etc., it is clear that Peter, has to be nominative in whatever order we put it, for example, *Peter oû miapê*, *Peter miapê oû*, *miapê Peter oû*, *oû Peter miapê*. And in the same way the rest can be understood. *Peter pirâ oû*, ‘Peter eats fish’. *Peter jagoára ojucâ*, ‘Peter killed the jaguar’.] (Translation by Bossong 2009)

21. As Bossong (2009) has demonstrated, Anchieta had the ‘Animacy Hierarchy’ in mind. ‘Nouns higher on this dimension (which I prefer to call ‘Inherency Scale’, see *inter alia* Bossong 1998: 203) are to be interpreted as subjects, whereas the lower ones usually function as objects. This becomes evident not only by relations between humans and plants or lower animals like fish, but also with respect to big predators like jaguars...’

By contrast, Ruiz de Montoya often discusses word order, explaining possible misinterpretations when the order of constituents is changed:

Quando ay igualdad entre agente, y paciente, y se muda la colocacion dicha, quedando el verbo en medio de ambas personas, siempre ay duda, vt *Peru omboe Chua*: dudase quien es el agente. (Ruiz de Montoya 1994[1640]: 35).²²
 [When there is a state of equality between the agent and the patient, and the aforementioned [normal] order is changed, with the verb being amidst both persons, there are always doubts, for example, *Peru omboae Chua*, there are doubts about who is the agent.] (Translation by Bossong 2009)

4.2.2 Antonio de Araújo's Cathecismo (1618)

Araújo's *Cathecismo* (1618) contains a section at the beginning (ff. 1r-3v) devoted to pronunciation: "Advertencias pera a pronvnçiaçam da lingua conteuda neste liuro" (ff. 1–4).²³ In what follows, we shall give a short description. Araújo dedicates his "advertencias" to "modern missionaries" ("os linguas modernos"), apparently the 'modern pronunciation' was different from what could be found in older grammars; an update was needed. Araújo gives the following rules:

1. For long and short syllables, the same accents ('accentos') are used, as in Latin,
2. Nha, nhe, nhi, nhò, nhù and ya, yè, yi, yò, yù are pronounced differently, as in 'yo' and 'iu'; when 'y' is used isolated, it is a 'relative', which corresponds with Anchietà's 'i-aspero' with the meaning *is, ea, id* (Anchietà 1999[1595]:6v),
3. In the description of the vowel /i/, Araújo informs his readers that two terms are used: 'i-grosso', and 'i-aspero', which must be pronounced with a 'rough sound in the roof of the mouth' ('hum sô grosso, ou aspero no ceo da boca'), written with a dot underneath the vowel. Araújo does not use Anchietà's term 'jota subscrito' here and he gives two different terms which were in use in that period ('o qual se escreue com hum ponto em baixo'),
4. <ç> before <e> or <i> is written with a dash between them ('risca no meyo') and must be pronounced as 'que', 'qui', not pronouncing the <u>,
5. When the 'little dash' ('risquinha') is written between <g> and <e> or <i>, it must be pronounced as 'gue', 'gui', not pronouncing the <u>, as in 'ninguem', 'alguidar'; Monhang-eme: Naimonhang-i,

22. Cf. Aragona: "Quando agente, y pasiente [sic] son terceras personas ai alguna duda; pero por la materia se conocen como quando es cosa animada o inanimada ó de mayor calidad a menor, quando ay total igualdad es la duda" (Aragona 1979[c.1625]: 53, cf. Bossong 2009).

23. I acknowledge Ruth Monserrat for the copy of Araújo's text. Anchietà's *Doutrina* (ed. 1992) and Bettendorff's *Compendio da doutrina* do not contain such prologues devoted to spelling or phonology.

6. In ⟨gue⟩, ⟨gui⟩, the ⟨u⟩ can be pronounced, whereas in other cases not. ⟨qui⟩ must always be pronounced as in Portuguese ‘aqui’.
7. Two dots (‘pontos’) are used on vowels in order to avoid to pronounce them as diphthong (as hiatus, or with glottal stop): aü, ey, oë, öü, uü ...,
8. The tilde (‘til’) is not as M, or N in Portuguese, but the pronunciation is slightly different (na pronunçiação differem pouco). Araújo does not explain the difference,
9. Sometimes, the tilde (‘til’) is written instead of M or N, ... Acẽ instead of Acem... If negative verbs end in Mi or Ni, we know that a tilde is used instead of the M or N. (‘Pera se saber se o til està em lugar do M, ou N, auemonos de ir aos verbos negatiuos formados dos seus affirmatiuos),
10. T. is an abbreviation for Tupã (‘God’).

The ten rules (‘Advertencias’) of Araújo are not copied from Anchieta, but we find some parallels. There are differences in the use of terms (Araújo’s ‘risca’ and ‘risquinha’ are not used by Anchieta, and Araújo gives two terms for the vowel /i/: ‘grosso’ and ‘aspero’), which demonstrates that not Anchieta was the only source used by Araújo. Anchieta’s ‘jota subscrito’ is not used by Araújo and when there are differences in pronunciation, Araújo does not always explain them. The learner will know them by ‘usage’ (‘O q[ue] tudo se saberà com o vzo’).

In the *Catecismo na Lingua Brasilica*, Bertolameu de Leam gives also a description of this vowel:

Y, he nota de voz guttural, que se forma na garganta dobrada a lingoa com a ponta inclinada abaixo, e lançado o halito opprimido na garganta, com um som mixto, e confunde entre I, e mais U, e que não sendo I, nem U, envolve ambos (not consulted, Araujo y Leam 1686: xiv, cited in Rodrigues 1997a: 379–380).

4.2.3 Luiz Figueira (1575–1643)

Figueira was born in Almodôvar between 1574 and 1576. In 1592 he entered the College of the ‘Espírito Santo’ in Évora. In 1602 he sailed to Bahia and in 1622 he founded the Jesuit mission of Maranhão. Figueira’s grammar is arranged according to the model of Álvares, and it is obvious that he also used Anchieta’s grammar, although he does not mention his name (see for more details Zwartjes 2002, and cf. Rodrigues 1997: 392).²⁴

24. “Não he facil, pio leitor, aos que aprendam alguna lingua estrangeira, de idade já crecida, alcançar todos os segredos & delicadezas della; *principalmente não avendo arte, nem mestres, que por arte a ensinarem*” (Figueira 1621: preface, not paginated).

4.2.3.1 *The language described by Figueira*

As noted in the introduction of this chapter, Anchieta comments on regional differences (Anchieta 1990[1595]: 1v), whereas Figueira does not mention any regional difference at all, which illustrates the fact that the latter attempted to describe one standard and uniform Brazilian language, for pedagogical, practical or possibly political reasons.

4.2.3.2 *Orthography and phonology*

Figueira's grammar opens with the letters of the alphabet, but his description of phonology is considerably shorter (ff.1r-2r) than Anchieta's. Figueira sums up those letters which exist, and those which are lacking:

As letras, de que se vsa nesta lingua, são as seguintes. A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, Y, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, T, V, X, til. Ficão excluidas, F, L, S, Z. Tambem se não vsa rr dobrado, ou aspero. (Figueira 1878[1687]: 1)

[The letters which are used in this language are the following: A, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, Y, K, M, N, O, P, Q, R, T, V, X, 'tilde'. Not included are F, L, S, Z. They do not use the geminate ("rough") rr.]

Figueira does not use Anchieta's term *i-aspero*, but instead uses its equivalent, *i-grosso*, which we have seen in the Catechism of Araújo:

Costumârao os antigos linguas usar deste mesmo i, jota com dous pontos, hum na cabeça, & outro no pé, & lhe chamavão i grosso: porque a pronunção é como entre u, & i. donde nasce que algũs o fazem u, & outros o fazem i: & formasse na garganta como *ig*: mas porque na impressão não se pode meter este i com os dous pontos, em lugar dele se poz y: o qual todas as vezes que se achar no meyo, ou no fim de algũa dição, se pronunciará como grosso no modo sobredito. (Figueira 1687: 1–2; cf. Rodrigues 1997a: 379)

[The authors of the old grammars used to use the same *i*, a 'j' with two dots, one above it and the other underneath, called *i-grosso*, because the pronunciation is between *u* and *i* which explains why some make them *u* and others pronounce them as *i*; and this (sound) is formed in the throat as *ig*, but since the printing is not able to reproduce this *i* with the two dots, they put an *y* instead, which must always be pronounced as explained, when it is placed in the middle or at the end of the word.]

In Araújo's text we find only one diacritic, ('o qual se escreue com hum ponto em baixo, que responde ao de cima', whereas Figueira prefers two dots, one above it and the other underneath. One of the few comparisons in Figueira's grammar with other languages is in the pronunciation of ⟨k⟩, where Greek is mentioned: "K, he proprio: porque fere asperamente E.I.Y. como o profirimos na dição Grega Kyrie (1878[1687]: 3).

4.2.3.3 *Morphosyntax*

The ‘cases’ and ‘declensions’ of the Tupi noun are exhibited as follows:

Os nomes nêsta lingua commummente não têm distinção de numeros, singular e plural, nem tambem de casos ... Assi como na lingua portugueza em lugar de casos ajuntamos algumas preposições aos nomes, vg. *Pedro, de Pedro, a Pedro, para Pedro, com Pedro*, etc. Assim tambem nêsta lingua qualquer Nome substantivo é governado, e varia com preposições (Figueira 1878[1687]: 13–14).

[The nouns in this language are generally not distinguished according to the numbers, singular and plural, nor according to cases. As in Portuguese, instead of cases, we adjoin some prepositions to the nouns as in *Pedro, de Pedro, a Pedro, para Pedro, com Pedro*, etc. In the same way, in this language any substantive noun is governed and differentiated by prepositions.]

4.2.3.4 *The inclusive-exclusive distinction*

As we have explained, Anchieta did not use the term ‘pronomen inclusivo/exclusivo’ as a meta-linguistic term, but rather the verbs ‘excluir’ – ‘incluir’. In Figueira we find a similar approach:

Assi os artigos, como o pronome, tem duas terminações, ou formulas na primeira pessoa do plural, como vemos. A primeira formula inclue em si a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos; vt Yajucà, nos matamos. f. Nos, & vos tambem com nosco. A 2. formula exclue a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos: vt Orojucà, nos outros matamos, não entrando vos nisso. (Figueira 1621: 6v-7r; 1878[1687]: 11)

[Thus, the articles – as the pronouns – have two endings, or ‘formulas’ in the first person plural, as we see. The first ‘formula’ includes in it the person or persons whom we address, as in *Yajucà*, ‘we kill’ i.e. We and you too (with us). The second ‘formula’ excludes the person or persons addressed, as in *Orojucà*, ‘we kill’, without your participation.]

Figueira did not follow Anchieta’s dichotomy between ‘affirmative’ and ‘negative’ verbs. Articles (‘artigos’) and pronouns (‘pronomes’) are presented now in a more systematic and orderly way. Figueira decides to propose the distinction between ‘active’ and ‘non-active’ verbs as fundamental. He exhibits two ‘conjugations’ of the Tupi verb: the first are verbs which begin with the ‘article’ *a* (‘conjugação geral dos verbos do artigo A’), and the second, those which begin with the pronoun *xe* (‘conjugação geral dos verbos, que começam per pronome, Xe’).

The personal prefixes are semantically conditioned by the verbs to which they are attached. Figueira’s definition is as follows:

E avemos logo de advertir, que os verbos huns se começam por artigos, outros se começam por pronomes, & polos artigos, & pronomes se conhecem, & distinguem as pessoas, & numeros dos verbos: porque a voz nua dos taes verbos he

sempre a mesma sem distinção alguma. Mas os artigos, & os pronomes respondem igualmente aos pronomes latinos, Ego, Tu, Ille, Plur. Nos, Vos, Illi. (Figueira 1878[1687]: 10–11)

1. Art. A, Ere, O.	Plur. Ia, Oro, Pe, O.
2. Art. Ai, Erêi, Oi	Plur. Iâi, Oròi, Pêi, Oi
Pronome, Xe, Nde, I	Plur. Iande, Ore, Pe, I

[And we must observe that some verbs begin with ‘articles’ whereas others begin with pronouns, and by the articles and by the pronouns persons and numbers of the verb are known and distinguished, since the form of the verb (‘voz’) of such verbs is always the same without any distinction (=without verbal inflectional morphology). Nevertheless, the articles and pronouns correspond to the Latin pronouns *Ego, Tu, Ille, Plur. Nos, Vos, Illi.*]

According to Figueira, the first class of ‘artigos’ co-occurs with ‘neuter verbs’ (=intransitive) and the second class with ‘many active’ verbs (=transitive).

4.2.3.5 Syntax and agreement

The syntax or ‘constructio’ of Tupi words is not complicated, according to Figueira, since in this language no formal distinction is made between cases and genders (“Como nesta lingua não ha variedade de casos, nem de generos, mais que o que se tem visto, fica facil a combinação dos verbos com os nomes, como se verá”: Figueira 1621: 81).

When Figueira noticed that agreement between the subject and verb in Tupi was not comparable to the rules of Latin grammar, he preferred not to call such different features ‘barbarisms’, because even Greek shows such an agreement asymmetry:

Parecera barbaria, concordar terceira pessoa no singular, com a primeira do plural. Mas não he de estranhar, pois tambem na lingua Grega elegantissima temos exemplo semelhante, porque comumente os nomes neutros no plural, pedem o verbo no singular: ut *Zóa tréki, Animalia currit*”. Figueira 1878[1687]: 99)

[It will seem barbarian to concord the third person singular with the first plural. But this should not surprise us, since in the most elegant language Greek we also have a similar example, and usually neuter plural nouns take a verb in the singular, as in “*Zóa tréki, Animalia currit*” (“the animals are running”).]

4.2.3.6 Word order

Figueira also describes the Latin postposition *tenus* and it is at least remarkable that he uses the term ‘proposição’ and not ‘postposição’. As we see, the reality of new vernaculars opened doors to the invention of an extended meta-language:

O uso ensinarà a boa collocação das partes da oração entre si; mas apontaremos aqui alguãs que pedem certos lugares, assi como vemos no latim, que esta proposição *Tenus*, sempre se põe depois do nome que rege. (Figueira 1878[1687]: 165)

[Usage will inform the collocation of the various parts of speech; but we note here some which have required position, as we see in Latin, where the form *tenus* is always put after the noun it governs.]²⁵

4.2.4 The anonymous grammar of the *Língua geral amazônica*.

Biblioteca de Coimbra, no. 69 (1750)

4.2.4.1 *Introduction*

In this section, the anonymous manuscript, entitled *Grammatica da lingua geral do Brazil. Com hum Diccionario dos vocabulos mais usuaes para a intelligencia da dita Lingua* (1750), will be analysed, since this has not been done yet satisfactorily in the context of the history of linguistics. In this grammar most definitions and pedagogical and descriptive techniques are in agreement with those of its predecessors, and often the descriptions and definitions of the parts of speech are identical to Figueira's. In the first place, the anonymous grammar gives us some information concerning language variety and language change, which is not found in the grammars of Anchieta and Figueira. When discussing the paradigms of the eight parts of speech, not all parallels will be summed up here, for reasons of space, but some examples will be given, to offer an idea of how missionaries relied on each other and how in some cases they tried to give their own solutions to problems. More interesting are some remarkable deviations from the traditional descriptive model, which will be analysed and discussed here, with a focus on the pronominal system (with the specific terms 'artigo', 'particula' and 'pronomes extravagantes').

4.2.4.2 *The author*

We know almost nothing about the anonymous author. He admits that he was not a very good 'master' of grammar, as we can read in the following section:

Todo o Gramatico saberá que as partes da oração são oito, e não trato aqui dellas porque não componho por hora a Arte, e nem mestre sou della ... (Anonymous 1750: f.361)

[Any grammarian will know that there are eight parts of speech and I will not deal with them here, since I am not composing an *Arte* nor am I a master of such ...]

25. For a more detailed comparison between Figueira and Anchieta I refer to Zwartjes & Altman (forthcoming).

In another section of his grammar, he reveals that he has some knowledge of other Amerindian languages, as the following citation demonstrates:

Não me parece mal esta opinião; porém a mim me parece, que são pronomes, porque *tendo noticia de outras Línguas* as acho nellas claramente feitas pronomes. (Anonymous 1750: f.132, emphasis is mine)
 [This view does not seem to me bad; they seem to me to be nonetheless pronouns, because being acquainted with other languages, I found them in these languages as well, clearly (made) as pronouns.]

He does not mention the names of the grammarians he used, but he does mention an “arte antiga” in his grammar (f.148).

4.2.4.3 *The manuscript*

The manuscript has 407 numbered folios, probably written by three different scribes, whose handwriting is in each case clearly recognizable as 18th-century. The first scribe wrote the grammar, the two others the rest (the dictionary, the religious texts, such as ‘confessionario’, ‘doutrina’, etc. and several word lists). On one of the last pages by the third scribe, the date is given: “20 de Abril de 1750, Vale” (f.397). The grammar is not dated but was probably written in the same period. A prologue is missing and the work starts with four folios numbered with Roman numerals (i-iv), containing a word list of degrees of consanguinity (‘graos de parentesco’), the ‘artigos’, the ‘pronomes’, to be discussed below, and the ‘dativos de proveito’.²⁶ The first folio numbered in Arabic numerals starts with the conjugation of the verb *Jucá* (‘matar’), the same verb used in Anchieta and Figueira. An introductory chapter on pronunciation is lacking. The section with the paradigms of the verb occupies 105 folios and after the conjugations a chapter follows entitled ‘The parts of speech’ (‘partes de oração’), containing a great number of rules, comments and observations (‘anotações’, ‘advertencias’ and ‘regras’). On folio 195 a chapter on syntax (‘syntaxe’) begins (ff.195–205), and, as in Figueira, is followed by some phrases dealing with the syllable (‘syllaba’, f.205); on the last page of this grammar, as occurs in Álvares, the section on the syllable comes directly after ‘syntax’ (Figueira 1878[1687]: 167). After the dictionary are appended a number of paradigms (‘Artigos’, ‘pronomes’, and the ‘dativos de proveito’, f.355), apparently superfluous since this class has been dealt with earlier in the opening section of the

26. It is not so clear why we find this subject on one of the first pages. It is remarkable that in the Tamil grammar of Henriques, a similar paragraph concerning the ‘dativus pretii’ is also appended in a section where we don’t expect this. This subject has been called a ‘page filler’ by Vermeer (1982: xx). The anonymous grammar includes the same ‘dativo de proveito’ once again at the end (f.355), quite a strange practice.

grammar. Such inconsistencies can be explained by the fact that this is a manuscript, which has not been edited for print.²⁷

4.2.4.4 *Language variation*

Unlike Anchieta and Figueira, the anonymous grammarian does not give us any information concerning regional differences – no comparisons are made, for instance, between the ‘Língua Geral Amazônica’ and varieties spoken in other regions, but the grammar contains two aspects which are different from those of Anchieta and Figueira: two different registers or stylistic varieties are referred to and the grammar even contains observations related to the frequency of certain expressions in language which is less or more sophisticated and, conversely, more or less common (“menos polida, e mais usada”, opposed to another register which is “muy polida, e pouco usada”) (Anonymous 1750: ff.4–5, 14, 117, 181, etc.).

Another distinction made is that between the language of those who are beginners, and that of those who are more skilled in learning the general language (“os que são poucos versados no lingua geral”, or “os que sabem pouco” versus “os bons linguas”).²⁸ In the section dealing with the adverb, we find also information about the register or sociolect of the ‘ladinos’: “He o mesmo, ainda que com menos uzo da gente ladina” (f.181). In the chapter which deals with the pronouns, the author describes pronouns which are “mais engraçados de que uzao os ladinos, ebriosos por melindre” (f.129), to be discussed at 4.2.4.8 below.²⁹ The author is probably referring to a sort of ‘media lingua’, a new ‘standard’ derived from an intermediate level of a group of non-native speakers in the learning process, adapted also by native speakers.

4.2.4.5 *Language change*

The anonymous grammarian not only comments on registers and stylistic differences, but also mentions an “arte antiga”, and in this passage he tells us that certain forms are not longer in use:

27. Another explanation is that the questions of the ‘artigos’ and ‘pronomes’ were considered as such important topics that the author decided to exhibit the system at the beginning and at the end of the manuscript, so that learners could check such crucial information easily when necessary.

28. This distinction is also made in two Portuguese Jesuit grammars written in India: cf. Henriques (f.39r. and f.55r.; Vermeer 1982: xx).

29. Cf. “... algumas vezes succede ser elegantissimo ambas juntas [the particles *ra*, *racó*], como fazem os ladinos por melindre nesta” (f.131) and “alguns indios mais ladinos nos imitam no optativo” (f.148).

Nos catecismos, e na Arte antiga se acha em lugar de oé esta dicção *mã*, a qual ainda que ao parecer he muy elegante, e algumas pessoas há, que ainda dão razão della, não ha hoje pessoa alguma, que a uze, e as mais dellas não a entendem; e por isso uzem desta ... (f.148).³⁰

[In the catechisms and in the old *Arte* we find instead of *oé* the word *mã* which still seems to be very elegant and there are some people who still give a reason for this, but today no one uses it anymore, and when it is used, others do not understand it.]

4.2.4.6 *The grammar*

In the sections describing ‘partes declinables’ we see many parallels between the anonymous work and the grammar of Figueira, for instance the use of the ‘modo permissivo’ (f.149), described in Zwartjes (2002: 44). The definition of the preposition by the anonymous author is almost verbatim that of Anchieta and Figueira.³¹ He follows the subclasses of the adverb of Figueira quite strictly, although adding more, and it is important that he gives in these subparagraphs quite a few examples which are not found in Figueira.³² He does not give all the interjections summarised by Figueira, but it is clear that he copied his list from Figueira’s.³³ Figueira’s list of conjunctions is reduced by the anonymous author (only five examples without definitions). The chapter on syntax in the anonymous manuscript is almost verbatim that of Figueira’s text (particularly, the ‘regras’ 1–6) and virtually nothing significant has been added. However, there are some important differences between the anonymous grammar and those of his predecessors, and these will be analysed in the following paragraphs.

30. Since neither Anchieta nor Figueira is mentioned, it is difficult to say which grammar is referred to as the ‘arte antiga’. Anchieta describes the use of *mã* as follows: “Optativo. O primeiro tempo do optativo (vt supra) sempre significa futuro, o se eu matasse cõ algumas partes præteriti temporis pode significar, perfeito & plusquã perfeito, o segundo sempre significa preterito. Alem disto, notesse que a particula, *mã*, sempre ha dir no fim, ainda que se interponhão outras partes, vt *Açôtemo ibácupe mã*, o se eu fosse ao Ceo, *Açôméimo ibácupemã*. Note that Anchieta describes the optionality of *mã* which can be omitted in the future of the optative and in that case *mã* is “sub intellecto” (Anchieta 1999[1595]: 24v). Cf. Figueira (1878[1687]: 16–17), who could also have been the source of inspiration, since he gives the same forms as in Anchieta. Elsewhere, as we shall see, Figueira certainly appears to be a source for the anonymous grammar.

31. Anonymous (f.174), Anchieta (1999[1595]: f.40r.) and Figueira (1878[1687]: 120–121).

32. Anonymous (f.179), cf. Figueira (1878[1687]: 126). Figueira’s subclasses can be found in (1878[1687]: 136).

33. Anonymous (f.194), cf. Figueira (1878[1687]: 147) and Zwartjes (2002: 51).

4.2.4.7 *The eight parts of speech and language universals*

When the author describes the subclasses of the nouns, he claims that these features are universal for all the languages of Brazil:

Todos os nomes dessa Lingua, e de outros qualquer idioma dos do Brazil, se podem reduzir em Substantivos, adjectivos, absolutos, verbaes, possessivos, relativos, comparativos e superlativos. (Anonymous 1750: f.107, emphasis is mine)

[All the nouns of this language, and of any other language in Brazil, can be reduced to substantives, adjectives, ‘absolutes’, ‘verbals’, ‘possessives’, ‘relatives’, ‘comparatives’ and ‘superlatives’.]

The noun in the *Língua Geral Amazônica* also has ‘universal’ characteristics:

Os substantivos se conhecem em qualquer idioma por declararem bastantemente seu significado sem dependencia de algum outro nome, (ff.107–108, emphasis is mine).³⁴

[The substantives are recognised in any language since they declare sufficiently their meaning, independently from any other noun.]

In contrast, the adjective “requires a substantive” (“que necesita de nome substantiuo para declarar sua significação”). The expression “sentido suspenso” reflects the two definitions of Álvares and Figueira.³⁵ The definition of the verb also reveals that the author attempts to consider this word class as the base for learning and understanding any language.³⁶ In the description of active verbs, we see a comparable language universal: “...se concluem os verbos activos em todas as linguas” (f.136).

4.2.4.8 *The pronominal system*

The anonymous grammar does not distinguish between the inclusive and the exclusive forms in the first person plural in his paradigm of the ‘pronomes’, where we find only *Iandê* (‘nos’), whereas we still find this distinction in the paradigm of the ‘artigos’ (*ya* = ‘nos todos’ and *oro* ‘nos sem vos’) (f.v. and f.355). Since we find the same paradigm in two different sections of the grammar, it is improbable that the scribe made a mistake. This is possible evidence for the gradual disappearance of the opposition between inclusive and exclusive independent pronouns, as demonstrated by Schmidt-Riese (1998: 326).

34. Cf. the observations concerning the verb ‘to be’: “o verbo sum tem tres significações mais precisas, e necessarias a todos os idiomas” (Anonymous 1750: f.141) (emphasis mine).

35. Álvares (1972[1572]: 48r.) and Figueira (1878[1687]: 68–69).

36. “Verbo he huma ordem de palavras, que per si fallão, que a subtileza dos homens tem inventado para saberem com fundamento *todos os idiomas* (f.135, emphasis mine).

The anonymous grammarian gives the paradigms of the ‘artigos’³⁷ and the ‘pronomes’ – following Figueira – before the major section of the conjugation of the verb. These paradigms differ from Figueira’s:

ARTIGOS Singular A, Ere, O.	Plur. Ya, Oro, Pe, O.
PRONOMES Singular Ixe, Indé, Aé	Plur. Iandé, Penhé (ou pé), Am-öá ³⁹

Only one series of the ‘artigos’ is given by the anonymous grammar, and the ‘pronomes’ are not the same as in Figueira’s grammar. The examples in the section on the pronouns in Figueira (*Xe, Nde, I*, etc.) are given in the paragraph on the ‘possessive’ in the anonymous grammar. Figueira translated them as *Ego, Tu, Ille* (Figueira 1878[1687]: 10) and the anonymous grammar as *Meu, teu, seu*, etc. (f.110). The latter also gives us more pronouns, only used by the “ladinos, ebriosos por melindre”: *Ícé, iné, ahé, jáné, penhé*.

How can we explain the differences between the anonymous grammarian and Figueira? Figueira gives two series of ‘artigos’, of which the first co-occur with intransitive verbs, and the second with transitives. In Tupi, the direct object can be placed at three different places: preceding the verb (*Tembi’u a-i-monhang* “I prepare the meal”), incorporated in the verb (*A-tembi’u-monhang*) or after the verb (*A-i-monhang tembi-’u*). If the substantive in the direct object position is not incorporated in the verb, the third person marker *-i-* must be infix:

a-i-monhang tembi’u
ere-i-monhang tembi’u
o-i-monhang tembi’u
oro-i-monhang tembi’u
îa-i-monhang tembi’u
pe-i-monhang tembi’u
o-i-monhang tembi’u. (Navarro 1997: 49)

All these personal prefixes were considered as the second class of the ‘artigos’ (*ai, erêi, oi*, etc.) by Figueira. In the eyes of the anonymous grammarian, the use of *-î-* was redundant³⁹ and probably for this reason he gives only the first series at the beginning for didactic reasons. He classifies two different conjugations of verbs, one which combines with the ‘artigos’ (*a-*), and the second which corresponds

37. The grammar also gives the synonym ‘sinais’, (f.143); cf. the ‘señal de demostración’, a synonym for the article in the Arabic grammar of Pedro de Alcalá (Zwartjes 1993). The term is used by Stephens for ‘diacritic’ (1640: 4r).

38. See also f.129 and f.355.

39. In Portuguese: “Faço-*a* a comida”, cf. Spanish “La comida *la* preparo”.

with pronouns (*xe-*), whereas in Anchieta's grammar only one conjugation is given, with affirmative and negative forms (1990[1595]: 17v.). Anchieta made the distinction 'activo' versus 'neutro' but in his grammar they do not form separate conjugations. The anonymous grammar distinguishes between two 'genders': 'activo' and 'não activo', the latter classified according to the dichotomy 'passivos' and 'absolutos'. The 'real neutral' verbs ('neutros verdadeiros') combine with the pronominal clitics *xe*, *n[d]e*, *i*, etc., and these forms are left out in the table set out at the beginning of the grammar, although the author discusses these later (f.137). He prefers to start with the pronouns *ixé*, *endé* (or *indé*), which are used in the position of the subject and in circumstances of ellipsis, emphasis, topicalization or contrast (Navarro 1997: 4; cf. Seki 2000: 62).⁴⁰ The second series, *xe*, *nde* (or *ne*), *i*, *oré*, *iande*, *pe*, *i* is used with predicative adjectives (*xe porang*: "I (am) nice"), *nde porang*, etc.). Independent possessive pronouns or adjectives do not exist in Tupi. The pronouns from the second series correspond to 'possessives': *xe anama* "my family". The 'impoverishment' of the pronominal system in the anonymous grammar of the *língua geral amazônica* – compared with the paradigms of Anchieta and Figueira – may be the result of the second language acquisition process of non-Tupi speakers, or perhaps more specifically of interference or contact between the *língua geral* and Portuguese (cf. Schmidt-Riese 1998: 213; 326).

4.2.4.9 The 'pronomes extravagantes'

The definition of the pronoun in the anonymous grammar is as follows: "Pronome he aquella, que se põe em lugar do nome de qualquer cousa". This is an exact copy of Figueira's (1878[1687]: 84–85) and different from Álvares's (1972[1572]: 51r). A novelty, however, is the use of the category of the so-called "pronomes extravagantes":

Uíá uíae	"aquelles, aquellas"
Masá	"qual"
Eboquói, Eboquéi	"esse, essa", etc., "eis la vai", "certamente" ⁴¹
Uieépe, mieépe	"aquillo que lá está longe a perder de vista"
Acoí, Aquei, aquieoaé	"aquelle"
Aipó	"este", "aquillo em que tinhamos fallado"
Ipó	"isso" (ff.132–135)

40. Example: *Abá-pe o-so? -Endé*. "Who was it?; You".

41. In Figueira's grammar, *eboquei* is a demonstrative adverb ('adverbio demonstrativo'; 1878[1687]: 134) and the anonymous grammarian's terminology appears to be inconsistent, since in his dictionary he classifies *Eboquói*, *Eboquéi*, and *Aquoi* as 'demonstrative adverbs' as well, and not as a 'pronome extravagante'.

This novel category is an extension of the list given by Figueira, since the latter is far from instructive, lacking any explanation:

Aé, Aëäé, Aëmemé, elle, elles. Có, Icó, este estes. Cóbäe, Ang, Iang, Anga, Vi, I, Guí, Ebuí, Ebuínga, esse, esses. Akér, Aquéia, Eboquéi, Eboquéia, Aipó, Aipóbäe, este, esse, esses, estes. Os quaes todos, & alguns mais, que se acharem deste genero, servem a ambos os numeros, a qualquer pessoa, & genero. (Figueira 1878[1687]: 85)
 [Aé, Aëäé, Aëmemé, 'he', 'they'. Có, Icó, 'this', 'these'. Cóbäe, Ang, Iang, Anga, Vi, I, Guí, Ebuí, Ebuínga, 'that' (Port. 'esse'), 'those' ('esses'). Akér, Aquéia, Eboquéi, Eboquéia, Aipó, Aipóbäe, 'this', 'that', 'those', 'these' (Port. 'este', 'esse', 'esses', 'estes'). All these and some more of this type serve for both numbers and for any person and gender.]

How can we explain the term “pronomes extravagantes”? The anonymous grammarian introduced this term since he felt the necessity to give more detailed explanations (ff.132–135) than are found in the grammars of Anchieta and Figueira. Some definitions are quite precise (“distinction between visible and not visible”), others are rather vague and often the criteria used are far from clear. The Tupi language distinguishes between demonstratives for referring to ‘visible’ objects or persons: *kó* (or *ikó*) = (Port. ‘este’), *ebokûei*, *eboûing*, *eboûi*, *úi* (Port. ‘esse’), and *kûei*, *kûe*, *úi*, etc. (Port. ‘aquele’, etc.) and not visible, only in the mind: *â*, *âng*, *îâ*, *îâng*, etc. (Port. ‘este’), also used for visible beings, *aipó*, *aê*, *akó*, *akûei*, (Port. ‘esse’, etc. ‘aquele’, etc.) (Navarro 1997: 20–21). The fact that Portuguese does not make the distinction between visible and invisible, explains why these pronouns are labelled as ‘extravagantes’. The anonymous grammarian invented a new subclass, probably for didactic reasons. The term ‘extravagantes’ can be interpreted literally as an adjective derived from ‘extravagar’ – to go beyond (the rules and subcategorisations of traditional grammar).

4.3 The Kiriri grammar of Luiz Vincencio Mamiani (1652–1730)

4.3.1 Introduction

Luiz Vincencio Mamiani della Rovere was born in Pesaro in 1652. He entered the Society of Jesus in Venice in 1668 and after his studies, he started his mission in Brazil. He returned to Europe in 1701 and he died in Rome in 1730 (Garcia 1942: xi). He was not the first missionary to describe the language of the Kiriri or Cariris, since it has been reported that João de Barros wrote an earlier *Arte e Proso-dia* of this language, but this work has been lost (Leite 1965: 218). The evangelization of the Cariris of Bahia started in 1660 by João de Barros in the region around the areas today called Canabrava, Ribeiro do Pombal and Saco dos Morcegos.

4.3.2 The language

Karirí (Kiriri or Kipeá) was originally spoken in the Serra dos Velhos, Paraíba State, and later at the ancient missions of Missão Velha, Missão Nova, Milagres, and on the islands of the São Francisco River near Cabrobó, Pernambuco (Loukotka 1968: 89–90). Von Martius and Spix (1966–1967[1823–1831]) report that in 1818, a tribe of 600 Kiriri-speaking Indians was still living in Vila de Pedra Branca in the *sertão* of Bahia along the river Paraguaça, south of modern Otaberaba. They lived together with the Sabuya tribe. Nowadays, the Kiriri language is extinct.⁴²

The family to which Kiriri belongs is called Macro-Jê, a name proposed by Mason in 1950, whereas Loukotka used the term Tapuya-žé in the same sense in 1942 (cited in Rodrigues 1999b: 165). Greenberg (1987: 86) does not classify Karirí as a member of the Macro-Jê languages, but Rodrigues (1999b: 166) concludes that the language is to be considered “a possible member of Macro-Jê”.⁴³ Its inclusion in this family is not so obvious, since it shows considerable discrepancies from other languages of this family (Rodrigues 1997b: 68).

The terms Karirí and Kiriri are not mere mis-spellings. In the prologue to Mamiani’s re-edition of his *Arte*, Garcia writes that ‘Quiriri’ is applied to the tribes of Bahia, and ‘Cariri’ for those of the North (Garcia 1942: xxii; Kraisch 2008).⁴⁴ According to Garcia (1942: xxviii) the Karirís lived near the river of São Francisco, and spoke ‘Dubucua’ (or Dzubucua), a different language, but related to that of another Karirí tribe, the Kipeá. In the study of Rodrigues (1999b: 169) we read that “Karirí was mainly located between Itapicuru and the middle and lower São Francisco river, in central and north-eastern Bahia and southern Sergipe, and with some extensions northwards and southwards.” All non-Tupi speakers (i.e. those not speaking the so-called *língua geral* as their native tongue) belong to the *tapuias*, divided by the historians and politicians of the period in question into 76 tribes (Kraisch 2005).⁴⁵ Mamiani composed a catechism and grammar in Geru for the Kipeá tribes (J. E. Borges 1984: 40). Kipeá Kiriri is the only non-Tupian language

42. In 1997, Rodrigues wrote that there were about 1,000 remaining Karirí in Mirandela (State of Bahia). They speak Portuguese, although some people recall isolated words of Kiriri (Rodrigues 1997b: 67).

43. According to Greenberg, the language belongs to “Equatorial”; Swadesh classified the language among the “Macro-Carib” family, and Rivet and Loukotka among the “isolates” (cf. Larsen 1984: 189).

44. According to Martin de Nantes (see below), ‘Cariri’ signifies ‘silent’, ‘timid’, ‘shy’, indicating their way of being (Rietveld 2002: 32).

45. For the history of the Cariri/Kiriri tribes see J.E. Borges (1984). The tribes are mentioned by Elias Herckman (c.1596–1644) who worked for the Dutch West India Company in his *Generale Beschrijvinge van de Capitanie Paraiba* (1639); for a nineteenth-century reprint and a

in eastern Brazil which was recorded in the colonial period and is documented in extant grammars, catechisms and wordlists.⁴⁶

4.3.3 Sources for eastern Brazilian languages of the Macro-Jê family

The most important source for the reconstruction of Kipeá-Kiriri is the work of Luiz Vincencio Mamiani, who wrote a catechism entitled *Catecismo da Doutrina Christã na lingua Brasilica da Nação Kiriri* (1698) and a grammar with the title *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica da Naçam Kiriri* (1699), both published in Lisbon by Miguel Deslandes.⁴⁷ Mamiani did not compile a dictionary of the language, but in his grammar he included several word lists. His catechism includes also a word list of kinds of consanguinity entitled “Catalogo dos nomes de parentesco na lingua Kiriri” containing 54 different entries (Mamiani 1942[1698]: 209–213).

Not only Jesuits were active in Brazil. The mission of the Capuchins there started in 1611 when they accompanied the French expedition to the Maranhão region led by the Huguenot Daniel de la Touche, Sieur de la Ravardière (1570–1631) and Chevalier François de Razilly (1578–1622).⁴⁸ This Capuchin enterprise came to a premature end two years later when the governor of Grão Pará, Jerônimo Fragoso de Albuquerque (d.1619), permitted only Jesuits in the colonized region (Gadenne 1997: 41).⁴⁹ In 1641, Dutch pirates captured a number of French Capuchins in Angola, some of whom were brought to Brazil as hostages, where they arrived in 1642, others being taken to Holland.⁵⁰ In 1644, the Dutch established religious freedom in their possessions in Brazil and allowed the Capuchins to preach.⁵¹ After the reconquest by the Portuguese, the Capuchins were allowed

Portuguese translation of this text, see my bibliography of secondary sources, and for other editions, see Borges (1984: 42).

46. Apart from the documents analyzed in this chapter, there exist also some word lists of Sabuyá and Pedra Branca Karirí compiled by Martius (Kamurú) (Rodrigues 1997b: 65).

47. The contents of the catechism are described in detail in de Goeje (1938: 201–202). The grammar was translated by the German linguist Hans Conon von der Gabelentz (1807–1874) as *Grammatik der Kiriri-Sprache* (1852).

48. See Dickason (2001: 103–106).

49. The Jesuits were expelled in 1696 from most regions of the São Francisco river, but in 1697 they returned to at least three missions, one near Rio das Rodelas above the Paulo Afonso Falls, the other two, Curral dos Bois and Carurús, 100 leagues above the Falls (Hohenthal 1952: 33).

50. See Pellicer (1649: 34v). The Dutch were surprised when they met Capuchins, since they never had seen such individuals before: “Quedaron los de su Casa como atonitos, por no aver visto jamas Capuchinos; y los mira como Personas de otro mundo”.

51. The Calvinist Dutch were actually undermining their own religion by bringing over these Catholic priests (Rietveld 2002: 28).

to continue their mission (particularly in Olinda, captured by the Dutch in 1630 [Leite 1965: 119]) in exchange for their collaboration with the Portuguese against the Dutch.

The Capuchin friar Martin de Nantes (1638–1714) began his mission in Bahia in 1671 (Hohenthal 1952). The Capuchins operated independently from the Portuguese authorities, since they were sent by the Vatican (*Propaganda Fide*), as happened in Africa. In 1688, Martin de Nantes returned to Europe, to be appointed Superior of a religious house in Quimper, where he worked until 1706. From 1712 until 1714 he was guardian of a Capuchin house in Lisbon (Gadenne 1997: 42; Rietveld 2002: 28). During his Brazilian mission, he started preaching the *Pater Noster*, the *Ave Maria* and the *Credo* in Portuguese, but when he became proficient enough in the local language, he wrote a vocabulary, a catechism and a ‘Life of Saints’ in Cariri and possibly also a grammar which has disappeared (‘art of the rudiments’, cf. Rietveld 2002: 28). He also learned Portuguese, and he often wrote about the importance of learning the language of the tribes, since he reports that many Portuguese priests did not know the local language. According to Nantes, the Portuguese lacked four essentials:

The first, study of the language, without which we are barbarians in the presence of barbarians. The second, magnanimity, to support many imperfections, rudeness, lack of gratefulness, until they are civilized, because lack of gratefulness is the daughter of bestiality. The third is a great individual lack of interest in regard to the temporary things and a great devotion doing all the possible good to them and protecting them against their oppressors. The fourth, a great love for chastity, with many protections, because of the dangerous solicitations to which we expose ourselves, because the Indians are very weak. (Cited in Rietveld 2002: 35).

His successor, Bernard de Nantes, probably used the linguistic works of Martin de Nantes when he published his *Katecismo indico da língua Karirís* in 1709.⁵² The French Capuchin mission remained in the region of the Rio São Francisco until the end of the 17th century, to be followed in 1709 by the Italian Capuchins, as a consequence of a disagreement between the French Capuchins, the Vatican and the Portuguese authorities (Hohenthal 1952: 35, note 2).

According to Garcia (1942: xxix), Mamiani studied and described the Kipeá language (Kippéa, or Quipéia) whereas Bernard de Nantes’ catechism is written in Dzubucuá. Together with the publication of Spix and Martius (1966–1967[1823–1831]), these sources offer the most important linguistic data for the reconstruction

52. I have seen neither the original nor the edition of 1896 by Julius Platzmann (1832–1902), *Katecismo indico da língua Karirís*. Cf. Dahlmann (1891: 88), who also mentions the catechisms of Fathers Araújo and Bettendorf.

of Kipeá-Kiriri.⁵³ In what follows, we attempt to give an overview of the most important contributions of Mamiani.

4.3.4 The grammar

Mamiani's *Arte* is divided in two parts. The first (1–47) deals with orthography, pronunciation, the declension of the nouns and the conjugation of the verbs. The second part is devoted to “syntax and construction of the eight parts of speech” (49–101). As far as we know, Mamiani did not compile a vocabulary of the language, but he decided to include a number of word-lists in his grammar, corresponding with the subject dealt with. These word-lists are arranged thematically according to grammatical category (such as adverbs), and for each category the examples are given in alphabetical order. In 1942, Aryon Dall’Igna Rodrigues compiled an unpublished dictionary of the language based on the grammar of Mamiani (“Vocabulários Português-Kiriri e Kiriri-Português”: cf. Rodrigues 1942).

4.3.4.1 *The sources of the grammar*

As we have demonstrated elsewhere (Zwartjes 2002), Mamiani follows the grammar of Manuel Álvares. Since Mamiani was an Italian Jesuit educated in Venice, we must not exclude the possibility that he was familiar with other grammars, particularly those which were in use in Italy before the appearance of the grammar of Álvares: Donatus, Guarino Veronese's (1374–1460) *Regulae*, Antonio Mancinelli's (1452–1505) *Donatus melior* (1487) and Lorenzo Valla's (1406–1457) *Elegantiae* were the most important.⁵⁴ In Venice, where Mamiani was educated, some teachers preferred to use “la grammatica del Spauterio” instead of the *Ianua* (Grendler 1989: 191). The Flemish humanist Ioannes Despauter or Despauterius (Jan Van Pauteren, c.1460–1520) wrote three grammars: *Syntaxis* (1511), *Prima pars*

53. For the most important studies on Kipeá-Kiriri see Rodrigues (1999).

54. According to the *Ratio studiorum*, the Latin grammar of Álvares was selected for the education of the Jesuits (Rosa 2006: 210). However, in many regions other grammars were used, as in Croatia, where Jesuits also learned Latin from the grammar of Aldus Pius Manutius (Aldo Manuzio; 1449–1515) (see Pandžić 2005). As Percival (1999: 23) observed “In the grammatical sphere, a model which was certainly available (although I have so far seen no mention of it by writers of New World grammars) was the *De institutione grammatica* by the Portuguese Jesuit Manuel Álvares In course of time, as we examine more grammars and dictionaries, we will be able to establish precisely how many different European models were utilized and what factors influenced the choice of a particular model by each missionary-linguist. ... An instructive comparison might meanwhile be made with the grammars of language spoken in areas under Portuguese control”.

grammaticae (1512) dealing with morphology, and *Rudimenta* (1514), a short compendium covering the parts of speech.⁵⁵ Later, other teachers in Venice used also the *De institutione grammatica* (1572) of Manuel Álvares.⁵⁶ According to Grendler (ibid.), only one teacher of that period reported that he used Aldo Manuzio's *Institutiones grammaticae libri quatuor*.⁵⁷ In conclusion, it will be complicated to answer the question of which grammars Mamiani studied, apart from that of Álvares. As we shall demonstrate below, Mamiani was familiar with the New World Tupi grammars of the “antigos”, probably referring to the existing grammars of Tupi.

Here follow some parallels between Mamiani's grammar and the Latin grammar of Álvares.

Priscian establishes the dichotomy between the *pronomina demonstrativa*, denoting things present to the speaker, opposed to the *pronomina relativa*, denoting things absent. Both Álvares and Mamiani continued the traditional distinction made on the base of sense perception.⁵⁸

Another example which demonstrates that Mamiani followed Álvares is his subcategorisation of the interjections:

Mamiani does not copy Álvares' model exactly, but most subcategories can be found. The main difference is that Mamiani decided to arrange the word-list alphabetically, following the Kiriri words, and not the Latin or Portuguese names of the subcategories. Some correspondences are very obvious, such as the expression ‘cum fastidio’, although the two authors apply them to different subcategories.

Table 4.4 The relative according to Álvares and Mamiani

Álvares	Mamiani
Relatium est, quod nomen antecedens in memoriam reducit: id duplex est substantiae, & accidentis. (1974[1572]: 49v)	O Nome relativo he o que reduz á memoria o nome Substantivo, de que se fallou, como no Latim Qui, Quae, Quod. (1877[1699]: 55)

55. A combined edition entitled *Comentarii grammatici* appeared in 1537.
56. An abridged edition appeared in 1583 and reprints and emended editions were printed almost in every country in Europe (see Sommervogel 1890).
57. The grammar of Manuzio was a great success and was reprinted with slightly different titles in 1501, 1508, and posthumously in 1523 with some work of Erasmus.
58. Nebrija and Despauterius have different definitions (cf. Zwartjes 2002: 39).

Table 4.5 Interjections according to Álvares and Mamiani

Álvares	Mamiani
Laudantis, & aliquando exultantis, vt 'euge'.	<i>Agà, Aganori</i> : ay, voz da mulher. Lat. 'Heu' dolentis.
Exultantis [sic], & interdum insultantis, vt 'vah'.	<i>Ami</i> : tiray là, voz também de mulher. Lat. 'Apagè, execrantis, aut rejicientis cum fastidio.
Lætantis, vt 'euax'.	<i>Ari</i> : arrelà, voz do homem, Lat. 'Apagè, ut suprà.
Dolentis, & ingemiscantis, vt 'ah', 'heu', 'hei'.	<i>Bó</i> : o. Lat. 'O', exclamantis.
Suspirantis, vt 'ahah'	<i>Papè, 'Vah'</i> , admirantis.
Lugentis, vt 'hoi', 'hei'	<i>Cuhè</i> : oh. Lat. 'Papè, Vah', admirantis.
Eiulantis, vt 'oh oh oh oh'.	<i>Hè</i> : ay. Lat. 'Ah', 'Heu', ingemiscantis.
Admirantis, vt 'papæ', ò, 'vah'.	<i>Hohò</i> : oh, voz da mulher. Lat. 'Papè', 'Vah', admirantis.
Admirantis, & interdum ironiæ, vt 'hui'.	<i>Homórò</i> : ay. Lat. 'Heu', miserentis.
Irridentis, vt 'ò' ...	<i>Yà</i> : ea. Lat. 'Age', 'Agedum', sollicitantis.
Exclamantis, vt ,prò', 'ò'.	<i>Yahè</i> : hay. Lat. 'Hei', voz do homem, dolentis.
Silentium indicentis, vt 'st'.	<i>Yuh, Yuhyá, Yuhyàretè</i> : huy. Lat. 'Hui', admirantis, aut rejicientis cum tædio; ou de quem festeja graças, & ditos.
Timentis, vt 'hei'.	<i>Mehi</i> : ora sús. Lat. 'Agè', 'Agedum', clamantis.
Deprehendentis aliquid ex improviso, vt 'at at'.	Esta Interjeição se compoem sempre com o verbo: ut, <i>Brocàmehi</i> ...
Præsagientis cum fastidio, vt 'apagè', 'apagesis'.	<i>Nenè</i> ou <i>Enè Enè</i> : diz o que cae na cousa.
Stomachantis, siue indignantis, vt 'malum'.	<i>Ræmy</i> : ay. Lat. 'Heu' aut 'Væ', da mulher miserentis....
Execrantis, vt 'nefas, infandum'. (Álvares 1974[1572]: f.60r-v).	<i>Sodewó</i> , Heus: Que modo he este? Lat. 'Hui', respondentis cum molestia (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 96–97).

The subcategories of the conjunctions in Mamiani also show a great similarity to those of Álvares:

59. The possible influence of the grammar of Álvares in the Spanish grammatical tradition has, as far as we know, hardly been studied and falls beyond the scope of this book. It seems that Nebrija's influence is more transparent. However, as we demonstrated in Zwartjes (2002: 54) in the category of the conjunction, we can postulate that the anonymous grammar of Quechua printed by Francisco del Canto in 1614 possibly made use of Álvares' model, since he classifies "Copulatiuas, disiuntiuas, aduersatiuas, causales, illatiuas, collectiuas, continuatiuas, condicionales" ("Canto" 1614: 30). Nebrija has a different classification: "Copulativa, continuativa, subcontinuativa, adiunctivæ, approbativa, disiunctiva, subdisiunctiva, electiva, adversativa, abnegativa, collectiva siue rationalis siue illativa, dubitativa, completiva" (Nebrija 1981[1481]: s.f.).

Álvares	Mamiani
Copulatiuæ, Disiunctiuæ, Aduersatiuæ, Collectiuæ siue illatiuæ, siue rationales, Causales, Expletiuæ. (1974[1572]: 60v) ⁶⁰	Conjunçoens copulativas, disjuntiva, causaes, adversativas, collectiva ou illativæ. (1877[1699]: 97–98)

4.3.4.2 *References to other languages and language variety*

Mamiani frequently compares Kipeá sounds with those of Portuguese, and sometimes we also find also references to other languages, such as “the language of the Castilians” (“os Castelhanos”, f. 3) and French (f. 4). There is also evidence for the fact that Mamiani had seen grammars of the *língua geral*, since comparisons are made between Kipeá and this language, not only in his grammar but also in his catechism. It is difficult to determine the degree to which he was proficient in it.

A terceira [vocalidade] he de I, tambem vogal guttural, a que *os Autores da arte da língua gèral do Brasil* chamáráo I grosso, pois se acha tambem nessa lingua. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 3, my emphasis)

[The third pronunciation] is that of the *I*, also a guttural vowel, which the authors of the grammar of the ‘general language’ of Brazil called *I* grosso (‘grave *I*’), since it is found in this language as well.]

...

Y com acento circumflexo he nota de vogal guttural, que ha tambem na lingua geral, & os antigos chamáraõ I grosso ...

[Y with a circumflex accent is the symbol for a guttural vowel, which also exists in the ‘general language’ and the old grammarians called it the ‘grave *I*’...]

Mamiani also refers to Hebrew, a language which, according to his view, has only ‘monosyllabic’ verbs. Non-derived and ‘simple’ (‘verbos simplices’, = non-compound) verbs in Kipeá-Kiriri are ‘monosyllabic’ in nature, as in Hebrew. In traditional grammar, one of the accidents of the verb is ‘figure’ (*figura*). According to Priscian, ‘simple’ (*simplicia*) verbs are base forms, as *cupio*, *taceo*; and others are compounds (*composita*) as *concupio*, *conticeo* and others are ‘decomposites’ (*decomposita* = ‘derived from compounds’), as *concupisco*, *conticesco* (cited in Porter 2002: 204). Kipeá-Kiriri, according to Mamiani, has ‘simple verbs’ which are all monosyllabic. Even all the words of the language are monosyllabic in nature and these ‘roots’ (‘raizes’) serve as a base for the process of composition, as in Hebrew. Mamiani admits that there are words with more than two syllables, but they are usually compounds. It is not possible to give exact ‘rules’ of how to

build these.⁶⁰ It is remarkable that Italian, his native tongue, does not play any role in his grammar.⁶¹

The grammar of Mamiani does not contain much information about geographical or stylistic variation, although he points at the existence of differences in the pronunciation of vowels: (“advertindo que em hūas povoações dos Indios a dita vogal se chega mais ao A, & em outras se chega mais ao E”) (Mamiani 1698: ‘Advertencias’, no numbered pages).

4.3.5 Phonology and orthography

The alphabet developed by Mamiani for Kiriri is not based exclusively on the Portuguese alphabet, since he uses the “Greek letter” ⟨Y⟩ and ⟨K⟩ and the ‘letters of the foreigners’ (‘estrangeiros’), possibly referring to Dutch, English, Flemish, German, or ‘Gothic’ (⟨VV⟩ or ⟨W⟩):

A, Æ, B, C, D, E, G, H, I, Y, K, M, N, O, P, R, S, T, V, W, Z

The letter ⟨L⟩ is missing, even in loans, as in “S. Paulo (dó) Apostroá” (Mamiani 1942[1698]: 22), although Mamiani does use this letter in the loan “Limbo dos Santos Padres” (54).

According to the classification of Azevedo, Kipeá has seven oral and five nasal vowels, as shown in Table 4.6 (from Rodrigues 1999b: 173).⁶²

60. “Os verbos simples desta lingua são todos os monosyllabos: & se houivesse quem podesse perfeitamente alcançar a força de todos os vocabulos, tenho para mim que acharia que toda a lingua consiste em vocabulos monosyllabos, que servem de raizes para formar os compostos, como na lingua Hebraea. O certo he que os mais dos Nomes, & Verbos que tem mais de duas syllabas, de ordinario são compostos. Não se póde dar regra certa para formar estes compostos; mas o exercicio, & a praxe da lingua a ensinará, assim para conhecer os compostos de que já usão, como para saber formar outros de nouvo” (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 68).

61. This does not surprise us entirely, since missionaries of non-Portuguese origin were heavily influenced by Portuguese culture. In Stephens’ grammar, we find no references to English either. The case of Febrès, the author of a Mapudungun grammar, is an exception. He wrote his grammar in Spanish and comparisons are made with Catalan, his native tongue (cf. Oyanguren and his references to Basque).

62. Azevedo’s classification is in “Língua Karirí: descrição do dialeto Kipeá”, MA thesis, Universidade de Brasília, 1965 (not consulted).

Table 4.6 The vowels of Kipeá-Kiriri (After Azevedo, cited in Rodrigues 1999b: 175)

Oral			Nasal		
Front	central	Back	front	central	back
i	j	u			
e	o		ẽ		õ
æ	a		æ̃	ã	ã̃

The set of consonants of Kipeá-Kiriri is as follows:

Table 4.7 Consonantal system of Kipeá-Kiriri (After Azevedo, cited in Rodrigues 1999b: 175)

	labial	dental	Alveolar	alveo-palatal	velar	glottal
Voiceless stop	p	t	ts	tʃ	k	ʔ
Voiced stop	b	d	dz	dʒ	g	
Fricative			s			H
Nasal	m	n		ɲ	ŋ	
Approximant	w	ɾ		J		

4.3.5.1 The vowels

Mamiani uses the following terminology in his description of the vowels.

- Vogal entremeya <æ> /æ/

Mamiani (<i>Arte</i>) (1877[1699])	Mamiani (<i>Catecismo</i>) (1942[1698])
– Entre as vogaes se conta aqui o Æ, ainda que se escreva como diphtongo Latino, para significar hũa vogal entremeya entre o A, & o E; & se pronuncia com hũ som diverso das outras vogaes, ou como A fechado que participa do E, ou como E largo que participa do A, v.g.: <i>Inhuræ</i> , Filho. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 1)	Quando se achar esta letra Æ escrita como diphtongo Latino, não se pronuncia como diphtongo, mas como vogal entremeya entre o A, & o E, de maneira que não seja bem A, nem seja bem E, mas vogal que participa de ambas essas vocalidades; advirtindo que em hũas povoações dos Indios a dita vogal se chega mais ao A, & em outras se chega mais ao E. (Mamiani 1942[1698] ‘Advertencias’, no numbered pages).

Mamiani (*Arte*) (1877[1699])

[Here among the vowels, an account is given of the *Æ*. Since it is written as the Latin diphthong, it serves to signify an intermediate vowel between the *A* and the *E* and it has to be pronounced with a sound different from the others, either as a closed *A* sharing the quality of an *E*, or as a long *E* sharing the quality of an *A*, e.g. *Inhuræ*, ‘son’.]

Mamiani (*Catecismo*) (1942[1698])

[When the letter *Æ* is written as a Latin diphthong, it must not be pronounced as a diphthong but as an intermediate vowel between the *A* and the *E* in such a manner that it is not an *A*, nor an *E*, but a vowel which shares both qualities (‘vocalities’); it must be observed that among some tribes this vowel approaches more an *A*, whereas in others more an *E*.]

In Azevedo’s reconstruction of the vowels, the front vowel /æ/ is proposed, which also has a nasalised counterpart /æ̃/ but we must have some reservations, since there are other possible candidates for this ‘intermediate’ vowel, such as the open mid front (/ɛ/) close mid front (/e/), or near open front /œ/. The information given by Mamiani is not precise enough for us to draw a definitive conclusion.

– “*Vogal simplex*” ⟨i⟩ /i/

The distinction between ‘*I simplex*’ and ‘*I duplex*’ had already been made in Antiquity (see *Excerptiones de Prisciano*, ed. Porter 2002: 48–49, and cf. Priscian, *Inst. Gram.* I.13.27–14.5, 14.14–15). Mamiani may have been inspired by classical grammars, since some of his examples are identical to those given by Priscian (*iocus*/‘jogo’ and *maius*/‘mayor’):

I modo pro simplici, modo pro duplici habetur: pro simplici, quando ab ea incipit sillaba, subsequente uocali in eadem sillaba, ut ‘Iuno’, ‘Iuppiter’, ‘iecur’, ‘iocus’; pro duplici autem, quando in medio dictionis ab ea incipit sillaba post uocalem ante se positam, sequente quoque uocali in eadem sillaba, ut ‘maius’, ‘peius’, ‘eius’. Inuenitur et pro simplici in media dictione, sed in compositis, ut ‘iniuria’, ‘adiungo’, ‘eiectus’.

[*I* is taken sometimes as a simple sound, sometimes as a double sound: simple, when it begins a syllable and another vowel follows in the same syllable, as in *Iuno*, *Iuppiter*, *iecur*, *iocus*; double when following a vowel in the interior of a word it begins a syllable and another vowel follows in the same syllable, as in *maius*, *peius*, *eius*. It is also found as a single sound in the interior of a word, but only in compounds such as *iniuria*, *adiungo*, *eiectus*.] (translation by Porter).

– ‘*Vogal guttural*’ ⟨i⟩/⟨ÿ⟩ /i/

Mamiani (<i>Arte</i>) (1877[1699])	Mamiani (<i>Catecismo</i>) (1942[1698])
<p>A terceira [vocalidade] he de I, tambem guttural, a que os Authores da arte da lingua gèral do Brasil chamáráo I grosso, pois se acha tambem nessa lingua: & assim como elles o escrevem por Y, para o differençar do I vogal simplex, também nos o escrevemos cõ o mesmo character, porèm com accento circumflexo por cima, assim, <i>ý</i>, para o differençar de outro Y consoante, que se escreve sem accento (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 3)</p> <p>[The third quality of the <i>I</i> is also guttural and the authors of the grammar of the <i>língua geral</i> called it the ‘rude’ <i>I</i>, since it exists in this language as well. And since they write it with an <i>Y</i> in order to distinguish it from the ‘simple’ vowel <i>I</i>, we write it also using the same character. However, with a circumflex accent on top of it, thus: <i>ý</i>, in order to differentiate it from another consonant <i>Y</i> which is written without an accent.]</p>	<p>Y com acento circumflexo he nota de vogal guttural, que ha tambem na lingua geral, & os antigos chamáraõ I grosso, & pronunciar-seha com os dentes fechados, & na garganta, ut <i>Mýghý</i>, contas (Mamiani 1942[1698]: ‘Advertencias’, no numbered pages).</p> <p>[Y with a circumflex accent it is a sign (=‘diacritic’) which also exists in the <i>língua geral</i> and the old ones called it the ‘harsh’ <i>I</i> and it must be pronounced with closed teeth and in the throat, as in <i>Mýghý</i> ‘payments’.]</p>

In his grammar, Mamiani refers to ‘authors’ of the grammar of the ‘*língua geral*’, and in the catechism, he refers to ‘antigos’ [grammarians]. The source of this fragment was obviously Figueira’s grammar and not Anchieta’s, since the latter uses the term ‘*i aspero*’ rather than Figueira’s ‘*i grosso*’ (cf. Schmidt-Riese 1998: 323–333), which is usually interpreted as /i/ in Tupi.⁶³

Nevertheless, the description by Mamiani is far from clear. As we have seen above, the grapheme ⟨æ⟩ may have different interpretations. Mamiani’s words “os dentes fechados” (“with closed teeth”) does not offer us the necessary details, since any vowel can be pronounced “with closed teeth”, (closed, opened, front, back, rounded or unrounded). Oliveira uses the same description for the pronunciation of the letter “*i-vogal*”: “pronüçiasse cõ os dentes quasi fechados: e os beiços assi abertos como no .e e a lingua apertada cõ as gëgibas de bayxo: e o espirito lançado cõ mais impeto” (Oliveira 2007[1536]: 177; f.8v).⁶⁴ The expression ‘na garganta’ (“in the throat”) could mean that the vowel in question is not a front vowel, excluding

63. It is remarkable that Figueira, and others such as Antônio de Araújo, were characterised as “línguas modernos/novos”, as opposed to the previous generation of the ‘antigos’, such as Joseph de Anchieta, Pero Correia, Antônio Rodrigues, Leonarde do Vale, i.e. the Jesuits who worked in São Vicente in the sixteenth century (Barros 2003: 9).

64. Oliveira mentions Quintilian as his main source in this paragraph.

possible other candidates, such as the /y/ (as in French ‘sucre’). If the sound in question is a back vowel, the letter ⟨u⟩ would be probably used. If Mamiani’s comparison with Tupi is correct, and if the interpretation of the ‘I grosso’ in that language is also correct, we can assume that the grapheme ⟨ŷ⟩ can be interpreted as /i/.

Further Mamiani is not consistent in using the ⟨i⟩ as a “simple” vowel. When the Portuguese spelling has ⟨y⟩ instead of ⟨i⟩, as in ⟨Martyres⟩, the Kiriri translation also has ⟨y⟩ (“Martyres idzé”; Mamiani 1942[1698]: 117).

- *The schwa* (close mid central /ə/ or mid central/ə/)

In the table of vowels of Rodrigues (based on Acevedo) we do not find the “e mute” (/ə/) (as in French ‘le’) as a phoneme. In Kipeá-Kiriri it occurs as an allophone of final ⟨a⟩ or ⟨æ⟩ as Mamiani explains:

Quando o vocabulo acaba em A, ou Æ sem accentto, & sem til, se pronuncia essa vogal a meya boca mal pronunciada como E Francez no fim da palavra: v.g. *Pide*, está; *Tekiébæ*, não veyo. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 4).

[When the word ends in A or Æ without an accent or tilde, that vowel must be pronounced indistinctly in the middle of the mouth, as the French *E* at the end of the word, e.g. *Pide*, ‘[it] is’; *Tekiébæ*, ‘I do not see’.]

Diphthongs are non-existent in this language (“As vogaes entre si não formão diphtongos, mas se pronuncia cada hũa por si como syllaba diversa”). This can be confirmed in the Catechism, where often two accents are used on several vowels of the same word: “Bó modé sité sanhiá dó siicróá mó dibuyēwehóádi?”/“Donde virão as almas para tornarem aos seus corpos?” (1942[1698]: 81). Mamiani probably attempts to transcribe the glottal stop, avoiding an erroneous pronunciation of two subsequent vowels as a diphthong instead of with hiatus. On the other hand, diphthongs occur in loans from Portuguese, as in “Purgatorio”, and often we find combinations of vowels in the text where Mamiani does not put two accents on successive vowels. It is difficult for a learner of this language to know if such an accentuated vowel has to be pronounced singly or as part of a diphthong, as in ‘Mó Arâkié dó itúitú idiómo sēbohó Tupã’/“Para o Ceo, para viverem alegres com Deos”].

4.3.5.2 *The consonants*

Not all the consonants are dealt with in detail by Mamiani. He gives the following definitions:

⟨c⟩/⟨k⟩

O C sempre se pronuncia **aspero** assim sobre as vogaes A, O, U, como sobre E, I, Y. E porque nestas derradeiras vogaes o C fere **brandamente** no Portuguez; para evitar o erro que poderia haver escrevendo-se o C com ellas, se introduziu o K, character Grego, que sempre tem o **som aspero** sobre todas as vogaes: v.g. *Kempe*, fino; *Kitci*, area.

[The letter *C* is always pronounced ‘harshly’ both before the vowels *A, O, U* and before *E, I, Y*. Since in Portuguese the *C* is realised smoothly when the latter vowels [*E, I, Y*] follow, to avoid any error which could arise, the Greek character *K* is introduced, which always has a ‘harsh’ sound preceding any vowel, e.g. *Kempe* (“fine”), *Kitci* (“area”).]

In modern terms, Mamiani’s ‘som aspero’ corresponds with ‘occlusive’ or ‘stop’, although the adjective ‘aspero’ is also used in another context with a different meaning.

⟨ç⟩/⟨s⟩

Usa-se tambem o *C* com zevra quando se segue à consoante *T*, v.g. *Tçate*, cortar: mas nos mais vocabulos se usa de *S*, por ser mais natural o seu **sibilo** a esta lingua.

[The *C* with cedilla is used when it follows the consonant *T*, e.g. *Tçate* (“to cut”), but in other words the *S* is used instead, since this sibilant is more natural in this language.]

The grapheme ⟨ç⟩ and the digraph ⟨tç⟩ are not presented as independent ‘letters’ of the Kiriri alphabet, since we do not find them in Mamiani’s alphabet at the beginning of his grammar (1877[1699]: 1).⁶⁵ Possibly, ⟨ç⟩ and ⟨tç⟩ represent the phoneme /ts/, to be distinguished from the digraph ⟨ch⟩, representing the fricative /ʃ/ or the affricate /tʃ/.

⟨d⟩

às vezes se pronuncia tam **brandamente**, que apenas se conhece: como nestas palavras *Ide*, mãy; *Udje*, legumes.

[Sometimes (the *D*) is pronounced smoothly,⁶⁶ so that it is hardly perceived, as in these words *Ide* (“hand”), *Udje* (“vegetables”).]

⟨g⟩/⟨gh⟩

sempre he **aspero** sobre todas as vogaes, & porisso se escreve juntamente com o *H*, Quando porém tem accento circumflexo sobre si, se ha de pronunciar **brando com aspiração na garganta**, que mal se enxergue: como nestas palavras *Ghý*, ser cheirado; *Inghe*, criança; *Rhenge*, velho.

[The *G* is always ‘rough’ before any vowel and therefore it is written together with a *H*. However, when it has a circumflex accent on it, it has to be pronounced

65. In the pre-modern period, the word ‘letter’ is used for both ‘figura’ and ‘potestas.’ Oliveira (2007[1536]: 175; f.14) identifies *v, y, ch, lh*, and *nh* as characteristic ‘letters’ of Portuguese, different from the usual letters of the Latin alphabet (“letras acostumadas”). Even the ‘tilde’ is a letter (“letra til”), although it is not a ‘perfect letter’ (“letra perfeyta”).

66. Mamiani possibly refers to the existence of an allophone [ð] (voiced dental approximant or fricative).

smoothly with aspiration in the throat, which is hardly perceivable; as in the words *Ghý* (“to be smelled”); *Inghe* (“child”); *Rhenge* (“old”).]

It has to be observed that in Mamiani’s text the circumflex is never used on the letter *G*, despite the description here.

⟨h⟩

como as vogaes, & consoantes sempre he **aspiração guttural**; excepto quando se segue ao *C*, & *N*, porque então faz como no Portuguez nas syllabas *Cha*, *Che*, *Nha*, *Nhe*. Esta **aspiração** he muito usada nesta lingua, por ser **muito guttural**: mas para evitar a multiplicidade desta letra em todas as palavras, que poderia causar confusão, usamos della na escritura sómente entre as vogaes, & deixamos nas consoantes; & para estas sirva de regra gèral, que as consoantes *T*. & *P*. pedem mais ordinariamente a aspiração do que as outras, como o uso, a praxe ensinarà melhor. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 2)

[like the vowels and consonants, the *H* is always a ‘guttural aspirated sound’, unless following the letters *C* and *N*, because then it is as in the Portuguese syllables *Cha*, *Che*, *Nha*, *Nhe*. This aspiration is frequently used in this language, as it is very ‘guttural’, but to avoid the superfluous use of this letter in all the words, which could cause confusion, we use it in our texts only between vowels and we omit it when accompanied by the consonants. And this general rule is applied, i.e. that *T* and *P* more naturally require aspiration than other consonants, as usage and *praxis* will teach better.]

Here the term ‘aspiração’ is used to express two different phenomena. The first is the ‘aspirated’ sound which corresponds with glottal fricative /h/, which could cause a problem for the Italian Jesuit writing in Portuguese, whereas in the second case the term does not correspond with ‘aspirated consonants’ as /t^h/ and /p^h/. According to many Renaissance grammars, the term ‘aspiration’ is used as a characteristic feature of these voiceless stops, since they are only pronounced using a certain ‘force’ of the air.

⟨i⟩/⟨j⟩/⟨y⟩

(de consoante), como tambem no Portuguez nestas palavras, *Jogo*, *Janella*; mas com som **mais brando**; v.g. *Adje*, quem; *Udje*, que. ... *Y* consoante se escreve sem *accento*. *I* **carregado**, ou **consoante duplex**, como usão os Castelhanos na syllaba *yo*; & se introduzio tambem na escritura Portugueza, como nestas palavras, *Mayor*, *Cayar*: & por isso escrevemos tambem nesta lingua por *Y* sem *accento*, v.g. *Buyẽ*, grande, *Cayà*, noite.

[The consonant *I* is as in Portuguese ‘*Jogo*’, ‘*Janella*’, but with a smoother sound; e.g. *Adje* (“who”), *Udje* (“what”) ... The consonant *Y* written without an accent is the heavy *I* or the double consonant, as the Castilians use in the syllable “yo”, and (this sound) is introduced in the Portuguese spelling, as in these words: “mayor”, “cayar”, and therefore we also write it in this language as a *Y* without an accent, as in *Buyẽ*, “big”, *Cayà*, “night”.]

In the table of Rodrigues we find only the voiced alveo-palatal /dʒ/, whereas the /ʒ/ is not included. In loans the voiced palatal fricative /ʒ/ could have been pronounced as in Portuguese ⟨j⟩, as in “Sãta Madre Igreja” (Mamiani 1942[1698]: 32) and “Judeos” (“M. Inhã dé sipá? D. Nó Judeóá”) (59), but the ⟨j⟩ also could have been adapted to the phonetics of Kiriri, which has a ‘smoother’ pronunciation (“mais brando”) – this is probably an attempt to describe the alveo-palatal approximant /j/, although the degree of friction cannot be determined. The Portuguese grapheme ⟨g⟩ in “no simy Indulgências inhaá” (“hangando as Indulgencias”) (146) has the same phonemic value as ⟨j⟩ in Igreja, i.e. to be pronounced as /ʒ/.

⟨v⟩/⟨vv⟩/⟨w⟩

he vogal, nunca consoante. E porque em alguns vocabulos concorre a vocalidade do U vogal com a vocalidade de V consoante, para pronunciar com propriedade essas duas vocalidades juntas, se introduzio o dublú character estrangeiro, que se escreve assim W, & se pronuncia com hũ som misto de dous VV, dos quaes o segundo fica liquido, & o primeiro como consoante: v.g. *Waré*, Padre.

[(The letter) V is always a vowel and never a consonant. And since in some words the qualities of the vowel-U and the consonant-V are both present, the double foreign character written as W is introduced, in order to pronounce these two qualities properly, and it is pronounced with a mixed sound of two V's, where the second is a liquid and the first a consonant, as in *Waré* (“father”).]

Mamiani observes that ⟨v⟩ is always a vowel, but probably the voiced labiodental fricative /v/ existed in loans, as in “Santa Maria Virgem” (30), “Ave Maria” (42) and “Advento” (204) (Mamiani 1942[1698]).

4.3.5.3 *Diacritics*

The tilde (~ “til”) is used to indicate nasalisation, and the acute to indicate stress.

O til se usa sobre algũas vogaes para denotar hũ som medio entre M, & N,⁶⁷ & tem a mesma pronunção como nos vocabulos Portuguezes vãa, sãa cousa: v.g. *Tupã*, Deos; *Hietçã*, eu.

[The tilde is used over some vowels to mark an intermediate sound between M and N and it has the same pronunciation as in the Portuguese words “vãa, sãa cousa” (“valueless, holy thing”), e.g. *Tupã*, “God”; *Hietçã*, “I”.]

In Anchietta’s grammar we find a comparable description: “Algũas partes da oração se acabão em til, o qual não he, m, nem, n, ainda q̃ na pronúncia diffirão pouco, vt, *Tĩ*, *Ainupa*^, *rua*^ (Anchietta 1999[1595]: 1r).

O agudo serve para **carregar** sobre a vogal, v.g. *Sambé*, paga. Ordinariamente se acha na derradeira vogal de todos os vocabulos desta lingua, excepto algũas

67. Compare Araújo’s description in 4.2.2.

palavras que não acabão em agudo como *Bæ*, *De* & alguns poucos vocabulos, que a experiencia ensinará. Sobre o til não se poem accento agudo, para evitar a confusão na escritura; mas basta advertir que o til sempre he agudo.

[The acute is used with the purpose of putting weight to the vowel, e.g. *Sambé*, “payment”. Usually it is used on the final vowel of all the words of this language, except for some words which do not end in an acute, such as *Bæ*, *De* and a few others, which will be learned by experience. On top of the ‘tilde’ no acute accents are written to avoid confusion in the writing, it is only enough to know that the ‘tilde’ is always acute.]

In the theoretical introduction, Mamiani admits only two diacritics, the circumflex and the acute (“Usamos de dous accentos, hum agudo, & outro circumflexo” (1877[1699]: 4) although he also uses the grave accent throughout his grammar. The difference between them is unclear. Probably there is no distinction at all, since we find on the same page *cradzó* and *cradzò*.

Sometimes, Mamiani uses the symbol ⟨ę⟩, but he does not give any explanation of this diacritic underneath the vowel ⟨e⟩ (“hohocribę”) (161), which is used sporadically in Anchieta’s grammar.

4.3.6 Morphosyntax

4.3.6.1 “Inflection”

Mamiani reports that there is no nominal or verbal inflection in Kiriri. According to his terminology, nouns are invariable, since cases are not marked, and verbs do not distinguish ‘tenses’:

Os nomes, & verbos nesta lingua não tem diversidade alguma entre si na terminação dos casos, & tempos (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 9–10).

[In this language, nouns and verbs have not any distinction (diversity) among each other in case and tense by their endings.]

Nevertheless, Mamiani observes that nouns and verbs have a certain “variation” by the addition of certain articles (“artigos”) or particles (“partículas”) and fundamental distinctions are made by these. A characteristic feature of Kiriri is, according to Mamiani, that the same sets of ‘articles’ and ‘particles’ are used for both nouns and verbs, unlike in Latin, where a fundamental distinction is made between nominal and verbal inflection (i.e. declensions and conjugations).

Porém, tem algũa variedade entre si assim nos nomes como os verbos em alguns artigos, ou partículas, que se ajuntão diversamente, & servem aos nomes de pronomes possessivos Meus, Tuus, Suus, & aos verbos de pronomes substântivos Ego, Tu, Ille. A diversidade destes artigos he o fundamento de dividirn os nomes, & verbos em diversas declinações: & porque os mesmos artigos servem assim aos

nomes, como aos verbos, a mesma divisão serve de regra commua a huns, & a outros. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 10)

[However, both nouns and verbs have certain variation in some ‘articles’, or ‘particles’ which are connected differently: they serve as possessive pronouns to nouns (*Meus, Tuus, Suus*) and as ‘substantive pronouns’ to verbs (*Ego, Tu, Ille*). The diversity of these ‘articles’ is the fundamental criterion for the division (classification) of nouns and verbs, and the same distinction is used as a common rule for another.]

The noun itself is not sensitive to morphological changes in the stem (as for instance in Latin *sermo, sermonis; rex, regis*), and is in principle undeclinable. Only the attached pronouns are variable or declinable, according to Mamiani’s approach. He makes a clear difference between the concepts of ‘case’ and ‘declension’, arguing that nouns have no case endings (“terminação dos casos”); although there are certainly “cases”, they are expressed by ‘prepositions’.⁶⁸

O que se disse dos nomes, & verbos, se hade entender tambem das preposições que fôrmão os casos, & por isso concordão tambem com os pronomes substantivos *Ego, Tu, Ille ...* (ibid.)

[What has been said about the nouns and verbs, has to be understood also for the prepositions which form the cases, and therefore they also agree with the substantive pronouns *Ego, Tu, Ille ...*]

Nevertheless, Mamiani recognizes five different declensions for Kipeá-Kiriri, but the difference between them is not based on nominal inflection in the Latin sense, but on the five declensions of the ‘articles’ of the possessive and substantive pronouns. Comparing this approach with other missionary grammars, we can conclude that Mamiani’s is original and based on totally different criteria from the others. In a large number of missionary grammars – with important exceptions – we find declensions and cases of the noun, which are in fact translations of the Latin paradigm of nominal declensions. Mamiani decided to present the nouns differently and classified them according to the prefixes (‘artigos’ and ‘partículas’), which are in fact the nouns combined with possessive/personal pronouns (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 10).

The five declensions are determined by the prefix, prefixed to nouns and verbs:

1. The first declension has the prefix (“pronome possessive, ou substantivo da terceira pessoa) *i-*: *Padzù* (“Pay”), *Ipadzù* (“seu pay”); *Cotò* (“furar”), *Icotò* (“elle furta”)

68. It occurs often in grammars of Amerindian languages that authors deny the existence of ‘cases’ and declensions in the languages they describe. Declensions are often interpreted as particles, prepositions, postpositions, or articles to the base form (cf. Schmidt-Riese 2002: 95).

2. Second declension: *s-*: *Ambè* (“paga”), *Sambè* (“sua paga”); *Arancrè* (“ter pejo”), *Saranocrè* (“elle tem pejo”)
3. Third declension: *se-*: *Ebayà* (“unha”), *Sebaya* (“sua unha”); *Eicò* (“descansar”), *Seicò* (“elle descansà”)
4. Fourth declension: *si-*: *Batè* (“rancho, morada”), *Sibatè* (“sua morada”); *Pà* (“ser morto”), *Sipà* (“elle he morto”)
5. Fifth declension: *su-*: *Býrò* (“barriga”), *Subýrò* (“sua barriga”); *Ucà* (“amar”); *Sucà* (“elle ama”). (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 12)

Kipeá has a large set of quantifiers which are prefixed to several noun-classes, particularly numerals and descriptive adjectives of dimension, consistency and color (Rodrigues 1997b: 69). According to the grammatical tradition, nouns and adjectives are both subcategories of the noun (‘nome substantivo’ and ‘nome adjetivo’). A subclass of adjectives is the ‘numeral adjectives’ which always “precede substantives” (52). Another subcategory of adjectives is the “non-numeral adjectives” (‘adjetivos não numeraes’), which are always preceded by a noun. Again, Mamiani’s classification does not follow any criteria of classical grammar. The linguistic facts urged him to start from different principles, based on the prefixes.

Mamiani distinguishes twelve different prefixes in Kipeá, which are attached to the “adjetivos numeraes, ou de medidas, ou de cores, ou outros, conforme a variedade da material dos seus substantivos com que concordão” (53). The choice of the twelve prefixes is motivated by the ‘gender’ or noun-class. Examples of such prefixes are *be-* for hills, dishes, stools, foreheads; *kro-* for birds, stones, stars and round objects, such as beads, fruit, and eyes; *kru-* for liquids and rivers, etc.⁶⁹ As Rodrigues demonstrates (1999b: 185) “the classifier prefix occurs with adjectives (which follow the head noun) and with quantifiers (which precede it)”. Mamiani’s description is clear, complete and correct. Mamiani did not decide to propose twelve nominal declensions based on the use of these classifier prefixes, since the nouns themselves are not marked by these quantifiers, which are only attached to numerals and descriptive adjectives. The pronominal/possessive prefixes are attached to nouns, and therefore they were fundamental for the shaping of a nominal system. This explains why Mamiani labels these declensions as ‘quasi-declensions’, since the nouns themselves are invariable:

Chamo Declinações, não porque sejam declinaçoens dos casos nos nomes, ou de tempos & modos nos verbos, mas porque são quasi declinaçoens dos pronomes, ou possessivos, ou substantivos, ... pela mesma razão, ... se poem juntas as declinaçoens dos nomes com as dos verbos. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 10)

69. For a complete description see the original text in Portuguese in Mamiani (1877[1699]) and for the English translation see Rodrigues (1999b: 185).

[I call them ‘declensions,’ not because they are declensions of cases of nouns, or of tenses and modes of verbs, but because they are ‘quasi-declensions’ of the pronouns, or possessive, or substantive pronouns ... and for the same reason, we put together the declensions of nouns and those of verbs.]

Tense and aspect are not morphologically marked, as they are in Latin or Portuguese. Mamiani explains that moods and tenses are all expressed ‘in one style’. Personal markers are explained in another section of his grammar, devoted to the ‘articles’:

As Conjugações dos Verbos nesta lingua não se pódem distinguir pela diversidade que tenham uns dos outros nos mesmos modos & tempos: porque todos os verbos quantos ha, se conjugão por hum estilo, & com a mesma terminação em cada hum dos modos, & tempos. (Mamiani 1877[1899]: 26)

[In this language, the conjugations of the verbs are not distinguished by variation, that one mood or tense distinguishes itself from other moods and tenses; because all the existing verbs are conjugated according to one ‘style,’ and with the same ending in each mood and tense.]

This explains that we do not find ‘conjugations’ of the verbs, but ‘declensions’ which are organized according to the same principles as those of nouns; they have to be treated in the same way, according to Mamiani’s grammatical theory. He avoids even the word ‘conjugation’ of the verb and prefers to use the word ‘declension’. No tenses or moods are included in these paradigms, which is not usual in missionary grammars. For learners of Kiriri who wish to find equivalents for the usual Portuguese tenses, Mamiani appends ten rules (‘regras’) which explain how these ‘tenses’ have to be formed, namely by the addition of certain elements to the verb. There is no consistent terminology developed for such elements and Mamiani uses the terms ‘adverb’ (as *Docohò* or *Dohó*, “então”), ‘syllable’ (as *Cri* “já”), or ‘particle’, etc. Mamiani’s main objective was to ease the learning process for his readers, and therefore he decided to devote a special paragraph including all the canonical tenses of Latin grammar. Here, the term ‘declension’ is not used, but ‘conjugation’. The tenses for the indicative mood are present, imperfect, preterite, pluperfect, and future. For the imperative mood Mamiani gives equivalents for the present and future; for the ‘modo permissivo’ there are present, preterite and future, etc.

4.3.6.2 *The inclusive-exclusive distinction*

A great number of languages in the world distinguish between the inclusive and the exclusive and there are several types of “clusivity” (see Filimonova 2005).⁷⁰

70. In missionary grammars of the Andean region, inclusivity versus exclusivity has been analyzed thoroughly by Adelaar (1993), but missionary grammars of Philippine languages have not been analyzed systematically yet on this topic.

Table 4.8 Exclusivity in Kipeá-Kiriri (Nagueira 1877: xxxix; Mamiani 1877[1699]: 11–13; cf. Bickel & Nichols 2005: 51)

	Independent Sing	Independent Plur	Prefixal Sing	Prefixal Plur
Excl	<i>hietçã</i>	<i>hietçã-de</i>	<i>hi-</i>	<i>hi-... -de</i>
Incl		<i>ketçã(a)</i>		<i>ku- (-a)</i>
2	<i>ewatçã</i>	<i>ewatçã-(a)</i>	<i>e-</i>	<i>e- ...-a</i>
3			<i>i-/s-</i>	<i>i-a/s..a</i>

Kipeá-Kiriri belongs to the so-called Belhare type, in which the inclusive is not marked and a suffix marks exclusivity. Unlike in Tupi, in Kipeá-Kiriri, the exclusive is marked in both singular and plural, as illustrated in Table 4.8.

In this chapter on syntax, Mamiani explains that the ‘substantive pronouns’ *Hietçã* (“I”), *ewatçã* (“you”) can also be used in an abbreviated form, “swallowing the first letter or syllable as in *Tetçã* (“I come”)” (“per aphæresim comendo a primeira letra, ou syllaba”: ut, *Tetçã*, eu venho”, 1877[1699]: 59). Mamiani describes the difference in detail in the section devoted to the ‘substantive pronouns’ (*Ego*, etc.):

Advirta-se que o plural exclusivo se usa, quando dizendo Nós, excluimos a pessoa com quem fallamos: v.g. *Pacri cradzó hinhadé* “matamos hũa vacca eu, & outro sem vós”. O inclusivo se usa quando se incluye a pessoa com quem fallamos: v.g. *Do pà cunà* “matemos ambos, eu & vós”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 7)⁷¹

[Note that the exclusive plural is used when we say “Nós”, we exclude the person to whom we speak, as in *Pacri cradzó hinhadé* “we kill a cow, I and another, without you”. The inclusive is used when the person to whom we speak is included, as in *Do pà cunà* “We both kill, I and you”.]

As in Anchieta’s definition, the distinction is also made in the paradigms of the possessive pronouns:

Singular. *Hiambè*, minha paga (“my payment”). *Eyambè*, tua paga (“your payment”). *Sambè*, sua paga (“his/her payment”).

Plural exclusivo. *Hiambèdè*, nossa paga, não vossa. (“our payment, without yours”)

Inclusivo. *Cambè*, ou *Cambeà*, nossa paga, & vossa paga (“our and your payment”). *Sambeà*, sua paga delles, ou suas pagas. (“the payment of them, or their payment”). (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 19)

71. Mamiani may have used Figueira’s grammar which has almost the same definition: “Assi os artigos, como o pronome, tem duas terminações, ou formulas na primeira pessoa do plural, como vemos. A primeira formula incluye em si a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos; vt Yajucà, nos matamos. f. Nos, & vos tambem com nosco. A 2. formula exclue a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos: vt Orojucà, nos outros matamos, não entrando vos nisso” (Figueira 1621: 6v-7r; 1878[1687]: 11).

It is noteworthy that Mamiani uses the exclusive form in the phrase (“No ibenhété cruçá dó nunhé *hietçãde* ená bó culupã idzené *dzumarãde*” [“Pelo sinal da Sãta Cruz livra-nos Deos nosso. Senhor de nossos inimigos” (Catecismo 1942: 1), which actually means ‘liberate us (and not you)/“our enemies” (“and not yours”).⁷²

4.3.6.3 *The animate versus inanimate distinction*

The demonstratives are, according to Mamiani, *Erí* or *Ighí*, *Erò* and *Rohò*, translated into Portuguese as ‘este’, ‘esse’, ‘aquelle’. When *Erò* and *Rohò* refer to persons, an *-a* must be attached to these forms: *Eróá* and *Rohóá* (“se falla de gente”). The distinction is also found in the minimal pair *ætçi* ~ *utçi* (“the person whose name I have forgotten” ~ “the thing whose name I have forgotten”). In fact, Mamiani did not quite capture the right distinction here: as Rodrigues (1997b: 74–75) demonstrates, the distinction is not only between human and non-human but rather between animate and inanimate.

4.3.7 Syntax

4.3.7.1 *Word order and agreement*

Mamiani reports clearly that the verb comes before the ‘nominative’: “De ordinario nesta lingua precede o verbo ao Nominativo” (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 98).⁷³ There are three exceptions, according to Mamiani. The pronominal prefix attached to the verb is a case where the ‘nominative’ precedes the verb, as in *Dzucà* (“Eu amo”); some adverbs can be placed at the beginning of the clause, as in *More site hirendè* (“Logo vem o meu amigo”; and finally, in questions, the “neuter verbs” are placed at the end, as in *Adjè icotò* (“Quem furtou?”). There is agreement

72. Blancas de San José pointed at possible misunderstandings which may occur, when inclusive and exclusive forms are used: “si hablando con los Tagalos vn Español para dezir algo de los Españoles, dixesse, tayo mangã Castilla, diria mal; por q[ue] denotaua que aquellos con quiẽ habla son tambien Españoles. Y si hablando cõ Dios dixesse, caavan mo tayo: tẽ misericordia &c. diria mal: por que era dezir q[ue] tambien entra Dios en aquellos de quiẽ el auia de tener misericordia: y assi en ambas partes se ha de dezirm camí” (Blancas de San José 1997[1610]: 8).

73. ‘Nominativo’ can have different meaning in missionary grammars. (1) Subject (2) Agent and (3) base form. For the shift of meaning of the two first in missionary grammars of the Philippines and Marianas, see Winkler (2007). ‘Nominativo’ with the meaning ‘base’ is found in the Quechua grammar attributed to Antonio Ricardo. “La declinación ... o se haze por variacion de casos como en la Latina, sino por addicion de ciertas particulas sobre el Nominatiuo” (1586: f.2r.) (cf. Schmidt-Riese 2002: 95).

between the question and the answer.⁷⁴ When the question exhibits this word order, the same order is repeated in the answer, as in *Hinhà sipà* (“Eu fuy que o matey, ou, de mim foy morto”).

Kipeá-Kiriri does not share the SV and AOV word order of many other languages of the Macro-Jê family, since it has a strict VS word order (Rodrigues 1997b: 65). In the ergative construction, i.e. when the agent of a transitive clause is marked by the ergative proposition *no-*, the unmarked word order of the constituents is VOA (Rodrigues 1999b: 188). After Mamiani gives the rule that the verb comes before the nominative, he adds that other constituents are placed after these two:

Depois do verbo, & do nominativo se poem o caso proprio do verbo, & depois os outros casos que houver na oraçam com as Preposiçoens necessarias. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 99–100)

[After the verb and the nominative the proper case of the verb is placed, and thereafter the other cases of the clause (=‘constituents’), if there are any, with the required prepositions.]

Further, Mamiani informs his learners that Kipeá-Kiriri is ‘right-branching’:

Havendo adjectivo, que concorda com o Substantivo, logo se poem depois do Substantivo; ut *Dicri udzà yachi*, “Deo-se a faca grande”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 99)

[When there is an adjective, which agrees with the substantive, it must be placed after the substantive, as in *Dicri udzà yachi* “The great machete is given”.]

Mamiani also observes that no prepositions are used in possessive constructions. Two nouns are placed after each other, and in such constructions the head comes first, followed by the ‘genitive’ (i.e., the semantic but not morphological genitive):

O nome que for immediatamente depois de outro nome sem ter preposição, he genitivo; ut *Erà Tupã*, “casa de Deos”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 6)

[The noun – not having a preposition – which follows immediately after the other noun, is the genitive, as in *Erà Tupã* “The house of God”.]

Obviously, the term ‘genitive’ had lost its original reference to a case-ending, being used with the meaning of ‘the possessed’.

The position of adverbs in the clause is described as follows by Mamiani, distinguishing four adverbial subclasses:

74. This recalls Alvarés’s *Interrogationis atque Responsionis consensus* (1974[1572]: 116), but with the difference that Mamiani observes that there must be ‘consensus’ between the word order of the question and the answer, whereas Álvares observes that there must be ‘consensus’ between the use of the cases (“Interrogatio, & Responsio casu consentiunt. Cui praeceptoris disti operam? Platoni. Cuius est hæc oratio. Ciceronis”).

1. those which are placed at the beginning of the sentence (“no principio da oração”)
2. those which are used as endings of nouns and verbs, forming a ‘composition’ with them, i.e. as adjunct elements (“que se usam no fim dos Nomes & verbos, com os quaes fazem composição”)
3. those which are placed after words (probably Mamiani had in mind those adverbs which do not form a new compound with the preceding word to which these are appended)
4. the so-called “adverbios indifferentes”.

The ‘adverbs’ of the first category are mainly extra-orational tags, and interrogatives; in the second class we find many suffixes which have several meanings, often serving as markers denoting negation, tense, mood and several aspects in the verb phrase (“começar a fazer” / “to start doing”; “fazer-se de novo” / “to do again”; “frequentemente” / “frequently”; “Prius tempore” / “earlier”; “ulterius” / “later”, “continuadamente” / “continuously”, etc.). Mamiani classified these verbs + ‘adverbs’ as compound forms and he always represents them without spacing between the two segments, i.e., as one orthographic word. Mamiani’s sections on the adverbs are original; in contrast, in most missionary grammars of this period adverbs are arranged according to their meaning (place, time, manner, etc.) and not according to their morphosyntactic behaviour.

4.3.7.2 *Ergativity*

The agent of a transitive verb is marked by the ergative prefix *no-* (Rodrigues 1999b: 188). Mamiani describes an ergative construction (with *-no*, classified as a preposition by Mamiani) as an ablative (i.e. as the agent) of a passive construction.⁷⁵ An example is

Pakri Paulo no ñiho
 Ø-pa-kri Paulo no ñiho
 3-BE.Killed-past Paulo (nom) ablative Indian
 “Paulo was killed by the Indian” (Example from Larsen 1984: 189).

75. Mamiani found a solution for the descriptive problem at hand, which is comparable to that of his colleagues describing ergativity in Hindi and Marāthī. In Hindi, for instance, an ergative construction takes an ‘agentive’ marker and does not rule verbal agreement and the direct object rules verbal agreement in number and gender. In Kipeá-Kiriri the verb has no agreement markers, except the third person and first person inclusive. As we have seen in the chapter on Hindi (2.5), the ergative construction (with *-ne*) is interpreted as a passive construction. In a passive sentence in Portuguese, or in English, the Direct Object of the active sentence becomes the subject of the verb and the Agent-Subject of the active construction is expressed by a prepositional phrase with the preposition ‘by’ in English, or ‘per’ (the passive Agent).

Pa is classified as a passive verb since it means “to be killed” and not “to kill” (Larsen, *ibid.*). The so-called “passive” verbs are not derived from active verbs and in fact they do not have a corresponding active verb at all. According to Mamiani’s theory, Paulo is marked by *-no* which is marker of “the ablative of agent”. The nominative-agent of a verb with an “active meaning” (according to Mamiani’s terminology “*verbo neutro*”) is also the agent and if there is a direct object, it is marked by the ‘preposition’ *do-*. Many verbs with an “active” meaning are not called “active” verbs by Mamiani but “neuter verbs”, since such verbs do not have corresponding passives (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 67). Nevertheless, only some ‘neuter verbs’ can be transformed to ‘passives’, when the ‘proper preposition of the passives’ *-no* follows.

Mamiani further explains the use of the ergative markers in several chapters, which demonstrates that he found it difficult to decide in which part of his grammar this topic fitted best. We find descriptions and more observations in a paragraph entitled “*Dos Verbos Passivos, & neutros, Simples & Compostos*”, which is part of the chapter on verbs; we find it again in the list of prepositions, and finally in the last chapter on syntax.

Porque para formar o verbo Passivo, se muda a Oração, & o nome que dantes era nominativo, fica depois ablativo com a preposição *A*, vel *Ab*, que corresponde ao nosso *No*; porém no nosso caso o nominativo não se muda, & sómente se acrescenta o caso com a preposição *No*, que se póde chamar mais propriamente ablativo de causa, do que ablativo do agente do verbo Passivo. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 68)
 [In order to construct a passive verb, the sentence is transformed and the noun which earlier was a nominative (subject/agent), is later an ablative with the proposition *A*, or *Ab* which corresponds with our *No*; Nevertheless, in our case, the nominative is not changed, and the case is only changed adjoining the preposition *No*, which can be called ‘ablative of cause’ more properly, than the ‘ablative of the agent of the Passive’]

Mamiani devotes two paragraphs to the “cases” of the verbs, using the dichotomy “*casos communs*” and “*casos proprios dos verbos*”. He finds it difficult to be consistent when applying this dichotomy, particularly when he wants to fit the ergative *-no* into this model. His decision is somewhat questionable, since *-no* is classified as ‘*caso commun*’ and ‘*caso proprio*’ at the same time. Mamiani explains the dichotomy ‘*commun*’ versus ‘*proprio*’ as follows:

Chamo *casos communs* aquelles, que se pódem usar com todos os verbos, quando o sentido da Oração o pede: como tambem na lingua Latina ha regras para a construção *commua* dos verbos em ordem aos *casos communs*. Mas como os *casos* nesta lingua se distinguem sómente pelas *Preposiçoens*, não se póde dar regra gèral para os *casos* sem apontar a *Preposição* conveniente a cada hum dos *casos*. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 75)

[I call those cases “common”, which can be used with all verbs, when the meaning of the sentence requires it: as occurs in Latin, where there are also rules for the ‘common construction’ of the verbs according to the rules of the common cases. But since the cases in this language are only distinguished by prepositions, general rules cannot be given for the cases without setting down the proper preposition that corresponds to each case.]

In the paragraph of the ‘casos communs’ the ergative marker *-no* is described as follows:

Caso commum de Causa, com a Preposição Nò.

Todos os verbos que tem depois de si hum caso que denota causa da acção significada pelo verbo, pedem o ditto caso com a preposição Nò: ut, *Bewi inhù inhà*, “Succedeo o movito por sua causa”. *Idzeyà no dibuânghetè*, “Afflige-se por causa de seus peccados”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 77).

[The ‘common case of cause’ with the preposition *nò*.

All the verbs which are combined by a subsequent case (‘constituent’) denoting the ‘cause of the action’ signified by the verb, require this case with the preposition *no*, as in *Bewi inhù inhà* [sic] “The abortion occurred through his/her cause”. *Idzeyà no dibuânghetè*, “He is terrified, because of his sins.”]

In the first example, *-no* is not found, whereas in the second the verb *dzeya* (“affligir-se”) is followed by *-no* which is added in order to explain “the cause” of the verb “to terrify”, namely, that it has been caused by his sins. In these examples, no passive constructions are used in the Portuguese translations. In the following paragraph where the ‘proper cases’ are described, we do find Portuguese passives when the Kipeá-Kiriri original has *-no*:

Caso com a Preposição Nò

Todos os verbos Passivos querem o ablativo do agente com a preposição Nò: ut, *Pacri no dumarã*, “Foy morto do seu amigo”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 78)

[All passive verbs require an ablative of the agent with the preposition *Nò*, as in *Pacri no dumarã*, “He was killed by his friend”.]

Mamiani also devotes a paragraph to *-nò* in his chapter on ‘prepositions’ (1877[1699]: 86). In his description, the Latin equivalents *A*, *vel Ab*, *propter*, *‘de causa’* are given, and we find this analysis again in a description of this marker in the final section on syntax.

E no verbo Passivo o caso proprio que precede aos outros casos, he o ablativo do agente com a Preposição Nò; ut, *perecri worobý no Warè hiai*, “Forão-me contadas humas novas pelo Padre a mim”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 100)

[And if the verb is passive, the proper case which precedes the other cases is the ablative-agent with the preposition *-Nò*, as in *perecri worobý no Warè hiai*, “Some news was told to me by the father”.]

In this example, the noun *worobý* ('new things') is marked by ergative *no* and when it is the agent of the clause, the Portuguese translation used is a passive construction.

Mamiani claims that from 'neuter verbs' only one active 'participle' can be derived, whereas from the 'passive verbs' two different nominalizations are derived, one with an active meaning, and the other passive:

Os verbos Passivos admitem dous participios em *Ri*; hum com significação activa, outro com significação passiva. Os verbos Neutros admitem sómente hum Participio activo em *Ri*; & todos estes Participios equivalem aos Latinos em *Ans* & *Ens*. [...]. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 82–83)
 [Passive verbs admit two participles ('nominalizations') (ending) in *Ri*; one with an active and the other with a passive meaning. Neuter verbs admit only one nominalization in *Ri* and all these participles correspond to the Latin (present) participles ending in *Ans* and *Ens*.]⁷⁶

As Rodrigues points out (1997b: 194), only the passive verbs have a second nominalization, referring to the agent, a feature which reveals the ergative nature of this language.

4.4 Conclusion

The Brazilian grammars generally did not have many problems describing the phonological structures of the languages. Anchieta proposes a system of diacritics, and the other grammarians studied in this chapter only used a small number of diacritics. Anchieta gives most details of phonological processes, such as prenasalisation, and his grammar has the largest section devoted to phonology.

All the grammarians studied in this chapter understood that traditional inflectional morphology as they knew it from Portuguese and Latin, had to be re-interpreted when applied to Amerindian languages. Anchieta and Figueira described fairly correctly the idiosyncrasies of the active/non-active system and its consequences for the use of verbal prefixes. From a morphological point of view, it was remarkable that nouns and verbs could share the same prefixes, and that it was not always possible to distinguish nouns from adjectives. Anchieta's descriptions are in many cases more precise than those of Figueira, although the latter presents the linguistic data in a more orderly way.

The anonymous grammar of the 'lingua geral' is written in the same style as the other grammars of indigenous languages of Brazil and is less original. Many passages are taken verbatim from Figueira. Differing from Anchieta and Figueira

76. See also Mamiani (1877[1699]: 55–56).

is the information about language use, variation and frequency. However, no distinction is made among regional dialects. It is not so probable that this anonymous author used the Latin grammar of Álvares. Elements which appear to be taken from Álvares were probably copied from Figueira, who was the most important source of the anonymous grammar. It is significant that the anonymous author mentions that he had seen other sources and that he knew more than one Amerindian language, but it is difficult to ascertain which works he could have consulted, apart from the grammars discussed here. It is not impossible that he had access to the Kiriri grammar of Mamiani.

There are not only some extensions in the anonymous grammar, compared with Figueira's, but in other cases we see also reductions, for instance in the lists of interjections and conjunctions. In the description of the pronoun, the anonymous grammarian apparently did not use Álvares, but again Figueira was his model; but in the section concerning the so-called 'pronomes extravagantes' a more detailed analysis is given of the system of the demonstratives than Figueira gave. This section was confusing and unclear in the grammar of Figueira and lacking in Anchieta's grammar. This subclass was added for didactic reasons, and labelled as 'extravagantes' since the members did not match the Portuguese system. The anonymous grammarian did not write an entirely new grammar, but his work contains some remarkable details. He demonstrates that the 'common' speech of his own days was different from the registers of earlier periods: although it was 'menos polida' it was still 'mais usada', whereas a register which was 'muy polida', was 'pouco usada'. Without any doubt, this is one of the most important contributions of the anonymous author, since earlier authors paid no attention to different registers or ways of speaking, but only commented on regional varieties.

Mamiani's observations with regard to Kipeá-Kiriri phonology, such as the description of nasal vowels, are generally fairly precise. It is remarkable that he pays more attention in his catechism to the pronunciation of the vowels than to that of the consonants. Comparisons between Kipeá-Kiriri pronunciation and that of other languages, such as Portuguese, or the language "of the strangers from Northern Europe" are sometimes helpful for the reader, but it is doubtful whether his learners would be familiar with Northern European languages. Mamiani adds a new dimension to the writing of grammars contrasting two non-European languages, Tupi and Kiriri, when he describes the particular vowel qualities of the so-called 'i-grosso'. In other cases, it is difficult to reconstruct the real values of some sounds, since the terminology used is not always transparent, particularly in those cases where the terms 'guttural', 'áspero', 'brando' are used, or when it is not possible to reconstruct the value of consonants, such as /f/ or /tʃ/ for the diagraph <ch>.

Comparing Mamiani's text with Bantu grammars (see the next chapter), Mamiani succeeded very well in his description of classifier prefixes. According to

Rodrigues (1997: 69), the three most salient characteristics of Kipeá-Kiriri noun classification are (1) the classifiers prefixed to numerals and descriptive adjectives of dimension, consistency and color, (2) the possessive classifiers used with names and acquired goods, and (3) the distinction between animate and inanimate in the paradigms of interrogatives and demonstratives. Mamiani's description of the first two features is fairly clear. The third distinction, between animate and inanimate, is not treated in detail, but we can infer from the Portuguese translation that the difference is morphologically marked in Kipeá-Kiriri.

The classification of the complements of the verb (circumstantials) is original and Mamiani introduces a great number of new metalinguistic terms for them, such as "casos communs do lugar, commodo, incommodo, instrumento, & materia, causa, companhia, espera, medo, respeito, vergonha, & resguardo, saudades".

He had to solve other linguistic problems too, since Kipeá-Kiriri had several noun classes and an ergative pattern. Without any doubt, he did this fairly successfully. The importance of syntax in grammar was gradually increasing. The earliest grammar of Anchieta does not treat syntax in a separate chapter, but we find observations concerning (morpho)syntax throughout his text. Figueira and Mamiani devoted proportionally more pages to syntax and they present syntactic properties in a more systematic way.

As Rodrigues demonstrates, the description of the ergative marker was a struggle for Mamiani since it was difficult to fit it into the framework of Latin. Mamiani found the solution in the 'passive verbs' and he introduces the term, 'ablative of cause', a term he prefers to use instead of the 'ablative of the agent of the passive'.

CHAPTER 5

African languages

In this chapter, three grammars of languages from Sub-Saharan Africa, all belonging to the Bantu group, will be analysed. One is of Kongo, by Hyacinth Brusciotto de Vetralla (c.1600–post 1659); one is of Kimbundu, by Pedro Dias (1622–1700); the third is of Sena or a similar language, by an anonymous Jesuit author.¹

5.1 Introduction

During the first eleven ICHoLS conferences on the history of linguistics and the six OsProMil conferences on missionary linguistics until 2010, little attention was paid to Africa.² The activities of the mainly Portuguese, Spanish and Italian missionaries – particularly Jesuits and Capuchins – who established their missions in Africa in the context of the *Propaganda Fide* of the Vatican or the Spanish and Portuguese crowns have been almost completely ignored in the literature. Of course, most pre-modern missionary sources have been studied by Bantu specialists, who have used these works as sources for the reconstruction of earlier stages of Bantu languages and for comparative research within the discipline of Bantu linguistics. However, the publications of these researchers are generally little known outside specialist circles, and in most comprehensive manuals on Bantu languages early missionary sources are generally neglected, or treated only very briefly. In Heine & Nurse (2000), Nurse & Philippson (2003) and Tucker Childs (2003) we find only scant references to Hyacinth Brusciotto de Vetralla: for instance, Heine and Nurse write that

The linguistic study of vernacular African languages dates back to Fr Giacinto Brusciotto's grammar of the Bantu language Kongo (or Kikongo), published in Rome in 1659. However, the study of African languages began in earnest only in the 19th century under the impulse of a few pioneering linguists.

1. In this study the prefix Ki- before glossonyms is generally omitted, since several allomorphs are used, such as Xi-, Chi-, Shi-, etc. The only exception is Kimbundu where the prefix is used in order to distinguish it from Umbundu, which is a different language.

2. Exceptions were the papers published by Gilmour (2004), Levi (2009) and Legère (2009). During the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, held in Tokyo in March 2010, there was a special session on Africa, with papers by Coelho (2010), Fernandes (2010), Ishikawa (2010), and Legère (2010).

Likewise, Katamba (2003: 103–104) notes that “Noun classification has always occupied a central place in Bantu linguistics. The earliest study of noun-classes was by Brusciotto.” Nothing is said in these manuals about Portuguese sources, such as Mattheus Cardoso’s (1584–c.1625) *Doutrina christã* and Pedro Dias’ grammar of ‘the Language of Angola’, or Kimbundu (=Ndongo), or the anonymous grammar of the ‘Cafre’ language which we shall analyze below.

Likewise, although descriptive reference grammars do not have to make reference to pre-modern sources, it is surprising that Möhlig (2000) does not mention any source written in Latin or Portuguese in his article published in an important manual on the history of linguistics (Auroux, et al. 2000a), in which he distinguishes three periods in the history of African languages, the ‘pre-colonial’, ‘colonial’ and ‘postcolonial’. Möhlig describes four 19th-century scholars as the pioneers of African linguistics: Johann Ludwig Krapf (1810–1881), Heinrich Barth (1821–1865), Sigismund Wilhelm Koelle (1823–1902) and Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel Bleek (1827–1875). The paragraph dedicated to the ‘colonial period’ starts in Möhlig’s article (2000: 981) after the Conference of Berlin of 1884/1885, when Western European powers extended their spheres of influence over territories of Africa. An important chapter in the history of African linguistics has been totally neglected, and no mention is made of the grammars of Brusciotto, Dias, and the anonymous author of the grammar of the ‘Cafre’ language. Nevertheless, some important works on these pioneering grammarians, lexicographers and the first translators of catechisms into Bantu languages have been published.³

Since early sources on Bantu languages are so scarce, it seems reasonable to expect a detailed description of those few we have, since such sources contain important linguistic data which shed light on the historical evolution of some languages or dialects.

5.1.1 Three grammars of African languages

The first of the three grammars which will be analysed in this chapter is a grammar of Kongo. Entitled *Regulae quaedam pro difficillimi Congiensium idiomatis faciliiori captu ad grammaticae normam redactae* (“Some rules for a better understanding of the most difficult language of the people of the Congo, brought into the norms of grammar”), it was written in Latin by the Italian Capuchin Giacinto Brusciotto (Hyacinthus Brusciottus a Vetralla; in Portuguese Jacinto Brusciato de Vetralla),

3. These include Alexandre (1967), Batista (2002 and 2004), Bontinck & Nsasi (1978), Bonvini, (1996; 2008; 2009) Buenaventura de Carrocera (1945), Cardoso (1966), Cole (1971), Doke (1961a and 1961b), Figanière (1863–1864), Moser (1986), Navarro (1999–2001), Petter (2006), and particularly Rosa (2006), the most complete overviews in this list being Doke (1961a; 1961b) and Bonvini (1996; 2009).

and published in Rome at the press of the *Propaganda Fide* in 1659 (Marsden 1796: 9). The grammar does not belong – in the strict sense – to the Portuguese tradition. It is possible that Brusciotto had some knowledge of the Kongo language, but we may assume that his text was based on the work of earlier Portuguese missionaries who probably knew the language much better.⁴ It is documented that another Italian Capuchin, Father Bonaventura da Sardegna (c.1600–1649), was the first author of a Kongo grammar, which he completed in 1645, although this work has been lost.⁵ Brusciotto's grammar was translated into Portuguese in 1886 by Antonio Thomaz da Silva Leitão e Castro (1848–1901), Bishop of Angola and Congo, as *Regras para mais facil intelligencia do difficil idioma do Congo reduzidas a forma de grammatica*. This grammar also contains a dictionary, *Diccionario abreviado da lingua congueza e de alguns vocabularios para uso de escola de linguas africanas*. It is not known if Leitão was the author of this *Diccionario* or if it was the work of 19th-century missionaries. Since many original 17th-century works have been lost, we cannot exclude the possibility that this dictionary is a translation of a work dating from the age of Brusciotto. An English translation of Brusciotto's grammar, by Henry Grattan Guinness (1835–1910), appeared in 1882 in London.

Secondly, we shall analyse a grammar of Kimbundu, entitled *Arte da lingua de Angola*, composed in Brazil by the Portuguese Jesuit Pedro Dias, and published in Lisbon in 1697 (Marsden 1796: 17). Although this work was known to some scholars in the 19th century – for instance Figanière (1863–1864: 106) and Chatelain (1888–1889: xvi) – it was ignored until the present day, although in the last decade scholars have become aware of this almost total neglect (Bonvini 1996; 2009).

The third grammar to be analyzed here is an anonymous 18th-century manuscript entitled *Arte da lingua de Cafre*. It is documented that Dominicans wrote catechisms in the Bantu languages of Eastern Africa, particularly in the languages which were spoken in and around Tet(t)e and Sena along the borders of the Zambezi river. The most important missionary of this Dominican enterprise was João dos Santos (d. 1622), under whose leadership 37,694 people were baptized. The Dominican mission was eventually unsuccessful, however, and the Jesuits followed, remaining in these regions for more than twenty years (1607–1628) (Levi 2009). The Dominican catechisms never appeared in print and the manuscripts have all been lost (Doke 1961a: 19). They are mentioned in sources such as Luís de

4. In Section 3.3 of the appendix to this volume, we discuss a similar case, namely the grammar of Vietnamese written in Latin by Alexandre de Rhodes, who was not Portuguese, but was inspired by, and based his work on, earlier Portuguese missionary studies of this language.

5. Bonaventura da Sardegna studied in Salamanca and took the Capuchin habit in 1629 in Madrid. In 1643, when he was Guardian of the convent in Valladolid, he was nominated as the first Capuchin missionary to the Congo (R. Gray 1998: 75).

Sousa's (1555–1632) *História de São Domingos* (Moser 1986: 2).⁶ Although there are publications analyzing the grammars of Brusciotto and Dias, the anonymous grammar of the 'Cafre' language seems to have been completely ignored. Following its discovery at the beginning of the 20th century, I am not aware of the existence of any recent comprehensive analysis of the anonymous grammatical sketch of this Mozambican language. The only comments on the work were made by Schebesta (1919–1920), who discovered the manuscript and published a transcribed version.

5.1.2 Their context in the early study of African languages

Before analyzing the grammars, we shall begin with a historical overview, which is mainly based on Pellicer de Tovar (1649), Cavazzi (1687), Doke (1961) and Bonvini (1996).

During the first centuries of Portuguese colonisation, no printing press was available in Africa. Printed literature was supplied to Abyssinia from Goa: in 1642, a work entitled *Magseph assetat* – originally written in Ge'ez, and translated into Portuguese – was printed at St. Paul's College in Goa (Priolkar 1958: 5). Works in Bantu languages were printed in Rome and in Portugal. Very few African missionary linguistic works from the 16th and 17th century have appeared in print, and few manuscripts have survived from this early period. What we possess are mainly the works of the Catholic missions. By the 19th century, as demonstrated in Gilmour (2004), important linguistic activities were reported from South Africa by Methodist missionaries who studied Xhosa, such as John Whittle Appleyard (1814–1874) and William Binnington Boyce (1803–1889). These have both been acknowledged as ground-breaking linguists (cf. Cole 1971: 5; Gilmour 2006).⁷

The Methodist missionaries were not the only group who worked in Africa. Anglicans from England, the Dutch Reformed Church, and several Catholic orders also established missions there (Errington 2008). At the beginning of the 20th century we see a huge production of missionary grammars by several missions. The Belgian missionaries in Zaïre, to mention but one example, published a great number of descriptive studies of Bantu languages from the Congo, such as Yombe (De Clercq 1921), Lebé (Gérard 1924), Songo (Samain 1923), and Makere, Medje and Mangbetu (Vekens 1928), published by the Vicariat Apostolique de Niangara au Congo and the Bibliothèque-Congo. In the same period, missionary linguistic works were written in the Portuguese colonies, such as grammars of Kimbundu

6. Moser bases his information on the edition of Sousa by M. Lopes de Almeida (1977, Part 4, book 4, Chapter 14), a work we have not yet consulted.

7. For more details, see Doke (1961a; 1961b) and Cole (1971).

(Cancela 1920), Ganguela of the region of Cubango in Angola (Baião 1938), and Landina/Rongo spoken in Lourenço Marques (Maputo) (Farinha 1917), to mention a few. These works fall outside the chronological scope of this study.

Beside this tradition of the study of Sub-Saharan African languages, in other parts of Africa, missionaries and others, such as orientalist, also studied African languages. The most important works which deserve to be mentioned are the *Grammatica linguae amharicae* (1698) published in Frankfurt by the German Orientalist Hiob Ludolf (1624–1704), together with his *Lexicon Amharico-latinum*. A grammar of Gêez was composed by the same author, the *Grammatica aethiopica* (Ludolf 1661a) and a *Lexicon aethiopico-latinum* (Ludolf 1661b, with a reprint in Frankfurt, 1702) (Cole 1971: 3). Mariano Vittori da Rieti (Marianus Victorius) (c.1518–1572), who assisted in the production of the 1548–1549 Ethiopic New Testament (Wilkinson 2007: 69), also composed a grammar of Gêez, entitled *Chaldaeae, seu Aethiopicae linguae institutiones* (Rome, 1630), with a prologue written by Achille Venereo (Achilles Venerius) and in this context we may also mention the dictionary of the Antwerp Carmelite Jacob Wemmers (1598–1646), *Lexicon Aethiopicum*, with an accompanying grammar (1638b). The Jesuit Athanasius Kircher (1601–1680) described Coptic in his *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus* (Rome, 1636), the earliest surviving description of an African language by a European. This trilingual dictionary was based on the bilingual Arabic-Coptic dictionary *al Sullam al-Kabêr* (“The Great Ladder”) composed by Barakat Ibn Kabar (died in 1324).⁸ Kircher’s grammar of Coptic appeared in 1643, entitled *Lingua Aegyptiaca restituta*. The Augustinian monk Guillaume Bonjour (1670–1714), born in Toulouse, studied Coptic for 11 years, before he left for China in 1707, where he was appointed by the Emperor as professor of mathematics, adopting the name Shan Yao-chan. He undertook several cartographic expeditions across China (Depuydt 2006: 598). One work written by Bonjour has appeared in print – *Monumenta Coptica seu Aegyptiaca Bibliothecae Vaticanae brevis exercitatio* (1699) – and several manuscripts are kept in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome, of which his *Elementa linguae copticae* (1698) has been recently published (cf. Depuydt 2006). The *Propaganda Fide* published Raphael Tuki’s *Rudimenta linguae coptae* in 1778.

No Portuguese works describing Gêez or Amharic have survived, although it is documented that Portuguese and Spanish Jesuits participated in the Ethiopian mission. Pero Pais (1563–1622) was born in Alcer in the diocese of Toledo, and entered the Society of Jesus when he was nineteen years old. He arrived in Goa in 1588 and, disguised as an Armenian merchant, travelled with António de Monserrate, a Persian-speaking missionary to the Mughal court, to Ethiopia; but only Pero Pais arrived, in 1603. Pero Pais was a remarkable linguist: he knew Latin and

8. The dictionary of Kenzi Nubian was produced in 1635. See also the appendix.

Greek and learnt Arabic, Amharic and Ge'ez and although it is known that he translated scriptural texts into Ge'ez (Alden 1996: 155), it is not known whether he also compiled dictionaries or grammars. We do not know either whether his works benefited from earlier Portuguese works. The Ethiopian mission of the Jesuits ended as in Japan. In 1634, all Jesuit priests were banished from the Kingdom of Ethiopia by Basilides (or Fasilides, 'Alam Sagad 1603–1667).⁹

Finally, we should mention António da Costa Peixoto's *Lingoa geral de Minna, traduzida ao nosso Igdioma, por–, Curiozo nesta Siencia, e graduado na mesma faculdade* completed in Ouro Preto between 1731 and 1741 (Petter 2006: 127–128). This is neither a missionary work nor a grammar, but a word-list of an African language with Portuguese translation, arranged semantically, and complemented with dialogues. The language belongs to the Gbe subgroup of the Niger-Congo branch. As Petter observes, the manuscript has not yet been analyzed in a satisfying way, but she does not mention the important study of Castro (2002).

5.1.3 Early catechisms in African languages

The first catechism in a Bantu language was written by the Franciscan Gaspar da Conceição, whose *Carthila da doutrina cristã em lingua do Congo*, published in Évora in 1555, has been lost (Moser 1986: 48; Bonvini 1996: 138).

The earliest extant source in a Bantu language, apart from some fragmentary word-lists and other documentation, is Mattheus Cardoso's *Doutrina christãa [...]* *De novo traduzida na lingoa do Reyno de Congo* of 1624, printed in 1624 (Lisboa: Geraldo da Vinha, Ed. Bontinck & Nsasi 1978). This is a Portuguese catechism, composed by Marcos Jorge (1524–1571) and Ignacio Martinz (1531–1598),¹⁰ accompanied by an interlinear translation into Kongo written by Mattheus Cardoso. According to Cannecattim (cited in Doke 1961a: 8), this catechism was translated by “black interpreters” (“Pretos interpretes”).

Brusciotto was mainly responsible for the Italian and Latin translations of the Kongo and Portuguese sections in his version of the *Doutrina christãa*, entitled *Doctrina christiana ad profectum missionis totius Regni Congi in quatuor linguas per correlativas columnas distincta* and published by the *Propaganda Fide* in 1650.¹¹ When

9. See also Section 2.1 for the Ethiopian mission also Fernandes's *Magseph assetat* printed in Goa in 1642.

10. Jorge, Marcos. 1671. *Doutrina christam ordenada a maneira de dialogo, pera ensinar os mininos, pello P. Marcos Jorge... Acrecentada pello Padre Ignacio Martins... De novo emendada, & acrecentada de hu a Ladaynha de N. Senhora*. First edition 1561.

11. Buenaventura (1945: 216) gives a slightly different title: ... *regni Congi in quatuor linguas dispartita, scilicet latinam, italicam, lusitanicam, et conigicam*.

he completed this edition, Brusciotto probably did not know Kongo at all (Bontinck & Nsasi 1975: 38), since he reproduced all the typographical errors which were present in the *editio princeps*, adding some more from his own hand. In the prologue of his quadrilingual *Doctrina*, he informs his readers that the work was originally written in Portuguese by the Jesuit Marcos Jorge and translated into Kongo by translators of the Congolese court, at the request of Cardoso. The Italian and Latin translations were made by Brusciotto and contain rules for the pronunciation of the language as it was spoken at court (Alençon 1914: 40). When the *Doctrina Christiana* was published in 1650 in Rome, Brusciotto had not yet been to the Congo and the Portuguese version had probably been brought to Rome in 1648 by Angelo (Ángel) de Valencia and Juan Francisco de Roma (Alexandre 1967: 30; Navarro 1999: 228).

Capuchins and Jesuits also composed texts in Kimbundu. The *Gentilis Angolae Fidei Mysteriis Lusitano olim idiomate [...] nunc autem Latino [...] instructus, atque locupletatus* appeared in 1661, composed by the Jesuits Franciscus Pacconio (1589–1641) and António do Couto (d. 1666) and the Capuchin Antonius-Maria da Monteprandone Amici (1607–1687) (Sommervogel 1890, vol. 2: 1587–1588; Cardoso 1966: 534; cf. Clerq, Swiggers & Tongerloo 1996: 447). This Latin version was based on the Portuguese edition of Pacconio, published posthumously under the title *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido nos mysterios de nossa Sancta Fé*,¹² “reduced to a more abbreviated method” (“reduzido a método mais breve”) by António do Couto (Marsden 1796: 47; Chatelain 1888–1889: xv; Santos 1974–1998, Chapter 7: 1). This 90-page work is the first published source in the Kimbundu (Ndongo) language (Bonvini 1996: 139); it was published by Domingos Lopes Rosa in Lisbon in 1642 or 1643. It is bilingual, with the Portuguese text on one page, and the Ndongo version on the facing page. The text is also relevant for the study of the description of sounds and grammar, since a short explanation in Portuguese is given in the prologue. These remarks can be considered as the earliest description of a Bantu language which has thus far survived (Cole 1971: 2). A third edition of this catechism was published in 1784 (Doke 1961a: 12).

In 1623, Father Cardoso was forced to abandon the African continent for Pernambuco (Bontinck & Nsasi 1978: 35), where he continued his work on the Kongo language. He probably left a copy of his *Doutrina* in Brazil, which could have served as the model for the work published by Geronymo de Contreras in Lima in 1629, entitled *Oraciones traducidas en lengua del reyno de Angola* (Sommervogel 1890, 2: 744; Streit-Dindinger 1931, 16: 844; Bontinck & Nsasi 1978: 35). At the College of San Pablo in Lima, the so-called language of Angola¹³ was taught and

12. Marsden (1796: 47).

13. According to Bontinck & Nsasi (*ibid.*) the “lengua del reyno de Angola” must be “the language of Congo”.

apart from this catechism, grammars, and dictionaries were published, almost seventy years before the grammar of Dias was published. Luis López started with the study of the language of the slaves, and the Jesuits in Lima asked permission to their superiors in Rome to establish courses in the language of the slaves. According to according to Martín, the Jesuits in Lima prepared:

A simple dictionary, a grammar and a guide for confessors. Rome's answer must have been positive, at least to a certain extent, because in 1629 San Pablo was using and distributing, even to the furthest ends of the viceroyalty, prayer leaflets, catechisms, and instructions printed in Lima in the language of the slaves. In 1630, fourteen hundred and forty copies of a simple grammar came off the press, and the Jesuits of San Pablo were furnished with the essential tools to begin the systematic study of the 'language of Angola.' For these linguistic publications in the African language, the Jesuits of San Pablo did not produce an original work as in the case of Quechua, but rather used a work edited in Portugal by Mateo Cardoso, a Jesuit theologian born in Lisbon, adapting it to the needs of America. These publications circulated among the Jesuits during the same years that Alonso de Sandoval's famous book *De Instauranda Aetiopum Salute* was fresh from the printing shops of Seville. (Martín 1968: 51)¹⁴

Unfortunately, all these Peruvian works on, or written in, the 'language of Angola', language of Congo have been lost, but it is obvious that the works of Portuguese missionaries played a crucial role in the teaching practice of the Jesuits in Lima who committed themselves to the study of the language of the Africans. It is also documented that Pacconio composed a grammar and began a dictionary (Bontinck & Nsasi 1978: 33), but no copies have been discovered. If they ever existed, we cannot exclude the possibility that Dias had seen, or used them or that these texts even were used and reprinted in Peru. In fact, Dias reports in one of his letters (see below) that he was composing a *Vocabolário Português-Angolano* and that he also planned to write a *Vocabolário Angolano-Português*, which could mean that he was composing something of his own, or that he was revising or copying the work of one of his predecessors.

Another catechism has survived, composed in the 'Arda' language.¹⁵ In 1648, the Spanish Capuchins started their mission in the Kingdom of Benin under the leadership of Angelo de Valencia. Notwithstanding minor successes, both missions

14. Alonso de Sandoval (1567–1652) published his work on slavery in 1627. Martín took his information from the *Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu* FG 1488 and the *Archivo Nacional del Perú* in Lima (ANP, Compañía de Jesús, Varios, Legajo 2, Libro de Viáticos y Almacén del Colegio de San Pablo 1628–1631 MS f.24). See also Bowser (1974: 245).

15. I am grateful to Norval Smith and Enoch Aboh for having informed me about the existence of this Christian doctrine, a source which had previously escaped my attention.

were unproductive, due to Portuguese rivalry and obstruction (Levi 2009).¹⁶ An anonymous Spanish Capuchin wrote a curious work entitled *Doctrina christiana* in the Arda language. Although the work does not belong to the Portuguese tradition – since it is written in Spanish – mention must be made of it here because it is one of the few published sources we have from these regions and as far as I know, the only non-historical African missionary source which appeared in press in Spain in the 17th century. The title is *Doctrina christiana; y explicacion de sus misterios, en nuestro idioma español, y en lengua arda*. It was published in Madrid in 1658, and has been reproduced and analyzed by Labouret and Rivet (1929). It has a prologue, but unfortunately we find no information there concerning the pronunciation of the language. As occurs in other African sources, mention is made of the complexity of this language, its ‘imperfectness’ and the difficulties of finding equivalents for Christian concepts. Sentences in this language, according to the anonymous Capuchin, are construed by ‘loose words’ (*dicciones sueltas*), without orthographic rules. In the prologue we read that the work is not only a catechism, but also a vocabulary.¹⁷ The major part is indeed published as a word-list, organised according to the topics of Christian doctrine: ‘Padre nuestro’, ‘el Ave Maria’, ‘el Credo’, ‘la Salve’, ‘los Articulos de la Fè’, ‘los Mandamientos de la Ley de Dios’, ‘los Mandamientos de la Iglesia’, ‘los Sacramentos de la Santa Madre Iglesia’, ‘las Obras de Misericordia’, ‘los enemigos del alma’, ‘que cosa es pecado mortal?’, ‘sobre la Doctrina Christiana’, and the ‘Acto de Contricion’.

As explained by Labouret and Rivet (1929: 2) the Arda *Doctrina christiana* was discovered by Ludewig (2007[1858]: 12), who believed that the Ardas were a “tribe of Indians living between the rivers Napo and Marañón in the Province of Quijos, not far from Quito”. In historical sources, mention is made of Jesuit missions in these regions between 1727 and 1768 (Labouret & Rivet 1929: 3). The language of the Ardas was classified as an Amerindian isolate by earlier scholars, but Labouret

16. According to Urbano Cerri, the *Propaganda Fide* sent fifteen Andalusian Capuchins to Sierra Leone in 1652, but through Portuguese interference only three arrived; these baptized an important king (Schmidlin 1933: 283, note 23, cited in Levi 2009).

17. “Entre todas las dificultades que ocurren en los principios de una nueva, y Católica conquista, la mayor es la de conseguir la le[n]gua, no solo por ser poco usada entre los Católicos, sino tambien por su imperfeccion; con que dificultosame[n]te pueden reducirse sus terminos a la explicacion de los de nuestra Santa Fè, y facilmente entuiarse los alientos mas feruorosos. Pero auiedo Dios nuestro Señor dado su asistencia para su comprehension, la experimentamos (con esperitual consuelo) no dificultosa, sino muy facil, y a poca costa, quedando aduertidos del modo de reducir à nuestro idioma [sic] las lenguas mas estrañas, con la seguridad de coger el fruto muy temprano, y desde el primer instante de su comunicaci3n. Van diuididos los periodos en dicciones sueltas, sin guardar las reglas de ortografia, a fin de q[ue] sirua esta quaderno, no solo de Catecismo, sino tambien de Vocabulario para el Ardo, y el Español” (Labouret & Rivet 1929: 1–2; & Planche III).

and Rivet demonstrated that it is an African language: “un parler de la Côte de Guinée, le gè ou popo, ou mina” (1929: 4). As Aboh and Smith (forthcoming) demonstrate, the Arda (or Allada) Kingdom was powerful and stable, with international allies and control of slave ports. The King of Allada sent an ambassador to Philip IV of Spain in 1658–1660, and to France in 1670. The Arda (presumably Allada) language does not belong to the Bantu stock, but is classified as a language of the Gbe family (Aboh & Smith forthcoming). Some Allada-Gbe linguistic material has been preserved in Saramaccan and Sranan in Surinam.¹⁸ Santos (1974–1998, Chapter 4: 4) and Leite (1965: 220) mention the Angolese father Manuel de Lima, a missionary in Brazil, who was supposedly the author of a catechism in the language of the Ardas.¹⁹ This reference may be an error; it could refer to the same source as the Spanish work of the anonymous Capuchin father, or to a different work. Leite (1965: 220) suggests that Ardas is possibly an erroneous transcription of the word “ardra”, possibly an African tribe, but he argues that according to others this ethnic term is used for an indigenous tribe of Brazil as well. It is not clear whether Leite is referring to the same work as the one studied by Aboh & Smith.

5.2 The Capuchin Hyacinth Brusciotto and his Kongo grammar (1659)

The Italian Capuchin Hyacinth Brusciotto’s mission in the Congo began in 1652 and ended in 1657. We know almost nothing about his life; he was a “Prefect of the Apostolic Mission of the Catholic Church to the Kingdom of Congo” (Doke 1961: 15a). He brought the linguistic works on Bantu languages which were available at that time to Rome, where he published in 1659 his *Regulae quaedam pro difficillimi Congiensium idiomatis faciliiori captu ad grammaticae normam redactae*.

5.2.1 The language

According to De Clercq (1921: 5), the most important dialects in Mayombe in the Belgian Congo of his days were Kongo, Sundi and Yombe. Kongo is spoken in the east and south, Sundi in the north and west and Yombe in the north-west. W. Holman Bentley (1855–1905) observed in his *Dictionary and Grammar of the Kongo Language* (1887) that the language described by Brusciotto is the Sonyo dialect or

18. Norval Smith and Enoch Aboh are both working on this language. Partial results were presented by Smith at the Workshop on the History of Slavery and Creolization (“Gbe words in Surinam creoles”, NIAS, June 11, 1996). See also Aboh & Smith (forthcoming) and R. Law (1997).

19. I acknowledge Gonçalo Fernandes (p.c. Tokyo, March 2010) for this reference, (cf. Leite (1993[1965]: 220).

that of St. Antonio, which was spoken in his days by the Oslongo (or Mu-Sorongo or Mu-shi-Rongo) (cited in Doke 1961a: 16). Kongo was the most important language of the ancient Kongo Kingdom (Cabinda, Zaïre and the northern regions of modern Angola). According to the updated Guthrie list of Bantu language classification as published by Maho (2003: 647), Kongo belongs to the so-called Ki-group.

5.2.2 Phonology

Brusciotto's grammar starts directly with "declension" (*declinatio*) of the nouns and an introduction to its 'principiations' (see 5.2.3.1). An initial chapter dedicated to orthography and pronunciation is missing. Brusciotto does not use many diacritics, but we do find the ⟨ü⟩ as in ⟨üazitissa⟩ and ⟨ç⟩ as in ⟨nçuzitissa⟩ (63), although the author does not explain in his grammar their exact phonetic value. At the end of this section, we find some observations concerning pronunciation:

Aduertendum quoque generaliter est quod verba, seu dictionis huius linguae incipientia à litteris B, D, P, S, Z, & V, quando stat pro consonanti requirunt ante se litteram N, cuius virtute oneretur vox illa in sua pronuntiatione. (Brusciotto 1659: 12)

[It has also to be observed, that words or phrases in this language beginning with B, D, P, S, Z, or V when it stands as a consonant, generally require before them the letter N which principle the word is made weightier in its pronuntiation.]

This fragment refers to the so-called Kongo law of nasal assimilation and as Doke (1961a: 17) observes, Brusciotto was not consistent in the spelling of these cases of assimilation. Most missionary grammars start with a chapter on orthography and pronunciation, but this is occasionally to be found as the final chapter, usually after the chapter on syntax, where according to the canonical order prosody is treated. Brusciotto describes the phenomenon of synaloepha in Chapter 26 ("Quaedam Regulae & Annotationes perutiles circa nomina & verba particularia" ["Some rules and useful observations about particular nouns and verbs"]).

Omnes voces, tam nomina quàm verba habentes litteram V, pro secunda littera primae syllabae pronuntiantur sic, vt praefatum V non percipiatur saluo quando post eam sequitur alis vocalis, vel littera N, v.g. *Mubhobheri*, 'Aduocatus', *mutima*, 'conscientia', *Mutinu*, 'Rex', proferuntur cum sinalephe in prima syllaba sic, *M'hobheri*, *m'tima*, *m'tinu*, (Brusciotto 1659: 75–76)

[All words, nouns as well as verbs, which have the letter V as the second letter of the first syllable are pronounced in such a manner that it is not perceived, except when after it another vowel or the letter 'N' follows, v.g. *Mubhobheri*, 'lawyer', *mutima*, 'consciousness', *Mutinu*, 'King', which are pronounced with synaloepha in the first syllable, as *M'hobheri*, *m'tima*, *m'tinu*, ...]

At the end of the same chapter, Brusciotto explains that when ⟨I⟩ stands for a consonant, it has to be written as ⟨Y⟩. Here he also observes that the vowels in Kongo are the same as in Portuguese, and his native tongue, Italian, is also used in his description:

Aduertendum quòd saepissimè loco I ante vocales, vt indicetur consonantis habere locum, ponitur Y, quia cum vocales huius idiomatis pronunciandae sint iuxta morem Lusitaniae; I quod inseruit loco consonantis, si poneretur, deberet pronunciari pro Gi, & non simpliciter per I, sicut etiam Que non pronunciatur, vt in Italico, seu Latino sermone, sed Lusitanico, quasi *che* Italicè. (Brusciotto 1659: 82–83)

[It has to be observed, that when the ‘I’ is placed before vowels it stands often for a consonant and has to be written with ‘Y’, since the vowels of this language have to be pronounced in the Portuguese manner, and when it is used as a consonant, it has to be pronounced as ‘Gi’, and not simply as ‘I’, as ‘que’ has not to be pronounced in the Italian or the Latin manner, but as Portuguese, almost as Italian *che*.]

5.2.3 Morphosyntax

Two characteristic features of Bantu languages will be analyzed here: the noun-class system with its concords and the TAM (Tense, Aspect and Mood) as it was described by Brusciotto.

5.2.3.1 Nominal inflection, declensions, ‘cases’ and the noun-classes

The N precedes its modifiers and Verb phrases are predominantly prefixing. Most Bantu languages have few real prepositions or adjectives. Nor do they have articles, although definiteness can be expressed by means of the nominal augment (subject), object markers in the verb (object), or ordering of the demonstrative in the NP (Nurse & Philippson 2003: 8).

In most Bantu languages, subjects and objects are unmarked for case and have subject (and sometimes object) markers attached to the verb (cf. Creissels 2000: 233; 235). In Latin, case affixes are bound morphemes affixed to the noun in an agreement relationship with its modifiers. Such a system of ‘cases’ has not been reported for any African language (Creissels 2000: 247). Bantu languages are so-called “noun-class languages” (Anderson 1985: 175–176). The base for the distinction between different noun-classes is partially semantic; noun-class systems can be based on animacy or on a human/non-human opposition, but other realities than biological gender can also form a noun-class, for instance shape (round, long, etc.), function, etc. Bantu languages generally mark their nouns with prefixes, also called ‘classifiers’, ‘noun-class prefixes’, or ‘noun-class markers’, which indicate to which class the noun belongs (cf. Payne 1997: 107–109; Williamson & Blench 2000: 12–13).

Brusciotto introduces a considerable amount of novel metalinguistic terminology, or uses existing terms with new senses. When analyzing nominal morphology, he concludes that the nominal paradigms had to be described in a different manner from the Latin system, which is based on declensions and cases. Brusciotto structured his first chapter, on nominal declensions, on the basis of the initial prefix which he called *principiatio*, the opposite of the term *terminatio* (“ending”). In total he treats eight different *principiationes* (Doke 1961a: 16–17). He was aware that often the plural classifier is different from its singular counterpart. He did not treat plural classifiers as different classes, but put them together in the same paragraph. This was motivated by the use of the word *article* (‘article’), which etymologically has the meaning of a ‘linking’ or ‘binding’ element, and is used by Brusciotto to describe what today we call ‘concord’. For instance, the noun of the first *principiatio* begins with *E* and the corresponding article is *Ria* as in *Etondo ria nZambianpungu* (‘Praise of God’). In the plural, this example has to be transformed as follows: *Matondo ma nZambianpungu* (‘Praises of God’). As Cole (1971: 3) observes: “It is significant that his division into ‘principiations’ was determined by the concordial agreements and not by the form of the noun prefix, thus revealing deeper linguistic insight than some of his successors up to the present day!” Further, Brusciotto introduces a specific term for concord, which he labels *connexio adiectiuorum cum substantiuis* (1659: 15).

5.2.3.2 Verbal morphology

Most Bantu languages have a rich system of Tense, Aspect and Mood (TAM) markers, compared to the Spanish or Portuguese, or Latin, of the missionaries. A large number of tense, aspect and mood morphemes co-occur in the verbal complex and their combinations were not easy to describe, since they did not fit the canonical verbal paradigms. An extended paradigm was needed.

In Bantu languages, aspect and tense are generally complementary notions (Batibo 2005: 1), although some morphemes are more closely related to what is called aspect while others have a more predominantly temporal connotation. In traditional grammar, tense is an autonomous ‘accident’ of the verb, as are voice, person and number. Aspect did not have the status of an ‘accident’, yet it was not totally absent. In the first place, some terms for the tenses have clearly an aspectual meaning. In Greco-Latin terminology, we see an amalgam of aspectual and temporal notions: on the one hand we have ‘present’, ‘past’ and ‘future’, which are clearly temporal notions, whereas terms such as ‘perfect’, ‘imperfect’, and ‘aorist’ represent notions which are more closely related to ‘aspect’ (and there are also subcategories, such as ‘verba inchoativa’ and ‘verba frequentativa’, signifying aspectual nuances). Like the Renaissance scholars who wrote grammars of the

vernacular languages of Europe, missionaries generally did not treat aspect in a systematic way, as this analysis came to be developed in more recent times.

Tense markers are generally used for present, past and future, but within this tripartite division there is an elaborate system of subcategories. The most common marker for present, immediate past and future is the prefix *a-*, which precedes the stem or root. This marker can have several different allomorphs, usually with variation of tone or syllabic duration. The most important aspectual markers are the perfect, habitual and progressive. The commonest suffix in most Bantu languages for the perfect is *-ile*, and for the imperfective the suffix *-a(n)g-* is used, which can represent habitual, iterative or continuative aspect (Batibo 2005: 1–2).

Thus far, the verbal root has combined with temporal morphemes. The system can be extended when more distinctions are made, adding aspectual morphemes, such as ‘perfective’ and ‘imperfective’, although not all the possible combinations can be produced, leading to some asymmetries: in the past tenses more aspectual markers co-occur than in the future tenses (*ibid.* 209). In sum, 24 morphological forms can be construed on the base of these temporal and aspectual morphemes. Future markers co-occur only with the perfective and imperfective aspects, while the present tense only has the imperfective aspect (*ibid.* 228).²⁰

Brusciotto treats the verb and its conjugations in the fourteenth chapter of his grammar, starting with the description of the concords between subject and the verb:

.... ad dicendum ‘res, quam Deus amat’ non valet dicere ‘*Quiuma azitissa nZambianpungu*’, sed hoc modo, ‘*Quiuma quiazitissa nZambianpungu*’. (Brusciotto 1649: 36)

[... e.g. to say ‘the thing which God loves’ it is not correct to use *quiuma azitissa nZambianpungu* but rather *quiuma quiazitissa nZambianpungu*.”]

His conjugation of the Kongo verb equivalent to Latin ‘amare’ begins as follows:

Coniugatio verbi ‘amo’, ‘amas’, ad cuius exemplum coniugantur omnia alia.

Praesens, & praeteritum hodiernae diei.

Singul. *Nzitissi*, ‘ego amo’, vel ‘amaui hodie’, id est, ‘hò amato’; *üzitissi*, *azitissi*.

Plur. *Tuzitissi*, *nuzitissi*, *azitissi*, ‘Illi amant’, vel ‘amauerunt hodie’.

It then proceeds to a “Praeteritum imperfectum, perfectum, & plusquam perfectum” (1st pers. sing. *yazitissi*); a “Praesens quod continuationem cum praeterito significat” (1st pers. sing. *yazitissa*); a “Futurum imperfectum” (1st pers. sing. *ncuzitissa*) and a “Futurum perfectum” (1st pers. sing. *ncuquina nçuzitissa*); an “Imperatiuus” (2nd pers. sing. *uzitissa ngue*) and an “Optatiuus” (1st pers. sing.

20. For other Congo languages and their verbal systems see for example Vekens (1928: 43) (Makere and Medje), Samain (1923) (Kisonge), Gérard (1924: 46–57) (Lebeo/Kingelima).

nguabho ... yazitissa); a “Praeteritum imperfectum, perfectum, & plusquam perfectum” (1st pers. sing. *nguabho ... yazitissi*); a “Futurum Coniunctiui” and a “Secundum Futurum” (1st pers. sing. *nancuzitissa* and *nancuquinga cuzitissa* respectively); an “Infinitiuus” (*cuzutissa*), and a “Gerundium” and a “Gerundio” (both *munacuzitissa*) (1659: 62–66).

So, the tenses which Brusciotto distinguishes are the “praesens, & praeteritum hodiernae diei” (present and preterite ‘of today’ [*hodiernia*]), and the “praeteritum imperfectum, perfectum et plusquam perfectum” (imperfect, perfect and pluperfect). Overall, *grosso modo* he follows the canonical order of Latin grammars, present – preterite – future – imperative – optative – subjunctive – infinitive – gerund, but he also decided to include a new subcategory which he labelled *praeteritum hodiernae diei*. In the present tense, he did not decide to use novel metalinguistic terms, but he makes a clear distinction between two different forms and describes the difference in terms of ‘aspect’. *Yazitissa*, opposed to *nzitissi* has to be interpreted as a form which has a ‘continuation’ with the preterite, “quod continuationem cum praeterito significat”), which is a description based on the notion of aspect and at the same time a further expansion of the Latin categories. It is remarkable that Brusciotto gives not only one equivalent of the ‘perfect future’: *Ncuquinga n̄cuzitissa* is translated as ‘amavero’ (“I shall have loved”), but also the adverbs *iam* and *tunc* are included in his translation, demonstrating that the original form in Kongo does not correspond with just one morphological verbal form in Latin, but extra elements are needed in order to translate the original with precision. Another comparable example is the form *amaui hodie* where *hodie* (‘today’) is added. Brusciotto also uses specific terms for some markers, such as the *signum futurationis* (future marker), *signum negationis* (negation marker) and *nota intransitionis* (intransitive marker) (1659: 77).

5.2.4 Syntax

Word and constituent order. Bantu languages are agglutinating and the default order of sentence constituents is S (Aux) VO (Adjuncts).²¹ The Noun precedes its modifiers and Verb phrases are predominantly prefixing. Brusciotto’s grammar does not contain a separate chapter dedicated to syntax, but some features related to (morpho)syntax are sporadically explained. Object Markers are normally placed between the SM – TAM markers and the root (cf. Nurse 2003: 90–91). Verb-Subject agreement is almost always obligatory, whereas Verb-Object usually does not show

21. Nurse (2008: 28) observes that it is less appropriate, when classifying languages, to apply a strict binary model, distinguishing between inflectional and agglutinating. He proposes a division between two extremes, as on a ‘cline’. Bantu languages are nearer to the agglutinating ‘ideal type’.

agreement, unless a specific human referent is involved, in which case the Object Marker (OM) precedes the verb stem (cf. Bearth 2003: 123).²² Brusciotto gives a precise description of the position of the Object marker before the verbal stem:

In temporibus praesentibus, *I, V, A*; Plur, *Tu, nu, a*, v.g. ‘Ego amo me’, *O meno inzitissi*: illud *I*, est signum personae amantis, illud *N* quòd immediatè sequitur personae amatae; & vltimo loco verbum *Zitissi*. (Brusciotto 1659: 52)

[In the present tenses, *I, V, A*, plural *Tu, nu, a*, e.g. ‘I love myself’, *O meno inzitissi*: the *I* is the marker for the person loving, the *N* which immediately follows is the person beloved, and in the last place [comes] the verb *Zitissi*.]²³

5.3 Pedro Dias (1622–1700)

The Jesuit Pedro Dias (1622–1700) was born in Vila de Gouveia, Portugal and lived in Brazil from his childhood. At the age of 19, he entered the Jesuits (1641), and studied law and medicine (Cardoso 1966: 524).²⁴ According to Leite (1947) Dias started to learn ‘the language of Angola’ in 1663 at the Jesuit College in Rio de Janeiro. The reason why he decided to write a grammar of this language can be found in a letter (cited in Bonvini 2009, who refers to Leite): the Angolan people had to communicate for the spiritual need of their souls” (“pela necessidade espiritual em que jazem os angolanos”), and the fact that until his time, no grammar had yet been written in Angola, nor in Brazil (“não se acha nenhuma Gramática desta língua, nem no Brasil nem no Reino de Angola”). He composed his grammar in Salvador, Brazil, completing it in 1694, and commissioned Miguel Cardoso (1659–1721) – an Angola-born native speaker of Kimbundu – as manuscript editor (Batista 2002: 1; Petter 2006: 126–7). It was published in Lisbon in 1697 as *Arte da lingua de Angola*.

It is not easy to determine which grammars Dias used as his model, since he does not mention any, but in his *Arte*, we find references to the catechism of

22. This is true of Swahili, but may not be equally true of all Bantu languages (Legère, personal communication, February 2009).

23. According to Legère (personal communication, February 2009), there is a problem with this example, since a verb normally ends in *-a*.

24. “...com os pobres e pretos da África, a cujo serviço colocou os seus conhecimentos médicos e os curava pelos próprios meios e com remédios por ele mesmo manipulados. Levado por este amor aos escravos e para mais facilmente os tratar, aprendeu a língua de Angola (não se diz quando: já a sabia em 1663) e escreveu a gramática da mesma língua para que outros a aprendessem” (Leite 1947: 9–11); cf. Cunha (2008) and Bonvini (2008).

Franciscus Pacconio, one of the authors of the *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido*.²⁵

This is the evidence we have which permits us to link Dias's work directly with African sources produced in Africa. There is little doubt, however, that Dias followed the Latin model of Manuel Álvares, as can be demonstrated in the following table:

Table 5.1 The three first rules of syntax, according to Álvares and Dias (Rosa 2006: 223)²⁶

Manuel Álvares (1572: 108r-108v)	Pedro Dias (1697: 33–34)
Verbum personale finiti modi antecedit nominatiuus apertè, vel occultè eiusdem numeri, & persone.	Regras do Nominativo. Verbum personale, &c. Todo o verbo pessoal nesta lingua tem seu nominativo claro, ou occulto. verbi gratia. ... Tambem se pôde dizer: <i>Eye ücola, nguicola pè</i> : onde está o primeiro nominativo <i>Eye</i> , claro, & no segundo verbo <i>nguicola</i> , occulto.
Prima, & secunda persona ferè non explicantur, nisi cum diuersa studia significamus.	Prima, & secunda persona, &c. A primeira, & segunda pessoa poem-se claramente, quando diversas pessoas mostraõ contrarios desejos. verbi gratia. <i>Eme ngandala culunda o milonga yâ nzambi, eye cuandala cuilunda</i> , eu guardo os preceitos de Deos, mas tu não queres guardalos. O exemplo está nos dous pronomes, <i>Eye</i> , & <i>Eme</i> , postos claramente; porque os agentes mostraõ diversos desejos; porque hum quer, & outro não quer.
Aut cum plus significamus, quam dicimus:[....] Tu, innocentior, quàm Mettellus?	Aut cum plus significamus, &c. ...

25. “Assim se vê em Pacomio [sic] na Salve Rainha” (Dias 1697: 8–9); “...como se vê no Catecismo do Padre Pacomio na Oração do Padre Nosso. *Quize cotuecâla o quifuchi quiaê*: ‘venha para onde nós estamos o teu Reyno’. O exemplo está nas palavras, *cotuecâla*, postas entre o verbo *Quize*, & nominativo, *quifuchi*” (Dias 1697: 34–35).

26. For a more detailed analysis, see Bonvini (2009), who concludes that: “Au plan graphique, nous allons aussi mettre en évidence, par des caractères gras, le traitement que chaque auteur a réservé aux différentes parties du discours, afin d’évaluer l’hypothèse émise par Zwartjes (2002) [...]. Ce tableau révèle un parallélisme évident entre ces deux grammaires [Álvares and Dias], qui se manifeste tant dans le plan général de l’œuvre, quasiment identique, que dans le traitement similaire des huit parties du discours et, surtout, dans la terminologie très proche et parfois même identique dans son expression latine. La référence à la langue latine est d’ailleurs fréquente dans le texte de Dias (1697: 1, 8, 23, 33, 36, 39, 46 et 47)”.

5.3.1 The language

Kimbundu was the most important language of the Ndongo kingdom, and was spoken in the centre and south-western part of modern Angola (Bonvini 1996: 142). As Chatelain (1888–1889: xv–xvi) observes, the Kimbundu language used in Pacconio's catechism is not exactly the same variety as the language spoken in Luanda, nor that of Ambaca, but possibly the dialect spoken in the mission of Cabinda in the district of Ambaca. One question which remains unanswered is whether the absence of contractions has to be interpreted as an exact recording of the spoken language, or possibly an intention of the author to give a less colloquial variety. In many other missionary grammars, contractions are considered as 'vulgar' and not as the 'pure' representation of the language.²⁷

According to Petter (2006: 127), the language described by Dias is Kimbundu as it was spoken in Brazil by the African slaves who came mainly from the region which today belongs to Angola. The language described does not show any features of pidginization or creolization.

The languages spoken from Zaïre to southern Angola, with Kongo and Kimbundu as the most important regional tongues, are closely related to one another. The homogeneity of the Angolan languages was a consequence of the politically powerful Kongo and Ndongo/Ngola empires (Lipski 2005: 202).²⁸ However, Dias does inform his readers that the 'Ambundos' came from a number of dialectally distinct areas, and he stresses that they sometimes use different particles, which have approximately the same meaning:

Nomes demonstrativos, meus, tuus, &c.

Para estes servem as mesmas particulas assim do singular, como do plural, acrescentandolhe a letrà *A, üà, rià, quià, cuà, luà, tuà*. Plur. *A, yà, gia, tua*. v.g. *Mutuüami*, 'pessoa minha'. *Mubicaüae*, 'escravo seu'. Plur. *Mubicaüetu*, 'escravo nosso'. *Mubicaüenu*, 'escravo vosso'. *Abicào*, 'escravos seus'. Advirta-se que no modo de fallar fazem algũas vezes sinalefa. v.g. *Mubicàe*, 'escravo seu'.

Deve-se notar, que as ditas particulas custumaõ muitas vezes usar dellas os Ambundos, pondo hũas por outras, por causa das variedades das linguas Angolanas. Mas sempre fazem o mesmo sentido; porque não variaõ totalmente a sustancia dos nomes, & verbos, ainda que o idioma não fique muy culto (Dias 1697: 10).

[Demonstrative nouns, *meus, tuus, suus, &c.* For these (demonstratives), the same particles are used, both for singular and for plural, adding the letter *A, üà, rià, quià, cuà, luà, tuà*. Plur. *A, yà, gia, tua*. e.g. *Mutuüami*, 'my person'. *Mubicaüae*,

27. See in particular the Spanish grammars of Aymara and those written in the Philippines.

28. Cf. Chatelain (1888–1889: xiv): "As linguas principaes com que o kimbundu confina – o kixikongo ao norte, as linguas kioko e lunda a leste e o umbundu ao sul – não são, por consequencia, tão diferentes d'elle e entre si".

‘his slave.’ Plur. *Mubicaüetu*, ‘our slave.’ *Mubicaüenu*, ‘your slave.’ *Abicào*, ‘their slaves.’ Notice that in this manner of speaking, they sometimes make synaloepha, v.g. *Mubicàe*, ‘his slave.’

It has to be observed that the Ambundos use the foregoing particles frequently, putting some of them instead of the others, due to the varieties of the Angolese languages. But they always have the same meaning, since they do not change the total substance of the nouns and verbs, even if the language is not very sophisticated.]²⁹

It is still difficult to determine how many slaves really understood the variety recorded by Dias: was he overstating the mutual intelligibility of this and other varieties?³⁰ Probably not. Alonso de Sandoval reports that the African slaves in Peru spoke ‘the language of Angola’, using the singular in stead of ‘languages’. These slaves “are very docile, and it appears that they will come very easily to our Holy Faith, toward which end the fact that they do not have idols, as they say they do not, will help them much, and also the belief, as they believe, in a God that is in heaven, whom they call *Zambianpungo*. *All speak a common language, though with some variety* (emphasis is mine) (cited in Bowser 1974: 235). Antonio Vieira (1608–1697) wrote in 1691 to the king of Portugal that the Africans were in the majority, outnumbering the indigenous people.³¹ The indigenous members of the society were approached in ‘their languages’ (Vieira here uses the plural), whereas the “Negros” were approached ‘in their language’ (Vieira here uses the singular, which may demonstrate that he did not know that dialectal varieties existed among the Africans, or that he knew this, but ignoring the existence of these varieties).³²

Dias does not use the term ‘kimbundu’ in his grammar, where we find ‘*lingua de Angola*’, as occurs in the title, ‘*esta lingua*’ (1), ‘*lingua Angolana*’ (33), and the

29. A similar observation is made when the author deals with the several forms for the past tenses in the chapter dealing with the verb: “Porèm tem-se por experiencia que algũas vezes usão hum por outro; deve ser pela variedade das terras, & nações” (Dias 1697: 24) [However, one has the experience that sometimes they use one form for another, due to the variety of the regions and nations.]

30. As happened in Manila, priests tried to ignore or eliminate the differences among dialects spoken by natives of Tagal or Southern Mĩn dialects in their grammars and dictionaries. It is always easier for priests to learn just one variety.

31. Vieira was born in Lisbon and he arrived at Salvador Bahía at the age of six. For a bibliography, see van den Besselaar (1981) and Levi (2004).

32. “E sendo muito maior sem comparação o número de Negros que os dos Índios, assim como os Índios são catequizados **nas suas próprias línguas**, assim os Negros o são **na sua**, de que neste Colégio da Baía temos quatro operários muito práticos, como também no Rio de Janeiro e Pernambuco” (cited in Leite 1965: 105). See also the ‘*línguas gerais*’ in the chapter on Brazil.

language of the ‘Ambundos’ (10, 23, etc.), also in plural ‘linguas Ambundas’ (17) (Bonvini 2009).

5.3.1.1 *The structure of the grammar*

Dias follows the canonical structure and order of traditional Latin grammar. We cannot exclude the possibility that he used Álvares, or possibly the works of Anchieta and Figueira, although no explicit references are found. According to Petter (2006: 127), Dias’s structure parallels that of Anchieta’s grammar of Tupinambá, but there are also important differences. The main difference is that Dias did not describe the paradigms of the nouns according to their Latin ‘cases’; but started from the principle of the noun-classes, which is one of the main features of the languages of the Bantu family. Although Dias recorded the change of the first vowel or syllable, which differs in singular and plural, this is probably insufficient for us to affirm that Dias understood and described the noun-class system of Bantu languages (Petter *ibid.*).³³ Quoting Bonvini (1996: 145), Petter also states that Dias had ‘embryonic’ knowledge of the system of concord for adjectives, pronouns and the third person of the verb, or the concords of the noun-classes.

5.3.2 Phonology and orthography

According to the perception of European missionaries, Bantu phonetics was generally not complex, and they were convinced that most letters of the Latin alphabet were applicable to the Bantu phonology. The alphabet they used was that which had been developed for the Portuguese-speaking world. In general, Catholic missionaries from the first centuries of evangelization did not adapt the alphabet drastically and only in sporadic cases we do see the use of diacritics or special combinations of letters representing unknown sounds for European learners of Bantu languages. Actually, Bantu phonetics can be quite complex, particularly when the tonal system has to be described. Tonal Bantu languages such as Kongo, Kimbundu and Sena distinguish between two surface tones, High (H) and Low (L), which are phonemic. Verbal tonology is more complex than tonal distinctions in nouns. Disyllabic stems can have all possible distinctions, HH, HL, LH, or LL. Noun prefixes are L, pre-prefixes (or augments) H (Nurse & Philippson 2003: 8). Tone is used both lexically and grammatically in many Bantu languages and often tone can express inflectional contrasts in the verbal morphology (Tucker Childs 2003: 76).

The general impression we have is that European missionaries hardly understood the tonal nature of the phonemic system. If they had any idea of its existence,

33. “Ao romper com o paradigma das declinações do modelo latino dos “casos”, encerra o debate sobre a interpretação das classes nominais” (Petter 2006: 127).

they did not develop an adequate system of diacritics for the vowels, as did some early missionary grammarians of Chinese or Vietnamese.³⁴ The sections devoted to orthography and phonology in the grammars analyzed in this chapter will be disappointing to a modern phonologist, but apparently their authors did not feel the necessity to dedicate much space to these features. We find only some unsystematic observations in the grammar of Dias, but he uses no term such as ‘tonada’, as occurs in Asia. We may assume that he was aware of the process of pre-nasalization, which is a common feature in many Bantu languages, with Kimbundu as no exception. Given the general view at that time, pronunciation had to be learned while listening carefully to native speakers, and although more elaborate phonetic descriptions were developed in other regions of the world, this is not the case in African grammars.

One of the first descriptions related to phonology and orthography is in Cardoso’s *Doutrina*. In his prologue he explains the difference between ⟨u⟩ and ⟨ü⟩. The diacritics are only used “in case of doubt”, as the author observes. When the diacritic is omitted, the letter stands for a vowel, and when it is used, it represents a consonant. Cardoso gives one exception to this rule; when the ⟨u⟩ follows an ⟨n⟩ or the vowel ⟨u⟩, it has to be interpreted as a consonant, as in ⟨üalenuu⟩ (Bontinck & Nsasi 1978: 15). When a vowel is placed before two consonants, or geminated, the syllable has to be pronounced as a long syllable, in which case the circumflex is used to designate the length. If no circumflex is placed on a vowel, the syllable is short. Further, Cardoso explains that ⟨s⟩ is never pronounced as a voiced sibilant /z/. These observations are the earliest explanations concerning the pronunciation of Bantu languages, albeit rudimentary. It is not surprising that the orthography in this *Doutrina* should be based on that of Portuguese, which means that ⟨cu⟩ is used for ⟨ku⟩ and ⟨qui⟩ for ⟨ki⟩. In general, we find the circumflex on vowels in penultimate position, but it is not clear if Cardoso is attempting to transcribe pitch or vowel stress (Doke 1961a: 9).

The first edition of the *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido* (1642) of Pacconio et al. has an introductory section entitled “Advertencias para se ler a lingua de Angola”, containing ten rules related to spelling and pronunciation,³⁵ such as the absence of the double ⟨R⟩, which is later the first rule on the first page of Dias’s grammar; the prenasalized consonants *b*, *d*, *g*, *v*, and *z*; and some further matters related to the Portuguese use of the ⟨v⟩, which can have the value of a glide

34. The same happened in the first Spanish grammars of Otomanguean languages, where tone was recognised but not always distinguished graphically in detail (see, for instance, Zimmermann 2003).

35. Here we see a striking parallel with the Araújo’s catechism, which has also an introductory section entitled ‘Advertencias’. As Cardoso, Araújo also sums up ten rules.

or a vowel, or when it is used without representing any phoneme at all (as in *gue*, *gui*, *que* and *qui*). Pacconio gives an example where words written with the same ‘letters’ in the language of Angola have a different meaning when different ‘accents’ are used: *mùcua* and *mucuà* (Bonvini 1996: 143). The same minimal pair appears in the Latin version which appeared in 1661:

Finally it should be noticed that it is of great importance to pronounce a noun or verb with an accent on the final (syllable), when there is an accent; also to refrain from pronouncing the accent when it is absent. For nouns and verbs are frequently found, that differ in meaning from those that bear the final accent, e.g. *Mùcua* and *mucuà*. *Mùcua* is ‘fruit’; *mucuà* means ‘native to’ or ‘born in such a part or region’. Thus, *mucuà Ndongo*, native to, or born in the kingdom of Donghi; *mucuà Matamba*, native to or born in the province of Matamba. (cited in Doke 1961a: 11)

In the Latin version, the section entitled “observationes in legendo idiomate Angollae” comprises three pages, where cross-comparisons are made between the Bantu language, Italian and Portuguese, as occurs in Cardoso’s *Doutrina*. The spelling is here also based on Portuguese alphabetical conventions. Here we find examples which explain the phenomenon of synaloepha, i.e. contractions such as *Macàmba ami* (“my friend”) > *Macàmi* and *Mòna uetu* (“our son”) > *Monètu* (Doke 1961a: 11).

Compared with Brusciotto and the anonymous grammar of the ‘Cafre’ language (Sena), to be described below, Dias’s grammar offers most details about how “letters have to be pronounced” and how “sounds have to be written”. The *Arte* opens with a chapter entitled “Advertencias de como se ha de ler, & escrever esta Lingua”, almost the same title as that of the corresponding section in Pacconio et al.’s work which has just been mentioned. The first rule given by Dias (1697: 1), which is also present in Pacconio (cf. Rosa 1997: 216), is that the language of Angola does not have the “R dobrado”. Dias also describes, as did Brusciotto, the process of pre-nasalization:

As letras seguintes, B. D. G. V. Z. se lhe poem antes a letra N v.g. *Nburi*, ‘Carneiro’. *Ndungue*, ‘Traças’. *Ngombe*, ‘Boy’. *Nvula*, ‘Chuva’. *Nzambi*, ‘Deos’.
[The letter *N* has to be placed before the following letters *B, D, G, V, Z*, e.g. *Nburi*, ‘butcher’. *Ndungue*, ‘plans’. *Ngombe*, *Nvula*, ‘rain’. *Nzambi*, ‘God’.]

Portuguese is also used for phonetic comparisons:

As syllabas *qua*, *que*, *qui*, *quo*, *quu*, pronunciaõ-se como no Portuguez, v.g. *Guirira*. E assim são as seguintes, *ga*, *gue*, *gui*, *go*, *gu*. *ja*, *je*, *ji*, *jo*. *ya*, *ye*, *yi*, *yo*, *yu*. (Dias 1697: 1–2)
[The syllables *qua*, *que*, *qui*, *quo*, *quu*, are to be pronounced as in Portuguese, e.g. *Guirira*, ‘como’. And the same applies for the following: *ga*, *gue*, *gui*, *go*, *gu*. *ja*, *je*, *ji*, *jo*, *ya*, *ye*, *yi*, *yo*, *yu*.]

As was the case in the brief rules in the catechisms, Dias also discusses the phenomenon of synaloepha:

Fazem frequentemente sinalefas algũs nomes, quando se ajunta o adjectivo ao sustantivo, & perdem muitas vezes duas, & mais letras e. g. *Macambaami*, ‘meus amigos’; dizem, *Macambàmi*. *Mubicauàmi*, dizem *Mubicàmi*, ‘meu escravo’. (Dias 1697: 2)

[Some nouns often make a synaloepha, when the adjective is combined with the substantive and in many cases they lose two or more letters, e.g. for *Macambaami*, ‘my friends’ they say *Macambàmi*; for *Mubicauàmi*, they say *Mubicàmi*, ‘my slave’.]

There is no theoretical section where Dias explains the tonal system, but he gives some minimal pairs where ‘accentos’ are placed on different syllables in such a manner that the word changes its meaning:

Tambem vay muito nos assentos, com que se escreve, ou se pronuncia; porque mudaõ a sustancia, & significação dos nomes, v.g. *Múcua*, ‘certa fruta’. *Mucuâ*, ‘morador’, ou ‘habitador’. (Dias 1697: 2)

[There is also much to do with the accents, which one writes or pronounces, since they change the substance and meaning of the nouns, e.g. *Múcua*, ‘a certain fruit’. *Mucuâ*, ‘resident’, or ‘inhabitant’.]

As has been stated, Dias mentions Pacconio’s catechism twice in his grammar, indicating that he used the *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido*, although it is not clear whether he used the Portuguese edition of 1642 or the Latin edition of 1661. Exactly the same example is given, viz. the minimal pair *Múcua* versus *Mucuâ*. Dias’s introductory chapter on pronunciation is far from complete and includes information better placed in chapters on nominal classes and their classifiers. Nevertheless, it gives a short impression of some features of Kimbundu phonology.

5.3.3 Morphosyntax

5.3.3.1 Nominal morphology

Dias’s nominal paradigms are not based on the principle of prefixes of the noun-classes, neither does the use of ‘articles’ play a specific role in his metalanguage. He does, however, include several instances where these prefixes are exhibited in columns. In the paragraph on the ‘nominatives’ (“dos Nominativos”), Dias recognizes an important difference between Kimbundu and Latin:

Naõ tem esta lingua declinações, nem casos; mas tem singular, & plural, v.g. *Nzambi*, ‘Deos’. *Gimzambi*, ‘Deoses’. (Dias 1697: 3)

[This language does not have declensions, or cases, but singular and plural, e.g. *Nzambi*, ‘God’. *Gimzambi*, ‘Gods’.]

After this general observation, more practical paradigms follow:

<i>Ca</i>	<i>Camba</i> , ‘amigo’	<i>Macamba</i> , ‘amigos’.	[“friends”]
<i>Que</i>	<i>Quehin</i> , ‘precipicio’, ou ‘rochedo’	<i>Maquehin</i> , ‘precipicios’.	[“abysses”]
<i>E</i>	<i>Embe</i> , <i>Maembe</i> ,	‘Pombos’.	[“doves”]
<i>Y</i>	<i>Yala</i> , <i>Mayala</i> ,	‘Machos’.	[“males”]
<i>Gi</i>	<i>Ngina</i> , <i>Magina</i> ,	‘Nomes’.	[“names”]
<i>U</i>	<i>Uanga</i> , <i>Maüanga</i> ,	‘Feitiços’.	[“enchantments”]
<i>Co</i>	<i>Cota</i> , <i>Macota</i>	‘Mais velhos’.	[“older ones”]
<i>Cu</i>	<i>Cunda</i> , <i>Macunda</i> ,	‘Corcovas’.	[“curves”]
<i>La</i>	<i>Lao</i> , <i>Malao</i> ,	‘Riquezas’.	[“riches”]
<i>Le</i>	<i>Leza</i> , <i>Maleza</i> ,	‘Fraquezas’.	[“weaknesses”]

(Dias 1697: 4)

Dias attempts to give semantic rules which explain the choice of the prefix corresponding to the noun-class and often he demonstrates that the same prefix has also to be used when the noun is accompanied by an adjective:

Os nomes appellativos, que começaõ no singular em *Mu*, & pertencem a homens, & mulheres, & a seus officios, no plural mudaõ a syllaba *Mu*, em *A*, & adjectivaõ no singular em *ü*, & no plural em *A*. v.g. *Mulumü üaoaba*, ‘marido bom’. *Alümü aoaba*, ‘maridos bons’. Exemplo dos officios: *Mubiri*, ‘pastor de gado’. *Abiri*, ‘pastores’. *Mulambi*, ‘cozinheiro’. *Alambi*, ‘cozinheiros’. (Dias 1697: 6–7)

[Appellative nouns beginning with *Mu* belong to men, women and their professions; in the plural the syllable *Mu* is changed in the singular to *A*, and adjectives beginning with *ü* in the singular change to *A* in the plural, e.g. *Mulumü üaoaba*, ‘good husband’. *Alümü aoaba*, ‘good husbands’. Example of professions: *Mubiri*, ‘shepherd’. *Abiri*, ‘shepherds’. *Mulambi*, ‘cook’. *Alambi*, ‘cooks’.]

Thus he took an important step to explain the way in which noun-classes may be distinguished in terms of meaning, but he did not succeed in determining the underlying semantics of all the noun-classes. After treating the nouns used for ‘men and women’ (“homens & mulheres”), he introduces nouns which are ‘irrational’ (“que não são de racionais”). He demonstrates further that the concords are not only to be applied within the noun phrase and its complements, such as demonstratives, adjectives, etc. but they even determine the choice of the verbal prefixes. According to classical grammatical theory, agreement occurs between noun and adjective (gender, case and number), subject and verb (number) and between relative pronoun and antecedent (gender and number, but not necessarily case).³⁶ The classical rules for agreement or ‘concord’ had to be adapted or

36. Some grammars also include a fourth ‘concord’, between question and answer (Roboredo 2007[1619]: 72): “A Pergunta & Reposta concordão dereitamente em Caso, Tempo, & Numero; ut *Quæ oratio optima? Est Dominica. Cuius est hæc oratio? Christi. Cui debetuer honos? Deo...*”.

expanded when applied to Kimbundu. Since adjectives can bear most features of agreement (gender, case and number) and the verb only one of them (number), Dias develops the following theory:

Todas as terceiras pessoas dos verbos são adjectivos, & como taes concordaõ com os sustantivos, v.g. *Yala riaoaba*, ou *rinêne*, ‘homem bom, & grande.’ Tambem se lhe poem todas as particulas assim do singular, como do plural, que aquí tornamos a referir, v.g. do singular, *U, Ri, I, Qui, Ca, Cu, Lu, Tu*. Plur. *A, I, Gi, Tu*. (Dias 1697: 8) [All the third persons of the verbs are adjectives, and as such they agree with the substantives e.g. *Yala riaoaba*, or *rinêne*, ‘good man, & a great man.’ They can also be preceded by all the particles, both singular and plural, which we shall show again here, e.g. singular, *U, Ri, I, Qui, Ca, Cu, Lu, Tu*. Plur. *A, I, Gi, Tu*.]

In fact, he had a point: there are verbs in Bantu languages which express quality, e.g. *kunoga* (“to be good”); in such a case, there is no adjective, but with the relative (which/who) the word can be translated into English as “a good man”.

Thus verbs behave according to Dias in the same way as the adjectives, since the same rules of agreement had to be employed. When comparing this description of verbal agreement with his definition of the adjective, the parallel becomes even more transparent:

Nesta lingua todos os adjectivos tem hũa fôrma só, porque não tem variedades de generos, nem casos, como a lingua Latina, mas sómente concordaõ com os sustantivos no numero, como já fica dito nos nominativos. v.g. *Mutu üaoâba*, ‘pessoa boa.’ *Atu aoâba*, ‘pessoas boas.’ O exemplo está em *Mutu*, no numero singular, & em *Atu*, no plural. Para concordar o sustantivo com o adjectivo são necessarias as particulas seguintes. Para o singul. *ü, i, ri, qui, ca, cu, lu, tu*: para o plur. *a, i, gi, tu*. (Dias 1697: 36–37)

[In this language all the adjectives have only one form, because they do not have the variety of gender and case, as in Latin, but they agree only with their substantives in number, as we have already said about the nominatives. e.g. *Mutu üaoâba*, ‘good person.’ *Atu aoâba*, ‘good people.’³⁷ The example has *Mutu*, in the singular, and *Atu*, for the plural. For the agreement of the substantive with the adjective the following particles are needed. For the singular *ü, i, ri, qui, ca, cu, lu, tu*: and for the plural *a, i, gi, tu*.]

As these particles were ‘necessary’ for the construction of the correct concord between the adjective and substantive, Dias concluded that the same particles are used for the agreement between the verb and its subject, which explains why he considered the words expressing the third person of the verb as ‘adjectives’.

It took centuries for the noun-class system in Kimbundu to be described in a more elaborate way. Chatelain (1888–1889) analyzed it thus.

37. This is clearly attributive but not recognised as such by Dias (Legère, p.c. February 2009).

Table 5.2 The noun-class system in Kimbundu (Chatelain 1888–1889)

Class	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X
Sing.	<i>mu-</i>	<i>mu-</i>	<i>ki-</i>	<i>re-</i>	<i>u-</i>	<i>lu-</i>	<i>tu-</i>	<i>ru-</i>	-	<i>ka-</i>
Plural	<i>a-</i>	<i>mi-</i>	<i>i-</i>	<i>ma-</i>	<i>mau-</i>	<i>malu-</i>	<i>matu-</i>	<i>maku-</i>	<i>j-</i>	<i>tu-</i>

Class I is mainly of humans, Class II of inanimate beings, Class III of inanimate objects, which according to Chatelain also include certain persons and animals, and so on. Chatelain also observed that some classes, such as Class VII, were extremely rare in his days.

We find information concerning agreement in the chapters on substantives and adjectives, and since Dias saw the third person of the verb as an adjective, we also find relevant information in the paragraphs on the verb. The verbal prefixes agree with the prefixes which co-occur with the subject of the verb.

5.3.3.2 Verbal morphology

The basic Bantu verbal complex has the following structure:

(NEG) SM TAM (OM-) Root (-Ext₁ Ext₂...)

The negation (NEG) precedes the Subject Marker (SM) and together with the Tense, Aspect, Mood (TAM) markers it precedes the Root, while Object Markers can be placed between the SM + TAM markers and the root. The SM shows agreement with the noun-class of the subject. This morphological sequence can be illustrated in the following examples from Swahili, cited from Tucker Childs (2003: 104–105):

Juma a-li m-pik-i-a Ahmed ugali
Juma SM-Past OM-cook-App-Indic Ahmed porridge
“Juma cooked Ahmed some porridge”
Wa-toto wa-ta-wa-pik-i-a wa-tu ugali
NCM-child SM-FUT-OM-cook-APP-INDIC NCM-human porridge
“The children cooked the people some porridge”

The verbal stem *-pik-* has the prefix *m-* which agrees with the subject “Juma” whereas the prefix *wa-* occurs when the subject (“the children”) is plural. Both prefixes belong to the same class, determined by the subject of the verb.³⁸ Dias describes verbal structure thus:

As particularas distinctivas das pessoas, são as seguintes: Singul. 1. *Ngui*, 2. *ü*, 3. *ü*.
Plur. 1. *Tu*, 2. *Mu*, 3. *A*.

38. For more examples from Umbundu see Valente (1964: 360).

Advirta-se que na terceira pessoa do singular serve hũa das oito particulas atraz referidas. v.g. do singul. *ũ, ri, i, qui, ca, cu, lu, tu*. Plur. *a, i, gi, tu*. E aquella de se ajuntará ao verbo na terceira pessoa, a qual pedir o sustantivo, que rege o verbo, como seu nominativo, assim, & da mesma maneira que dissemos no paragrafo dos adjectivos. v.g. *Quimaquinène*, ‘cousa que he grande’. *Mútu uzola nzambi*, ‘pessoa, que ama a Deos’. (Dias 1697: 11)

[The distinctive particles of the persons are the following: Singular. 1. *Ngui*, 2. *ũ*, 3. *ũ*. Plur. 1. *Tu*, 2. *Mu*, 3. *A*.

Note that in the third person of the singular one of the eight foregoing particles is used, e.g. for the singular *ũ, ri, i, qui, ca, cu, lu, tu*, and for the plural *a, i, gi, tu*. And that attached to the verb in the third person which the substantive that governs the verb requires as its nominative (=‘subject’), the same occurs (with adjectives) as we have said in the paragraph on the adjectives, e.g. *Quimaquinène*, ‘something which is large’. *Mútu uzola nzambi*, ‘a person who loves God’.]

In this description Dias uses, instead of ‘articles’ or ‘principiations’, the concept of ‘particle’. It is interesting that he does not use the meta-linguistic term for the Greek part of speech ‘article’ when he describes Portuguese, but labels both the definite article ‘o’ as the contracted form of prepositions and definite articles as ‘particles’:

Em lugar destas particulas Portuguezas, ‘o’, ‘os’, ‘ao’, ‘aos’, ‘aã’, ‘às’, usaõ os Ambundos da vogal O, pronunciada quasi guttural, & sem apices, porque nunca serve de vocativo, como no Portuguez, & Latim. (Dias 1697: 33)

[Instead of these Portuguese particles ‘o’ (the), ‘os’ (‘the, pl.’), ‘ao’ (‘to the, masc.’), ‘aã’ (‘to the, fem.’), ‘às’ (‘to the, fem. pl.’), the Ambundos use the vowel O, pronounced almost gutturally, without ‘apices’ [?], because they never serve as a vocative, as in Portuguese and in Latin.]

It is interesting that Dias informs his learners that Kimbundu is a ‘pro-drop’ language (i.e. it shows ‘zero anaphora’ of the pronoun), as are almost all Bantu languages (Nurse & Philippson 2003: 8).

A primeira, & segunda pessoa poem-se claramente, quando diversas pessoas mostraõ contrarios desejos, v.g. *Eme ngandala culunda o milonga yã nzambi, eye cuandala cuilunda*, ‘eu guardo os preceitos de Deos, mas tu não queres guardalos’. O exemplo está nos dous pronomes, *Eye*, & *Eme*, postos claramente; porque os agentes mostraõ diversos desejos;³⁹ porque hum quer, & outro não quer. (Dias 1697: 34)

[The first and second person have to be used overtly when different persons demonstrate contrary desires, e.g. *Eme ngandala culunda o milonga yã nzambi, eye cuandala cuilunda*, ‘I keep the precepts of God, but you do not want to keep them’. The example is illustrated by the two pronouns *Eye* & *Eme*, both put overtly

39. See for “diversos desejos” and “contrarios desejos” also Section 2.5.2.4.

(‘clearly’) because the agents demonstrate different desires; since one wants, and the other does not.]

As in Spanish or in Portuguese, the personal pronoun as subject of the Verb Phrase is used in examples when there is a contrastive focus on different subjects. In that case the pronouns have to be expressed, as Dias explains.

The description of Tense Aspect Mood (TAM) in Dias’s grammar is much more elaborate than that of Brusciotto. Dias recognises the mechanisms of the concord which we have described. Dias advises his readers to start with the imperative, which is the ‘unincremented’ form (‘sin acrescentamento’), which is the starting point for any other. Although he does not use the concept of the ‘root’ (‘raíz’), or ‘theme’ here, he does refer to ‘essential syllables’ (“syllabas essenciaes”), which possibly is inspired by Latin grammars of Hebrew. In this tradition, consonants (usually three) together form the ‘root’: these consonants are called ‘radical letters’, forming the ‘semanteme’, while other vowels and other consonants are called ‘servant letters’. Synonyms were often used, e.g. ‘essential’ or ‘substantial’ letters, opposed to ‘servile’ or ‘accidental’ letters.⁴⁰ It is difficult, if not impossible, to determine the sources which informed his choice of the term ‘essencial’; it is also possible that he did not use a meta-linguistic term at all, demonstrating simply that some letters were ‘essential’, ‘basic’, or ‘fundamental’ for the meaning and others not (as the increments, or attached bound morphemes). In other words, this seems to be an insight into the concept of morpheme. However, as often happens in missionary linguistics, the boundaries between language and meta-language are not always easy to draw. Dias uses this term in his description of the verb conjugation:

Conjugação dos verbos.

Primeiro advertencia. Para sabermos porque letra começa o verbo, polohemos no Imperativo, sem algum acrescentamento, nem antes, nem depois; porque neste caso se poem o verbo simplezmente com suas letras, & *syllabas essenciaes*, v.g. *Gibá*, ‘mata tu’. *Nzóla*, ‘ama tu’. (Dias 1697: 11; emphasis is mine)

[Conjugation of the verbs. First observation. In order to know the initial letter of the verb, we put it in the imperative, without any increment, neither before nor after (the imperative form), since in this case the verb is put simply with its letters and its essential syllables, e.g. *Gibá*, ‘kill!’ (imp., sing.). *Nzóla*, ‘love!’ (imp. sing.)]

40. The sources in Latin are Johannes Reuchlin (1455–1522) and the Polyglot Bible of Alcalá de Henares (Arnao Guillén de Brozar, 1514–1517). The latter has a paragraph which focuses on the pedagogical strategy of “how to find the essential letters first” before constructing derived forms, etc. This strategy soon spread throughout Europe and even beyond. One clear example is the grammar of Gêez, the classical and liturgical language of Ethiopia: “Quamadmodum in lingua Hebraea, Syria, Chaldaea, & Arabica verborum radix semper in primis inuestiganda est” (see for more details Zwartjes 2008a: 414).

After explaining some of the principles of concord, Dias demonstrates the conjugation of the verbs as follows:

Conjugação que serve a todos os verbos, excepto alguns impessoaes.

Modo indicativo, tempo presente.

Sing.	<i>Nguizôla</i>	'eu amo'	["I love"]
	<i>üzôla</i>	'tu amas'	["you love"]
	<i>üzôla</i>	'elle ama'	["he loves"]
Plur.	<i>Tuzôla</i>	'nòs amamos'	["we love"]
	<i>Muzôla</i>	'vòs amais'	["you (pl.) love"]
	<i>Azôla</i>	'elles amaõ.'	["they love"] (Dias 1697: 12)

He also recognises the 'continuative' aspect of the present tense, and as did Brusciotto, observes that the same aspect is used for the imperfect.

Nota.

Frequentemente usaõ deste primeiro preterito [=imperfecto] por presente do indicativo, principalmente na primeira pessoa. (Dias 1697: 13)

[Frequently, they use this first past tense (= 'imperfect') for the present of the indicative, in particular in the first person.]

He distinguishes five different 'pretéritos' ('preterite tenses'). The first is the 'pretérito imperfecto' ('imperfect') (Port. 'amava', 'I loved'). Then there are three 'pretéritos perfeitos' ('preterite perfect'), which are all translated as 'amei' ('I have loved') and then more precisely: the first as 'ha pouco que amei' ('I have loved' [recent past]), the second as 'eu amei ha tempo' ('I have loved' [remote past]) and the third simply as 'eu amei' ('I have loved'). Finally, the fifth past tense is the 'pretérito plusquamperfecto' ('pluperfect'). In the chapter entitled 'Rudimenta', he explains the differences among the three 'pretéritos perfeitos':

Tem os verbos desta lingua geralmente tres preteritos perfeitos; o 1. significa ha pouco tempo; o 2. que ha mais tempo; o 3. que ha muito mais tempo. Porém tem-se por experiencia que algũas vezes usaõ hum por outro; deve ser pela variedade das terras, & nações. (Dias 1697: 24)

[The verbs of this language generally have three past perfect tenses: the first means a short time ago, the second longer ago, and the third a long time ago. However, one has the experience that sometimes they use one form for another, due to the variety of the regions and nations.]

For the verb meaning 'to love' (imperative *nzôla*), the first person singular forms of these three tenses are, respectively, *ngazola*, *ngazolo*, and *ngazolele*. Dias may not have recognised the perfect *-ele/-ile* in *ngazolele*, or he decided not to comment on it, but he explains clearly the meaning of the affix *-a* which is a past tense marker in many Bantu languages. Dias's description is thus:

Segundo advertencia he, que a letra A, acrescentada, & collocada entre a particula distinctiva de pessoa, & o verbo, he sinal universal de preterito: v.g. *üanzola zola*, ‘tu amavas’. *Gagiba giba*, ‘eu matava’. *Gazolele*, ‘eu amei’. *üazolole*, ‘tu amaste’. (Dias 1697: 11)

[The second observation is that the letter A, augmented and placed between the distinctive particle of person and the verb, is the universal sign of the preterite, e.g. *üanzola zola*, ‘you (sing.) loved’. *Gagiba giba*, ‘I killed’. *Gazolele*, ‘I have loved’. *üazolole*, ‘you (sing.) have loved’.]

We do not find any symmetry among the three ‘perfect tenses’ and those of the future. Dias gives only two different futures, but no comments accompanying the paradigm. The difference can be derived implicitly from the translations the author gives: *Nguicazóla* is ‘eu amarei’ (‘I shall love’) which is the ‘synthetic’ form, versus *Nguizacuzóla*, ‘eu virei a amar’ (‘I shall be loving’) which is a periphrastic translation.

As occurs in many grammars, not only those of missionaries, but also vernacular grammars of the same period in Europe, both paradigms of the optative and subjunctive are fully exhibited, although these Latin categories do not have their morphological counterparts in the languages described. They are only distinguished by addition of the words ‘Ojalá’, ‘como’, ‘cuando’, etc. Dias also prefers to dedicate separate columns to these two moods, but he observes that they do not have different forms, being only distinguished by the use of ‘particles’:

Nota 1. Os tempos do Optativo, & Conjunctivo não differem dos do modo Indicativo. Pelo que ajuntando, & antepondo os adverbios do Optativo, & Conjunctivo aos tempos do indicativo, faz-se o mesmo sentido, & escusar-se-ha muito estudo. (Dias 1697: 20)

[Note 1. The forms (‘tenses’) of the Optative and Subjunctive do not differ from the Indicative mood. By joining and putting the adverbs of the Optative and Subjunctive before the tenses of the indicative, the same meaning is obtained and they don’t need much study.]

In sum, we can establish that Dias follows the traditional order of the tenses. In the past and future tenses, he expanded the paradigms, although he did not invent novel terminology for these subcategories, such as Brusciotto’s *praeteritum hodiernae diei* but used descriptions such as “ha pouco tempo”, “ha tempo”. Brusciotto added the adverbs *iam* and *tunc* in order to explain more adequately the differences between aspects. In Dias we find parallel cases, where he translates the pluperfect indicative by adding the adverb ‘já’ (= *iam*) and the pluperfect is translated with the adverbs ‘já então’, equivalents of Brusciotto’s *iam tunc*. Finally, an

interesting observation by Dias is that the language lacks a passive verb: “Naõ tem os Ambundos ... verbo passivo, ma usaõ do verbo activo” (Dias 1697: 43).⁴¹

Generally speaking, although Dias recognised some different aspects and tenses of the Kimbundu verbal system, he did not aim at writing a grammar which would provide too many explanations or be full of theoretical background information. He thus made use of an adequate meta-linguistic terminology for the tenses and aspects of the verb for this language. At the end of the 19th century, the modern descriptive model for the Kimbundu verbal system was developing, starting more or less with the grammar of Chatelain (1888–1889: 32–50), with its distinction of tense subcategories of:

- ‘indicativo presente continuo’
- ‘pretérito I’ (“que indica una acción o un estado cumplido y pasado, pero cuyo efecto todavía subsiste”) [“which indicates an action or completed and past ‘state’, but whose effect still is going on”]
- ‘preterito continuo’ ([1] “como pretérito I, que la acción o el estado todavía continúa”) [“which is as preterite I, but the action or state still continues”] ([2] “la acción se repitió muchas veces”) [“the action was repeated frequently”].
- ‘pretérito II’ (“para indicar un acto o estado pasado, sin que tenga relación con el presente, pero sí con un cierto momento en el pasado”) [“indicates an act or state in the past, without indicating any relation with the present, rather only with a certain moment in the past”]
- ‘pretérito III’ (“tiempo pasado más remoto que el pretérito II”) [“past time, more remote than pretérito II”]
- ‘futuro I’ (“tiempo más o menos próximo”) [“more or less near future”]
- ‘futuro II’ (“=futuro I, con la diferencia que presupone que el sujeto mudará de lugar; el ‘locativo’”) [“as future I, but presupposing that the subject will move somewhere, the locative”]
- ‘futuro III’ (“que es el futuro con mudanza de lugar, pero más lejano que el Futuro II”) [“future tense, with change of place over a greater distance than in the Future II”]
- ‘futuros continuos’ (estará haciendo) [“continuous future”, “I will be doing”]
- ‘condicional’ (haría) [“conditional”, “I would do”]
- ‘habitual’ (suelo hacer) [“habitual”, “I am used to doing”]
- ‘negativo’ [“negative”] ...

This description is evidently more precise than that of Dias, but we can see that most of Dias’s data and the structure of the subcategories and his approach were reasonably correct.

41. For the interpretation of this observation, I refer to Bonvini (2009).

5.4 The anonymous “Arte da língua de Cafre”

In Congo and Angola not so many works survived compared to the number of Spanish and Portuguese missionary works elsewhere. As we noted at 5.1.1 above, it has been reported that in the 17th century a Dominican composed catechisms in two different Mozambican Bantu languages, those spoken in Tet(t)e and Sena in the Zambezi valley, but these have been lost (Moser 1986: 48). As far as I know, the brief anonymous grammar *Arte da lingua de Cafre* is the only source which has survived from this early period. If linguistic comparisons are made, we have to rely on references from much later periods, such as António Lourenço Farinha's *Elementos de Gramática Landina (Shironga)*, *Dialecto indígena de Lourenço Marques* (1917), which described the variety spoken in Lourenço Marques (today Maputo, the capital of Mozambique), or the Sena grammar published by Anderson in 1897.

Among other Jesuit documents in the Biblioteca da Ajuda in Lisbon (Mss. 36–49–V-18), a grammar was discovered and published in 1919–1920 by Schebesta in the “Série da Província da China”. It was part of a larger manuscript, possibly written by João Álvares (post 1745), which consists of ten sections, including historical, religious and linguistic material from the missions in China, Cochim, Africa (Ethiopia and Mozambique) and India:

- Memorial sobre os ritos, religião e doutrina dos chineses, para defesa junto dos Vigários Apostólicos e Missões estrangeiras na China. 1680.
- Alegações a favor do Padroado dos Reis de Portugal no Oriente, defesa da Companhia de Jesus contra os Vigários Apostólicos. 1680.
- Compêndio de missas, orações e sufrágios, de que gozam os benfeitores da Companhia de Jesus.
- *Arte de língua cafre*
- Bispos de Cochim
- Parecer sobre a impressão de livros em Espanha
- Censura da obra chinesa, Kiã Ly.
- Missão da Companhia de Jesus na Etiópia.
- Questão dos Ritos Sínicos.
- Doutrina do Pe. Lopo de Abreu acerca da forma como se atraíam os Canarins ao Baptismo Causas da guerra que o governador da Índia André Furtado de Mendonça moveu ao Mogor.

5.4.1 The language

The ‘Cafre’ language described in the anonymous grammar belongs to the Senga-Sena group, which includes Nsenga, Kunda, Nyungwe and Tet(t)e, Sena, Rue and Podzo (Maho 2003: 649).

When Schebesta published the grammar of the ‘Cafre’ language, he came to the conclusion that the language described is the Sena language and not Nyungwe. The term Nyungwe (o nyuñgwe) is according to Bleek (1856: xii) what the natives use for Tet(t)e. Sena and Nyungwe are closely related and mutually intelligible. Schebesta gives several examples in order to demonstrate that the Cafre grammar describes Sena. Before him, Bleek had already compared these dialects and the following brief comparison based on Bleek (1856: 20, 22, 24) illustrates the relationship among these languages:

Nowadays, it has been established that Sena and the languages spoken in the Congo and Angola are related, since there is no doubt that it is a branch of the Bantu family. However, during the time of the anonymous author, this relationship had not been discovered. Although Bleek (1856) demonstrated that there is a relation among several languages in Mozambique, Figanière (1863–1864: 105) wrote in the same period that he was “persuaded that there is no similarity between the two languages of Angola and Mozambique”. Figanière cites Sebastião Xavier Botelho’s (1768–1840) *Memoria estatistica sobre os dominios Portuguezes na Africa oriental* of 1835, which claims that most languages of the Mozambican region are related to each other but mutually unintelligible:

As it is very difficult to discover the origin of the languages spoken by the various people of Oriental Africa, we are of opinion, founded on the best authority, that the Caffre language is the common origin of the languages of all this region, but divided into so many dialects that the various tribes are almost entirely unintelligible to one another (Botelho 1835: 386, cited in Figanière 1863–1864: 106)

In the same source, we read that the ‘Cafres’ of the region between the Sena and Tete rivers are the “most civilized” of all the ‘Cafres’ and have the only dialect which observes “some rules of syntax in their discourses” (*ibid.*).

The anonymous Jesuit grammarian whose work we analyse here did not hold the ‘Cafre’ language in high esteem, characterising it thus:

Table 5.3 Related languages in Mozambique (Bleek 1856: 20)

	Tet(t)e	Sena	‘Cafre’
Head	<i>musôro</i>	<i>musôro</i>	<i>mûsoro</i>
Eye	Sing. <i>dzîso, zîso</i> pl. <i>măso</i>	<i>diso</i> pl. <i>makûtu</i>	<i>rhîsso (rihîsso)</i> pl. <i>maso</i>
Ear	<i>kûtu</i>	<i>kûtu</i>	<i>cûtu</i>
pl. <i>makû</i>	pl. <i>masso</i>	pl. <i>màcûtu</i>	

A lingua de Cafre he muito limitada e não composta como as outras linguas.
(Schebesta 1919–1920: 766)

[The Cafre language is very limited and not formed as the other languages.]

And in another section of the grammar we read:

Esta lingoa por ser muito limitada ha muito falta de palavras (770)

[Since this language is very limited, there is a great lack of words.]

5.4.2 Phonology and orthography

Like Brusciotto's grammar, the anonymous *Arte da lingua de Cafre* starts directly with an *Advertencia pelos nomes* and here also an introductory chapter or paragraph on orthography and pronunciation is missing. We find vowels without diacritics, with circumflexes and with grave accents, but no comments on their phonetic values. No phonological comparisons are made with other languages. Sporadically, the author gives alternative pronunciations, expressing his preference for one of them:

Exemplo seja no verbo que significa 'amar' que he *cûyânga* ou *cuânga*, que de ambos os modos se pronuncia ou com *y* no meyo de *u*, *a*, etc, ou sem elle, mas a melhor pronunção ... *cuyanga*. (Anonymous f. 201r-v; Schebesta 1919–1920: 766)

[An example might be the verb meaning 'to love' which is *cûyânga* or *cuânga*, which in both manners is pronounced with the 'y' between the 'u' and the 'a', or without it, but the better pronunciation is ... *cuyanga*.]

At the end of the manuscript we find no chapter or paragraph on prosody or pronunciation and no observations on these are made anywhere in the text. Pre-nasalization is not described at all.

5.4.3 Morphosyntax

5.4.3.1 Nominal morphology

We do not find any trace of Brusciotto's *principiationes* and nothing comparable to Dias' treatment of the noun-classes, but the author concludes that nouns are indeclinable and that they do not have a case system:

Os nomes substantivos são indeclinaveis e sem casos. (Schebesta 1919–1920: 766)
[The substantive nouns are indeclinable and without cases.]

Bantu languages have a relatively high number of noun-classes: we saw at 5.3.3.1 above that Kimbundu has ten, and a count of twenty is not exceptional (Creissels 2000: 243). The anonymous Jesuit tried to describe some correspondences between

the Latin gender system and the morphology of the language he was describing, concluding that there is no distinction between masculine, feminine and neuter in the ‘adjectivisation’:

...[esta lingoa] nem tem genero masculino, femenino e neutro em suas adjectivações. Sò tem alguma mudança de letras em seu adjectivo, v.g. *bonus, bona, bonum*, ‘couza boa’, *chintu chacucoma*. Veja se a sua variação nos nomes sequ^{tes}:

‘Bom homem’ *hûà cùcomà*

‘Boa terra’ *rhico racucòma*

‘Boa molher’ *mucazi huâ cucoma*

‘Bom mundo’ *chânu chacucoma*

‘Boa caza’ *nhumba cacûcòma*

Plural deste[s] nomes

‘Bons homens’ *hûamûna huacucoma*

‘Boas terras’ *marhico acucoma*

‘Boas molheres’ *huàcazi huacucoma*

‘Bom mundo não tem plural’

‘Boas cazas’ *nhumba zacucoma*

[...(this language) does not have masculine, feminine and neuter gender in its ‘adjectivisations’. It has only a change of letters in its adjective, e.g. *bonus, bona, bonum*, ‘good thing’, *chintu chacucoma*. See its variation in the following nouns:

“Good man” *hûà cùcomà*

“Good land” *rhico racucòma*

“Good woman” *mucazi huâ cucoma*

“Good world” *chânu chacucoma*

“Good hunt” *nhumba cacûcòma*

Plural of these nouns

“Good men” *hûamûna huacucoma*

“Good lands” *marhico acucoma*

“Good women” *huàcazi huacucoma*

“Good world does not have a plural”

“Good hunts” *nhumba zacucoma*.]

For the author it is evident that a different system was operating from that he was used to in Latin, where the three genders of nouns, masculine, feminine and neuter, determine the corresponding gender of the adjective. This led him to the conclusion that gender is non-existent in the language he was describing. As Doke (1961a: 18) observes “the copyist evidently understood nothing of the concord”, but a short list is given of nouns combined with possessives, demonstratives and adjectives in concordial agreement, although no theoretical explanations are appended, or as Doke puts it, “the principle of the noun-classes is not recognized, and the result is a confusing jumble of examples as far as concord is concerned” (1961a: 19).

5.4.3.2 Verbal morphology

The anonymous *Arte da lingua de Cafre* has the following paradigms for the verb. The verb ‘amar’ is used as it was by Brusciotto and Dias. We shall limit ourselves to the active and affirmative forms:

Presente			
‘Eu amo’	<i>ine dinianga</i>	ou <i>dianga</i> ou <i>diyanga</i>	[“I love”]
‘Tu amas’	<i>ioe uinianga</i>		[“you love”]
‘Elle ama’	<i>iie aniang</i>		[“he loves”]
‘Nos amamos’	<i>iffe tinianga</i>		[“we love”]
‘Vos amais’	<i>imoe munianga</i>		[“you (pl.) love”]
‘Illes amão’	<i>ioo aniang</i>		[“they love”]
Imperfeito			
‘Eu amava’	<i>ine nandichianga</i>	‘Amando eu’ <i>ine dichiang</i>	[“I am loving”]
[...]			
Perfeito			
‘Eu amei’	<i>ine nandidayanga</i>	ou <i>dadayanga</i>	[“I have loved”]
[...]			
Plusquamperfeito			
‘Eu amara’	<i>ine dingadayanga</i>		[“I had loved”]
[...]			
Futuro			
‘Eu amarei’	<i>ine didzayanga</i>	ou <i>didzadzayanga</i>	[“I will/shall love”]
[...]			
Modo Conjunctivo			
Presente			
‘Como eu amo’	<i>Apo ine dinianga</i>	ou <i>dianga</i>	[“...that I love”]
[...]			

The anonymous Jesuit gives first the Latin categories in the traditional order, without adding new categories of moods and tenses. There is no indication that he understood how the TAM affixes had to be applied and how the mechanisms of verbal formation worked. He seems only to have tried to give translations of the Latin categories and nothing more. The elaborate system of TAM affixes attached to the verb in Sena was not to be described until much later. One of the first attempts to be made after the anonymous grammar analysed here was in the Sena grammar of W. Anderson (1897) who explains the verbal system thus:

NA	denoting the present	
	<i>ndi-na-funa</i>	“I want”
NA SO	denoting immediate present time	
	<i>madzi a-na-so-wila</i>	“the water is just boiling”
NA DZA	denoting the simple future	
	<i>ndi-na-dza-enda</i>	“I will go”
A	denoting the perfect or recent past	
	<i>nda-fika</i>	“I have arrived”
DA	denoting the remote past	
	<i>apale a-da-enda</i>	“The boys went”

KA	I. denoting continuant past time	
	<i>a-ka-pata-mabasa</i>	“they were working”
	II. denoting the purpose of an action already mentioned	
	<i>wa-enda ka saka nkuni</i>	“he has gone to get firewood”
NGA	denoting ability, possibility, or condition	
	<i>ndi-nga-enda</i>	“may go, if I go, etc.”
NGA DA	denoting past condition or possibility	
	<i>a-nga-da-ti-panga</i>	“if he had told us, he would have told us, he might have told us”
NGA DZA	denoting future condition or possibility	
	<i>Ti-nga-dza-mu-ona</i>	“if he should see him”. (Anderson (1897: 24–25)

In more recent studies, such as Nurse (2008: 92) we find that Sena has four possibilities for future reference. The anonymous author only gives one, but he gives two forms for the imperfect (‘Eu amava’ *ine nandichianga* and ‘Amando eu’ *ine dichiana*). *Chi-* is probably the Sena form for ‘persistent *kĩ*’, which is used when a situation has held continuously (Nurse 2008: 145). Nurse (*ibid.* 147) gives the example “*ndi-ci-ri ku-dya*” (“I am still eating”), which explains the use of the gerund in the anonymous author’s translation.

The *Arte da lingua de Cafre* contains hardly any information on syntax or the order of the words or constituents, apart from this fragment, where we find a description of the head-initial position of the noun in a noun phrase:

Sempre os possessivos e adiectivos são depois dos substantivos. (767)

[The possessives and adjectives are always (put) after the substantives.]

5.4.4 Meta-language

The anonymous Jesuit is inconsistent in his use of metalinguistic or semi-metalinguistic terminology, as indeed most of his contemporary colleagues. No clear distinction is made among ‘syllables’, ‘letters’, and ‘increments’ (Schebesta 1919–1920: 766) and in the same section the author also uses the term ‘acrescentamento’ (*ibid.* 767).

5.5 Conclusion

As Tucker Childs (2003: 76) concluded, “early field workers missed the boat or even ignored the analysis of tone and went blithely ahead with their work”. The three missionary-grammarians whose work we have discussed did not, as we have seen, develop any elaborate writing systems for the Bantu languages, but tone was

recognised by Dias, although he did not succeed in describing it very thoroughly. Apparently the grammarians held the view that the phonetic systems of the languages were not complex enough for many new letters, letter combinations or diacritics to be created. On some occasions, we find some minimal pairs, which reveal their interest in this subject. However, our grammarians did not change the traditional order of the grammar, nor did they make substantial changes in the parts of speech system. The structure of the word is seen as a ‘base’ to which ‘increments’ can be attached. The authors often use the terms ‘incremento’ or ‘acrescentamento’ and it is interesting that Dias’s descriptions includes the term ‘essential letters’, which is widely used in the Latin grammars of Hebrew in Europe and elsewhere. There is no consistent use of the term ‘particle’ in Dias, but one of the main contributions of Brusciotto’s grammar is the introduction of the terms *principiatio* and the use of the word *articulus* in a totally innovative way in order to describe the Bantu concords, which he labeled as *connexio*. The same author introduced (semi) metalinguistic terms for several types of markers, such as the *signum futuritionis* (future marker), *signum negationis* (negation marker) and *nota intransitionis* (intransitive marker), which offers evidence of an attempt to find meaningful concepts for bound morphemes within the structure of the word. In the verbal paradigms we have seen that both Brusciotto and Dias extended the canonical paradigms of the tenses, giving place to new forms. Their starting point was the Latin paradigm, but they also worked in the opposite direction, and seem to have had the insight that the Bantu form must be considered first. For the Latin or Portuguese equivalents they made use of adverbs such as Latin *iam tunc* or Portuguese *já então*. Dias’s extensions are more elaborate than Brusciotto’s, whereas the anonymous author of the ‘Cafre’ language does not seem to have had a thorough knowledge of the verbal system or of the Bantu noun-classes, or of the TAM mechanisms in the verbal system. If we compare the three grammars with Portuguese grammars in Asia, one of the most obvious differences is that we find almost nothing about culture, religions, anthropology, or language usage or variation. As in the works of many of their colleagues who wrote grammars of other ‘oral cultures’ in the Americas, comments regarding high and low registers are also absent.

CHAPTER 6

Arabic and Hebrew

6.1 Introduction

Two grammars of Arabic and one of Hebrew will be described, all written in Portuguese by Franciscans. The first Arabic grammar is Antonio Baptista's *Instituições da lingua arabiga* of 1774, and the second is João de Sousa's *Compendio da grammatica arabiga* of 1795. The Hebrew grammar, by Francisco da Paz (born 1731), is *Compendio dos principios da Grammatica Hebraica* of 1773.

6.2 Arabic

6.2.1 Introduction

Antonio [do Rosário] Baptista [Abrantes] (1737–1813), taught Arabic in Lisbon to Franciscans of the “Ordem Terceira da Penitência”. In 1807, he migrated with the Royal family to Brazil, where he was confessor of the princess Carlota Joaquina de Borbón y Borbón (1775–1830). He died in Rio de Janeiro in 1813. Not much is known of his life, except that he learned Arabic from the Maronite Paulo Hodar (1720–1780).

João de Sousa (1734?–1812) was born in Damascus in 1734 (according to others in 1730), his parents having been born in Portuguese India. He was a native (or near-native) speaker of Arabic, since he spent his adolescence in Damascus, where he also learned French, Italian and Spanish, but not Latin. When he was sixteen years old, he was sent to Europe and in 1750 he arrived in Lisbon. The “Reitor” of the University of Coimbra appointed him as a secretary of the university in 1758. At the age of 40 he was ordained priest of the “Ordem Terceira de S. Francisco” (Verdelho 2008: 77) and for preaching he needed to learn Latin, a language he learned in a couple of months. He worked as an interpreter for the Portuguese government – particularly in the negotiations related to the liberation of captured citizens – in two different Arab countries, first in Morocco between 1773 and 1774, where he learned Moroccan Arabic, and later (from 1786 until 1789) in Algeria. De Sousa also published a book entitled *Vestígios da lingua Arabica em Portugal, ou Lexicon etymologico das palavras e*

nomes Portuguezes, que tem origem Arabiga, published in Lisbon by the Officina da Academia Real das Sciencias in 1789 (cf. Verdelho 2008: 78). De Sousa also worked as an “Oficial da Secretaria de Estado da Marinha” and in 1792, he became a professor of Arabic in Lisbon, successor of António Baptista Abrantes, the author of the *Instituições*, and teacher of Arabic of the “Ordem Terceira da Penitência”. The chair of Arabic – which was originally founded for teaching Arabic to priests – became in 1795 public on de Sousa’s request. De Sousa died in January 1812 (Carvalho 1981: 1.31–1.32). In the Library of Évora, many works of de Sousa on Arabic literature, history and political issues are conserved, most of them still unpublished.

The missionary grammatical descriptions and dictionaries of African, Asian and Brazilian languages were mainly written for missionaries who had to learn the local languages for preaching and taking confession. The Arabic grammars, as their introductions state, aimed at three different target groups: academics, missionaries and those involved in commercial activities. Since de Sousa explains to his readers that he composed his grammar in part for those missionaries who attempted to convert the Muslims (“Os que intentarem Missionar para converterem aquellas gentes das trevas de Mafoma”, de Sousa 1795: xii), the grammar can be classified as a ‘missionary grammar’, although he remarks that others could benefit from the knowledge of Arabic as well; for instance, the study of Arabic is necessary for all those scholars who study Hebrew. Many obscure roots in Hebrew – particularly in the book of Job, according to Baptista – can be explained with knowledge of Arabic, where many of those roots are still in use:

Esta lingua tem muita proximidade com a Hebraica da qual deriva a sua origem [...] No Antigo Testamento; principalmente no livro de Job, que se diz contemporaneo de Moysés, se encontram muitas palavras Arabigas. (1774: ii)

[This language has a close affinity with Hebrew from which its origin derives. In the Old Testament, particularly in the book of Job, which is said to be contemporary to Moses, we find many Arabic words.]

Arabic, de Sousa continues, does not only compete with Greek or Latin, it is even much more important than these languages, since the geographic area of the Arabic speaking world is much vaster than the Roman Empire ever has been. The study of Arabic is also important for the study of other sciences, such as philosophy, geography, poetry, mathematics, medicine, history and politics (1795: xii). According to de Sousa, knowledge of Arabic is necessary for all those who wish to participate in religious debates and polemics. How can we “refute the principles of the Qur’ân and how can we answer our enemies successfully, without knowing the language?” (1795: xiii). He also stressed the importance of learning Arabic for diplomacy,

particularly for those who were responsible for the international contacts between the Portuguese court and the officials of Morocco and Malaya at the time.

There are four characteristics of the Arabic language which justify the study of it: *antiquitas*, *amplitudo*, *elegantia* (*copia/facilitas*) and *utilitas/necessitas*.¹ According to Baptista, the Arabic language is not ‘useless’ (“inutil”), but ‘elegant’ (“elegante”). No language can compete with Arabic, with two exceptions: Hebrew and Aramaic (‘Chaldaic’).

6.2.2 The grammars and their sources

When Baptista informs his readers which sources he has used, we find the same eclectic approach as in other Arabic grammars of this period, such as that written in Spanish by Francisco Cañes (1730–1795). De Sousa explains in his prologue that his learners were supposed to learn his Compendium within a period of only one month, before starting to read the “*Fabulas de Locumán*” (f.vii), edited by Erpenius.

Baptista’s grammar is mainly based on the grammar of the Dutch orientalist and theologian Thomas Erpenius (Thomas van Erpen; 1584–1624), who worked as an interpreter of the States General of Holland and studied Arabic, Persian, Turkish and Ethiopic in Venice. He wrote grammars of Aramaic, Hebrew, Ethiopic and Arabic, the last of which were particularly successful throughout Europe.² In Baptista’s prologue we read that he did not only use Erpenius, but also oriental sources:

Trabalhei sobre o que escreveram os melhores Gramaticos, assim orientaes, como Europeos. (Baptista 1774: vi)

[I worked on what the best grammarians had written, oriental as well as European.]

1. These aspects were even the subject of the lecture of the English orientalist Thomas Hunt (1696–1774) on the occasion of his inauguration as professor of Arabic in Oxford: *De antiquitate, elegantia, utilitate, linguæ arabicæ oratio* (Oxford, 1738). We find the same four aspects which justify the study of Arabic in the works of ab Aquila and Cañes. Baptista and de Sousa are not an exception.

2. Hebrew: *Grammatica Ebraea generalis* (1627). Aramaic: *Grammatica Chaldaea ac Syra* (1628; re-edition 1659). Ethiopic: his “*Grammatica Aethiopica*” is mentioned in the *Oratio* of Vossius (1577–1649) but remained unpublished. Arabic: *Grammatica Arabica* (1613), published with the *Lexicon Arabicum* by Franciscus Raphelengius (François Raphelengien, Frans van Ravelingen, 1539–1597) in one volume; *Grammatica Arabica dicta Gjarumia, & libellus centum regentium cum versione latina & commentariis* (1617); *Rudimenta Linguæ Arabicæ. Accedunt ejusdem praxis grammaticæ; & consilium de studio arabico feliciter instituendo* (1620) and *Grammatica Arabica. Ab autore emendate & aucta: cui accedunt Locmanni Fabulae et Adagia quaedam arabum* (1636).

De Sousa informs his readers in his prologue that it was difficult to find a copy of the Arabic grammar of Thomas Erpenius in Portugal, which motivated him to publish another grammar in Portuguese:

Naõ porque não haja por onde se possaõ instruir nos seus principios, pois ha muitas [grammaticas] compostas tanto pelos Orientaes como pelos Europeos; mas porque sendo huma Lingua pouco cultivada neste Reino, apenas se acha alguma Grammatica de Erpenio. (Sousa 1795: v)

[Not because there does not exist a method by which its principles can be instructed, since there are many of them, compiled by Orientals as well as by Europeans. But, since the Arabic language is little cultivated in this kingdom, one can barely find any copy of Erpenius' grammar.]

In his prologue, de Sousa observes that the grammars written in Arabic are not useful for those who do not know the language yet (“...as dos nacionaes ainda que as houvesse não serviaõ por serem na mesma Lingua que ainda se ignora”), whereas some of the European grammars – except for the grammars of Erpenius and Baptista – are not convenient since they are confusing (“e algumas dos Europeos são inconvenientes pela sua nimia diffusão, e confusão”, 1795: v). Baptista's grammar was good according to de Sousa, since it was derived from Erpenius's, but it was also hard to get in that period (“porque he muito boa, e chegada a do Erpenio, mas tambem he rara”, 1795: vi).

As we can read in de Sousa's prologue, other Western grammars were used also, and he particularly mentions the Arabic grammar written in Latin composed by Philip (Philippus/Filippo) Guadagnoli (1596–1656), entitled *Breves Arabicae Linguae Institutiones* and published by the *Propaganda Fide* in Rome in 1642 – but, according to him, it is not recommended to learn Arabic from this grammar, which must be avoided due to its prolixity and tendency to puzzle readers (“Por tanto foi a prolixidade e embaraço o que mais dezejei evitar”) (de Sousa 1795: fol. vii).

De Sousa quotes in his prologue a fragment of the Swiss professor of Hebrew Johann Heinrich Hottinger (born in Zurich in 1620 and drowned in 1667 on his way to Leiden University who invited him in). Hottinger worked as professor of eastern languages and Biblical criticism at Heidelberg and in the fragment cited by de Sousa we find the names of two “famous Rabbis” (“celebres Rabbinos”) Aben Ezra and David Kimhi, who also made use of their knowledge of Arabic in order to explain obscure roots in Hebrew.³ De Sousa (ibid.) refers also to the preface by Brian Walton (1600–1661) to the six-volume London *Polyglotta* of 1654–1657,

3. “quorum scripta Arabicis ubique non modo plena sunt vocibus; sed et frequentius in Radicum obscuriorum investigatione ab Arabes nos rejiciunt (de Sousa 1795: ix).

where we find a similar observation on Arabic studies as a complementary discipline for Hebrew philology.

Philip Guadagnoli is the only Italian source mentioned by de Sousa, although many other studies were published in Italy in that period. I have demonstrated elsewhere (Zwartjes 2007a,b and 2011e) that Franciscus Martelottus (d. 1618), Antonio ab Aquila (d. 1679), Thomas Obicini (1585–1632) and Guadagnoli wrote their grammars and dictionaries in Italy for their teaching practices at the monastery of San Pietro di Montorio, founded by Obicini, where Arabic was taught to missionaries who were being prepared to spread the faith in the Middle East.⁴ I have demonstrated that the Italian/Vatican grammarians benefited from the Arabic tradition and even made explicit references to Arabic grammarians. As I have also demonstrated elsewhere, Martelottus and Guadagnoli's grammars used a great number of neologisms in Latin, borrowed from the Arabic grammatical tradition.

In Zwartjes (2007a, b and f) we also demonstrated that the grammars of the Spanish Franciscans who taught Arabic in Damascus, such as Bernardo González (c.1665–c.1735), Lucas Cavallero (18th century) and Francisco Cañes (1730–1795) heavily relied on Erpenius's grammar, but the names of other grammarians of the *Propaganda Fide* are also mentioned, particularly in the prologue of Cañes. When de Sousa decided to write his grammar of Arabic, he used mainly the work of his teacher António Baptista and when analysing the Arabic terminology, it is obvious that both relied heavily on Erpenius. It is difficult to find evidence for a possible indirect influence from Erpenius through the works of the Spanish Franciscans González, Cañes or Cavallero. As has been explained in Zwartjes (2011e), Erpenius replaced in his own grammars most Arabic terms he had used in his translations of Ibn al-Ājurrūm's and al-Jurjānī's treatises by Latin equivalents, although some Arabic terms were still conserved, such as the concepts for the vowels *fathā*, *kasra*, and *ḍamma*. In Erpenius's grammars, there are also chapters devoted to the Arabic concepts of *jazm*, *tašdīd*, *madda*, *hamza* and *waṣl* ("De syllabis, ubi Gjezm & Tesdid"; "De literis و ا ي ubi de Medde, Hamze, & Veslo"), but there is no trace of Arabic terminology in the chapters devoted to the particles (i.e. the so-called *particulas nasbantes*, *charrantes*, and *chesman-tes*), which are widely used by the Franciscans in Rome and those of the Spanish tradition.

4. Obicini was abbot of the Franciscan house at Aleppo between 1613 and 1619; in 1621 he returned to Rome where he founded the college at San Pietro di Montorio. He helped to develop the designs of Oriental types at the *Propaganda Fide* Press.

6.2.3 The language

In the Americas and in the Philippines, missionaries described the indigenous languages as they had learned them by language usage (*consuetudo*), although we often find observations concerning the ‘elegant style’ opposed to less refined or colloquial styles. Tamil, Japanese, Chinese and Arabic were languages of diglossic societies. Grammarians and lexicographers had to determine which variety they decided to describe and we find different strategies. Pedro de Alcalá (fl. 1491–1505) explains in his grammar that he was not so much interested in the ‘refined speech of the ‘sabios alfaquíes’. His purpose was to teach the language of the ‘ordinary people’ (‘los populares’). As we can read in the prologue to his dictionary, Pedro de Alcalá wrote his dictionary not only for the Old Christians who wanted to learn Arabic, but also for the New Christians.⁵

As the titles of the grammars of Cañes and Cavallero demonstrate, the language under description is not only classical Arabic, but also colloquial Arabic, in this case the urban dialect of Damascus.⁶ Erpenius did not compose missionary grammars, since he aimed mainly at academics, philologists and theologists who studied Hebrew and Aramaic. The purpose was reading and translating Classical Arabic texts. As we have observed, the main source of the Portuguese grammars was the work of Erpenius, which explains why we do not find any comments in de Sousa’s grammar on colloquial Arabic, and as we have seen, the work was not written only for missionaries, but served also as a tool for Hebrew philology in academic circles.

Baptista devotes a short section of his grammar to what he calls vulgar pronunciation: “Regras genericas para se ler sem vogaes, e conforme a pronuncia vulgar” (“General rules for reading without vowel signs, and in according to popular pronunciation” 1774: 324 ff.). This way of pronouncing is different from that of the

5. “Ca assi como los aljamiados (o cristianos viejos) pueden por esta obra saber el arauia, viniendo del romance al arauia: assi los arauigos (o nuevos cristianos), sabiendo leer la letra castellana: tomando primero el arauia, ligeramente pueden venire en conocimiento del aljamia” (Alcalá 1505: prologue, ii verso). [As the ‘aljamiados’, or old Christians can learn Arabic through this work, coming from Romance to Arabic, so the Arabs (or new Christians), having mastery of the Castilian alphabet, taking first the Arabic, easily can have knowledge of the ‘aljamia.’] (cf. Cowan 1981: 358).

6. The Franciscan Pedro Antonio Fuentes (fl. 1775/6) composed in the same period as Baptista, de Sousa and Cañes a grammar of Classical Greek, a language which served as a “universal key of sciences” (“llave universal de las ciencias, 1776: vi), and another of colloquial Cypriote Greek, since this was the language which missionaries had to learn for their religious enterprises. It was necessary for communicating with any kind of people, literate, or uneducated, for preaching and confessing.

“Nacionaes”. The first observation concerns the ‘zero-vowel’, or apocopate which is called in Arabic *jazm*. When a final vowel is absent, the noun is “*jazm-ed*” (“alguns Escritores costumão nos taes Nomes expressar as vogaes diferentes, mas sempre giesmão as ultimas letras”). Baptista attempts to explain that nominal case-endings are not always pronounced in colloquial speech. The second rule given by Baptista concerns the pronunciation of the vowels. In Classical Arabic, there exist only three vowels (or four, if we include the ‘zero-ending’), but Baptista explains that the letters *a*, *i*, and *u* are pronounced differently under certain circumstances. He explains that sometimes *a* tends to be pronounced as *e* and *u* to *o*, i.e. examples of ‘vowel raising’ (*imāla*).

The two Portuguese grammars are not composed locally and describe classical Arabic, unlike the grammars of the Spanish Franciscans González, Cañes and Cavallero, who based their work on the local variety where they worked. Baptista’s and de Sousa’s grammars could be useful everywhere in the Arabic speaking world. Although Baptista appends a table of two different forms of the Arabic alphabet, Levantine and Maghribian (“Africano”), at the end of his book (1774: 371), no detailed information is given about vernaculars.

6.2.4 The structure of the grammar of de Sousa, compared with those of Erpenius and Guadagnoli

In the following table, the structure of the grammar of Sousa will be compared with Erpenius (edition of 1613) and Guadagnoli. For reasons of space, we have not included the grammar of Baptista, and those of Antonio ab Aquila, Franciscus Martelottus, Agapito à Valle Flemmarum (17th century) and the Spanish Franciscans.

It is obvious that de Sousa follows the grammar of Erpenius closely. It is not impossible that he was inspired by Guadagnoli, but if this was the case, he decided not to follow him in the use of Arabic terminology. In particular, in the fourth book de Sousa follows Erpenius using the same categories of the adverb. The Spanish Franciscans composed also dictionaries and Cañes mentions the Leiden professor Jacob Golius (1596–1667). Erpenius’ grammar was printed together with the dictionary of Raphelengius, but we do not know which dictionaries were used in Portugal.

Thomas Erpenius: <i>Grammatica Arabica</i> (1613)	João de Sousa: <i>Compendio da grammatica arabiga</i> (1795)	Philip Guadagnoli: <i>Breves Arabicae linguae institutiones</i> (1642)
	Prefacio	Ad lectorem Index titulorum
Liber Primus, de orthographia.	LIVRO I das Instituições da lingoa Arabiga Capitulo I. Do Nome, Valor, e Figura das Letras Arabigas	Alphabetum Arabicum De Vocalibus De Essocun, seu nota priuationis Vocalis [...]
I. De litteris De Nominibus literarum De Ordine De figuris literarum De Potestate figurarum	II. Da divisaõ das Letras III. Das Figuras Arismeticas	
II. De diuisionibus literarum	IV. Do nome, figura, e valor sas vogaes	
III. De vocalibus	V. Das cinco notas	
IV. De syllabis, ubi Gjezm & Tesda	Appendix. Da mudança das Letras	
V. De literis و ا ubi de Medde, Hamze, & Veslo.	Regras geraes das letras	
Corrolarium de perfectione scriptura		
	LIVRO II Capitulo I. Das partes de Oraçaõ [...]	De Dictionibus, seu partibus orationis
Liber secundus de Verbo Capvt Primvm. De Verbo in genere	LIVRO III. Capitulo I. Do Verbo em Geral Explicação dos tempos	De Verbo Praeteritum primae Coniuga- tionis De Modsareo Modsareum primae coniugationis Modsareum Rafeatum, Nasba- tum, Gesmatum De Imperatuo De Nun Confirmationis De Masdaro
II. De prima Triliteri Coniuga- tione De Praeterito De Futuro De Imperativo De Participio De Infinitivo Paradigma passivi	Particulas do Preterito Particulas do Futuro Do Futuro Do Imperativo Do Participio Do Infinito II. (lacking)	
III. De quadriliteris & coniuga- tionibus deriuatiuis prima classis	III. Da primeira Conjugação do verbo simples de tres letras	De Nomine Agentis, seu Participio Actiuo
IV. De reliquis deriuatiuis	IV. Da Conjugação Passiva dos verbos Regulares de tres letras	De Participio Passiuo
V. De verbo Surdo seu defectiuo secunda radicali	V. Dos verbos derivados, ou compostos	De Nomine Temporis, Loci, Instrumenti De Nomine Viciis De Nomine Speciei De Nomine Copiae Abundantiae in loco
VI. De Verbo Hamzato	VI. Do verbo de quatro letras, e das Conjugações derivadas da primeira Classe	De verbo quattuor litterarum [...]
VII. De Verbo Quiescente Phe, و & ي	VII. Dos verbos compostos da segunda e terceira Classe [...]	
VIII. De Quiescente Ain Concauum و Concauum ي	VIII. Da Conjugação do verbo Surdo	De Verbis Hamzatis
IX. De Verbo Quiescente ل	IX. Do verbo Hamzato [...]	
X. De Verbo dupliciter imperfecto	XII. Do verbo Quiescente a primeira Radical, و, ou ي	

Thomas Erpenius: <i>Grammatica Arabica</i> (1613)	João de Sousa: <i>Compendio da grammatica arabiga</i> (1795)	Philip Guadagnoli: <i>Breves Arabicae linguae institutiones</i> (1642)
	XIII. Do Verbo Quiescente a segunda Radical, <i>ي</i> , ou <i>ي</i> XIV. Do verbo Quiescente a ultima Radical, <i>ي</i> , ou <i>ي</i> XV. Dos verbos duas vezes imperfeitos	
Liber Tertius, de Nomine [...]		De Nomine, eiusque proprietatibus. [...]
Liber Quartus, de Particulis, I. De Particulis coniunctis II. De Particulis separatis Adverbia loci temporis vocandi demonstrandi interrogandi, affirmandi negandi, reliqua [...]	LIVRO IV Capitulo I. Da Particula II. Das Particulas Separadas Preposições Das conjunções Copulativas Causaes Adverbios de Lugar Adverbios de Tempo Adverbios de chamar Adverbios de mostrar Adverbios de perguntar Adverbios de afirmar Adverbios de negar Outros Adverbios Interjeições	De Particulis [...]
Liber Quintus. De Syntaxi I. De Syntaxi Nominum II. De Syntaxi Verborum De Syntaxi Particularum	LIVRO V Capitulo I. Da concordancia Em quanto ao Numero Em quanto ao Genero II. Da Concordancia do Adjectivo com o Substantivo III. Da Concordancia do relativo com o antecedente IV. Da Regencia do Verbo [...] VII. Da Regencia dos Nomes [...] X. Da Regencia das Particulas [...]	De Connexione partium Orationis De Mobtadao, seu basi Orationis. De Chabaro, seu Praedicato De Verbo, seu Actione [...] De constructione Verborum De constructione Nominum De constructione particularum
Errata Observationes in lexicon Arabicum	Errratas [sic] [...]	
		De Arte Metrica [...]

6.2.5 Phonology and orthography

In his classification of Arabic letters, de Sousa explicitly informs his readers that he follows the Arabic model, but he does not give the Arabic technical terms for the classes in this model, as other Franciscans had done before him:⁷

Os Arabes dividem o seu Alfabeto em cinco classes de Letras, Labiaes, Dentaes, Linguae, Palatinas, e Gutturaes. Tambem as dividem em solares, e lineares: e esta he a divisão mais necessaria. (de Sousa 1795: 4)

[The Arabs divide (the letters of) their alphabet into five classes: Labial, Dental, Lingual, “Palatine” (“oral”) and Guttural. They divide them also into solar and lunar letters⁸, and this is the most important classification.]

Baptista’s alphabet is as follows:

A (Alef) (ا), B (Be) (ب), T (Te) (ت), Ts (Tse) (ث), Gi, ou ji (Gim) (ج), H (Ha) (ح), Hh, (Hha) (خ), D (Dal) (د), D bleso (Dzal) (ذ), R (Re) (ر), Z (Ze) (ز), S (Sin) (س), Ch, ou X (Chin) (ش), Ss (Sad) (ص), D (Dad) (ض), T (Ta) (ط), D bleso (Dza) (ظ), A (Ain) (ع), G (Gain) (غ), F (Fe) (ف), Q (Qaf) (ق), K (Kef) (ك), L (Lam) (ل), M (Mim) (م), N (Nun) (ن), W (Wau) (و), H (He) (ه), I (Ie) (ي), La (Lam Alef) (ال). (Baptista 1774: 2–3)

De Sousa’s system is different, and he apparently did not copy Baptista’s grammar:

A (Alef) (ا), B (Bé) (ب), T (Té) (ت), C (Cé) (ث), Gi, ou ji (Gim) (ج), H (Hhá) (ح), J(a) (Je) (خ), D (Dál) (د), Z (Zál) (ذ), R (Ré) (ر), Za (Zain) (ز), S (Sin) (س), X (Xin) (ش), Sç (Sád) (ص), Dh (Dád) (ض), T (Táh) (ط), Za (Záh) (ظ), Aa (A-in) (ع), Ga (Gain) (غ), F (Fé) (ف), Ca (Cáf) (ق), K (Quef) (ك), L (Lam) (ل), M (Mim) (م), N (Nun) He (Hé) (ه), O (Uáu) (و), I (Y-e) (ي), La (Lamaléf) (ال). (de Sousa 1795: 2–3)

In Baptista’s alphabet, there is no distinction between ظ and ذ which are both transcribed as “D (bleso)”, whereas in de Sousa’s alphabet, there is no distinction between ز and ظ, which are both transcribed as “Za”. De Sousa’s H (Hhá) is used for (ح), whereas Baptista uses (Hha) for (خ). It is remarkable that de Sousa’s system contains two letters derived from the Spanish alphabet: the ⟨j⟩ or ‘jota’ for the voiceless velar fricative (خ) and ⟨c⟩ for the voiceless interdental fricative (ث) (according to the pronunciation in Classical Arabic). These two transliteration systems are obviously not derived from the alphabet developed in Damascus by the Spanish Franciscan González, who has:

7. E.g. Martelottus (1620: 35): *chalchiiton* (حلقية = “guttural”; d.w.z. pharyngo-laringal), *sciagiariiaton* (شجرية = “palatine”, or “oral”), *sciaphahiiaton* (شفهية = “labial”), etc.

8. When the clitic article *al-* precedes a noun which begins with a solar consonant, it is assimilated to the solar consonant: *al-šams* is pronounced as *aš-šams* (“the sun”). The article does not assimilate when the noun begins with a lunar consonant, as in *al-qamar* (“the moon”).

Aleph, Be, Te, Ce, Chím, Hha, Ja, ô, ge, Dal, Çal, Re, Zain, Sin o Scin, Xin, o Sxin, Ssad, Ddad, Tta, Zça, Aain, Gain, Fe, Qkaf, Kaf, Lam, Mim, Nun, He, Vau, Ye (González 1719: 2–4).

Baptista and de Sousa developed an alphabet specifically for Portuguese learners, so there are some differences between their alphabets compared with Erpenius. The Spanish graphemes ⟨j⟩ and ⟨c⟩ are used, which cannot be found in Erpenius. It is also clear that de Sousa did not follow Baptista closely. Erpenius did not always use the same system in his different editions, as the following extracts from 1613 and 1636 will illustrate:

Spiritus lenis Graecorum ꝥ Hebraeorum (Eliph) (ا), B (Be) (ب), T (Te) (ت), T *Blæsum* (Tshe) (ث), G *Gallorum ante e & i* (Gsim) (ج), ꝥ Hebraeum, id est, duplex H ex imom pectore protractum, H, HH (Hha) (ح), Ch seu ꝥ Græcorum cum razione gutturis, (Cha) (خ), D (Dal) (د), D *Blæsum* (Dshal) (ذ), R (Re) (ر), Z, aut S inter duas vocales (Ze) (ز), S initio dictionis, aut post consonantem (Sin) (س), Sj Belgarum, Ch Gallorum, Sch Germanorum, & Sh Anglorum Sj (Sjin) (ش), TS, sed ita vt S magis quàm T audiatur (Tsad) (ص), Idem blæsè (Dshad) (ض), T in gutture pronuntiatum (Ta) (ط), Idem blæsè: vix differt à ض (Dsha) (ظ), ꝥ *Hebr. difficillima letra* (Ain) (ع), G in gutture pronuntiatum (Gain) (غ), F (Fe) (ف), K in gutture pronuntiatum (Kaf) (ق), C ante a o u, id est K in anteriori parte oris (Kef) (ك), L (Lam) (ل), M (Mim) (م), N (Nun) (ن), W nostrum, Germanicum, Anglicum (Waw) (و), H (He) (ه), ꝥ *Heb.* Id est j concona quam caueât Galli suo more pronuncient, is enim sonus ج est. (Ie) (ي). (Erpenius 1613: 1–2)

Spiritus lenis Graecorum (Elif) (ا), B (Be) (ب), T (Te) (ت), T *Blæsum* (Thse) (ث), G *Gallicum* (Gjim) (ج), Hh (Hha) (ح), Ch, (Cha) (خ), D (Dal) (د), D *Blæsum* (Dshal) (ذ), R (Re) (ر), Z (Ze) (ز), S (Sin) (س), Sj, ch *Gal.* (Sjin) (ش), S (Sad) (ص), D (Dad) (ض), T (Ta) (ط), D (Da) (ظ), ꝥ *Hebraeum* (Ain) (ع), G. *Latin* (Gain) (غ), F (Fe) (ف), K (Kaf) (ق), C (Kef) (ك), L (Lam) (ل), M (Mim) (م), N (Nun) (ن), W *German* (Waw) (و), H (He) (ه), I *Consona* (Ie) (ي). (Erpenius 1636: 2–3)

The Portuguese grammarians did not follow Guadagnoli either:

ꝥ (Alif) (ا), B (Be) (ب), T (Te) (ت), Th (The) (ث), G (Gim) (ج), Hh (Hha) (ح), Ch, (CHa) (خ), D (Dal) (د), Dh (Dhal) (ذ), R (Re) (ر), Z (Zain) (ز), S (Sin) (س), Sc (Scin) (ش), Ss (Ssad) (ص), Ds (Dsad) (ض), Td (Tda) (ط), Tdh (Tsha) (ظ), Ae ꝥ (Ain) (ع), Gh (Gain) (غ), F (Fe) (ف), QC (Cof) (ق), CH (Caf) (ك), L (Lam) (ل), M (Mim) (م), N (Nun) (ن), H (He) (ه), V (Vau) (و), L & ꝥ Lam Alif (ال) I (Ie) (ي). (Guadagnoli 1642: 1–2)

As these examples demonstrate, there is no consistency in the use of the term *blæsum*, which means “mispronouncing one’s words through a speech defect, drunkenness, etc. stammering” (Glare 1994).⁹

9. See also Beligatti (Chapter 2).

6.2.6 Parts of speech and morphology

The grammars of Baptista and de Sousa do not offer anything different from the grammars of Erpenius, which they follow *grosso modo*. As is usual in Arabic grammars, there is a tripartite division of the parts of speech:

Estas [partes da oração] entre os Arabes são tres; Nome, Verbo, e Particula; Ao nome ajuntaõ o pronome e Participio; A Particula, a Prepozição, Adverbio, Interjeição, e Conjunção. (De Sousa 1795: 22)

[There are among the Arabs three parts of speech: Noun, Verb and Particle. To the noun belong the pronoun and the participle; the preposition, adverb, interjection and conjunction belong to the particle.]

As occurs in other Arabic grammars of that period, the pronouns are subdivided in two categories, those which can stand alone, and the affixed (“affixos”, Sousa 1795: 52). The root consists of the ‘radical letters’ (“radicaes”), opposed to those letters which “serve” them (“servis”) (ibid. 56). There are only two ‘tenses’, past and future, while the present tense is lacking (“preterito ~ futuro, que tambem serve para presente”). There are three numbers: “singular, dual, plural”. On page 76, de Sousa gives a table of the verbal derivations, numbered from 1–13, subdivided into three classes (1–4; 5–9 and 10–13).

In the chapter on nominal declension, de Sousa follows the Arabic tripartite case system (Nominative, Genitive and Accusative). He observes that the dative and ablative are not separate cases, since they are included in the genitive.¹⁰ The vocative does not have a special ending but is marked by the particle يا (“yā”; [“o”]) (1795: 41). De Sousa distinguishes four nominal declensions:

1. Triptota no Singular, e Plural
2. Triptota no singular, e Diptota no Plural
3. Diptota no Singular, e Triptota no Plural
4. Diptota em ambos os numeros (de Sousa 1795: 43–44)

The chapter on the verb begins with a definition of the ‘root’:

O Thema do verbo chama-se Raiz, e as letras de que se compoem chamõ-se radicaes. As letras porém que servem para a formação da Conjugação, do Tempo, da Pessoa, do Numero, e do Genero chamão-se servis, e são estas; ا ت س م ن و ي (de Sousa 1795: 56)

[the theme (or “stem”) of the verb is called ‘root’ and consists of the letters which are called ‘radicals’. Conjugations, tenses, person and number and gender are expressed by ‘servile’ letters, which are the following: ا ت س م ن و ي]

10. “Os casos entre os Arabes são tres; Nominativo, Genitivo (que comprehende o dativo, e Ablativo) e Accusativo” (de Sousa 1795: 37).

When de Sousa and Baptista classify the tenses and moods of the Arabic verb, they conclude that it does not make much sense to give paradigms of the entire Latin system, since only three tenses are relevant, the preterite, future and imperative, and the others are distinguished by particles, not morphologically by specific verbal inflection:

Os Arabes não tem mais do que tres tempos, Preterito, Futuro, e Imperativo, exprimindo com estes todos os mais tempos, e modos, que tem alguns tempos semelhantes, e que só se distinguem pelas Particulas. (Baptista 1774: vii)
[The Arabs have only three tenses, Preterite, Future and Imperative, including in them the other tenses and modes which have the same endings, and which are only distinguished by the (use of) particles.]

6.2.7 Syntax. Word order and agreement

The chapter devoted to syntax in Baptista’s grammar follows closely Erpenius’s model. It is possible that Baptista used one of the later re-editions of Erpenius, such as the one published in 1733, as the following example illustrates:

Table 6.1 Agreement according to Baptista and Erpenius

Baptista (1774)	Erpenius (1733)
Concordancia do Nome com o Verbo, do Nome Adjectivo com o Substantivo, ed o Relativo com o Antecedente, he quasi a mesma, que a das outras Linguas, observando sempre os que camos a tratar (281)	Concordantia Substantivi cum Adjectivo, relativi cum Antecedente, ac Nominativi cum Verbo eadem hic est quae in aliis linguis. Solum observando est... (140)
...	...
Plural Inhumano, isto he, que não signifique homem, elegantemente concorda com o Verbo no Singular Feminino: assim como جنات تجري من تحتها الأنهار [jannātun tajrī min tahtihā-l-anhārun] <i>jannáton tajrī men tahtihal anharon</i> quintas, pelas quaes correm rios: onde os Plurares Inhumanos جنانة <i>jannáton</i> , e ألأنهار <i>alanharon</i> concordão com os Singulares Femininos تجرى e, ها <i>há</i> . (284)	Plurale inhumanum (sic voco non significat homines) eleganter construi modo singularis foeminini, ut, جنات تجري من تحتها الأنهار [jannātun tajrī min tahtihā-l-anhārun] horti sub quibus currunt fluvii, ubi Singularia Foeminina ها <i>hā</i> & , تجري <i>tajrī</i> , construuntur cum جنات [jannātun] & ألأنهار [anhārun] Pluralibus inhumanis. (141)11

11. The same example is given in Cañes (1775: 89): “Si el nombre, que antecede al verbo, es plural inhumano, (esto es, que no significa hombres) entonces no es necesaria la concordancia del nombre con el verb o; antes es mas elegante poner el verb o en la tercera persona singular femenina: como las aguas corren” and cf. Agapito a Valle Flemmarum’s (1687: 232) “De Concordantiis” for a similar description.

The chapter entitled “da concordancia” analyses the three concords, which we can find in most western grammars of this period, (1) noun and verb, (2) substantive and adjective, (3), relative and antecedent. Agreement asymmetry is explained in terms of ‘elegance’:

Porém se o verbo estiver antes do Nome não he necessaria a concordancia em Numero, porque he mais elegante a oração entre os Arabes, se o Nome está no Numero Dual ou Plural, ter o verbo no Singular, assi como نصر رجال [našara rijālu] Ajudaraõ os homens. هرب رجالان [haraba rajulāni] Fugiraõ os dois homens. [However if the verb comes before the noun, concord in number is not necessary, because the sentence it is more elegant among the Arabs to have the verb in the singular, even when the noun is in the dual or in the plural number, e.g. نصر رجال [našara rijālu] “the men helped” هرب رجالان [haraba rajulāni] “the two men fled”.]¹²

6.3 Hebrew

As is well known, no spoken varieties of Hebrew existed in the age of these missionaries, so the Hebrew data are mainly based on a written corpus. In this section we shall not attempt to give an account of the study of Hebrew in Portugal or elsewhere in the lusophone territories, but only, and briefly, of the Hebrew grammar composed by the by the Franciscan Francisco da Paz (fl.1774). Although it is not a missionary grammar in its strict sense, it gives us an impression of how Franciscans studied and taught Hebrew in the 18th century.

A number of Hebrew grammars were written in Portuguese, Latin or Hebrew in the early modern period, particularly by Sephardic Jews of the diaspora.¹³ In

12. See for more details about agreement asymmetry and government in missionary grammars of Arabic Zwartjes (2007b).

13. They include the following: Mosseh Raphael de Aguilar, *Epítome da grammatica hebraica por breve methodo composta, para uso das escholas* (ed. 2, 5421 = 1661) (Cardoso 1994: 223–224); Mosseh Ben Gidhon (or Gideam Abrediente) (d. 1688), *Grammatica hebraica. Parte Ia onde se mostram todas as regras necesarias, assim para a intelligencia da lingua, como para compor e escrever nella em prosa e verso, com ellegancia e medida que convém* (1633); David Jachia, *Lingua eruditorum ex Isaia* (1506); Scheleno (or Selemoh/Schelomão) (de) Oliveyra *Manus, sive instrumentum linguae* (1689), *Medicina da Lingua* (1686), *Livro da Grammatica hebraica e chaldaica* (1688) and *Manual da lingua hebraica. Grammatica breve da lingua chaldaica* (1689); and finally, Selomoh Jehuda Leão Templo (d. c. 1733) ראשית חבמה *Principio de Sciencia ou Gramathica Hebrayca. Por hum Methodo Breue, Claro, Facil, e Distincto ... para Uzo das Escolas como a ensina no Medrás em que assiste, No K.K. de Talmud Torah* (5463 = 1703). I am not aware of the existence of a monograph on the grammars written in Portuguese, since researchers who deal with the teaching of Hebrew in Portugal focus on grammars written in Latin, such as the *Tabula in*

the following table, the letters of the Hebrew alphabet are given with the corresponding Latin letters. Paz also adds some observations on how to pronounce them:

Ordem.	fig.	nom.	Valor numer.	Pronúncia.			
1	א	Aleph ¹⁴	1	<i>Aspiração tenue</i>			
2	ב	Beth	2	b	e	u	
3	ג	Ghimel	3	g			
4	ד	Daleth	4	d			
5	ה	He	5	<i>Aspiração simples</i>			
6	ו	Vau	6	u			
7	ז	Zain	7	z			
8	ח	Hheth	8	hh	<i>Aspiração forte</i>		
9	ט	Teth	9	t	<i>crasso</i>		
10	י	Iod	10	i	<i>molle</i>		
11	ך/כ	Kaph	20	k	ou	kh	
12	ל	Lamed	30	l			
13	מ/ם	Mem	40	m			
14	נ	Num	50	n			
15	ס	Samech	60	ſ			
16	ע	Ain	70	hhh	<i>Aspiração fortissima</i>		
17	פ/ף	Pé	80	p	ou	ph	
18	צ/ץ	Tsade	90	ts	ou	tz	ou ss
19	ק	Qoph	100	q	<i>forte</i>		
20	ר	Resch	200	r	<i>duro</i>		
21	שׁ	Schin	300	sch			
	שׂ	Sin	s	<i>duro</i>			
22	ת	Tau	400	t	ou	th	T

(Da Paz 1773: 3–4)

As we can see, not so many details are given. The distinction between ⟨h⟩, ⟨hh⟩, and ⟨hhh⟩ is remarkable and as far as I could trace, the use of three ‘h’-es is unique. Further, Paz does not follow the Greco-Latin model when he classifies the Hebrew

grammaticam Hebraeam (1529) of the Flemish grammarian Nicolaus Clenardus (1495–1542) and the *Grammatica hebraea, novissima edita* (1566) of Francisco de Távora. I have not been able to see the Hebrew grammar of the Franciscan João Encarnação, entitled *Grammatica linguae sanctae* and completed around 1757, nor that by Joaquim da Encarnação (=Joaquim de Azevedo) who wrote a grammar entitled *Arte da lingua Hebraica* in the same period, so here we shall discuss only Francisco da Paz’ *Compendio*.

14. In da Paz’s table the names of the letters are also written in Hebrew.

letters, but gives the Hebrew terms, which are all originally derived from the Arabic grammatical tradition:

Letras Hebraicas:

Linguae (Datlenat)	Palatinas (Gikaq)	Guturales (Ahhha)
Labiales (Bumaph)	Dentales (Zastserasch)	

(Paz 1773: 5)¹⁵

Like most Hebrew grammars, three parts of speech are distinguished – noun, verb and particle – but Paz demonstrates how the remaining classes from the Greco-Latin system can be classified in the Hebrew system:

He composta a lingua Hebraica de tres partes da oração; e são estas שמ, nome, em o qual se inclui o pronome, פועל, acção, ou verbo, que inclui tambem os participios; e מלה, que comprehende o adverbio, preposição, conjunção, e interjeição. (Paz 1773: 24)

[The Hebrew language consists of three parts of speech, שמ, the noun, including the pronoun, פועל, action, or the verb, including also the participles and מלה, including the adverb, preposition, conjunction and interjection.]

Nominal declension is non-existent, since there are no cases in the Latin sense:

Dos Casos dos nomes.

Os casos dos nomes Hebreos não se distinguem entre si pelas terminações, porque em todos os seis he a mesma; mas pelos artigos he que se distinguem. (Paz 1773: 25)

[On the cases of the nouns.

In Hebrew, the cases of the nouns are not distinguished by their endings, since all the six cases have the same ending, but they are distinguished by the articles.]

As in other Hebrew grammars, the distinction is made between “absolute” or “separable” forms opposed to those which are “affixed” or “inseparable”:

Os pronomes primitivos podem-se considerar em dous estados; ou em quanto absolutos, e separados, ou em quanto affixos, e inseparaveis. (Paz 1773: 34)

We also find the distinction between ‘servile’ and ‘radical’ letters, as in other Hebrew grammars:

15. Cf. also Leão Templo: “Os Ynstrumentos, e Orgãos da Falla, para Expressir & Prenunciar bem as palavras, são cinco: asaber a Garganta, a Lingôa, o Pahadâr, os Dêntes, e os Bêyssos. A estes cinco, Aplicarão os Gramathicos as letras de cada classe, es fizerão esta divizão” (5463: 6). The classification can already be found in David Kimḥi: (a) laryngeals: אההייע (2) palatals: נכייק (3) dentals: זםשרייע (4) lingual-dentals: דטלניח and (5) labials: בוםף (Mikhlol, apud Chomsky 1952/5713: 11).

Das letras servis. Os adverbios, e proposições, de que acabamos de fallar, ou são dicções perfeitas, como as sobreditas, ou são sómente humas letras, que por esta causa se chamão servís.

Deve-se pois saber, que das vinte e duas letras Hebraicas onze são radicaes, e onze servis. As radicaes são as de que se compõem a raiz, nem servem de outra cousa, ... As servís são aquellas, que ainda que algumas vezes formem a raiz, outras vezes servem de adverbios, proposições, ou de finaes para conhecer as pessoas, e nomes (Paz 1773: 146)

[On the servile letters. Adverbs and prepositions (lit. 'propositions') where we talked about, are either 'perfect' dictions, as those we mentioned, or only some letters, which are called 'servile' for this reason.

One has to know, that 11 of the 22 Hebrew letters are radical, and 11 are servile. With the radicals, roots can be constructed and they do not serve another thing ... The servile are those which sometimes can form a root, and sometimes they serve as adverbs, prepositions, or endings which signify persons and nouns.]

In the fourth chapter devoted to syntax, Paz gives the Greco-Latin based tripartite division of concord, or agreement:

1. O nome com o verbo [Noun with verb]
2. O adjectivo com o substantivo [adjective with substantive]
3. O relativo com o antecedente [relative and antecedent]. (Paz 1774: 152)

The grammar of Francisco Paz is obviously derived from the Hebrew tradition, particularly from western grammars of Hebrew. However, as the citation on agreement demonstrates, the Latin model is always present. Paz does not inform his readers explicitly about his methodology and he does not mention his sources, unlike other Portuguese grammarians who inform their readers explicitly about their methodology, as the following citation from Leão Templo's *Principio de Ciencia ou Gramathica Hebrayca* of 1703 illustrates:

{Dedicatoria}: ... Não a escrevo para os Doctos; ofereço aos Principiantes. Por isto sahe com hum Linguagem, ajustado a Capacidade de quem aprende; não com a Erudição de quem ja sabe ... Esplicando nella todos os Termos e Phrasis GRAMATHICOS; como são *Nome Substantivo, Adjectivo, Verbo, Adverbio, Modo Cazo &c.* ... Que como estes Termos são todos emanados de Lingoa Latina: succede muytas vezes a os nossos Aprendizes, como não tem conhecimento dessa Lingoa: Decorar os Vocabulos, sem entender as Reglas. Sahe tambem Illustrada con alguas Reglas novas; huas tiradas de nossos GRAMATHICOS: Otras forjadas, na Officina de meu Trabalho.

[Dedication: ... I do not write (this grammar) for the erudite, but I offer it to beginners. Therefore it is written in a suitable language for the learner's capacity, not with the erudition of the one who already knows ... explaining all the terms and phrases of grammar, such as substantive noun, adjective, verb, adverb, mode, case,

etc. ... since these terms all emanate from the Latin language: It occurs often to our learners who do not know Latin that they learn the words by heart, without understanding the rules. This grammar also contains some new rules, some derived from our grammarians, others hammered out in my own workshop.]

6.4 Conclusion

The Arabic and Hebrew grammars written by the Portuguese Franciscans Baptista, de Sousa and Francisco Paz are remarkably different from all the others described in this study. They are not modelled on the work of Álvares, nor on any other grammar of Latin, nor on the Portuguese grammars of Oliveira and Barros. The Arabic grammars follow closely the grammar of the Dutch orientalist Erpenius, and seem to be familiar with – at least some – grammars which were developed in Italy or in Spain. The Hebrew grammar of Paz follows the tradition of western Hebrew grammars, although we have not investigated yet which sources are used specifically. We can conclude that these grammars did not develop new approaches. They copied from others and when there are differences, they are seldom of such an importance that they could be labelled as creative solutions. The importance of these works for the history of linguistics in Portugal is limited, but it is significant that these sources enriched the Portuguese meta-language with technical terms derived from Arabic or Hebrew.

CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

As we have explained in the introduction, pre-modern missionary sources have in the past been largely neglected. Scholars have often confined themselves to pointing out the shortcomings of the Latin-based model and the inappropriateness of imposing Eurocentric concepts onto other languages. Our research often corroborates this assumption, but it is much more important for the historiography of linguistics that most authors were aware of these shortcomings and attempted to invent new approaches. No elaborate innovative meta-language was developed in the period, but it is obvious that missionary-linguists frequently modify meanings of conventional terminology. This monograph is, in part, an attempt to ‘revitalise older linguistic documentation’, analysing how and to what extent the meaning of traditional metalinguistic language was (gradually or drastically) changing in different contexts. There is no doubt that the universalist training of the missionaries often clashed with the demands of their fieldwork, as Hanzeli (1969:100) has pointed out, but it is also evident that this model had its explanatory power and flexibility, since it could be adapted to the linguistic facts whenever they found this relevant. As Dixon (1997:130) observes: “Every language poses some kind of theoretical challenge, and solving this is likely to lead to feedback into theory, helping to enlarge and refine it”. In the descriptions of some Asian languages (in particular Japanese and Arabic) the influence of local grammatical theory is present and this aspect added a new dimension to descriptive linguistics. Missionaries recognized the presence of exotic, unexpected and hitherto-unknown items and the absence of familiar presumed-to-be-universal entities (Gil 2001:103) in a varying degree.

7.1 Phonology and orthography

7.1.1 The Indian subcontinent

In India, we have seen that the Latin alphabet is generally not so much adapted or refined. Henriques’s phonological description is quite exact, although his transcription is often careless, and frequently leads to serious misunderstanding. His sections in Tamil script do not lead to any mis-readings, but an important shortcoming is that long and short vowels are hardly visible in his Latin orthography.

Thomas Stephens wished to see his grammar published in Devanagari script, which illustrates his awareness of the inappropriateness of the Latin alphabet. When he was forced to use the latter, he decided to develop an enlarged romanisation system using diacritics. His articulatory description of retroflex consonants is clear and quite complete, since both the tongue tip (the active articulator) and the hard palate (the passive) are mentioned. Stephens uses a diacritical sign which he calls “pontinho”, “til” or “sinal”. Assumpção’s romanisation of Bengali probably did not derive from earlier sources, as far as we could trace. In his adapted Latin alphabet, only few diacritics are used. His phonetical description shows under-differentiations and phonemic contrasts in Bengali between aspirated and unaspirated, dental and palatal phonemes, the existence of nasalisation, etc. are usually not marked orthographically. The anonymous grammar of Marathi deals with the alphabet in the opening section of the grammar, but there is not much attention to pronunciation in general, although there are some definitions, such as the pronunciation of the letter *â*, which is a “guttural sound which is pronounced with the mouth half open”, and there is an attempt to describe retroflex consonants (“the tip of the tongue has to be curled, while touching the upper teeth”), which is quite exact. Finally, the anonymous grammar of Hindi has the most elaborate system of diacritics, compared with the others of the Portuguese tradition in India. Its author’s descriptions possibly depend on – or were inspired by – previous sources, such as the grammars of Ketelaar and Captain Hadley. The anonymous grammar did not benefit from or improve on Beligatti’s *Alphabetum*, which had been published some years earlier. Beligatti’s phonetical descriptions are usually exact and much more refined than the anonymous grammarian’s; on the comparative level, Beligatti’s work is of significant importance, since many sounds are compared with Arabic and Persian.

7.1.2 Japan

In the Far East, the Portuguese grammarians benefitted from the local educational infra-structure and the existing grammatical tradition. We see that Rodrigues gave much importance to the pronunciation of the Japanese language, and he even introduced Japanese technical terms into his meta-language. His *Arte breve* contains tables where the local script is exhibited, accompanied by a version in Latin script. It is noteworthy that Rodrigues also compares many sounds with other languages than Portuguese, such as Italian, Castilian, and Old Castilian. Rodrigues uses diacritics for vowels, in order to mark vowel quality and probably also quantity. There are many sections where particular features are explained, such as assimilation, or ‘sandhi’. In South East Asia, missionaries developed an adapted Latin alphabet, which is of great importance. Tonality was hardly recognized in tonal languages in

New Spain, but Spanish, Italian, French and Portuguese missionaries in East Asia developed a fairly correct transcription system for the different tones. No Portuguese grammars survived of tonal languages, such as Chinese and Vietnamese, but it is important that other works, such as Alexandre de Rhodes' grammar and dictionary of Vietnamese, were based on the work of pioneering Portuguese missionaries, in particular Gaspar do Amaral, Francisco de Pina and Antonio Barbosa.

7.1.3 Brazil

In Brazil, the romanisation of Tupi and Kiriri did not cause serious problems, since these languages did not have a complex phonological system, according to the perception of a speaker of Portuguese, where nasality exists. Anchieta developed the most elaborate system of the works studied in the chapter on Brazil, introducing some diacritics. He described the unknown vowel /i/ and Figueira and Mamiani followed him. Araújo seems to have used also other sources than Anchieta. Mamiani also expanded the Latin alphabet as used in Portuguese, adding the 'vogal entremeya' ⟨æ⟩ and the 'North European' ⟨w⟩.

7.1.4 Africa

Tonality is important in Bantu languages, but no detailed descriptions are documented in the missionary works of this early-modern period. It is not clear if in Cardoso's catechism, pitch or vowel stress is marked. Dias, probably inspired by Pacconio et al.'s *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido*, does not give a detailed description of tonality, but he gives some minimal pairs where 'accentos' are placed on different syllables in such a manner that the word changes its meaning. An introductory section on orthography and phonology is lacking in the anonymous grammar of the Cafre language.

7.1.5 Arabic and Hebrew

Finally, Arabic technical terms are included in the grammars of Baptista and de Sousa, which were inspired by, or translated from Erpenius, Guadagnoli and others. However, it is significant for the history of Portuguese linguistics that these works used equivalents of this particular terminology in Portuguese. Da Paz follows western grammars of Hebrew and we have seen that he follows the Hebrew tradition in his section devoted to the classification of the letters based on their articulatory features.

7.2 Morphosyntax

Generally, much progress was made regarding the interpretation, adoption, adaptation or resemantization of the Greco-Latin concepts of inflection, declensions, conjugations, tenses, moods and aspects.

7.2.1 India

In Tamil, nouns are inflected for case, number, person and gender and Henriques distinguishes five declensions. His criteria are partially semantic and partially morphophonemic. He divides the Tamil verb into nine conjugations based on the stem-ending with the tense formatives. Henriques also describes honorificity in Tamil. The Konkani noun shows a three-gender system and two declensional classes, based on the ending. Stephens compares Konkani with Latin; the oblique cases are derived from the genitive. Stephens informs his readers also that many nouns are not inflected at all ('indiclinaueis'). The six declensions proposed by Stephens are partially based on gender and partially on their endings. The paradigm of the Konkani verb has been extended, introducing other tenses without introducing new terms, by devising labels such as 'preterito perfeito 1', 'preterito perfeito 2', and 'preterito perfeito 3'. The use of the 'substantive verbs' in periphrastic constructions is discussed as well. Nouns in Bengali have no grammatical gender and Assumpção distinguishes four nominal declensions, based on their morphophonetic appearance, i.e. according to their formation of the genitive case. The verbal paradigm is extended as well, including 'preterito perfeito' and an 'outro preterito perfeito', without further explanations. Marathi nouns have three genders, numbers, and cases are expressed by postpositions. Motivated by the Latin doctrine, the anonymous grammarian distinguishes five declensions which are determined by the form of the genitive. The author uses the term 'particulas demonstrativas' for the markers of the oblique cases, which demonstrates that he was aware that he could not interpret these 'endings' in the same manner as in Latin. His verbal paradigm is also extended, including a form which is less used, and another which is more common ('preterito imperfeito pouco uzado' and 'preterito imperfeito mais uzado'). Many aspectual idiosyncrasies of this language are not described at all in this anonymous grammar. The treatment of declensions and cases and the verbal paradigms of Hindi is more or less the same as those of the Marathi grammar. It is noteworthy that the grammarian of Hindi uses the term 'verbo auxiliar', which is – as far as we could trace – the only missionary Portuguese source which uses this term.

Most grammars pay attention to constituent order and agreement, although Henriques's grammar is an exception. Stephens's grammar of Konkani and the two

anonymous grammars of Marathi and Hindi devote sections to topics related to ergativity and agreement. Stephens concludes that ‘neuter verbs’ agree with the agent, and that all the preterite perfects of the active verbs agree with the patient in number, gender. Usually, these authors interpret ergative construction as Latin passives, where the agent in the Ablative of the passive construction is marked by a ‘postposition’ – or in modern terms, the ergative marker.

7.2.2 Japan

It is noteworthy that Rodrigues uses Japanese terms for his classification of the parts of speech. Nouns in Japanese are not ‘inflected’ in the sense of Latin inflection, but nominal morphology is determined by affixation. An important contribution of Rodrigues to the history of Linguistics is that he attempts to define case and topic-markers as well. Rodrigues understood intuitively that *wa* is a topic marker, using the term ‘denotativo’ and ‘demostrativo’. The translation ‘quanto a...’ reflects exactly the meaning of this affix. Another important aspect is his treatment of the adjective noun, ‘nome adjectiuo’, and the ‘real indeclinable adjectives’ (‘verdadeiros adiectiuos indeclinaveis’). Rodrigues was aware that some ‘adjectives’ behave as verbs do. His description of the attributive adjective is fairly precise and correct. His tripartite division of the tenses of the verb is also given in Japanese terms (*quaco*, *ghenzai*, *mirai*), although Portuguese equivalents were available. Honorificity is described in detail, which also demonstrates that he did not rely on any Latin model on this point.

Rodrigues distinguishes between two different word orders, one which is characteristic for Chinese, and the other for Japanese (*coye* versus *yomi* syntax). He was aware that Japanese is a left-branching language and described this in detail.

7.2.3 Brazil

In Brazil the traditional concept of ‘inflection’ was not useful and had to be avoided. In Tupi, there is not always a clear distinction between noun and verb, since nouns can have the same tense-mood suffixes as verbs. The paradigms of the verbs are based on the active versus non active system of the Tupi verb. Anchieta and Figueira were aware that the Latin model was in fact inappropriate. The two different sets of pronominal prefixes which are semantically conditioned are described in detail. In Kipeá-Kiriri, Mamiani decided not to classify the verb into ‘conjugations’. Tense and aspect are not morphologically marked as in Latin and verbs have no agreement markers, except for the third person and first person inclusive. He also described the opposition between animate and inanimate in detail.

Anchieta does not devote a separate chapter to syntax, unlike Figueira. These Jesuits distinguished between two sets of ‘articles’ which co-occur with ‘active’ or ‘non-active’ verbs. Ergativity in Kipeá-Kiriri is explained as a passive. The agent of a transitive verb is marked by the ergative marker *no-* (a preposition according to Mamiani), which marks the ‘ablative’ of a passive construction.

7.2.4 Africa

Bantu languages have noun classes and a rich system of tense and mood marking in verbal morphology. In Brusciotto we find the terminological innovation of *principiationes* and we cannot exclude the possibility that he was inspired by previous Portuguese sources, which have been lost. There is no trace of Brusciotto’s *principiationes* in Dias, but Dias was aware that often the same particles are used for the concord between the verb and its subject. Dias extends the tense-mood system, including a ‘preterito perfeito 1’, a ‘preterito perfeito 2’, and a ‘preterito perfeito 3’. These tenses are explained as “ha pouco tempo” (a short time ago) “ha mais tempo” (longer ago) and “ha muito mais tempo” (“a long time ago”). Some aspectual-temporal details are not explained on the theoretical level, but the translations, such as the adverbs ‘já’, ‘já então’ are used with the aim to explain the differences in the verbal forms Dias presented. The author of the *Arte da lingua de Cafre* concluded that nouns are indeclinable and that they do not have system. Probably, the author did not understand very much of the system of concord. The *Arte da lingua de Cafre* hardly contains any information of tenses aspects and moods, since only the Latin categories are exhibited and translated, so that a learner could find the equivalent of the Latin or Portuguese forms.

7.3 Parts of speech

7.3.1 Adaptations of the traditional model

Most grammarians follow the classical classification of eight different parts of speech. The anonymous grammar of Hindi ‘reduces’ Hindi word-classes into nine parts of speech, adding the ‘artículo’. Rodrigues uses three different models, the traditional system with eight, his own classification with ten parts of speech, adding the ‘article’ and ‘particle’, and also the tripartite division inherited from Japanese grammatical theory. The Arabic grammars follow the traditional Arabic tripartite division between noun, verb and particle, as occurs with the Hebrew grammar of da Paz.

7.3.2 Articles

Since the Greek language has definite articles, Greek grammarians invented a name for it, the ‘arthron’, whereas the Latin language does not have definite articles. The technical term *articulum* (‘artículo, ‘artigo’) became superfluous and was re-introduced in the Renaissance. As we have noticed in this study, the term is used for totally different purposes, and reflects the creativity of the missionary linguists.¹ The Hindi grammar distinguishes the ‘artículo finito’ in order to mark number and gender, whereas the term ‘artículo indefinitivo’, or ‘indefinito’ is used also to mark case; they are equivalents of the contracted forms ‘do’, ‘ao’ etc. In the paradigms, postpositions, such as *ka*, *kè* are labeled as ‘artículo indefinitivo’ and they are particularly used in possessive constructions. Rodrigues also uses the terms ‘partículas’ and ‘artigo’, which are both independent parts of speech, for specific purposes. The ‘particle’, which is the ninth part of speech, are divided into two different categories, the ‘partículas articulares’ and other which are used for honorific forms (“honra somente”). These ‘partículas’ are attached to verbs (honorifics, compounds, tenses, moods negative forms, adverbs, conjunctions, nouns which have the “force of verbs” (tem força de verbo), i.e. *te, ni, fa*, or, *te, ni, vo, fa*. The tenth part of speech, the ‘artigo’ are those ‘particles’ which correspond with the Latin case-endings of the nouns.

In the grammars of Tupi, the term ‘artículo/artigo’ is opposed to the ‘pronome’. This distinction was necessary in order to explain the different sets of personal prefixes which exist in a language with an active structure. The ‘artigos’ *a, ere, o, oro, ya, pe* and *o* (with a second set *ai, eriei, oi, proi, yai, pei* and *o*) co-occur with verbs of the type *ajucà* (“I kill”), the first conjugation of Figueira, and the ‘pronouns’ *xê, ndê, y, ore, yande, pe*, and *y*, are attached to verbs of the type *Xemãenduar* (“I remember”), which is Figueira’s second conjugation. The division into two conjugations, is based on the specific set of personal prefixes. Mamiani uses the term ‘artigo’ for different purposes. Nouns and verbs have certain variation in some ‘articles’, or ‘particles’ which are connected differently: they serve as possessive pronouns to nouns (*Meus, Tuus, Suus*) and as ‘substantive pronouns’ to verbs (*Ego, Tu, Ille*). The diversity of these ‘articles’ is the fundamental criterion of how we divide (classify) nouns and verbs, and the same distinction is used as a common rule for one and another.

1. See Zwartjes (1993) and Ramajo Caño (1987:65–66). The Greek word ‘arthron’ means link, joint and sometimes the term was used for such a purpose, being a link between verb and noun. The preposition has this function, as described by Philip Melancthon (1497–1560) (quoted in Padley 1976:51).

7.4 Extra-grammatical information

The dictionaries have not been the main topic of this study. It is obvious that missionaries usually give much more information about history, culture, flora, ethnology, musicology, arts, and so on in their lexicographical studies than in their grammars. Nevertheless, some grammars also include such information. Rodrigues's grammar is the most comprehensive source which contains information about indigenous culture, and on the other extreme we find the anonymous grammars of Hindi, Marathi, and Sena which hardly contain any information devoted to the local people, their religions, their traditions, etc.

Almost every grammar, however, contains some information about the languages and their varieties, although they do not deal with such topics in a systematic way. In the Indian subcontinent we find some observations of the difference between the speech of the Brahmans and the non-Brahmans. It is again the work of Rodrigues which supplies most details concerning language variation, high and low registers, the language of the people of the regions of Kyoto and varieties from other regions, sociolects, children's and women's speech, and so on. In Brazil, we find only some remarks by Anchieta related to regional differentiation, and Dias only mentions the fact that not all the Ambundos speak the same Angolan dialect. The Arabic grammars of Baptista and de Sousa are prescriptive grammars of Classical Arabic, although Baptista's contains a short paragraph on 'vulgar pronunciation', unlike the Spanish Franciscan grammars of Arabic which concentrate on the colloquial language.

7.5 A Portuguese tradition?

Is it meaningful to speak of the specific contribution of Jesuits of a particular 'nationality' or linguistic area? The Jesuits in the Spanish and Portuguese colonies had different native tongues, and a great number of them composed their work in a language other than their mother tongue. Generally, it does not make much sense to trace 'nationalities' among Jesuits. In the Portuguese tradition, we can note the Spanish Jesuit Joseph de Anchieta was born in S. Cristóval de La Laguna, Tenerife, being a native speaker of Spanish, and his father Juan de Anchieta was a Basque from Guipúzcoa. Anchieta wrote the first grammar of Tupi in Portuguese and also composed literary works in Castilian, Portuguese, Latin and Tupi. A century later, the Italian Jesuit Luis Vicêncio Mamiani wrote a grammar of Kipeá-Kirirí. Anchieta was educated in Portugal, and it would be an arduous task to trace any 'Spanish' characteristics in his grammar written in Portuguese. The same applies to Mamiani: are there any traces of Italian grammars in his description of Kipeá-Kirirí? We

do not exclude such a possibility, but even if elements could be traced, this would affect only the microstructure, since the macrostructure follows that of ‘universal renaissance grammar’. Thomas Stephens was born in Bulstan, Wiltshire, in England. Being a Catholic, he left England for Rome, where he completed his novitiate in the Society of Jesus in 1575. He sailed from Lisbon to Goa, where he spent the rest of his life working among the Brahmin Catholics of Salsette, in the college of Espírito Santo, Todos os Santos and Santo Ignácio, usually called the College of Rachol. Stephens learned Hindustani and also mastered Marathi, Konkani and Sanskrit. Again, the same question could be raised (though this has hardly been done to date): how ‘English’ is the grammar of Stephens? It is also known that the Jesuits studied foreign cultures and even adapted themselves to the manners of the countries they lived in. Francis Xavier arrived in 1549 in Japan and insisted that followers should respect and understand Japanese culture. Both in Japan and China Jesuits gained the status of Confucian scholars as an introduction to their missionary life, and even became key figures in the Chinese civil service. Given that Jesuits were indeed so sensitive to foreign cultures and even allowed a dialogue between the European and the ‘other’, it would be totally unimportant and non-significant to highlight the specific ‘national’ character of a certain Jesuit, or the language he spoke in his home country as his native tongue. So much for the nationality of Jesuit missionaries.

There are fewer works written in Portuguese, compared with those in Spanish. Often it does make sense to define different schools within the Spanish tradition, based on geographical criteria, such as the Philippine tradition of missionary linguistics, the Mexican, or the Andean, and even within these areas, sometimes local traditions can be even distinguished, such as the Jesuit tradition of New Spain, the Jesuit ‘school of Juli’ in the Andes, etc. It will be obvious that such classifications cannot be made in the Portuguese tradition, since fewer grammars survived, and from many regions only one or two works are available. A work written in a specific region with less common features could possibly represent a broader linguistic local tradition, but if not many works survived, it will be difficult, if not impossible, to talk about ‘schools’. The same applies for the distinction between the works of Catholics from different orders. In the Spanish colonies, we see that sometimes Jesuits produced different works from those of Augustinians, Dominicans or Franciscans. Since only one source of our corpus was not composed by a Jesuit (the Bengali grammar of the Augustinian Manuel de Assumpção, leaving apart the Arabic and Hebrew grammars), such comparisons do not make sense at all. In most cases, it will be safer to talk about the specific features of the work of a certain individual, rather than manifestations of a regional school or a religious order. Due to the diversified and heterogeneous background of the authors discussed and the typological differences between the languages, we have been able to quote a great

number of examples which illustrate that they were forced to adapt the Latin model and it is needless to say that this model predominated, since it was the only universal model available at the time. Nevertheless, we have seen that the Arabic and Hebrew grammars were following other examples than Álvares, Barros or Oliveira, since they were derived from western grammars of Arabic and Hebrew which were partially inspired by the Arabic and Hebrew grammatical tradition.

Finally, one of the most important contributions of these missionaries to historiography is the fact that they were pioneers in several topics which today belong to specific subfields of linguistics, such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, translation theories and practices, and even beyond linguistics: culture, history, geography, and (linguistic) anthropology.

Since this monograph concentrates on grammars, we hope that in the near future research will be continued, in particular in the field of lexicography. In an appendix, we shall give a brief account of the most important bilingual Portuguese dictionaries.

APPENDIX

Lexicography

1. The Indian subcontinent

1.1 The Indian lexicographical tradition

1.1.1 *Sanskrit*

Although lexicography is not the main topic of this study, we shall briefly give a survey – not a comprehensive one – of the most important dictionaries of the languages of the Indian subcontinent. In Vogel (1979) we find a list of bilingual and multilingual dictionaries from the Indian lexicographical tradition. In the 11th century mention should be made of the *Vastukoṣa* of Nāgavarman, a Sanskrit-Kanarese dictionary (Vogel 1979: 379). Another Sanskrit-Kanarese dictionary was composed in 1398–1399, the *Abidhāna* of Abhinava Mangarāja. Vogel (1979: 379) mentions an anonymous Sanskrit-Kawi dictionary which was meant to facilitate the reading of works of Old Javanese literature and he (1979: 380–383) identifies a list of administrative terms in Marathi, Telugu, and Persian with their equivalents in Sanskrit from the 17th century. Other dictionaries and wordlists to which he refers include an anonymous Sanskrit-Newari dictionary possibly written in Kathmandu between 1450 and 1750, a Persian-Sanskrit dictionary from 1365 and another from the 16th century, a Sanskrit-Tibetan encyclopedia with 9,565 entries from the 9th century, an 18th-century Tibetan-Sanskrit dictionary containing 15,000 words and a Chinese-Sanskrit vocabulary of Buddhist terms from the period of Emperor K'ang-shi (1662–1723). Also from the 18th century is a pentaglot lexicon of Buddhist terms in Sanskrit, Tibetan, Manchu, Mongol and Chinese compiled in Peking.

1.1.2 *Tamil*

As we observed in the second chapter (Section 2.1) there exists an important local pre-Christian 'grammatical' tradition in Tamil. One of the most important treatises is the *Tolkappiyam*, which according to some scholars dates back to 1000 B.C.¹ Its first part is on orthography, the second on morphology and the third on literary conventions and usages (Thani Nayagam 1970: 69). We must not exclude the

1. According to Chevillard & Passerieu (1989: 415) *Tolkappiyam*: "est considéré comme l'œuvre la plus ancienne et serait date du début de l'ère chrétienne".

possibility that missionaries collecting their linguistic data used also local sources in Tamil. For a historiography of Tamil lexicography, see James (1991 and 2000).

1.2 Dictionaries compiled by Europeans

It has been documented that Henriques Henriques also had begun a bilingual dictionary in about 1549, possibly Tamil-Portuguese “with easy translations adapted to the level of the people”, and possibly another in the 1590s, both lost (James 2007: 273–274).

Antão de Proença/Antoine de Proënza S.J. (1625–c.1666) compiled a Tamil-Portuguese dictionary entitled *Vocabulario tamulico com a significacão portugueza*. This *Vocabulario* was printed in Ambalacat in July 1679, with the Portuguese in movable type and the Tamil on wood blocks cut by Ignacio Arcamone (1615–1683) (Streit 1929: vol. V: 154, no. 440; Gomes Rodeles 1913: 165; Sommervogel 1890, vol. VI, col. 1241). This work contains 16,546 entries and does not follow the traditional order of the Tamil syllabary (James 2007: 275).² Proença acknowledges his predecessor Ignacio Bruno (1585–1659), whose dictionary has been lost. Proença was also inspired by Roberto de Nobili (1577–1656) and Manoel Martins (c.1597–c.1656). His *Vocabulario* was further revised by Fathers Antonio Pereira, Valeriano Catáneo, and others (see the recent study of James 2009: 276–278; cf. James 1991: 60–66 and 2000: 96–105). As James (2000: 97) demonstrates, “De Proença generally excluded literary words, and relied on a large collection of colloquial items, both Brahmin (Grantha) and words peculiar to the usage popular among ‘inferior’ social classes and the rural population”. He listed headwords in Tamil script, but in Latin A-B-C order, according to Portuguese phonological convention, saying that “It will be easier for them to look up the words in the order of their own alphabet... The work was aimed at Portuguese speakers...”. James (2000: 105) also mentions another version ascribed to Domingos Madeyra (1685–175?) entitled *Vocabulario thamulico lusitano*. The manuscript, dated 1750, is in the State Central Library, Panaji (MS M37).³ Other Tamil dictionaries include the following:

- Joannis de Cerqueyra, *Dictionarium Tamulico-Grandonicum seu potius Malabarico-Grandonicum compositum* (“Tamil-Grantha, or rather Malabar-Grantha dictionary”).⁴

2. As James observes (2007: 276) this practice was not adopted by Costanzo Beschi.

3. I could not verify if this text is the same as the *Vocabulario tamulico-lusitano* and the *Vocabulario lusitano-tamulico* mentioned by Lopes (1969: 153) as in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris.

4. Albert I Royal Library, Brussels, MS 21868 (Lopes 1969: 157; cf. James 2000: 105).

- João Ernesto (d. 1732), *Vocabulario malavarico* (MS, 1730).⁵
- Baltazar Esteves da Cruz, SJ: *Vocabulario lusitano-tamulico*, 1738.⁶
- Balthasar da Costa (c.1610–1673): *Vocabulario portuguez-tamul et arte tamulica* (printed without compiler's name at Ambalacat in c.1680).⁷

As we mentioned in Section 2.1 above, the Jesuit Johann Ernst Hanxleden compiled an unpublished dictionary entitled *Dictionarium samscredamico-lusitanum* with Antão (Anton, Antonio) Pimentel (fl. 1721–1751) and Bernhard Bischofinck (c.1691–c.1746), and according to Streit (1929, vol. 5.222), this author also wrote an unpublished *Dictionarium Malabarico-Lusitanum*.

In Ceylon, more dictionaries were written of both Sinhalese and Tamil. Jacome Gonçalves (1676–1742) compiled a *Diccionario de palavras selectas* in 1731 and a *Vocabulario lusitano tamulico e chingalatico* (“Portuguese, Tamil and Sinhalese vocabulary”) in 1735, neither of which has yet been published (James 2000: 121).⁸ Machado (1965[1741]: vol 2.472–474) also mentions the following works of Gonçalves:

- *Cathecismo breve sobre os principaes Mysterios da Fé* (1715)
- *Vocabulario Chingala Lusitano* (1730)
- *Vocabulario Lusitano Chingala*
- *Vocabulario Lusitano Tamulico, e Chingala com a declaração das frases Chingalas*
- *Diccionario breve de palavras selectas, e deficeis da Coronica, e Evangelhos*.

Two other works from Ceylon may be mentioned here. The first is Euzebio do Rosario's *Vocabulario ordenado para os que se applicaõ ao Tamil, e chingala comecado pello Portuguez, proseguido pello Tamil, e accabado pello Chingala* of 1772. According to E. Pieries (1961) this is a copy or an adaptation of Gonçalves' *Vocabulario lusitano tamulico e chingalatico* of 1735 (cf. James 2000: 125).⁹ The second

5. University of Coimbra, Catálogo de manuscritos [da Biblioteca da Universidade]: códices 1081 a 1311. Coimbra (1935: 10). I acknowledge Paolo Aranha for this link on-line: http://bdigital.sib.uc.pt/bg3/UCBG-Ms-1090/UCBG-Ms-1090_item1/index.html

6. State Central Library, Panaji (James 2000: 105).

7. State Central Library, Panaji, MS M35, *Vocabulario lusitano-tamulico*, is attributed to him (cf. James 2000: 96 and 2007: 274).

8. Streit & Dindinger (1931: 217) give a variant title for the latter, *Vocabulario lusitano-tamulico-chingala com declaração de suas frases*.

9. Fonseca (2006: 336) includes in her appendix a grammar and dictionary written by Pedro de Bras, entitled *Arte e Vocabulário [da língua chingalá]*. She reports (loc. cit.) that the Sociedade de Geografia de Lisboa houses three more manuscripts, one attributed to Gonçalves, *Vocabulario Portuguez Tamul e Chingala* and two anonymous and undated, *Vocabulário chingalítico et lusitano* and *Vocabulario luzitano, tamulico, e chingalítico*.

is the *Vocabulario portuguez e malabar*, 67 folios of a manuscript *Grammatica tamulica* by Onorato de Udine (Honoratus Utinensis), dated 1793, which comprises a grammar of Tamil in Latin including Tamil-Latin wordlists. There follows a two-folio “Vocabulario das palavras malabares mais frequentes nos discursos, com a sua explicação em idioma portuguez” (James 2000: 125).

1.3 Konkani

In a footnote to Section 2.3.1 above, we mentioned Diego Ribeiro’s dictionary of the Konkani language, *Vocabulario da lingua Canarim*, of 1626 (Sommervogel 1890: 1: cols. 188–189; Gomes Rodeles 1913: 157; Machado 1965[1741]: vol 1.690–691). According to Fonseca (2006: 338), another copy of the same work has a different title: *Vocabulario da lingoa da terra (canarim)*.¹⁰ Another anonymous manuscript from the 17th century, containing only the Konkani-Portuguese second part, with the title *Vocabulario da lingoa Canarina com versam portugueza*, was reprinted in facsimile by the Junta de Investigações do Ultramar in 1973.

More dictionaries of Konkani were composed, although not all of them survived. Most were written in Portuguese, with a minority in Latin:

- Anonymous, *Vocabulario Canarim com alfabeto Portuguez*. Jesuit archives, Rome. As Naik (2010) has recently demonstrated, this vocabulary was probably written by one of the Jesuit successors of Diogo Ribeiro, containing 1,000 entries more than Ribeiro’s dictionary.
- Miguel de Almeida, *Vocabularium Benedicti Pereyra conversum in linguam concanicam et divisum in duas partes: altera explicat vocabula lusitana in lingua concanicam, altera explicat vocabula concanica in linguam lusitanicam* (MS, apparently no longer extant) (Fonseca 2006: 335).
- Gaspar de São Miguel, O.F.M. (c. 1595–1647), *Dictionarium et ars lingua Canarinae* (MS, 17th century). The same author also wrote a dictionary in Portuguese entitled *Diccionario da lingua canarina, e portugueza* (MS, no longer extant) (Fonseca 2006: 338), and a *Vocabulario da Lingua Portugues e Canari*, conserved in the Central Library of Panaji, Goa (Naik 2010).¹¹
- Manuel Banha, *Vocabulario da lingua concani* (MS, no longer extant) (Fonseca 2006: 335). Streit (1929: vol. 5.221) also mentions a Konkani-Portuguese

10. Biblioteca de Ajuda, 46-VIII-36.

11. Gaspar de São Miguel does not have an entry in Machado. He also wrote a book of sermons and an apologetical work with a description of the manners of the Hindus and a refutation of their religion (Meersman 1960: 450). Fonseca (2006: 338), citing Simão Cardoso, mentions also an unpublished grammar written in Portuguese, *Arte da lingua canarina*, perhaps of 1640.

dictionary with a different title, *Dictionarium linguae Canarinae et lusitanae* (MS, 17th century) (cf. Cunha 1958[1858]: 223).

- Antonio de Saldanha, S.J. (1598–1663), *Vocabulario de lingua Concanica* (MS, 17th century, no longer extant) (Streit 1929: vol. 5.230; Cunha 1958[1858]: 222 and 227; Machado 1965[1741]: vol.1.382; Fonseca 2006: 339). Antonio Saldanha was born in Morocco and came to Goa in 1615. He also compiled a work entitled *Varios modos de fallar* (Naik 2010).
- Anonymous, *Vocabulario da lingoa Canerim do Norte*, dated 1664 (MS, 17th century, now at King's College, London) (Streit 1929: vol. 5.236). According to Naik, it is probably the work of a Franciscan.
- Leo Cinnamo S.J., (?) *Vocabulario Canarin vertido en Portuguesa* (MS) (Streit: *ibid.*).

Finally, the National Library of Lisbon conserves two more anonymous manuscripts from the 16th or the 17th century, entitled *Vocabulario da lingoa canari. Começa polo alphabeto dos nomes da nossa lingoa pera que mais facil mente se achẽ os nomes que buscarmos* (Cod. 3044) and the *Vocabulario da lingua [sic] canarim* (Cod. 3195) (Fonseca 2006: 340).

1.4 Hindi

The anonymous Hindi grammar discussed at Section 2.5 above occupies 51 pages of a larger work, in the rest of which (pp. 52–136) word lists are included: 'frazes indostanas', 'modo de contar', 'partes do anno', 'nomes de mezes', 'dias de lua', 'dias de somana', 'nomes de Christo, que se lem na Escripura Sagrada', 'In Veteri Testamento', 'In Novo Testamento', 'nomes que se atribuem a Deos', 'nomes dos Bemaventurados', 'de Virtudes', 'das couzas celestes', 'nomes pertencentes ao orbe da terra', 'clima', 'partes do corpo', 'animaes', 'vestidos, e joyas', 'cor de pannos', 'officios mechanicos e seus instrumentos', 'Officios, que el Rey dà no Palacio, na Corte, e fora della', 'doenças', 'mezinhas em commum', 'pedras preciosas, e outras mais', 'arvores', 'frutas', 'ervas, e raizes', 'paõ e legumes', 'flores e sementes', 'couzas mineraes', followed by an extensive list of 'particles'. Finally, the vocabulary includes 'Nomes de parentes', 'vicios', 'caseyros', 'jogos', 'de Varoens, e Matronas insignes de Escripura, e for a della', 'nomes de varias condiçoens de homens', 'nomes, e termos, que se encontraõ nas sciencias', 'nomes dos Reys (que tem havido neste Indostan)'. In fact, the Portuguese anonymous work resembles the word lists of Joan Josua Ketelaar (1659–1718), which are arranged according to the order of the Latin reader *Ianua linguarum resereta* of 1631 by Jan Amos Komenský (Comenius, 1592–1670)

(Bhatia & Machida 2008, vol. 1: 64). The lexicon is organised according to the world of the Bible: first the creator, then other things follow.¹²

1.5 Other languages

There are also trilingual or multilingual dictionaries which deserve mention here, since they also include Portuguese:

- *Nieuwe Woordenschat, uyt het Nederduitsch in het Gemeene Maleidsch en Portugeesch, zeer Gemakkelijk voor die eerst op Batavia komen* (1780) (Lopes 1969: 155).¹³
- Augustin Aussant, *Vocabulaire français, anglais, portugais de l'Inde, persan, maure et bengale, contenant de 3700 à 3800 mots* (MS, written at Chandernagore in 1782, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris) and *Vocabulaire bengal, français et portugais de l'Inde* (1785).

Finally, we mention again Manoel de Assumpçam's *Vocabulario em Idioma Bengala e Portuguez* of 1743, in which the grammar analysed at Section 2.4 above appears.

2. Japan

2.1 The Japanese lexicographical tradition.

The earliest dictionary compiled in Japan is not a dictionary of Japanese but of Chinese, and dates from 683. The earliest sources are mainly from the Heian period (794–1185) and Bailey labels these work as “dictionary-like compilations”, which are “in fact not Japanese language dictionaries at all, but rather dictionaries of Chinese characters written in Chinese. For the Japanese dictionaries, I refer to Bailey (1960).

In Section 3.2.3.3 we described the *Rakuyōshū*, or *Ra cu yo xu sive Dictionarium Japonicum; Characteres habet hinc Sinicus, illinc Iapponicus* (Marsden

12. For Ketelaar's grammar of Hindustani of 1698, cf. Hvenkilde (1979), and for this and Rüell's of Sinhala (1700), cf. Zwartjes & Pytlowany, in preparation. In the Spanish missionary grammar of Arabic of Lucas Cavallero and Juan de la Encarnación we see a comparable thematic arrangement of the word lists.

13. There are copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, and the Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague. From a linguistic point of view, this work is interesting, since it contains colloquial Portuguese as it was spoken in Batavia, written in Dutch orthography (as “piknienoe”, ‘kourtou’, ‘goordoe’, ‘apertadoe’, etc. (Lopes 1969: 155). For more details concerning the Portuguese Creole, I refer to Maurer (2003).

1796: 76), which is difficult to classify according to Western standards. Bailey (1960–1961: 300) characterizes the work as “dictionary of characters” and not as a “dictionary of words”, whereas Maës (1975d) labels the work as “Le dictionnaire de langue et d’histoire, un dictionnaire de type analytique”. Bailey does not exclude the possibility that the compilers of the *Rakuyōshū* had been inspired by Chinese dictionaries written by Europeans (Bailey 1960–1961: 323).

2.2 The Vocabulario of 1595 and the Dictionarium of 1603–1604

A *Vocabulario da Lingoa de Iapam com a declaração em Portugues* was published at Nagasaki by the Collegio de Iapam da Companhia de Iesus in 1603, with a supplement which appeared in 1604. A facsimile edition was published by Iwanami Shoten in 1960. According to Cooper (1976: 418) it has 800 pages containing 32,798 entries. It has been erroneously attributed by some scholars, such as Boxer (1967: 195), to João Rodrigues, but this person can not be the same one as the João Rodrigues who was the author of the grammar analysed in Chapter 3 above.¹⁴ According to Moran (1993: 182) the chief supervising editor of the *Vocabulario* was a certain Francisco Rodrigues, the teacher in Japanese of Valignano and Bishop Cerqueira.

As has been demonstrated in Chapter 3, Rodrigues described mainly the language spoken by the court of the Kyoto region (in the capital of Myaco), although he often provides useful information concerning the lower registers and the spoken varieties of this language. In the Japanese tradition colloquial speech was regarded as deserving no serious attention at all, and serious study of it starts in the nineteenth century (Atsuko Tashiro 2004: 211). The main purpose of the *Vocabulario* was much more descriptive than prescriptive and focused on the spoken language. This does not mean that the editors recorded the several varieties without any prejudice, since they often labelled entries in terms of “good” and “bad”, particularly terms related to elegance and politeness. The editors compiled a dictionary which was supposed to be an adequate tool for learning to speak, and not for learning to read Japanese (Cooper 1976: 418), although they also included information concerning the more prestigious language.

This was not the first Japanese dictionary written by Europeans; in 1595 an anonymous trilingual Latin-Portuguese-Japanese dictionary, *Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum*, was published in Amakusa.¹⁵ Kishimoto (2005: 207;

14. Weber (1912/online): “Rodrigues compiled also a Japanese-Portuguese dictionary (Nagasaki, 1603)”. See for more details Boxer (1949–1950: 351).

15. There is another version in manuscript in the Biblioteca da Ajuda in Lisbon and a reprint prepared by Pietro Marietti for the *Propaganda Fide* Press published in 1870 in Rome with the title *Lexicon Latino-Iaponicum* (Streit 1928: 514, cf. Verdelho 1995: 368, note 40). The Portuguese translations are not included, hence this edition is bilingual Latin-Japanese (Lopes 1969: 141).

Table A.1 Calepino dictionaries

1545-Antwerp	Latin	Greek	German	Flemish	French				
1545/6-Venice	Latin	Greek	Italian						
1559-Lyon	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish					
1565-Lyon	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French				
1568-Basle	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German			
1570-Lyon	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Hebrew		
1570-Basle	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Flemish		
1584-Basle	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Hebrew	Flemish	
1585-Lyon	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Hebrew	English	Polish
									Hungarian
1590-Basle	Latin	Greek	Italian	Spanish	French	German	Hebrew	Flemish	English Polish\
									Hungarian
1595-Amakusa	Latin	Portuguese	Japanese						

2006: 18) demonstrates that the main source of this monumental work was the dictionary of the Italian lexicographer Ambrosio Calepino (1440–1510), particularly the 1570 edition published in Lyon.

The Calepino dictionary was originally a monolingual dictionary of Latin, but changed gradually, from the middle of the 16th century onwards, into a multilingual dictionary, as the following table based on Verdelho (1995: 342) illustrates.

According to Streit (1929, vol. 5, 579), the author or compiler of this anonymous work has been identified as the Jesuit Manuel Barreto (born in Feira, Portugal in 1564 and died in Nagasaki in 1620), who also composed a *Vocabulario Portuguez-Japonico*, a manuscript which is no longer extant. Other possible sources are the Latin-Portuguese-Spanish dictionary of 1634 by Bento Pereira S. J. (1605–1681), the Portuguese-Latin and Latin-Portuguese dictionary of 1570 by Jerónimo Cardoso (c.1500–c.1569) and the Latin-Spanish dictionary of 1492 by Elio Antonio de Nebrija (1441/44?–1522). As has been demonstrated by Messner (1999) the Portuguese sections of the *Dictionarium* are direct translations from the Latin examples of the Calepino. Kishimoto (2006: 25) concludes that the editors “translated the Latin entries of the original Calepino into Portuguese and Japanese. Most of the Japanese were clearly translated from the Portuguese translations written beforehand, though many appear to be based on the original Latin as well as the Portuguese.... In several cases, they also modified the Latin and Portuguese and provided original Japanese explanations to help the readers understand things and concepts unfamiliar to them in their culture”.

As Boxer observed (1967: 195), this dictionary was mainly intended for learners of Japanese, since “native scholars began to study their own tongue scientifically until much later”. However, this was not its only purpose: it was also composed

for Japanese learners studying Latin (Kishimoto 2006: 17). The Portuguese language was probably not the object of study, as Messner observed.¹⁶ Since the Latin entries are given first in this dictionary, followed by the corresponding Portuguese and finally the Japanese equivalents, it is indeed mainly intended for learners of Japanese who already know Latin.

The *Dictionarium* of 1603–1604 is arranged alphabetically starting with Japanese, followed by the Portuguese equivalents. This dictionary was not only intended as a tool for missionaries to learn the Japanese language. It is actually also a huge compilation of ethnographic and knowledge of the time in Japan, and it includes several technical terms from Buddhism and Japanese literature. Like Rodrigues' grammar, the *Vocabulario* provides the reader with detailed information about regional varieties, particularly *Ximo* (Kyushu) and *Cami* (Kyoto) speech, but also varieties from other kingdoms, such as the speech of the kingdom of Vouari or Owari (Cooper 1976: 418). Women's or children's words are also labelled as such. Words related to Japanese religious practices are labelled as B (Buppo). Cooper (1976: 423) counts fifty terms related to Buddhism and Shintoism under the letter 'A' alone, and more than a hundred under 'B'. In order to accommodate differences in language usage, multiple equivalents are sometimes given.

The compilers were not the first in codifying distinctions in language usage. One of the first Europeans who wrote about Japan, Alessandro Valignano, already described some characteristics of the Japanese language in detail:

Tienen todos una lengua, que es la mejor y más elegante y copiosa que se sabe en lo descubierto, porque es más abundante y exprime mejor su[s] conceptos que la nuestra latina; porque fuera de tener mucha variedad de nombres, que significan una mesma cosa, tiene de su naturaleza una manera de elegancia y honrra, que nose pueda tratar con todas las personas ni de todas las cosas, con los mesmos nombres y verbos, antes conforme a la qualidad de las personas y de las cosas han de usar de sus vocablos altos y baxos, de desprecio y de honrra; y de una manera hablan y de otra escriben, y es muy diferente el hablar de los hombres del de las mugeres. (Valignano ed. Wicki 1944: 152–153)

[They have all one language, which is the best and most elegant and copious which is known in the discovered world, since it is more abundant and it expresses its concepts better than our Latin language, since, apart from having much variation in synonyms, it has from its nature a way of elegance and honour, so that it is not possible to treat with all individuals, nor with all things using the same nouns and verbs, but this must be in agreement with quality of the persons and things; high and low words must be used, words of contempt and of honour, and they speak in one way, and they write in another, and women's talk is very different from men's speech.]

16. "Die portugiesischen Definitionen sind daher nicht Selbstzweck, sondern nur eine Hilfe zum Verständnis und bilden nicht einen eigenständigen Wörterbuchteil" (Messner 1999: 51).

2.3 Meta-linguistic terms in the dictionaries

Rodrigues wrote his grammar mainly for Portuguese-speakers or novices who were able to read Portuguese with some knowledge of Latin grammar. The Amakusa edition of Álvares's grammar and the *Dictionarium* were mainly written for Japanese learners of Latin. In the third chapter, we saw that Japanese terminology was included in Rodrigues' grammars. The terminology employed was predominantly phonological, though some was also applied to literary styles and the tenses of the verb. Most of these terms, such as *firacu*, *subaru* and *nigoru* (1604–1608: 173v–176r), are also registered in the *Vocabulario de Iapam* and deal with pronunciation. The subclasses of the written styles are also rendered in Japanese, such as the 'estillo *naiden* ("escrituras das sectas de Iapam, que propriamente tratam das cousas da saluaçam, da philosophia natural)" (1604–1608: 184v) and 'Estilo *gueden* (=Zocuxo)' ("pertence soamente ao secular, como a leys, bom gouerno do reyno, artes liberaes, historia, cartas, &c.") (1604–1608: 185r). It will be tempting to search also for meta-linguistic terminology in the Latin *Dictionarium* for the reconstruction of Japanese terminology of that period. Which strategies were used by the editors and which didactic purposes did they have? Did they include Japanese equivalents for Latin categories, such as *gerundium*, *supinum* and *nominativus*? How did the editors translate them?

Unfortunately, the dictionary does not supply many details. The result of our inquiry is minimal. Under *accusatiuus* we find only the literary non-linguistic meaning (Port. 'aquillo polo q̃ acusamos') The entry *ablatiuus casus* is not translated into Japanese at all and we find only the explanation *est sextus casus apud latinos*). A comparable definition can be found under *vocatiuus*: "Apud grāmaticos, vt vocatiuus casus. Lus. Caso polo qual chamamos a alguem. Iap. *Fitouo yobu cotobano tenifa*", whereas no entry is included for *nominatiuus*, *genitiuus*, *datiuus*. We would expect, as explained by Haguenaer (1976: 243–244), that Japanese equivalents for 'declension' and 'conjugation' would be included as well, but this was apparently not the teaching practice of the Jesuits in Japan. The Jesuits in Japan could have used Japanese translations or explanations of Latin terminology in the classrooms, but the editors apparently did not decide to register them all in the Latin-Portuguese dictionary. As Haguenaer (1976: 244) concluded: "c'est par la pratique, et en les obligeant à apprendre par cœur des exemples et des textes, que les Jésuites ont enseigné les rudiments du latin à leurs élèves japonais".

Nevertheless, the *Dictionarium* does include some entries related to grammatical terminology, and some are translated into Japanese, which have not been recorded by Haguenaer. Under the entry *verbum* we find not only the meaning in its non-metalinguistic sense ("palaura") and the Japanese counterpart *cotoba*, but also the definition in Latin "Est pars orationis, quae per tempora, & personas declinatur" – but unfortunately the compilers did not translate this definition into

Japanese. No comparable definition is given for *nomen* but only the Portuguese and Japanese translations ('nome' and Japanese *na*). The editors include a definition for *pronomen* without equivalents in Portuguese and Japanese ("vna ex octo orationis partibus ita dicta, quod vice nominis fungatur").¹⁷ Under the entry *coniunctio* we find the Portuguese *conjunção da oração, das palauras, &c.* which is also translated into Japanese: *cotobauo cusan auasuru tenifa* (*cusan, cusari* = "chain", *auasuru* "join"). There are no traces of Rodrigues' Latin equivalents of the term 'particula', but it is interesting that Rodrigues was apparently not the first grammarian in Japan who classified the 'article' as an independent part of speech, since we find under the entry *articulus* – among other meanings – "parte da oraçam, ou periodo". The Japanese translation is also given: *Cutono fedate* (= "divider in script", i.e. the "periodo" as a graphic punctuation, not as a grammatical concept).¹⁸ Finally, we find a definition exemplified by the Latin demonstratives: *Item, est particula, quae indeclinatis nominibus praeponitur, vt, hic, haec, hoc*. Unfortunately, no Japanese 'articles' or 'particles' are given here as examples, so we will not be able to reconstruct which Japanese 'particles' were recognized and described as such in this "pre-Rodrigues" source. The term 'particle' is not included at all, and the 'article' is only translated as "juntura dos membros", which is the original meaning of the concept borrowed from Greek.

Diego de Collado (d.1638), author of a Latin-language grammar of Japanese, also produced a dictionary (Collado 1638b) and a catechism (Collado 1638c). The first was mainly based on the *Dictionarium* of 1603–1604, but he warns his readers that they should rely on the Spanish, rather than on the Latin explanation of Japanese, since he added the Latin version at the last minute by order of his superiors of the *Propaganda Fide*.¹⁹

3. China and Cochinchina (Vietnam)

3.1 Introduction

There are no extant grammars of Chinese and Vietnamese written in Portuguese, but it is known that others relied on previous Portuguese sources which have been

17. Cf. *participium* "pars orationis apud Grammaticos", *adverbium* "quasi iuxta verbum dicitur, quia in orationis prope verbum ponitur" and *interiectio* "est pars orationis, animi affectum exprimiens".

18. Toyoshima (personal communication, november 2009).

19. "Mallem etiam te maiorem fidem adhibere proprietati explicationis Hispanicae, quam latinae: quia cum Hispanicam solam ponere decrevissem, fuit necessarium ex superiorum ordine acceleratissime latinam adiicere".

lost. In this chapter the dictionary of Chinese by Michele Ruggieri (1543–1607) and Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) will be discussed first, and in the second place we shall analyse the grammar and dictionary of the *lingua annamitica* of Alexandre de Rhodes (1593–1660), which is based on the work of the Portuguese missionaries Gaspar do Amaral (1594–1646), António Barbosa (1594–1647) and Francisco de Pina (1585–1625), whose works have been lost, except for some letters of the last-named.

3.2 The Chinese linguistic tradition

China has a rich native tradition of phonological study (Norman 1988: 152). The reconstruction of Middle Chinese is based on the native rhyme book *Qìyùn* and later on rhyme tables. In phonological descriptions and classifications, concepts are borrowed from Indian phonological theory and Classical Tibetan sources were possibly also used (Norman 1988: 29–31). Native treatises in Chinese had already been developed some centuries before the Common Era. These linguistic reflections deal with the nature of the language, lexicology and systems of phonological description and dialectology and achieved excellent results (Casacchia 1989: 431). Important information on phonology has also been derived from other non-Western sources written by foreigners.²⁰ An illustrative example is the Korean sinologist and government interpreter Sin Sukchu (1417–1475) whose work reflects a form of the standard language of that period (Coblin 2000: 537). The introduction of Buddhism called for the translation of works in Sanskrit and the necessary transcriptions of foreign words formed the foundations of Chinese phonology (Casacchia 1989: 431). Chinese lexicography developed in the Han period from monolingual commentary on literary classics (Considine 2010: 134–139).

3.3 Chinese dictionaries composed by westerners²¹

As has been observed by Schreyer (1992: 1) the history of the discovery of the Chinese language in the West has not yet been written. The first missions to China were not permanent. They go back as far as the thirteenth century when Franciscans such as Giovanni da Piano Carpini (d. 1252), William of Rubruck (c.1215–1270) and Giovanni da Monte Corvino (1247–1328) set foot in China (cf. Wessels 1924: 4). There is no evidence for any linguistic studies of Chinese by

20. It is, similarly, remarkable that Arabic grammarians and lexicographers were often non-Arabs, e.g. al-Zamakhsharī (1075–1144) and al-Fīrūzābādī (1329–1415), who were Persians.

21. Part of this section is derived from Klöter & Zwartjes (2008).

the Franciscans during the middle ages, as occurred in other regions.²² The traveler Marco Polo (1254–1324) did not mention the Chinese language, which explains why Christopher Columbus (1451–1506) took a Jewish interpreter who could speak Hebrew and Arabic (Schreyer 1992: 3) on his way to “Cathay”. In Asia, the ‘linguistic discovery’ started in the 16th century. European priests encountered languages with a long-standing literary tradition and high cultural prestige. They could benefit from the knowledge of teachers who taught their languages to foreigners. Some missionaries came into contact with Chinese people in Goa. Chinese boys were brought to St. Paul’s College there by 1546 (Witek 2001b: 151–152). One of these boys was Francis Xavier’s future aide Antonio.²³

The Portuguese-Chinese dictionary of 1595, the oldest extant European-Chinese bilingual dictionary, was arranged alphabetically. In the East, there already existed bilingual word lists or glossaries which were arranged semantically. One of the most important glossaries of this kind was the Chinese-Mongolian glossary composed by Qoninci and Mašāih Muhammad entitled *Huá-Yī yìyǔ* (“Chinese-foreign translated words”), composed between 1382 and 1388. Similar works appeared later, including Chinese-Japanese, Chinese-Jurchen, Chinese-Tibetan, Chinese-Vietnamese, Chinese-Korean, Chinese-Malay, and Chinese-Cham (a Malayo-Polynesian language spoken in Vietnam and Cambodia) dictionaries or wordlists (Witek 2001: 180; Considine 2010: 139).

Language teaching in China involved the instruction of the Chinese writing system. The *Libro y relación de las grandezas del Reyno de la China* (1585) of an anonymous Franciscan gives us a good impression of the teaching practices in China:

... y pa[ra] cada cosa tienē la suya, de manera q̄ quātas palabras ay en el mūdo, tātās son las letras vnas de otras diferentes, y con todo esto las aprenden y sabē, y no ay quien no sepa leer, ni aldea por pequeña que sea (como yo lo vi) que no aya escuela para los niños: en las quales enseñan juntamente buenas costūbres, y como han de tratar vnos con otros, y las cortesias que han de hazer a los Magistrados, y a todo genero de gente, y sus leyes, costumbres, y ceremonias: y finalmēte mucha parte de la Philosophia moral... (James & Moran 2003: 80)

22. E.g. the medieval practical handbook *Codex Cumanicus*, which contains several glossaries in Italo-Latin, Persian, German and Cuman Kipçaq, a Turkic language, together with a grammatical compendium and Cuman riddles.

23. Antonio “had spent about seven or eight years (1544–1551) in Goa where he learned Latin. Xavier chose Antonio as his aide in the hope that he would accompany him into China. After the death of Xavier in 1552, Antonio went to the Moluccas and returned to India in 1556. There he was a catechist for the next four years. In 1578, Valignano met him in Macao where Antonio was known as a venerable Christian” (Witek 2001: 151–152).

[There's a separate written word for everything that exists, so that there are as many letters, each different from the others, as there are things in the world, and yet they learn and remember every one. Everyone knows how to read and, as I saw myself, even the tiniest villages have a children's school in which they teach them good manners, how to behave towards each other, and how to address the magistrates and people of all backgrounds correctly, as well as their laws, customs and ceremonies, and a great deal of moral philosophy....] (translation by James & Moran 2003: 81).]²⁴

Chinese was a prestige language for many non-Chinese-speaking cultures, as happens with Arabic in the Muslim world, and with Sanskrit and Pali in association with Buddhism. Chinese became the prestigious literary language of Japan, Korea and Vietnam (cf. Bossong 2007: 126). The Asian-European linguistic encounter therefore contrasts sharply with missionary linguistics in the Americas, where the priests could not rely on any written material and had to develop their own. Although we have several missionary sources in the Americas which explicitly aim at describing the language of the court (e.g. the grammars of Tarascan and Nahuatl, cf. Flores Farfán 2007), priests generally described the vernacular speech of the common people. From the earliest period, historians and missionaries concluded that the Chinese characters were universally understood in the Chinese territories and even beyond. The Jesuit Matteo Ricci wrote as early as 1582 in Spanish that

The Chinese have such different languages in different provinces, that they do not understand each other, other than by writing; for they write the same characters and letters, which, since they are the figures of things and since things have everywhere the same figure, are understood by everyone, although they use different words in different languages. (cited in Schreyer 1992: 9)

According to Ricci's view, all missionaries should speak and write the language of the court known as Mandarin (*guānhuà*, spelled as *cuonhua* by Ricci, or '*la lingua della corte forense*') (Schreyer 1992: 31; Witek 2001: 178). This language "is used in audiences and tribunals", and, "if one learns this, he can use it in all provinces; in addition, even the children and women know enough of it to be able to communicate with all the people of another province" (cited in Coblin 2000: 539).²⁵

24. See also Juan González de Mendoza's *Historia de las cosas mas notables ... de la China* (1585), in Walravens (1987: 87). The *Libro y relación* may have been based on the *Tractado em se cõtam muito por estêso as cousas da China* (1569) of the Dominican friar Gaspar da Cruz (d.1570) (Henning Klöter, personal communication, May 2008).

25. 'Mandarin' in Ruggieri's time referred to the court language of the Nanjing area and was thus not based on the pronunciation of the Beijing area, as is modern Mandarin. "Mandarin" has distinct meanings (Witek 2001: 160). According to the definitions of Coblin (2000: 537) what

Ricci taught Chinese using textbooks on Chinese philosophy and ethics, such as the *Sì Shū* ('Four books') of Confucian learning and one of the *Wǔ Jīng* ('Five Classics') (Schreyer 1992: 31). In 1584, Ruggieri and Ricci sent a Chinese translation of the Decalogue, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria and the Creed to Rome. The first book printed by Europeans in China was Ruggieri's *Tianzhu shilu* ("True Account of God"), published in 1584 (Witek 2001: 155). In 1592, Ricci translated the first six books of Euclid's *Elementa* and published the whole work in Chinese in 1607. His *Treatise on Friendship* (Chiao-yu Lun) is an original work in Chinese written by himself (Schreyer 1992: 34).

The Jesuit Francis Xavier (1506–1552) is one of the first missionaries who mentioned the difference between Chinese and Japanese. The languages were not mutually intelligible but he concluded that "when they write they understand each other only by writing, for they know the signification of the letters, but the pronunciation always remains different" (cited from Schreyer 1992: 5).

The Jesuits became engaged in writing Chinese dictionaries in the late sixteenth century, although it is curious that no comprehensive grammars were published, as was the case in Japan (for details, see Brockey 2007). The Jesuit Michele Ruggieri, who first arrived at the Malabar Coast in November 1578, where he learned the local language, set foot in 1579 in Macao. According to the instructions left behind by Valignano, who was on his way from India to Japan, Ruggieri was asked to focus on learning Mandarin (*guānhuà*) the quasi standard of the literati-officials (Witek 2001: 154). Ruggieri did not attempt to describe one of the regional vernaculars. Ricci wrote in 1582 that there are many different languages in China, but also that "they have still another language which is, as it were, universal and common. And this is the language used by the Mandarins and the court, and to them it is like Latin to us" (cited from Schreyer 1992: 9). Unlike the Portuguese Jesuit João Rodrigues, who could benefit from earlier attempts of missionaries to describe the Japanese language, Ruggieri could only rely on the information supplied by native speakers and he did not have any earlier descriptions by missionaries at his disposal. Unable to find a bilingual Mandarin-Portuguese tutor, he was left learning Mandarin on his own, a "ridiculous task", as he conceded. He decided to learn Chinese in the same manner as the Chinese learned the language

missionaries called "la lengua mandarina, 'falla mādarin' is "the universal standard language or koinè spoken by officials and educated people in traditional China during the Míng (1368–1644) and Qīng (1644–1912) dynasties". The *guānhuà* is the direct continuation of what missionaries called "lengua mandarina". Other senses of the word 'Mandarin' are *zǎoqí guānhuà* ("Old Mandarin"), which dates back to the Yuán period (1260–1368) and *běifāng fāngyán* or *guānhuà fāngyán* which is used for the entire northern or northern-like Chinese speech forms. Finally 'Mandarin' is used as a synonym for Modern Standard Chinese (Norman 1988: 191).

themselves and also learned Chinese from his Chinese master drawing pictures (Brockey 2007: 246). Later he started to study Chinese books in Canton.

Matteo Ricci and Francesco Pasio (1554–1612) could continue the work of their predecessors. Ricci was born in Macerata, Italy, and studied law, philosophy, rhetoric, theology and mathematics in Rome. After having obtained permission for his mission to Goa, he started to study Portuguese in Coimbra where he lived for almost one year in 1577. He arrived in Goa in March 1578. Together with Pasio, Ricci arrived in Macao in August 1582; Ruggieri had been there since 1579 (Dahlmann 1891: 26). Ruggieri and Ricci studied Chinese together in Macao, and in 1583 they opened a first permanent mission in Zhaoqing (Witek 2001: 154).

3.3.1 *The Dicionário Português-Chinês*

Ricci realised that the Chinese language had “neither articles, nor cases, nor numbers, nor genders, nor tenses, nor modes” (Brockey 2007: 247), but as far as we know, he did not attempt to write a grammar. Together with Ruggieri, Ricci compiled his *Dicionário Português-Chinês*, a dictionary of Portuguese words, Chinese characters, and their romanisation.²⁶ (The dictionary has no title; Pasquale D’Elia (1890–1963), a Jesuit who discovered the manuscript, called it *Dizionario portoghese-cinese*.) It was probably prepared between 1583 and 1588 when Ruggieri and Ricci were in Zhaoqing (Witek 2001: 18; Masini 1996b: 239). Messner (cited in Witek 2001: 159) acknowledged that a number of entries were copied from the dictionary of Cardoso. The work contains Italian entries written by Ruggieri (Witek 2001: 165, note 32). The Portuguese entries – approximately 6,000 entries according to Witek (2001: 184) – are not written by the same scribe as the one who wrote the Portuguese entries and there is strong evidence (Witek 2001: 156–157) that they are from Ruggieri’s hand. As has been observed by Brockey, “the first missionaries employed the same texts that Chinese children learned by rote to increase their vocabulary and practice writing characters” (Brockey 2007: 248–249). The romanised Chinese forms in Ruggieri & Ricci’s *Dicionário* have no tone marks (James & Morgan 2003: 9).²⁷ They were apparently written by Ricci, who used an Italian-based orthographic system (Witek 2001: 157), unlike Ruggieri, who used an orthography which finds its foundations in Italian and Portuguese as well. Italian is used for the initials ⟨c⟩ = [tʃ] or [tʃʰ] before ⟨e⟩ and ⟨i⟩; [k] or [kʰ] before ⟨a⟩, ⟨o⟩ or ⟨u⟩ and sometimes [x] before ⟨u⟩. ⟨sc⟩ (= [ʃ]) before ⟨i⟩ and finally ⟨z⟩ for [ts], or [tsʰ]. Portuguese-based orthographies are ⟨ç⟩ (= [ts] or [tsʰ]),

26. Witek (2001: 159) rejects the theory of Yang, according to whom the dictionary is “incorrectly attributed to Ricci or to Ricci and Ruggieri”.

27. This does not mean necessarily that Ruggieri was unaware of tone-distinctions, but “at that time he did not devise yet a method to indicate such”, as Witek observed (2001: 187).

⟨g⟩ [=ʒ] before ⟨e⟩ and ⟨i⟩, -m for [-ŋ] and ⟨-v~⟩ which is interchangeable with ⟨-m⟩ (= [ŋ]) or with ⟨-n⟩ (= [-ŋ]) (Witek 2001: 187). Ricci sometimes changed Italian spelling, such as ⟨gn⟩ (= [-ŋ]) into Portuguese orthographies ⟨nh⟩.²⁸ The Chinese characters are written by a native Chinese hand (ibid.). There are also Italian entries which are not written by Ruggieri or by Ricci.

There was also another, totally different dictionary, composed by Ricci with the assistance of Sebastian Fernandes (1562–1621) and Lazzaro Cattaneo (1560–1640) (Witek 2001: 184).²⁹ It is called *Vocabulario sinico-europeo* (*Chinese-European dictionary*) by Daniello Bartoli (1608–1685) (cited in Witek 2001: 185) and *Dictionarium sinicum* by Athanasius Kircher (1601–1680). This second dictionary, which unfortunately has been lost, was composed between 1598 and 1599 and did include diacritic marks. As Witek (2001: 185) concluded, “the principal language of the dictionary was Chinese and not Portuguese”.

3.3.2 Other early European studies of Chinese

In the second half of the 16th century, knowledge of Chinese was increasing among missionaries. An obstacle which they encountered was the phonology of Chinese, and particularly its tone system. Alonso Sánchez wrote in 1583 that “the differences in pronunciation that there are, with lips, the throat, the palate, or through the nostrils, carry many different meanings, which is impossible for us” (cited in James & Morgan 2003: 9). Serious study of the Mandarin tone system started around 1598/1599, when Lazzaro Cattaneo and Sebastian Fernandes, under Ricci’s direction, developed a Mandarin tone marking system. Cattaneo was the teacher who taught Ricci the tone system using principles from music and developed a romanisation system, based on the Beijing dialect (Witek 2001: 160, Fu 2001: 185). Athanasius Kircher mentions a Spanish missionary Diego Pantoja (1571–1618), who determined the Chinese tones according to musical notes.³⁰ Pantoja was another assistant of Ricci in the period from 1601–1610.

The five tone marks invented by Ricci and Cattaneo were adopted in later works describing Chinese, such as Martino Martini’s (1614–1661) *Novus atlas sinensis* (1665), which includes an appendix “de Regno Catayo” by Jacob Golius (1596–1667) where the names of the tones are given (p. vii). Golius was a student of the Dutch Orientalist Thomas van Erpen (Erpenius; see Section 6.2.2 above).

28. See for a complete survey of Ruggieri’s and Ricci’s orthographies with the corresponding IPA symbols the tables I, II and III (respectively for the initials, the finals and the tones) (Witek 2001: 190–193).

29. Cattaneo’s dates are from Masini (1996a: 24).

30. “P. Jacobus Pantoja primus notas invenit; quas supra Europaeo modo scriptas dictiones Sinicas” (cited in Masini 1996b: 241, note 16).

From 1624 to 1629 Golius travelled to Arabia and Syria and elsewhere in the Middle East, and particularly during his stay in Constantinople he collected Arabic manuscripts for Leiden University. One of his main contribution to Arabic studies is his *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* (1645), based on Arabic dictionaries, such as the *Qāmūs* of al-Fārūzabādī (died 1415) and the *Sihāh fi-l-lughā* of al-Jawharī (d. in 1002 or 1008). The Jesuit Father Martino Martini (1614–1661) was captured in 1651 near the Philippines by the Dutch and was taken to Batavia. In 1653 he sailed for Europe, and avoiding the route through the Channel – where the British and Dutch were in a state of war between 1652 and 1654 – he landed at Bergen in Norway in 1653. From there he reached Amsterdam, where he had his famous atlas printed by the publisher Blaeu. As soon as Golius was informed that a Chinese scholar was in Amsterdam, he wanted to meet him as soon as possible, since he had collected a large number of Chinese books. Finally, they met in Leiden and Golius interviewed Martini on several subjects he was interested in. Later, they met each other in Antwerp where Golius wished to obtain more details concerning the “secrets of the Chinese language”. Golius published these new historical data concerning the Chinese empire in his “De Regno Catayo Additamentum” as an appendix to Martini’s atlas, the first printing from wood of Chinese characters in Holland.³¹ It is less well known that Martini presented Golius with several Chinese books and manuscripts, enriching Golius’ collection. Golius decided that the University of Leiden should take over his collection of Oriental manuscripts. A part of it is still conserved there, but since the university was not able to fund the indemnity payable to the heirs of Golius as a condition of the bequest, it was decided that some of the collection had to be sold. Books from it were acquired by Narcissus Marsh (1638–1713), Archbishop of Armagh and founder (in 1701) of the first public library in Ireland, who in turn bequeathed his oriental manuscripts to the Bodleian library at Oxford (Gillespie 2003). Among them was the *Vocabularium Hispanico-Sinense*, a Spanish-Chinese dictionary which contains a “libellus Hispanicus de pronuntiationis Charact. Chinensium”. As I demonstrate in (Zwartjes 2011a) the dictionary is another copy of the Dominican Francisco Díaz (1606–1646), of whom until today four copies were found (Raini 2010). If the author of the appended *arte de la lengua mandarina* was also Díaz, this is probably the earliest fragment of a grammar of Mandarin Chinese, compiled in the 1640’s.³² It is probable that Golius obtained this manuscript from Martini and it can be traced back to the Philippines, since the tone system of Mandarin Chinese is compared with that of Southern Mǐn (‘chincheo’), and mention is made of the Sangleys, the

31. For more details see Duyvendak (1936: 303–304).

32. There exist earlier Western sources of Southern Mǐn, as Chirino (1604) and de Mançano (?1620) and other anonymous grammars (cf. Klöter 2011).

Chinese minority in Manila. It is obvious that Portuguese sources or scribes participated in one way or another in the production of this manuscript, since not only are Chinese words translated into Spanish or Latin, but we often find Portuguese translations, in particular in the final sections. It remains still unclear which Portuguese sources were used (Zwartjes 2011a: 328–329; Chinese section 366–367).

These studies of the Chinese language were followed by material in Athanasius Kircher's *China illustrata* of 1667 (121–127) and Antonio de Gouvea's (1602–1677) *Innocentia Victrix* of 1669 (267), Francisco Varo's (1627–1687) *Arte de la lengua mandarina* of 1703, and Joseph Henri-Marie de Prémare's (1666–1736) *Notitia linguae Sinicae* of 1728. The description of the tonal system had also success outside the Chinese territories; it was adapted for the tones of the *lingua annamitica* in the anonymous *Manuductio* and the dictionary of Vietnamese by Alexandre de Rhodes (see Section 3.3 below).

The importance of Macao as a centre of education was crucial in the beginning, but gradually diminished when Jesuits abandoned the college of Macao for language training (Brockey 2007: 251). This fact probably explains why grammars of Chinese written in Portuguese are non-existent. The most important early Western descriptions of Chinese are those written by Spaniards, mainly Dominicans, who “spent their formative years amid the Fujianese sojourners in Manila” (Brockey 2007: 259, cf. Klöter & Zwartjes 2008).

Just as Rodrigues's grammars of Japanese are one of the key sources for the reconstruction of Japanese of that period, western missionary linguistic documentation is important for the reconstruction of Chinese phonology in the pre-modern period.

Chinese treatises which exclusively deal with syntax are non-existent in the pre-modern period. As Norman (1988: 152) states “the study of grammar is a rather recent development. Although one can find observations concerning grammar in traditional philological works, the systematic study of this subject did not begin until the late nineteenth century”. Mã Jiànzhōng (1845–1900) composed a systematic grammar modelled on the Western model. Francisco Varo's and Basilio de Glemona's (1648–1704) grammar and catechism are two of the few sources which shed light on the syntax of vernacular Chinese. No Portuguese grammars are still extant, but we may assume that Portuguese manuscripts were an important stage in the development of Western missionary grammars in the early period.

As was the case with Japanese texts for learning practices, preference was given to Classical literature in these early works on Chinese. Varo does not agree with this view, since he advises his students to learn Chinese from “vernacular novels” (see Section 3.3.3 above). Ruggieri and Ricci's dictionary was not the only dictionary written in Portuguese. Walravens (1987: 215) mentions in his catalogue two Chinese-Portuguese vocabularies, which date probably from the eighteenth

century. According to Walravens “die portugiesische Version der Vokabulare ist in süd-chinesischer Umschrift wiedergegeben. Das zweite Heft trägt den Titel: *Folangji huaren huabo* [Wörterliste für europäische Geistliche].” A similar vocabulary has been described by Bawden (1954: 12–33).

The National Library of Portugal conserves a dictionary, *Prosodia ou dictionario da [língua] chineza e portugueza* (Ms Cod. 3306), from the 18th century. Its entries are in Chinese characters and in romanisation (Verdelho 2008: 83). There are also references to other dictionaries, which have been lost. Streit (1964, vol. 5: 296) mentions a *Diccionario da lingua chinesa e portuguesa* composed by the Portuguese Jesuit Gaspar Ferreira (1571–1649) (cf. Fonseca 2006: 337), and Louis Pfister mentions a work composed by Alvaro Semedo (1586–1658) entitled *Zi Kǎo* (“Studies on characters”) and two other dictionaries. It is unknown if these works were ever printed (Pfister 1934: 146). The titles of these dictionaries are according to Fonseca (2006: 339) *Diccionario sinico-lusitano* and *Diccionario lusitano-sinico*. The Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren (1742: 10) also mentions “Los Vocabularios de los Portugueses”, which apparently were available in Manila in the 1740s, although he does not give any details concerning the titles or the names of the authors.

In Macao, the teaching of Chinese in Portuguese was given new directions in the 19th century. The Lazarist Father Joaquim Afonso Gonçalves (1781–1834) taught Chinese in the College of São José de Macau and published the following works in Portuguese and Latin:

- *Diccionario portuguez-china no estilo vulgar mandarim e classico geral* (1821).³³
- *Grammatica Latina ad usum Sinensium juvenum* (1828).
- *Arte china constante de alphabeto e grammatical comprehendendo modelos das diferentes composicoens* (1829).
- *Diccionario china-portuguez* (1833).
- *Vocabularium Latino-sinicum: Pronuntiatione mandarina latinis literis expressa*. (1886[1836]).

These 19th-century linguistic works fall outside the chronological boundaries of this book. They are described in detail by Levi (2007).

3.4 Cochinchina (Vietnam) and Malaya

Alexandre de Rhodes worked as a missionary in Cochinchina and Tongking from 1624 to 1630. After his expulsion, he worked for ten years in Macao, where he probably came into contact with the language studies of Chinese and Japanese compiled

33. In Verdelho (2008: 24) we find the year 1831.

by other Jesuits. He returned to Cochinchina in 1640 and in 1645 he was condemned to death and later banned from this country again. Later he continued his mission in Persia, where he died in Isfahan in 1660. In Walravens' (1987: 221) catalogue, mention is made of his work *Relazione de' felici successi della santa fede predicata da' padri della Compagnia di Gesù del regno di Tunchino* (1650). In 1651, he compiled a catechism (Rhodes 1651c; cf. Phan 1998) and a dictionary (1651b) entitled *Dictionarium annamiticum, lusitanum et latinum*, published at Rome by the *Propaganda Fide* (Marsden 1796: 57), containing an introductory essay with the title "Linguae annamiticae seu Tunchinensi brevis declaratio" (ff.1–31.). In the prologue "Ad lectorem" Alexandre de Rhodes informs his readers that he spent twelve years learning the language and that the Portuguese priest Francisco de Pina was the first missionary who was able to preach in the local language (Lopes 1969: 147).

De Rhodes mentions the names of two other Portuguese priests, Gaspar do Amaral (1594–1646) and António Barbosa (1594–1647), who left a dictionary of Vietnamese and Portuguese unfinished when they died.³⁴ Gaspar do Amaral was born in Corvaceira in the Bishopric of Viseu. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1608, studied philosophy and theology, and taught Latin in the Colleges of Braga, Coimbra and Évora. In 1623, he travelled with Patriarch of Abyssinia, Affonso Mendes to India, then to Macau, from where he went to Cochinchina. In the reports of the Jesuits, it is documented that he baptized more than 40,000 individuals during his seven-year-long stay. He was "Provincial do Japaõ, e China", and "Reytor do Collegio de Macao" and it is documented that he also had a thorough knowledge of Japanese. He died in 1645. Antonio Barbosa was born in 1604 in Arrifana de Souza in the Bishopric of Porto. He entered the Society of Jesus in Lisbon in 1624, travelled to Goa and Macau, and collaborated with Gaspar do Amaral.

Most likely, Alexandre de Rhodes was mainly responsible for the Latin version of this dictionary, but the linguistic data were based on the work of Barbosa and do Amaral. Since the Portuguese original has been lost, it is impossible to say to what degree Alexandre de Rhodes contributed to this project, whether by adding, changing, or eliminating linguistic data which were collected by the Portuguese. Whatever the contributions of his predecessors may have been, he has been credited with perfecting the Romanization system used in his work, of which the foundations still remain today in Vietnam (Maggs 2000: 442).

Another source written in Latin has been conserved: the anonymous seventeenth-century work entitled *Manuductio ad linguam tunchinensem*, attributed to

34. "Aliorum etiam ejusdem Societatis Patrum laboribus sum usus praecipue P. Gasparis de Amaral, & P. Antonij Barbosae, qui ambo suum composuere Dictionarium ille lingua Annamitica incipiens, hic á Lusitana, sed inmatura iterque morte nobis erectus: utriusque ergo laboribus sum usus" (Alexandre de Rhodes 1651: prologue).

Francisco de Pina, who was born in Guarda and entered the Jesuit order in 1605. According to Machado (1965[1741]: vol. 2.221), he co-authored the *Dictionarium Annamiticum* with Alexandre de Rhodes. The *Manuductio* is analysed and translated by Jacques who demonstrates that the authors of the manuscript were Portuguese pioneers of Vietnamese linguistics, prior to 1650.³⁵ It is also documented that other dictionaries circulated in manuscript in the 17th century, such as the *Diccionario lusitano-annamitico* written by Manuel Ferreira (1630–1699) (Fonseca 2006: 337).

In conclusion, the Portuguese contributed considerably to the progress made in the study of Asian languages, not only Japanese or Chinese, but also Vietnamese, although it is impossible to determine exactly which elements were developed by the Portuguese and which by others, such as de Rhodes.

3.4.1 *The Roman alphabet and the description of tone*

According to Bosson (2007: 129–130) the Jesuit Cristoforo Borri (1583–1632) described tone-distinctions as early as 1633, but Francisco de Pina mentions ‘tonalities’ (Port. ‘toadas’) in Vietnamese earlier, in 1622 or in 1623 (Dror & Taylor 2006; Klöter 2009: 90). In the grammatical compendium of Alexandre de Rhodes we find a detailed description of tone in Chinese. De Rhodes mentions the *chu nom*, the popular or demotic script (Phan 1998: 29), which was developed since the seventh century but reached its final form in the 13th century under the Tran dynasty. The *chu nom* was “a script in which Chinese characters are borrowed and altered to render the meaning of Vietnamese words”. It has been documented that one of the first missionaries, the Italian Girolamo Majorica S.J. (1591–1656), wrote in the *chu nom* script (Phan 1998: 30). Francisco de Pina wrote a catechism in *chu nom*, but as happened in Japan and China (cf. João Rodriguez, Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci), the use of the Roman alphabet was preferred.

A large number of diacritics, indicating the tones and the vowel sounds, is characteristic of the romanisation of Vietnamese. One vowel can have two different diacritical signs at the same time. In this early period, missionaries report that “one single syllable, for instance *dai*, denotes 23 different things depending on the various ways of pronouncing it, which means one can speak only by singing” (quoted in Phan 1998: 32). Vietnamese possessed six tones, often compared with the musical tones *do*, *re*, *mi*, *fa*, *so*, *la*.³⁶ De Rhodes developed five diacritics, which

35. Jacques (2002: 146–197): facsimile edition and transcription [Ms. Biblioteca da Ajuda, Lisboa, Jesuitas na Asia; collection, vol. 49/VI/8, fol. 313r to 323v.].

36. Chinese as described by Varo has five tones. Probably, foreigners living in Macau also knew the local language Cantonese, which has at least six tones (depending on how you define tone, you can also argue for seven, eight or even ten tones) (Klöter, personal communication, April 2008).

he used – together with unmarked vowels (as it were, a 0-diacritic) – to represent these tones: the Greek acute, grave and circumflex accents (the last resembles a tilde in early modern printed Greek), the subscript iota, and a superscript hook which he thought of as like a question mark.³⁷ In modern grammars, these six tones are (1) mid-level, or flat (*ngang*), as in *ma* ‘ghost’; (2) high-rising (*sắc*), as in *má* ‘cheek’; (3) low-falling (*huyền*), as in *mà* ‘but’; (4) falling-rising and constricted (*hỏi*), as in *mả* ‘tomb’; (5) high-rising and broken (*ngã*), as in *mã* ‘horse’; and (6) low-falling and short and constricted (*nặng*), as in *mạ* ‘rice seedling’.³⁸

3.4.2 Morphology and syntax

This appendix focuses on lexicography, but a short account will be given of the grammatical treatise of de Rhodes, which he included in his dictionary as a prologue or introduction. It was not published separately. We repeat that it is not clear to which degree de Rhodes contributed to the development of this grammatical treatise. Possibly, a great deal derives from the Portuguese missionaries.

Morphologically, nouns are not distinguished from verbs (“indifferentes ut sint nomina vel verba”), a distinction which can only be made when the contexts of the words is considered (“quae ex orationis contextu cognoscuntur ut cheò, ‘remus’, l. remigo”). Plural and singular are only understood when interpreting the context; both what “precedes” and what “follows” is relevant (“plurale & singulare ex adiunctis antecedentibus & consequentibus colligitur”).³⁹ Nouns have no declension, number or cases (“neque enim nominibus sunt ullæ declinationes, vel numeri, vel casus”).

37. “Diximus accentus esse quasi animam uocabulorum in hoc idiomate, atque ideò summa diligentia sunt addiscendi. Vtimur ergo triplici accentu linguæ Græcæ, acuto, graui, & circumflexo, qui alia non sufficient, addimus iota subscriptum, & signum interrogantis nostræ; nam toni omnes huius linguæ ad sex classes reducuntur, ita ut omnes prorsus dictiones huius idiomati ex his sex classibus seu tonis pertineant, nulla uoce prorsus excepta: Tonus æqualis, acutus, circumflexus, ponderosus seu onerosus, lenis. ... Hos autem sex accentus ad nostræ musicæ tonos sic accomodare possumus ut aliquam cum illa, videantur habere proportionem per has voces... ita ut ex his vocibus etiam in lingua Tunchinica significatiuis, per sex tonos linguæ Tunchinensi, dò, re, mî, pha, sỏ, lá, possimus referre aliquot modo sex tonos nostræ musicæ, non tamen ita exactè, quin magna intersit differentia; quare nullus istos tonos addiscere poterit, nisi ab aliquot qui linguam benè calleat, illos per seipsum audierit sæpius, ut illis assuescat” (de Rhodes 1651, fols. 8–10).

38. Phan (1998: 33). In southern Vietnamese there are five tones (cf. Nguyễn 1970: 17, 157).

39. Cf. Christian Mentzel’s *Sylloge minutiarum lexici latino-sinico-characteristici* of 1685, where, by contrast, we find “quae omnia ex **antecedentibus, et non consequentibus** characteribus sunt haurienda (cited in Klein 2001: 49); Francisco Varo (1703: f.19) agrees with de Rhodes: “En esta lengua todos los nombres en sus casos son indeclinables, e invariables, solo se diferencian por algunas particulas que se les antepone, ò por lo **anteçedente y subseçuente**..”

The section dealing with the pronouns occupies a relatively long part of the grammar (chapters IV “De Pronominibus” and V: “De alijs pronomibus”) (14–23). There is much attention to honorificity: relations between superior and inferior, father and son, lord and servant, man and wife, children among themselves, and so on (“Primitiuorum pronominum est magna copia pro diuersis gradibus & differentijs hominum. Superiores respectu inferiorum, pater cum filijs ... discipuli cum magistro loquentes ... at cum magistris ad religionem pertinentibus..., etc.”) (14–15).⁴⁰

De Rhodes explains that the verb is not inflected for number and person (“Numerus & persona verborum colligitur ex pronomibus super additis, ut, tòiêo, ego amo...”) (23). The rules for the honorifics must be observed, as explained in the chapter on the pronouns. Tenses are distinguished by addition of ‘particles’ (“Tempus dignoscitur ex quibusdam particulis adiectis”) and they are understood by what precedes and follows (“colligitur ex modo loquendi ex antecedentibus, & consequentibus...”) (23–24), as occurs with the formation of the moods.

It is not impossible that de Rhodes had seen some grammars of Japanese, perhaps those written by Rodrigues, or grammars from India where special sections are devoted to the ‘negative’ verbs. De Rhodes argues that there are no negative verbs in Vietnamese (“Nulla sunt uerba negatiua, sed solum fiunt per particulas negatiuas ut...”). Since there are no ‘negative verbs’ in Latin or in French either, such an observation makes only sense if we assume that de Rhodes wants to inform his students that what they might have learned from grammars of other Asian languages, did not apply for Vietnamese. A proper passive does not exist, according to de Rhodes (“Passiua propriè non dantur”). There is no participle, and instead of them, some particles are used with the meaning of ‘qui, quae, quod’ (“Participijs hæc lingua caret eorum loco utuntur uerbo com particulis significantibus qui quæ, quod...”) (26). Prepositions were not different from those in “our languages” (“Præpositiones ordinariæ, quæ sunt in hac lingua, nostris respondent...”) (26). The subcategories of the adverb are “optantis, uocantis, interrogantis, respondentis, ita affirmando superioribus, cum honore, da, æqualibus, pháí, inferioribus, u’g: confirmandi profecto, negandi [...] dubitantis, iubentis, prohibentis, demonstrantis, comparantis, temporis, quantitatis multum”. Adverbs are abundant in this language, and can often be reduplicated (“Adverbijs abundat hæc lingua, quæ sæpe etiam duplicantur”) (27); there are interjections (“gaudentis, dolentis,

40. Cf. Emeneau, cited in Rosén (1996): “There is a set of true deictic pronouns, but except for the first person singular *tôi* these are little used in the present day language. Most of them are limited to situations in which no deference is required, i.e. to those in which the speaker adopts an attitude of superiority towards the hearer, or to those rare situations in which perfect equality between speaker and hearer is assumed. Instead of true pronouns, nouns or noun phrases are often used in reference and address. The nouns used are kinship terms.”

miserentis, plangentis, iridentis”) (27); and finally, there are a number of categories of conjunctions (“copulatiuæ, disiunctivæ, aduersatiuæ, colectiuæ, comparatiuæ, expletivæ”) (27).⁴¹

The section devoted to syntax is relatively short (only three pages). Eight short rules are given:

1. The subject (=nominatiuus) must precede the verb
2. The noun that follows after the verb is “the case of it” (“est casus illius”) (in the examples, direct objects are given)
3. The adjective is placed after the substantive (“Substantivum ordinariè præcedit, & sequitur adiectivum, vt *Chúa cá*”)
4. If two substantives are placed after each other, the second is in the “oblique case”. (“*Chúa nhà, Dominus domus: si dicam, nhà Chúa, idest, domus Domini*”.)
5. The verb “to be” (=verbum substantivum) can be omitted, and a “demonstrative must precede the verb”: (“adiectiva secum deferunt verbum substantivum, ita vt non sit necessè illud addere, maximè si præcedat aliquod pronomen demonstrativum”).
6. “Copulative conjunctions” are seldom used. (de Rhodes 1651: 29ff)

3.4.3 Malay

In the catalogue of the National Library of Portugal, a Malay-Portuguese dictionary is mentioned, composed by Elias José Francisco do Vale (fl. 1777), entitled *Diccionario malayo, e portug[ue]s* (1777?) (BNP F. 6613; BNP Cod. 3142; cf. Verdelho 2008: 83). In this dictionary Portuguese-Malay dialogues are included. Another copy is also conserved in the same library (BNP F.4330; BNP Cod. 3050–3051).

4. Brazil

Compared with Japan and India, few Portuguese bilingual dictionaries of the languages of Brazil have survived. The anonymous work *Vocabulário na Língua Brasilica* was completed in 1621 and is extant in two manuscripts, one in the Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa and one in the Biblioteca Municipal de São Paulo (Fonseca 2006: 339).⁴² The dictionary is attributed to Leonardo do Vale, who also wrote one of the first catechisms in Tupi (Leite 1965: 219).⁴³ In the prologue of

41. These categories are not arranged in the same way as in Álvares or in Rodrigues and not all the subcategories occur in the grammar of the Rhodes.

42. Another manuscript is housed in the same library (Ms 11481) (cf. Ayrosa 1952: 10).

43. The São Paulo MS was published in 1938; a second edition (1952–1953) took account of the Lisbon MS as well.

Araújo (1618) mentions also a dictionary, which was planned to be published (“... deixando as mais para o vocabulario, *que se deseja imprimir* (Araújo 1618: “advertencies, f. 1r), which could be the same as the one composed by Leonardo do Vale.

João de Jesus’s *Vocabulario da lingua geral* (MS, post 1718) has been lost (Cardoso 1994: 227). Fonseca (2006: 340) mentions one more anonymous dictionary in the National Library of Portugal, *Vocabulario da lingua Brazil[ica]* (Cod. 3143, probably from the 17th century) (Verdelho 2008: 91). An anonymous work describing the ‘língua geral amazônica’ (Cod. 69, Coimbra) also contains a dictionary. Mamiani’s *Vocabulario kiriri* never appeared in print; it is known that the work existed in 1696, but it has never been found (Fonseca 2006: 338). Dahlmann (1891: 64) mentions a work entitled *Diccionario Portuguez e Brasileiro* which was printed in 1795 in Lisbon (“in der Druckerei des Patriarchen”) which is based on the manuscript entitled *Diccionario da lingua geral do Brazil*, compiled by the Jesuit João Daniel.⁴⁴ In Verdelho (2008: 88) we find an anonymous Portuguese-Guaraní dictionary, entitled *Folklore brasileiro: vocabulario guarani XVI seculo* (MS, 19th century, National Library of Portugal, Cod. 9614). Finally, it is documented that António Boaventura de Santo composed a *Vocabulario do idioma sacaca [com uma Doutrina christã]* which was never printed and which has been lost (Fonseca 2006: 335).⁴⁵

5. African languages

The first dictionary of a Sub-Saharan African language (Kenzi Nubian) which has survived is the *Dizionario turco-italiano e italiano-nubiano*, completed in 1635 and revised in 1650 by the Franciscan Observant Arcangelo Carradori di Pistoia. The work was printed in 1652.⁴⁶ This dictionary has been often called “the oldest dictionary of an African language”, but Sidarus mentions much earlier works, such as the Greek-Coptic Glossary of Dioscorus of Aphroditos which dates to the 6th century. “Ibn al-’Assal’s Arabic-Coptic *sullam muqaffa*, written in the 1200s, can quite unhesitatingly be described as a dictionary; following a then-current Arabic

44. Dahlmann (1891: 64): “welches aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach aus der Feder des berühmten jesuiten João Daniel stammt, welcher 18 Jahre lang als Missionär unter den Indianern lebte und spatter im Kerker von S. Julião bei Lissabon seine Erinnerungen niederschrieb und seine Sammlungen ausarbeitete”. I have not been able to verify if the *Diccionario da lingua geral* is to be identified with any of the other works mentioned in this paragraph.

45. The same author wrote also the *Arte da lingua dos aroás* and the *Arte da lingua commua, a que chamão geral [com un Confessionario e Practicas varias]*, which also have been lost (Fonseca 2006: 335).

46. See Spaulding (2000) and the editions by K.V. Zetterstéen (A–O), Inge Hofmann (complete) and Sidarus (1978: 123).

tradition, it was arranged alphabetically from the last letter of the word backwards (so, for instance, “apple” would be close to “people” but far from “apricot”) [...] After Coptic, the next oldest is an Arabic-Berber lexicon written in 1145, containing some two thousand words. Its writer was Abū Abdallāh Muḥammad Ibn Jaʿfar al-Qaysī, better known as Ibn Tumart” (Sidarus 1978: 123).

The Jesuits J. Van Wing and C. Penders published in 1928 a dictionary entitled *Le plus ancien dictionnaire Bantu – Het oudste bantu-woordenboek – Vocabularium P. Georgii Gelensis* (Bonvini 1996: 140). This is a rather misleading piece of work, which neither reflects the language of its original nor identifies its author correctly. According to Buenaventura (1945: 219) the text of the original manuscript is conserved in the National Library in Rome.⁴⁷ He reports (1945: 225) that it follows the alphabetic order of Latin entries, followed by the Spanish and the Congolese equivalents. In the latter we find often two or three synonyms, together with the formation of the plural of the nouns and adjectives. The dictionary contains important information related to the flora and fauna of the Congo. It comprises 169 folios. On folio 12, it has the following title: *Vocabularium Latinum, Hispanicum, et Congense ad usum Missionariorum transmittendorum ad regni Congi Missiones*, probably the title given by Hyacinth Brusciotto when he brought the manuscript to Rome. As Buenaventura (1945: 225) observes, the dictionary of 1928 is not just a French-Flemish version of the Latin-Spanish-Congolese original, but an entire new Congolese-French-Flemish work. Since the original version was organized alphabetically according to the Latin entries, this new edition was modified drastically.

The dictionary is attributed by Van Wing and Penders to the Fleming Joris van Gheel (Jorge de Gela, actually Adrian Willems; 1617–1652). In the manuscript we read in Italian: “Vocabulario conghese che scrisse di propria mano per sè il P. Giorgio di Ghela essendo Missionario in quel Regno, e che vi fù morto di ammortature con globbi di terra” (d’Alençon 1914: 41). D’Alençon (1914: 41–42) concludes that this was not an original work of Joris van Gheel but probably copied from a work of the missionary Manuel Roboredo (Cole 1971: 2). One of his arguments is that van Gheel lived in Congo for a relatively short period (from June 29th 1651 until December 1652). Moreover, his knowledge of Spanish was limited. It is probable that there already existed a dictionary of Congolese, a grammar and a *método penitencial* before 1651 when Van Gheel came to São Salvador. (He learned the Congolese language from the works of Ángel de Valencia and Juan Francisco de Roma.⁴⁸)

47. Unfortunately, I have not been able to consult the original version of this dictionary, which is a curiosity in the Spanish-Latin lexicographical tradition.

48. “... las reglas y cartillas de la lengua conguesa que trajeron a Europa los PP. Fr. Ángel de Valencia y Fr. Juan Francisco de Roma, se hizo bastantemente noticioso en breve tiempo, por ser de claro y perspicaz ingenio” (Buenaventura 1945: 216–217).

What, then, was the first missionary dictionary of Congolese: whose work might Van Gheel have transcribed in the manuscript published by Van Wing and Penders? The Congolese mission started in 1645, and the first Capuchin missionaries arrived in the Congolese city which they called São Salvador (now M'banza-Congo in Angola) in 1648: José de Pernambuco (d. 1653), Antonio Teruel, Antonio M. de Monteprandone, Ángel de Valencia, Jerónimo de Montesarchio and others. A number of them were Spanish, but not all: the missionary who chronicled their work was an Italian, Giovanni Antonio Cavazzi da Montecuccolo (1621–1678), whose narrative *Istorica descrizione de' Tre Regni Congo, Matamba et Angola* (1687) incidentally reports the difficulty of learning the local languages and the great number of languages and dialects (Book IV, par. 1, cited in Buenaventura 1945: 212–213).⁴⁹ Manuel Roboredo, later called Francisco de São Salvador (d. 1665), son of a Portuguese father and a mother of Royal Congolese blood, founded language centers, not only in São Salvador, but also in Sogno, Luanda and Matamba. Buenaventura de Carrocera (1945: 210) argued that the original *Primer diccionario de la lengua congolesa* was partially, or entirely the work of these Capuchin monks, since no earlier attempts had been made by the Jesuits, Dominicans, Carmelites or Franciscans (ibid. 211).⁵⁰ This does not seem very likely. As we mentioned in Section 5.1.3 in the age of Pacconio, catechisms, dictionaries and grammars circulated among the Jesuits in Peru around 1629, antedating the linguistic works of the Capuchins. Probably these Portuguese works are the earliest Portuguese dictionaries of an African language (Congo and/or Kimbundu), but they have been lost.

According to Buenaventura (1945: 222) the author of the trilingual dictionary was possibly Manuel Roboredo. Probably there was also at least one Spanish-speaking author, since we would expect that Roboredo would have composed a Latin-Portuguese-Congolese dictionary, or maybe Latin-Congolese, rather than authoring a Latin-Spanish-Congolese dictionary on his own. Antonio Teruel cannot have been the co-author of Roboredo, since he affirms that there already existed a dictionary when he started to learn Congolese. Later, he composed a quadrilingual Latin-Spanish-Italian-Congolese version and a grammar, which are not to be confused with the original work of Roboredo and

49. In 1658, all Spanish missionaries were expelled. Later, only Italians were allowed to continue their mission in São Salvador. The importance of Portuguese in São Salvador was also gradually diminishing, but it was still present until the twentieth century; in 1907 the *Cantigos religiosos em Kikongo, Portuguez e Latim* were published in São Salvador with a re-edition published in 1959 (Cardoso 1966: 523).

50. “Los dominicos, jesuitas .. no dejaron gramáticas, ni diccionarios, ni siquiera un mal vocabulario para que los que habían de ir después de ellos a aquel campo de apostolado, pudiesen aprender la lengua que tan difícil se hacía a todos” (Buenaventura 1945: 211).

his collaborators. These may, in fact, have been Buenaventura de Cerdeña, José de Pernambuco or Francisco de Veas, as Buenaventura (1945: 223–224) suggests.⁵¹ We do not know why the *Propaganda Fide* press decided not to publish the quadrilingual dictionary of Teruel, nor other lexicographical works from the Congo mission can be traced if they survive. It is not impossible that they are still in the Archive of the Capuchin Order or in that of the Congregation of the *Propaganda Fide* in Rome.

It has been reported that Van Gheel also composed a lost work entitled *Los rudimentos de la doctrina cristiana, y gramática en lengua conguesa* (Buenaventura 1945: 217). Another grammar, which has been lost too, is supposed to have been compiled by the Spanish priest Buenaventura de Cerdeña (d. 1649). To the best of my knowledge there are no other reports of linguistic works in Africa composed in Spanish. In the work *Mission evangelica al reyno de Congo, para la serafica religion de los Capuchinos* written by José Pellicer de Tovar and printed in Madrid in 1649 (Alençon 1914: 39), no concrete titles are given of linguistic studies. Another dictionary, *Dicionário Português, Latim, Sonho, Bundo* (1650) is recorded by Cardoso (1966: 538, no. 392), but has not survived as far as we can ascertain.

In 1886, Brusciotto's grammar was translated into Portuguese by the Bishop of Congo and Angola, D. Antonio Thomaz da Silva Leitão e Castro, as *Regras para mais facil intelligencia aprender do difficil idioma do Congo reduzidas a forma de grammatica por Fr. Jacintho Brusciotto de Vetralla*. To the grammar, a dictionary was then appended, entitled *Diccionario abreviado da lingua congueza e de alguns vocabularios para uso de escola de linguas africanas, estabelecida em Loanda pelo dito Prelado*. The work was published in Loanda. We do not know if Leitão was the author of this dictionary or if he re-edited the lexicographical work of other missionaries. Nevertheless, it is evident that he included material from many different languages. His dictionary starts with a "portugués-congués" wordlist (49–93), followed by more 'Vocabularios': "portugués-n'bunda" (95–129), "portugués-n'jenji" (131–133), "portugués-garangaja" (135–137), "portugués-quioco" (139–144), "portugués-lunda" (145–149), "portugués-ca-luiana" (151–156). It is also clear that Leitão used earlier sources, possibly from the age of Brusciotto, since he includes a list at the end of his dictionary entitled "Comparação da Antiga com a moderna lingua congueza nas palavras da presente grammatica e vocabulario anexo" (157–158), and another with the heading "Vocabulario", a list with three columns "Portugués – Antiga – Moderna" (159–178).

51. It has also been suggested that he collaborated with Bonaventura da Sardegna (R. Gray 1998: 75).

The model for this grammar could not have been the dictionary of Father Bernardo Maria de Cannecattim (Figanière 1863–1864: 106) entitled *Diccionario da Lingua Bunda, ou Angolense, explicada na Portugueza, e Latina* (1804).⁵² The first entries of both works are totally different, as will be obvious in the following table where the first six entries are listed:

Table A.2 Comparison between Leitão and Cannecattim

Leitão (Congo)	Cannecattim (Mbundo)
Abaixar	Absorto
Abaixo	Abster-se
Abelha	Abstendo-se
Aboboca	Abstinencia
Abortar	Abundancia
Abreviar	Abundante cousa

Cannecattim informs his readers in his prologue that he was the first to publish a dictionary of this language.⁵³ Leitão does not mention any source for his dictionary at all.

In the chapter on grammars of African languages, we have also described the anonymous grammar of the ‘Cafre’ language. No dictionary from this language has survived in this early period.⁵⁴ However, in the anonymous *Cafre* grammar we find a reference to a vocabulary, which is evidence for the fact that at least one circulated in that period:

52. The same author published his *Colecção de Observações Grammaticaes sobre a Lingua Bunda ou Angolense* in 1805 with a second edition in 1859 (Chatelain 1888–1889: xvii; Doke 1961b: 23, Cole 1971: 4). Verdelho (2008: 53) mentions a second dictionary entitled *Diccionario abreviado da Lingua Congueza*, also published one year after the first dictionary, in 1805. According to Cole (*ibid.*) Cannecattim’s work is considered to be “linguistically inferior to the works produced by his seventeenth century predecessors”. Chatelain came to a similar conclusion (1888–1889: xvii): “porém tudo isto vae misturado com tantos erros etanta grammatica latina em vez de africana, que é preciso já saber a lingua para poder discriminar o pouco que presta do muito que está errado. Pedimos pois aos senhores criticos, que para o futuro, contrariamente ao que teem feito até aqui, reconheçam a superioridade linguistica dos padres jesuitas sobre o frade capuchino”.

53. “He inutil entreter-me em mostrar o trabalho, e difficuldade desta obra; porque o ignorante já mais a poderá avaliar, e o sabio conhece os embaraços que encerra escrever o primeiro vocabulario de hum Idioma, cuja índole, e extensão he desconhecida” (Cannecatim 1804: “Ao leitor”, v).

54. Victor José Courtois published a *Dicionário Portuguez-Cafre-Tetense* in 1899.

A ‘quilibet’, qualquer responde, *oninse*, cô seu plural *huanonse*. O mesmo responde ‘qui’ **O mais se verà no vocabulario.** (Anonymous [18th century]: f.204v, emphasis is mine)

[With ‘quilibet’ anything corresponds, *oninse*, with its plural *huanonse*. And the same form corresponds with ‘qui’. For more see the vocabulary.]

6. Arabic and Hebrew

6.1 Arabic

The Arabs have a large and rich lexicographical tradition since Khalīl b. Aḥmad al Farāhīdī’s (died in 780) *Kitāb al-ʿayn*. The first bilingual Arabic-Persian dictionary is the eleventh-century compilation of Maḥmūd Ibn-ʿUmar az-Zamakhshārī (1075–1144). The first Western Arabic-foreign language dictionary is the *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum* of Jacob Golius, although Pedro de Alcalá published the first Foreign language-Arabic (the spoken dialect of Granada) in 1505.⁵⁵ In Italy dictionaries were also printed in the seventeenth century, such as Dominicus Germanus’s *Fabrica Linguae Arabicae* (1639, Rome: Propaganda Fide) *Fabrica Arabica copiosioribus impensis atque vberiori structura*. (1640), and in this context Antonius Giggeius’s *Thesaurus linguae Arabicae* (printed in 1632), can be mentioned (Fück 1955: 79). The Spanish Franciscan produced also dictionaries, such as the *Intérprete Árábico* of Bernardino González and the *Compendio* of Lucas Cavallero and Encarnación (1709–1710) (cf. Zwartjes 2007f and 2011 forthcoming a) and the dictionaries of Cañes. The latter mentions in his prologue works of north Europeans (Golius), Spaniards (Alcalá), Italians (Valle Flemmarum, etc.) but in the prologues of Batista and de Sousa no mention is made of any dictionary, so we just do not know whether there circulated Portuguese-Arabic bilingual dictionaries in that period. It is probable that they used Golius’s dictionary in their language instruction, since this was one of the best of that period. The only reference to a Portuguese-Arabic dictionary, namely *Dicionário português-árabe* (MS Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal, COD.11135: 18th century, 8 folios) can be found in Verdelho (2008: 76).

6.2 Hebrew

Hebrew lexicography flourished in al-Andalus and as their Arabic colleagues, Hebrew lexicographers were excellent linguists who wrote major grammars. One of

55. In the Middle Ages word lists Latin-Arabic circulated in Spain, such as the 12th-century *Glossarium Latino-Arabicum* and the 13th-century *Vocabulista in Arabico* (Fück 1955: 10 and 22).

the first Western bilingual dictionary is the *Dictionarium Hebraicum* (Basileæ: Io. Froe, 1525) of Sebastian Münster (1488–1552), who also published a *Dictionarium trilingue* in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (Basileæ: per Henricvm Petri, 1562). As far as I have been able to trace, no bilingual dictionaries Hebrew-Portuguese were composed in this early period in Portugal. Baptista and de Sousa did not include dictionaries or word-lists to their grammars, as occurs in other regions⁵⁶ And I have not been able to investigate which dictionaries were used in Portugal in this period.

56. For instance, the *Brief abridgment of the Hebrve dictionaire, conteining not onlie the primitive words called the rootes, but also those that are derived from them*in Petrus Martinus's grammar (1593).

References

Primary Sources

- Adelung, Johann Christopher & Johann Severin Vater. 1806–1817. *Mithridates oder: allgemeine Sprachenkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in beynahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten*. 4 sections in 5 vols. [1: *Asiatische Sprachen*. 2: *Europäische Sprachen*. 3.1: *Afrikanische Sprachen*. 3.2 and 3.3. *Amerikanische Sprachen*. 4: *Nachträge*.] Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung.
- Aguilar, Mosseh Raphael de. 5421=1661. *Epitome da grammatica hebraica por breve methodo composta, para uso das escholas, do modo que a ensina, etc: Segunda edição novamente corrigida e accrescentada de hũ tractado sobre poesia hebraica*. Amsterdam: na Ofic. de Joseph Athias.
- Alcalá, Pedro de. [Before 5 feb. 1505a]. *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arauiga*. Salamanca: Juan Varela.
- Alcalá, Pedro de. [Before 5 feb. 1505b]. *Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana*. Salamanca: Juan Varela.
- Alcalá, Pedro de. 1971/1883[c.1506a]¹. *Arte para ligera mente saber la lengua arauiga emendada y añadida y Segunda mente imprimida*. Salamanca: Juan Varela. Ed. Paul de Lagarde: *Petri Hispani de lingua arabica libri duo*. Gottingae: In aedibus Dieterichianis Arnoldi Hoyer. Reprint: Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1971[1883].
- Alcalá, Pedro de. 1928[c.1506a]. Edición facimlar: New York: Hispanic Society of America.
- Alcalá, Pedro de. 1971/1883[c.1506b]. *Vocabulista arauigo en letra castellana*. Salamanca: Juan Varela. [Biblioteca Nacional, R 31638.] Ed. Paul de Lagarde: *Petri Hispani de lingua arabica libri duo*. Gottingae: In aedibus Dieterichianis Arnoldi Hoyer. Reprint: Osnabrück: Otto Zeller, 1971[1883].
- Alcalá, Pedro de. 1928[c.1506b]. Facsimile edition: New York: Hispanic Society of America.
- Aldrete, Bernardo de. 1972[1606]. *Del origen i principio de la lengua castellana o romance que oi se usa en España*. Roma: Carlo Vulliet. Ed. Lidio Nieto Jiménez, 2 vols. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- Álvares, Manuel. 1972[1572]. *De Institvtione grammatica libri tres*. Olyssipone: Excudebat Ioannes Barrerius, Typographus Regius. [Facsimile ed. prepared by J. Pereira da Costa, Funchal: Junta Geral do Distrito Autónomo do Funchal.]
- Álvares, Manuel. 1594. *De Institvtione grammatica libri tres*. Amakusa. SI.
- Anchieta, José de. 1992. *Doutrina cristã*. Tomo 1: *Catecismo brasílico*. Obras Completas, vol. 10. Introdução, tradução e notas do Pe. Armando Cardoso SJ. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.

1. Works without date, place or editor. Only the *Vocabulista* has a date (1505). The works have been printed probably between 1504 and 1508, according to Anssens-Lestienne (1983), but according to Norton (1978: 124–126) these works are written in 1501.

- Anchieta, Joseph de. 1874[1595]. [*Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais vsada na costa do Brasil*]. Ed. Julius Platzmann. *Grammatik der brasilianischen Sprache, mit Zugrundelegung des Anchieta*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Anchieta, Joseph de. 1999[1595]. *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais vsada na costa do Brasil. Feyta pelo padre – da Cõpanhia de Iesv*. Coimbra: Antonio de Mariz. Ed. facsimilar y estudio por Leogário A. de Azevedo. 2 vols. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Anonymous. 1981[end of the 13th- first decades of the 14th century]. *Codex Cumanicus*. Edited by G. Kuun, with the prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus by Louis Ligeti. Budapest: Kőrösi Csoma Társaság, Magyar Tudományok Akadémia Könyvtára.
- Anonymous. 2009[1586]. *Arte, y vocabulario en la lengua general del Perv llamada Quichua, y en la lengua Española. El mas copioso y elegante que hasta agora se ha impresso*. Los Reyes: Antonio Ricardo. Ed. Julio Calvo, vol. 1: *Arte y vocabulario...* [Facsimilar edition], vol. 2: *Estudio*. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo.
- Anonymous. 1953[1595]. *Dictionarivm latino lvsitanicvm, ac iaponicvm, ex Ambrosii Calepini volumine depromptum...* Amacusa: In Collegio Iaponico Societatis Iesv. Ed. Hirosato Iwai. Tokyo: The Tokyo Bunko, Oriental Library.
- Anonymous. 1998[1603–1604]. *Evolabon nippon jisho (Vocabulario da Lingoa de IAPAM com declaração em Português), feito por algvns padres, e irmãos da companhia de IESV. Com licença do ordinario, & superiores em Nangasaqui no Collegio de Iapam da Companhia de IESVS*. Osaka: Naruo Maeda Seibundo.
- Anonymous. 1952[1621]. *Vocabulário na língua brasileira*. Ed. Carlos Drummond. Segunda edição revista e confrontada com o Ms. Fg. 3144 da Bibl. Nacional de Lisboa. São Paulo, SP: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Anonymous. 1952[1621]. *Vocabulário na língua brasileira*. Ed. Carlos Drummond. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo. [=Boletim no. 137, Etnografia e Tupi-Guarani, no. 23; edition of the Ms fg. 3144, Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa.]
- Anonymous. 1972[1630]. *Vocabulario de Iapon declarado primero en portugves por los padres de la compañía de IESVS de aquel reyno, y agora en Castellano en el Colegio de Santo Thomas de Manila*. Manila: Tomas Pinpin, y Iacinto Magaurlua. Facsimilar edition: *Classica Japonica Facsimile Series in the Tenri Central Library*. General Editor Makita Tominaga. Section I: Linguistics. Editor of the Section of Linguistics: Hisanosuke Izui. Tokyo: Tenri Central Library.
- Anonymous. [Capuchin father]. 1658. *Doctrina christiana; y explicacion de sus misterios, en nuestro idioma español, y en lengua arda. Consagranse, y dedicanla a la concepcion purissima de Maria Santissima Señora nuestra los primeros misioneros de aquel Reyno*. Madrid: García Morrás.
- Anonymous. 17th century. *Arte de la lengua chiochiiu*. [Grammar of the Language of Zhāngzhōu]. British Library, London. Ms Add. 25317.
- Anonymous. 17th century. *Bocabulario de la lengua sangleya por las letraz de el A.B.C*. British Library, London. Add. Ms. 25317.
- Anonymous. (s.a.). *Dictionario Hispanico Sinicum*. University of Santo Tomás, Manila. Ms. t.216.
- Anonymous. (s.a.). *Vocabulario Hispanico y Chinico*. University of Santo Tomás, Manila. Ms. t.214.
- Anonymous. [17th century?]. *Arte da lingua de Cafre*. [Ms. Biblioteca da Ajuda, Lisboa colecção “Jesuitas na Asia” Codex B.B.A. 49, V, 18, fol. 201. Ed. P.P. Schebesta. 1919–1920. *Anthropos* 14–15.764–787.]

- Anonymous (attributed to Francisco de Pina). 2002[17th century]. *Manuductio ad linguam tunckinensem*. In: Roland Jacques: *Portuguese Pioneers of Vietnamese Linguistics Prior to 1650/L'œuvre de quelques pionniers portugais dans le domaine de la linguistique vietnamienne jusque en 1650*. Bangkok: Orchid Press. [Portuguese Pioneers of Vietnamese Linguistics/Pionniers portugais de la linguistique vietnamienne.] Appendix II.146–197, facsimile edition, transcription and [Ms. Biblioteca da Ajuda, Lisboa, *Jesuítas na Ásia* collection, vol. 49/VI/8, fol. 313r to 323v.].
- Anonymous. 1750. *Gramatica da lingua geral do Brasil. Com hum Diccionario dos vocabulos mais uzaues para a intelligencia da dita Lingua*. [Ms. códice 69 da Biblioteca da Universidade de Coimbra.]
- Anonymous. 1778a. *Gramatica marastta a mais vulgar que se practica nos Reinos do Nizamaxà, e Idalxà offerecida aos mvtos reverendos Padres Missionarios dos dittos reinos*. Roma: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide.
- Anonymous. 1778b. *Gramatica indostana a mais vulgar que se practica no Imperio do gram Mogol offerecida aos muitos reverendos Padres Missionarios do ditto Imperio*. Roma: Na Estamperia da Sagrada Congregação de Propaganda Fide.
- Anonymous. 1990[first half 18th cent.]. *Arte de la lengua totonaca*. Edición en facsímil del manuscrito original con introducción, transliteración enmendada y normalizada, e índices de contenido léxico y gramatical por Norman A. McQuown con dictámenes sobre su posible autor y sobre la fecha del papel. México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Anonymous. [18th cent.]. *Luces del otomí ó gramática del idioma que hablan los indios otomíes en la República Mexicana compuesta por un padre de la Compañía de Jesús*. Ed. Eustaquio Buelna. México: Imprenta del Gobierno Federal, en el ex-Arzobispado, 1–121.
- Aquila, Antonio Ab. 1650. *Arabicae linguae novae, et methodicae institutiones. Non ad vulgaris dumtaxat Idiomatis; sed etiam ad Grammaticae doctrinalis intelligentiam, per Annotationes in Capitum Appendicibus suffixas, accomodatae*. Authore F. Antonio ab Aquila Or. Min. Sancti Francisci strict. Obser. Theologo, atque in Collegio Sancti Petri Martis Aurei à Sacra Congregatione de Propaganda Fide Arabicae linguae deputato lectore. Opus tum omnibus Arabicae linguae studiosis, tum potissimum Apostolicis Viris, per Asiam & Africam Fidem propagaturis, utile & necessarium. Romae: Typis Sac. Cong. de Prop. Fide.
- Aragona, Alonso de. 1979[between 1620 and 1629] *Breve introduccion para a[prender la] lengua Guaraní*. Presentación, edición y notas por Bartomeu Melià. *Amerindia*, 4: 23–61. [Ed. Based on a Ms conserved in the Colegio del Salvador, Buenos Aires.]
- Araújo, Antonio. 1618. *Cathecismo na Lingoa Brasilica em que se contem a summa da Doutrina Christãa com tudo o que pertence à nossa Santa Fè, e bons costumes composto a modo de dialogos*. Lisboa: Craesbeeck. Second edition: Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes, 1686.
- Argote, Jerônimo Contador de. 1725. *Regras da lingua portugueza, espelho da lingua Latina, ou disposição para facilitar o ensino da língua Latina pelas regras da Portugueza...* Second edition (First edition 1721). Lisboa Occidental: Na Officina da Musica.
- [Arnauld, Antoine & Claude Lancelot (Port Royal)]. 1676. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*. Paris, Pierre Le Petit. English translation: *The Port-Royal grammar: general and rational grammar/by Antoine Arnauld and Claude Lancelot*. Jacques Rieus & Bernard E. Rollin, eds. with a preface by Arthur C. Danto and a critical essay by Norman Kretzmann. The Hague: Mouton [Janua Linguarum, Series minor, vol. 208.]
- Assumpçam, Manoel da (Assumpção) 1743. *Vocabulario em Idioma Bengalla e Portuguez*. Dividido em duas partes dedicado Ao Excellente Rever. Senhor D. Fr. Miguel de Tavora, Arcebispo de Evora do Conselho de Sua Magestade. Foy deligencia do Padre – Religioso Eremita

- de Santo Agostinho da Congre[ga]ção da India Oriental. Lisboa: Na Offic. De Francisco da Sylva. Livreiro da Academia Real, e do Senado.
- Assumpçam, Manoel da. 1743. *Breve Compendio da Grammatica Bengala*. First section of the *Vocabulario*, 1–40.
- Baptista [Abrantes], Antonio. 1774. *Instituições da lingua arabiga compostas por Fr. . – Religioso da Provincia da Terceira Ordem de S. Francisco de Portugal, e Professor da mesma Lingua no Convento de N. Senhora de Jesus de Lisboa. Para o uso das escolas da mesma congregação*. Lisboa: Na Regia Officina Typografica, Livraria d'Alcobaça. On-line: <http://purl.pt/13842/4/>
- Barros, João de. 1971[1540]. *Grammatica da lingua Portuguesa*. Olyssipone: Apud Lodouicum Rotorigui Typographum (Luys Rodriguez). Ed. Maria Leonor Carvalhão Buescu. *Gramática da lingua Portuguesa. Cartinha, gramática, diálogo em louvor da nossa linguagem e diálogo da viciosa vergonha*, 57–134. Lisboa: Universidade de Lisboa, Publicações da Faculdade de Letras.
- Beligatti, Cassiano. 1771. *Alphabetum Brammhanicum seu Indostanum Universitatis Kasí*. Romae: Typis Sac. Congregationis de Propag. Fide.
- Beligatti, Cassiano. 1773. *Alphabetum Tangutanum sive Tibetanum*. Romae: Typis Sac. Congregationis de Propag. Fide.
- Bertonio Romano, Ludouico. 1603a. *Arte breve de la lengva aymara, para introdvction del arte grande de la misma lengva. Compuesta por el P. – de la compañía de Iesus en la Prouincia del Piru, de la India Occidental*. Roma: Luis Zannetti. [The British Library London, c33 d 19 (1–2).]
- Bertonio Romano, Ludouico. 1603b. *Arte y grammatica mvy copiosa de la lengva aymara. Con muchos, y varios modos de hablar para su mayor declaracion, con la tabla de los capitulos, y cosas que en ella se contienen, &c. Compuesta por el P. – de la compañía de Iesus en la Prouincia del Piru, de la India Occidental*. Roma: Luis Zannetti.
- Bertonio, Lvdouico. 1612a. *Arte de la lengva aymara, con vna silva de Phrases de la misma lengua, y su declaracion en Romance. Por el padre – Italiano de la Compañía de Iesus en la Prouincia del Peru natural de Rocca Centrada de la Marca de Ancona, dedicado al illvstrissimo y Reuerendissimo señor don Hernando de Mendoça Obispo del Cuzco de la mesma Compañía*. Juli: en la casa de la Cõpañia de Iesus de Iuli en la Prouincia de Chucuyto: Francisco del Canto.
- Bertonio, Lvdouico. 2006[1612b]. *Vocabvlario de la lengva aymara. Primera Parte, donde por abecedario se ponen en primer lugar los Vocablos de la lengua Española para buscar los que les corresponden en la lengua Aymara. Compuesto por el P. – Italiano de la Compañía de Iesus en la Prouincia del Piru, de las Indias Occidentales, Natural de la Roca contrada de la Marca de Ancona. Dedicado al Illvstrissimo y Reuerendissimo Señor Don Fray Domingo Valderrama Centeno Maestro en sancta Theologia, Arçobispo, y primer Obispo de la Paz, del Consejo de su Magestad. Segunda parte del vocabulario en la cual por orden del ABC se ponen en primer lugar los vocablos de la lengua aymara para hallar los que le corresponden en la Española*. Iuli, Pueblo en la Prouincia de Chicuito: Francisco del Canto. Transcripción de le edición de 1612 por Enrique Fernández García. Arequipa: Ediciones El Lector.
- Beschi, Costantino Giuseppe. 1738[1728]. *Grammatica Latino-Tamulica. Ubi de Vulgari Tamulicæ Idiomate*. Trangambariae [Tranquebar]: Typis Missionis Danicæ.
- Bettendorf, Johann Philipp. 1687. *Compêndio da Doctrina Christã na Lengua Portuguesa e Brasileira*. Lisbon: Miguel Deslandes.

- Blancas, Francisco de S. Joseph. 1997[1610]. *Arte y reglas de la lengua tagala*. en el Partido de Bataan, por Thomas Pinpin Tagalo. Edición facsímil de la edición princeps con Estudio de Antonio Quilis. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Brusciotto, à Vetralla, Hyacintho (Giacinto). 1650. *Doctrina christiana ad profectum missionis totius regni Congi in quatuor linguas per correlatiuas columnas distincta, et eminentiss. ac reuerendiss. S.R.E. Cardinalibus SRC. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide exhibita, & dicata a F. Hyacintho a Vetralla concionatore Capuccino ...* Romæ: Typis & sumptibus eiusdem Sac. Congreg.
- Brusciotto à Vetralla, Hyacintho. 1659. *Regulae quaedam pro difficillimi Congensium idiomatis faciliiori captu ad grammaticae normam redactae F. – Concionatore Capuccino Regni Congi Apostolicae Missionis Praefecto*. Romae: Typis S. Congr. De Prop. Fide.
- Brusciotto, Giacinto. 1886[1659]). *Regras para mais facil intelligencia do difficil idioma de Congo, reduzidas a forma de grammatica por Fr. Jacintho Brusciotto ... e traduzidas do latim pelo Bispo ... Antonio Thomaz da Silva Leitão e Castro. Seguidas do dicionario abreviado da lingua congueza ...* Loanda: Domingos Lopes Rosa.
- Caldwell, Robert. 1856. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian or South-Indian Family of Languages*. London: Harrison.
- Cannecattim, Bernardo Maria de. 1804. *Diccionario da lingua Bunda ou Angolense, explicada na Portuguesa e latina, composto por Fr. – Capuchino Italiano da Provincia de Palermo, Missionario Apostolico, e Perfeito das Missões de Angola, e Congo*. Lisboa: Na Impressão Regia.
- Cañes, Francisco. 1775. *Gramatica arabigoespañola, vulgar, y literal. Con un diccionario arabigo-español, en que se ponen las voces mas usuales para una conversacion familiar, con el Texto de la Doctrina Cristiana en el idioma arabigo*. Madrid: En la Imprenta de Don Antonio Perez de Soto.
- Cañes, Francisco. 1787. *Diccionario Español Latino-Arabigo en que siguiendo el diccionario abreviado de la Academia se ponen los correspondencias latinas y arabes, para facilitar el estudio de la lengua árabiga á los misioneros, y á los que viajaren ó contratan en Africa y Levante...* 2 vols. Madrid: Don Antonio Sánchez.
- Cárceres, Pedro de. 1905[c.1580]. *Arte de la lengua othomi por fr. – del orden de San Francisco*. Ed. N[icolás]. León. *Boletín del Instituto Bibliográfico Mexicano*, número 6.43–155. México: Imprenta Sucesores de Francisco Díaz de León.
- Carochi, Horacio. 1645. *Arte de la lengva mexicana con la declaracion de los adverbios della. Al Illustriss.º y Reuerendiss.º Señor Don Iuna de Mañozca Arçobispo de Mexico, del Consejo de su Magestad, &c. por el Padre – Rector del Colegio de la Compañia de Iesvs de San Pedro, y San Pablo de Mexico*. México: Iuan Ruyz.
- Carrera, Fernando de la. 1644. *Arte de la lengva yvnga de los valles del Obispado de Truxillo del Peru, con vn Confessionario, y todas las Oraciones Christianas, traducidas en la lengua, y otras cosas. Avtor el beneficiado Don –, natural de la dicha ciudad de Truxillo, Cura y Vicario de S. Martin de Reque, en el Corregimiento de Chiclayo. Dirigido al Rey N. Señor en sv Real Consejo de las Indias*. Lima: Ioseph de Contreras.
- Cavallero, Lucas. 1709.² *Compendio de los Rudimentos y Gramatica Araba en que se da suficiente notizia de la lengua Vernacula o Vulgar y algunas Reglas de la literal Iustamente P.M.R.F. Bernardino Gonzalez hijo de la Proâ de la Concepzion en España Lector Jubilado en Arabo y Misionero Apostolico del Oriente y recopilada por el Re.^{do} P. Fr. – Mº Apostolico hijo de la Proa de los Angeles Lector actual Arabo en el colegio de Damasco*.

2. In the colophon we read that the work was finished in 1710.

- Manuscrito [Bibli.A. Tingstadii, Rogge Library, Strängnäs, Handskriftssamlingen, Sweden; J. Tingstadii Gåfva 4:0, 108.]
- Cavallero, Lucas. 1710. Manera o modo de introducirse hablar en que se ponen las mas frecuentes saluciones que se hacen vnos a otros los que vsan la lengua Araba con algunas otras palabras communes para los principiantes. Comenzelo dia dieziseis de henero de 1710 dia en que nustra sagrada Relijion dio el primer lustre a la Iglesia por los Bienabentura y sus Compañeros. Manuscrito [Bibli.A. Tingstadii Rogge Library, Strängnäs, Handskriftssamlingen, Sweden; J. Tingstadii Gåfva 4:0, 108.]
- Cavazzi de Montecuccolo, Giovanni Antonio. 1687. *Istorica descrizione de'tre' Regni Congo, Matamba et Angola sitvati nell' Etiopia inferiore occidentale e delle missioni Apostoliche esercitateui da Religioso Capuccini accuratamente compilata dal P. – Sacerdote Capvccino il qvale vi fv, Prefetto e nel presente stile ridotta dal P. Fortvnato Alamandini da Bologna Predicatore dell'istesso Ordine All'Illystratissimo Signor Giacomo Isolani*. Bologna: Per Giacomo Monti. (First edition 1671).
- Chirino, P. Petrus. 1604. *Dictionarium Sino Hispanicum*. Biblioteca Angelica, Rome. [Ms. Ital.-lat. N. 60.]
- Clenardus, Nicolaus. 1561. *Tabula in grammaticam hebraeam/Nicolaus Clenardus; a Johan. Isaac nunc recens correctae, et aptiori ordine digestae, unà cum eiusdem et Joan. Quinquarborei adnotationibus*. Third edition: Coloniae: apud haeredes Arnoldi Birckmanni.
- Collado, Diego. 1632a. *Ars Grammaticae Iaponicae Lingvæ. In gratiam et adivtorivm eorum, qui prædicando Euangelij causa ad Iaponiæ Regnum se voluerint conferre. Composita, & Sacrae de Propaganda Fide Congregationi dicata à Fr. Didaco Collado Ordinis Prædicatorum pewr aliquot annos in prædicto Regno Fidei Catholicae propagationis Ministro*. Romæ: Typis & impensis Sac. Congr. de Propag. Fide.
- Collado, Diego. 1632b. *Dictionarium sive Thesauri Linguae Iaponicae Compendium compositum, & sacrae propaganda fide congregationi dicatum a fratre Didaco Collado ord. Prædicatorum..* Romæ: Typis & impensis Sac. Congr. de Propag. Fide.
- Collado, Diego. 1632c. *Niffon no Cotobani yo confesion, vo mosu yodai to mata confesor yori goxensa cu ... Modus confitendi et examinandi poenitentem Iaponensem, formula suamet lingua Iaponica. Auctore fr. Didaco Collado ...* Romae: Typis & impensis Sac. Congreg. de Prop. Fide.
- Couto, Antonio de. 1642. *Gentio de Angola sufficientemente instruido nos mysterios de nossa sancta Fé. Obra posthuma, composta pello Padre Francisco Pacconio da Companhia de Iesu. Redusida a methodo mais breve & accomodado á capacidade dos sogeitos, que se instruem pello Padre Antonio do Couto da mesma Companhia*. Lisboa: Domingos Lopes Rosa.
- Couto, Antonio de. 1661. See Pacconio (1661).
- Dias, Pedro. 1697. *Arte da lingua de Angola, offerecida a virgem senhora N. do Rosario, Mãe, & Senhora dos mesmos Pretos, Pelo P. – Da Companhia de Jesu*. Lisboa: Na Officina de Miguel Deslandes, Impressor de Sua Magestade.
- Ducoeurjoli (or Joly). 1801. *Manuel des habitans de Saint-Dominque ... suivi d'un traité de médecine domestique appropriée aux îles, d'une Pharmacopée américaine; du premier vocabuláire français-créole*. 2 Vols. Paris: Lenoir.
- Duret, Claude. 1614. *Thresor de l'histoire des langues de cest universe, contenant les origins, beautez, perfections, decadences, mutations et ruines des langues Hebraique, Chananeenne, Samaritaine, Chaldaïque, Syriaque, Egyptienne, Punique, Arabique, Sarrasine, Turquesque, Persane, Tartaresque, Africaine, Moresque, Ethiopienne, Nubienne, Abyssine, Grecque, Armenienne, Seruiane, Esclauonne, Georgiane, Iacobite, Cophtite, Hetrurienne, Latine, Italienne,*

- Cathalane, Hespagnole, Alemande, Bohemienne, Hongroise, Polonaise, Prussienne, Pomeranienne, Lithuanienne, Walachienne, Liunionne, Russienne, Moschouitique, Gothique, Nortmande, Francique, Finnonienne, Lapponienne, Botnienne, Biarmienne, Angloise, Indienne Orientale, Chinoise, Japonaise, Iaiuienne, Indienne Occidentale, Guineanenouvelle, Indienne des terres Nuefues, &c. Les langues des Animaux et oiseaux.* Cologny [Genève]: Mathieu Berjon.³
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1613. *Grammatica Arabica*. Leidae: In officina Raphelengiana. Published with the *Lexicon Arabicum* by Franciscus Raphelengius in one volume. (Leidae: Ex Officina Auctoris).
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1617. *Grammatica Arabica dicta Gjarumia, & libellus centum regentium cum versione latina & commentariis Thomae Erpenii*. Leidae: Ex Typographia Erpeniana Linguarum Orientalium.
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1620. *Rudimenta Lingvæ Arabicae. Accedunt ejusdem praxis grammatica; & consilium de studio arabico feliciter instituendo*. Leidae: Ex Typographia Auctoris.
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1636. *Grammatica Arabica. Ab autore emendate & aucta: cui accedunt Locmanni Fabulae et Adagia quaedam arabum: ab eodem autore cum Latina versione pridem edita; at nunc vocalibus et notis orthographicis illustrate*. Amstelodami: Typis Joannis Jansonii.
- Erpenius, Thomas. 1733. *Rudimenta linguae Arabicae auctore Thoma Erpenio. Florilegium sententiarum arabicarum ut et Clavim Dialectorum, ac praesertim Arabicae, adjecit Alb. Schultens*. Lugduni Batavorum: Apud Samuelem Luchtmans Academiae Typographum.
- Fabricius, Johann Philipp & Christian Breithaupt. 1809[1779]. *A Malabar and English Dictionary*. Second edition revised and corrected by the rev. Pœzold, Mr. William Simpson and the Malabar Catechists. Vepery: Mission Press.
- Fabricius, Johann Philipp & Christian Breithaupt. 1778[1789]. *A Grammar for Learning the Principles of the Malabar Language, properly called Tamul or the Tamulian language by the English missionaries of Madras*. Second edition: [Vepery]: Mission Press printed at Vepery near Madras.
- Febres, Andres. 1975[1764]. *Arte de la lengua general del reyno de Chile, con un dialogo chileno-hispano muy curioso: a que se añade La Doctrina Christiana, esto es, Rezo, Catecismo, Coplas, Confessionario, y Pláticas; lo mas en Lengua Chilena y Castellana: y por fin un vocabulario hispano-chileno, y un Calepino Chileno-Hispano mas copioso. Compuesto por el P. – misionero de la Comp. De Jesus*. Lima: en la calle de la Encarnacion. Ed. facs. Vaduz: Georgetown: Cabildo.
- Fergusson, James. 1773. *A Dictionary of the Hindostan Language: in two parts I. English and Hindostan, II. Hindostan and English. ... To which is prefixed a grammar of the Hindostan language*. London: printed for the author; and sold by T. Cadell.
- Fernandes, António. 1642. *Magseph assetat idest Flagellum mendaciorum: contra libellum aethiopicum falso nomine dictum: Masgueb Haymanot, idest Fidei Thesaurus*. Goae: in Collegio D. Pauli, Societatis Iesu.
- Figueira, Luis. 1621. *Arte da lingua brasilica, composta pelo Padre – da Companhia de IESV, Theologo*. Lisboa: Manoel da Silua.
- Figueira, Luis. 1878[1687]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Facsimile edition: Julio Platzmann. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.
- Fuentes, Pedro Antonio. 1775. *Gramatica vulgar griego-española. Compuesta por el P. Fr. – de la Regular Observancia de N.P. San Francisco de la Santa, y Apostolica Provincia de Santiago*,

3. Not seen, cited in Schmidt-Riese (2008: 173).

- Predicador Apostolico, ExGuardian de Belen, Ex-Presidente Parroco, y Lector de lengua Griega en el Colegio de Misiones de Santa Cruz de Leufcosia, Capital del Reyno de Chipre.* Madrid: Joachin Ibarra.
- Fuentes, Pedro Antonio. 1776. *Gramatica griego-literal para el uso de los estudios de España y seminario de Tierra Santa por el P. Fr. – de la Regular Observancia de nuestro P.S. Francisco, Guardian del Convento de Belen, Presidente, lector y Párroco que ha sido de lengua griega en los Conventos de Santa Cruz de Nicosía y Santa María de Lárnica en el Reyno é Isla de Chipre.* Madrid: Joaquin Ibarra.
- Germanus [de Silesia], Dominicus. 1639. *Fabrica Linguae Arabicae cum inter-pretatione latina & italica, accommodata ad usum linguae vulgaris, & scripturalis.* Romae: Typis Sac. Congreg. de Prop. Fide.
- Germanus [de Silesia], Dominicus. 1640. *Fabrica Arabica copiosioribus impensis atque vberiori structura.* Romae: Typis Sac. Congreg. de Prop. Fide.
- Gessner, Conrad. 2010[1555]. *Mithridates. De differentiis linguarum tum veterum Tum quæ hodie apud diuersas nationes in toto urbe terrarum in usu sunt.* Zürich: Froschauer. Bernard Colombat & Manfred Peters, eds. Genève: Droz.
- Gidhon, Mosseh Ben (=Gideam Abrediente). 1633. *Grammatica hebraica. Parte Ia onde se mostram todas as regras necesarias, assim para a intelligencia da lingua, como para compor e escrever nella em prosa e verso, com elegancia e medida que convém.* Hamburgo: (no publisher).
- Gilberti, Maturino. (Gylberti) 1987[1558]. *Arte de la lêngua de Michuacâ copilada por el muy Reuerêdo padre fray – de la orden del Seraphico padre sant Francisco, de regular obseruâcia.* México: Iuan Pablos. Ed. facsimilar J. Benedict Warren. Morelia, Michoacán: Fimax Publicistas editores [=Colección “Fuentes de la Lengua Tarasca o Purépecha” II.]
- Gilberti, Maturino. 2004[1558]. *Arte de la lengua de Michuacan compilada por el muy reverendo padre fray Maturino Gilberti.* Transcripción, edición, y notas: Cristina Monzón. Zamora, Mich.: El Colegio de Michoacán: Fideicomiso Teixidor.
- Gilberti, Maturino. 1989[1559]. *Vocabulario en lengua de Mechuacan Compvesto por el reuerendo padre Fray – dela orden del seraphico Padre sant Francisco. Fue visto y examinado y con licencia impresso. Dirigido al mvy Illustre y reuerendissimo Señor Dõ Vasco de Quiroga Obispo de Mechuacan.* Introducción, documentos, y preparación fotográfica del texto, por J. Benedict Warren. Colección “Fuentes de la Lengua Tarasca o Purépecha”. Vol. 3. Morelia, Michoacán: Fimax Publicistas Editores.
- Gilchrist, John B. 1796. *A Grammar of the Hondoostanee Language.* Calcutta: at the Chronicle Press.
- González, Bernardino 2005[c.1705]. *Intérprete Árábico.* Edición y estudio preliminar por Ramón Lourido Díaz. 2 vols. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia/Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación.
- Guadagnoli, Philippus (Filippo). 1642. *Breves Arabicae Linguae Institutiones.* Romae: Ex Typographia Sac. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Guadagnoli, Philippus. 1649. *Considerationes ad Mahomettanos cum responsione ad obiectiones Ahmed filii Zin Alabedin ...* Romæ: Typis Sacrae Congreg. de Prop. Fide.
- Hadley, George. 1772. *Grammatical remarks on the Practical and Vulgar Dialect of the Indostan Language, commonly called the Moors. With a vocabulary, English and Moors. The whole calculated for the Common Practice in Bengal.* London: T. Cadell.
- Halhed, Nathaniel Brassey. 1778. *A Grammar of the Bengal Language.* Hoogly: [unknown publisher].

- Henriques, Henrique. [Anrique Anriquez]. 1982[1549]. *Arte malauar*. Ed. Hans J. Vermeer: *The First European Tamil Grammar. A critical edition by –. English version by Angelika Morath*. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag. [Edition based on cod. 3141, Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa].
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1785[1784]. *Idea dell'Universo, che contiene la Storia della Vita dell'Uomo, Elementi Cosmografici, Viaggio Estatico al Mondo Planetario, e Storia della Terra*. Vol. 17: *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinità, e diversità*. Cesena: Gregorio Biasini.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1785. *Idea dell'Universo...* Vol. 18: *Trattato dell'Origine, formazione meccanismo, ed arminia degl'Idiomi*. Cesena: Gregorio Biasini.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1786. *Idea dell'Universo...* Vol. 19: *Trattato I. Aritmetica di quasi tutte le nazioni conosciute. Trattato II. Divisione del tempo fra le nazioni Orientali*. Cesena: Giorgio Biasini.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1787a. *Idea dell'Universo...* Vol. 20: *Saggio Pratico delle Lingue*. Cesena: Giorgio Biasini.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1787b. *Idea dell'Universo...* Vol. 21: *Vocabolario Poligloto* [sic]. Cesena: Giorgio Biasini.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1800–1805. *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeracion, division, y clases de estas segun la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos*, 6 volúmenes. Madrid: Imprenta de la Administración del Real Arbitrio de Beneficencia.
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo. 1801. *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeracion, division, y clases de estas segun la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos*. Vol. 2: *Lenguas y naciones de las islas de los mares Pacífico é Indiano Austral y Oriental, y del Continente de Asia*. Madrid: Imprenta de la Administración del Real Arbitrio de Beneficencia.
- Holdermann, Jean-Baptiste. 1730. *Grammaire Turque ou methode courte & facile pour apprendre la langue turque, avec un recueil des noms, des verbs & des manières de parler les plus nécessaires à scavoïr avec plusieurs dialogues familiers*. Constantinopla: [Ibrahim Mütefferika].
- Golius, Jacob(us). 1653. *Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, contextum ex probatoribus orientis lexicographis*. 13 Vols. Lugd. Bat.: B. et A. Elsevier.
- Golius, Jacobus. c.1655. “Byvoeghsel van 't Koninckryck Catay”. In: Martino Martini c.1655.
- González Holguín, Diego. 1975[1607]. *Gramatica y arte nveva de la lengva general de todo el Peru, llamada lengua Qquichua, o lengua del Inca, añadida y cymplida en todo lo quel faltaua de tiempos, y de la Grammatica, y recogido en forma de Arte lo mas necessario en los dos primeros libros. Con mas otros dos libros postreros de addiciones al Arte para mas perficionarla, el vno para alcançar la copia de vocablos, y el otro para la elegancia y ornato*. Ciudad de los Reyes del Peru: Francisco del Canto. Ed. facs. Vaduz-Georgetown: Cabildo.
- Gonçalez Holguin, Diego. 1952[1608]. *Vocabulario de la lengva general de todo el Perv llamada Lengua Qquichua o del Inca. Corregido y renovado conforme a la propiedad cortesana del Cuzco. Dividido en dos libros, que son dos Vocabularios enteros en que salen a luz de nuevo las cosas que faltavan al Vocabulario. Y la suma de las cosas que se aumentan se vea en la hija siguiente. Van añadidos al fin los privilegios concedidos a los Indios, compvuesto por el padre – de la Compañía de Jesus, natural de Caçeres. Dedicado al Doctor Hernando Arias de Vgar-te del consejo de su Magestad oydor de la Real Audiencia de Lima*. Ciudad de los Reyes: Francisco del Canto. Ed. Raúl Porras Barrenechea. Lima: Imprenta Santa María. [Edición del Instituto de Historia, Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos. Publicaciones del cuarto Centenario.]

- Huerta, Alonso de. 1993[1616]. *Arte de la lengua qvechva general de los Yndios de este Reyno del Piru. Dirigido al Illustrissimo Señor Don Bartholome Lobo Guerrero Arçobispo Tercero del Compvesto por el doctor – Clerigo Presbytero Predicador de la dicha Lengua en esta Sancta Yglesia Cathedral, y Cathedratico propietario della, en la insigne y Real Vniuersidad desta Ciudad de los Reyes, natural de la muy noble y muy leal Ciudad de Leõ de Huanuco*. Reyes [Lima]: Francisco del Canto. Ed. Ruth Moya: *Arte breve de la lengua quechua*. Estudio introductorio –, Transcripción Eduardo Villacís. Quito: Corporación Editora Nacional. [=Colección Kashcanchiracmi, vol. 3.]
- Hunt, Thomas. 1739. *De antiquitate, elegantia, utilitate, linguæ arabicæ oratio*. Oxford: Impentis Ricardi Clemens.
- Jorge, Marcos. 1624. *Doutrina christã. Composta pelo P. Marcos Jorge... Acrescentada pelo Padre Ignacio Martinz... De novo traduzida na lingoa do Reyno de Congo, por ordem do P. Mattheus Cardoso theologo, da Companhia de Jesu. Ao Illustrissimo S. D. Miguel de Castro, Arcebispo Metropolitano desta cidade de Lisboa*. Lisboa: Geraldo da Vinha.
- Kašić, Bartul. 2005[1604]. *Bartholomaeus Cassius/Bartul Kašić. Institutiones linguae Illyricae/Osnove hrvatskoga jezika*. Editionem alteram curavit, interpretatione vernacula commentariisque instruxit Zvonko Pandžić. Zagreb & Mostar: Tusculanae Editiones. [=Vrela za hrvatsku kulturnu povijest/Quellen zur kroatischen Kulturgeschichte, 11.]
- Ketelaar, Jona Josua. 2003[1698]. *Ketelaar: Original Manuscript [1698 A.D.]*. Ed. by Tej. K. Bhatia and Kazuhiko Machida. Vol. 3. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Kircher, Athanasius. 1636. *Prodromus Coptus sive Aegyptiacus, ad ... cardinalem Franciscum Barberum; in quo, cum linguae Copticae, sive Aegyptiacae, quondam Pharaonicae, origo, aetas, vicissitudo, inclinatio, tum hieroglyphicae literaturae instauratio, uti per varia variarum conditionum, interpretationumque difficillimarum specimina, ita nova quoque et insolita methodo exhibentur*. Romae: typis S. Cong. de propag. Fide.
- Lagunas, Juan Bautista de. 1890[1574]. *Arte de la lengua mechoacana, con el dictionarito, o Copia verborum, de los mas principales Verbos, con sus Ethymologias. Casi al modo que lleva el Ambrosio Calepino. Para que por esta breuedad y Reglas tan prouechosas: se puedan aprouechar los estudiantes. Ahonra y gloria de la sanctissima Trinidad, Padre, Hijo, Espirito sancto. Impresso en la Ynsigne ciudad de Mexico: Pedro Balli. Ed. Nicolás León: Arte y diccionario tarascos por el Fr. – Impresos en México el año 1574. Los Reimprime por vez primera el Doctor –. Morelia [Michoacán].*
- Larramendi, Manuel de. 1886[1729]. *El imposible vencido. Arte de la lengua Bascongada. Su autor el Padre – de la compañía de Jesús, Maestro de Teología de su Real Colegio de Salamanca*. Nueva edición publicada por los Hijos de I. Ramón Baroja. San Sebastián: Establecimiento tipográfico de los Editores.
- Leem, Knud. 1748. *En lappisk Grammatica efter den Dialect, som bruges af Field-Lapperne udi Porsanger-Fiorden: samt et Register over de udi samme Grammatica anførte Observationers Indhold, hvorhos er føyet et Blad af den berømmelige Historie-Skriveres Hr. Baron Ludvig Holbergs Kirke-Historie oversat i det Lappiske Tungemaal med en Analyse over hvert Ord*. Kiøbenhavn: Gottman Friderich Kisel.
- Léry, Jean de. 1972[1578]/1990. *Histoire d'un voyage fait en la terre du Bresil, autrement dite Amerique*. Ed. Michel Contat. Lausanne: Bibliothèque Romande. Latin edition, *Historia navigationis in Brasiliam quae et America dicitur: qua describitur autoris navigatio, quaeque in mari vidit memoriae prodenda: Villagagnonis in America gesta, Brasiliensium victus & mores/á Ioanne Lerio Burgundo gallicé scripta: nunc vero primum latinitate donata &...*

- illustrata*. [Geneva]: Excudebat Eustathius Vignon. English translation: *History of a voyage to the land of Brazil, otherwise called America...*, with an introduction by Janet Whatley, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 1990.
- Lobato, António José dos Reis. 1770. *Arte da grammatica da língua portugueza, composta e offerecida ao Ill.mo e exc.mo senhor Sebastião José de Carvalho e Mello, Ministro e Secretario de Estado de sua Magestade Fidelíssima da Repartição do Reino, etc. ...* Lisboa: Impressão Regia.
- López, Francisco. 2009[1627]. *Arte de la lengva iloca compuesto por el Padre fr. – de la Orden de S. Agustin*. Manila: Colegio i Vnversidad de S. Thomas de Aquino, por Thomas Pinpin. Edición y estudio de Joaquín García-Medall. 2 Vols. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo.
- López, Francisco. 1628. *Arte de la lengva Yloca. Compuesto por el Padre Fr. – de la orden de N.P.S. Augn. Con las licencias de los Superiores en Manila en la Compañia de Iesvs. Por Raym.^{do} de Peñafort*. (Ms).
- López, Francisco. 1895[1628]. *Gramática ilocana compuesta por el P. Predicador Fr. – corregida y aumentada por el P. Carro*. Tercera edición. Malabón.
- Ludolf, Hiob [Hyob, Job]. 1661a. *Grammatica Aethiopica nunc primùm edita & curâ Johannis Michaelis Wanslebbii*. London: Thomas Roycroft.
- Ludolf, Hiob [Hyob, Job]. 1661b. *Lexicon aethiopico-latinum, accessit eiusdem Grammatica Aethiopica*. London: Thomas Roycroft.
- Ludolf, Hiob. 1698. *Metshafe Timehirt the Lissame Amhara, seu Grammatica linguæ amharicæ quæ vernacula est Habessinorum in usum eorum qui cum antiqua hac et præclara natione Christiana conversari volent, edita*. Francofurti ad Moenum: Apud Johannem David Zunnerum.
- Lugo, Bernardo de. 1978[1619]. *Gramatica en la lengva general del nvevo reyno, llamada Mosca. Compuesto por el Padre Fray –, Predicador General del Orden de Predicadores, y Catedratico de la dicha lengua, en el Conuento del Rosario de la ciudad de Santa Fè*. Madrid: Bernardo de Guzmã. Ed. Manuel Alvar: *Resurrección de una lengua. Introducción a la edición facsimilar de la Gramática Chibcha del Padre Fray – editada en 1619*. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica del Centro Iberoamericano de Cooperación.
- Magdalena, Avgvstin de la. 1679. *Arte dela lengva Tagala, sacado de diversos artes por Fr. –, Religioso Descalço del Señor S. Diego coProcurador General de la Provincia de S. Gregorio de las Islas Philipinas*. México: Francisco Rodriguez Lupercio.
- Mamiani, Luiz Vincencio. 1942[1698]. *Catecismo da Doutrina Christãa na lingua Brasilica da Nação Kiriri*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Edição fac-similar. Rio de Janeiro: Imprensa Nacional.
- Mamiani, Luiz Vincencio. 1877[1699]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brazilica da Naçam Kiriri composta pelo p. – da Companhia de Jesu, missionario nas Aldeas da dita Nação*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Segunda edição publicada a expensas da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Typ. Central de Brown & Evaristo.
- Mamiani, Luiz Vincencio. 1852[1699]. *Grammatik der Kiriri-Sprache*. Translated by H.C. von der Gabelentz. Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus.
- Mançano, Melcior de. ?1620. *Arte de la lengua Chio Chiu*. [Grammar of the language of Zhāngzhōu.]. [Biblioteca de la Universidad de Barcelona, Ms. 1027.]
- Martelottus (=Martelotti), Franciscus. 1620. *Institutiones Linguae Arabicae tribus libris distributae. In quibus uberrime quaecumque ad litteras, dictiones & oratio-nem attinent, explicantur. Authore P. Francisco Martelotto Martinensi, Sacerdote, Theologo, Clericorum Regularium Minorum*. Romae: Excudebat Stepanus Paulinus.

- Martini, Martino. c.1655. *Novus Atlas sinensis, a Martino Martinio Soc. Iesu descriptvs et serenissimo archicvi Leopoldo Gvilielmo Avstriaco dedicatvs*. Cum privilegio S.C. Maj. Et Ord. Faed. Belg. Amsterdam: Ioan Blaeu. Dutch edition: *D'Atlas van 't Uyterste Asia, Of Landt-beschrijvingh van 't Sinesche Ryck*.
- Martinius, Petrus. 1970[1593]. *The Key of the Holy Tongue*. Translated by John Udall. Menston: The Scolar Press Limited. [Series English Linguistics 1500–1800. A Collection of Facsimile Reprints, vol. 226.]
- Mata, Pedro de la. 2007[1748]. *Arte de la lengua cholona*. Transcripción y edición preparada por Astrid Alexander-Bakkerus, con un prólogo de Willem Adelaar. [The British Library, Ms. Additional 25.322. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Mayans y Siscar, Gregorio. 1981[1737]. *Orígenes de la lengua española compuestos por varios autores*. Madrid: Juan de Zúñiga. Reprint: Madrid: Atlas.
- Mentzel, Christian. 1685. *Sylloge Minutiarum Lexici latino-sinico-characteristici, Observatione sedulá ex Auctoribus & Lexicis Chinensium Characteristicis eruta, inque Specimen Primi Laboris ulteriùs exantlandi Eruelito & Curioso Orbi exposita à Christiano*. Norimbergae.
- Molina, Alonso de. 2001[1555]. *Aquí comienza vn vocabulario en la lengua castellana y mexicana*. Ed. Manuel Galeote. Málaga: Universidad de Málaga. [Analecta Malacitana, Anejo 37.]
- Molina, Alonso de. 1945[1571a]. *Arte de la lengua Mexicana y Castellana*, compuesta por el muy Reuerendo padre fray – dela orden de Señor sant Francisco. México: en casa de Pedro Ocharte. Edición en facsímil por Antonio Graño. Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica. 1945. [Colección de incunables americanos, siglo XVI, vol. 6.]
- Molina, Alonso de. 1944[1571b]. *Vocabvlario en lengva castellana y mexicana*, compuesto por el muy Reuerendo Padre Fray –, dela Orden del bienauenturado nuestro Padre sant Francisco. Dirigido al my excelente señor Don Martin Enriquez, Visorrey destanueua España. México: En Casa de Antonio de Spinola. Edición facímil: Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica. 1944. [=Colección de incunables americanos, siglo XVI, vol. 4]
- Molina, Alonso de. 1944[1571c]. *Vocabvlario en lengva mexicana y castellana*, compuesto por el muy Reuerendo Padre Fray –, dela Orden del bienauenturado nuestro Padre sant Francisco. Dirigido al my excelente señor Don Martin Enriquez, Visorrey destanueua España. México: En Casa de Antonio de Spinola. Edición facímil: Madrid: Ediciones Cultura Hispánica. 1944. [=Colección de incunables americanos, siglo XVI, vol. 4.]
- Molina, Alonso de. 2001[1571]. *Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana*. Edición facsímil y estudio de Esther Hernández. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional/Biblioteca Nacional.
- Nantes, Bernardo de. 1709. *Katecismo indico da lingua Kariris, acrescentado de varias praticas doutrinaes, e moraes, adaptados ao genio, e capacidade dos indios do Brasil*. Lisboa: Na officina de Valentim da Costa Deslandes.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. 1981[1481]. *Introductiones Latinae*. Salmanticae. Facsimile Edition Salamanca: Industrias Gráficas Visedo.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. 1996[c.1488]. *Introducciones latinas contrapuesto el romance al latín*. Intriducción, edición y notas de Miguel Ángel Esparza Torres & Vicente Calvo Fernández. Münster: Nodus Publikationen.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. 1989[c.1495]. *Vocabulario español-latino*. Facsimile Edition. Madrid: Real Academia Española.
- Nebrija, Antonio de. 1992[1492]. *Gramática castellana*. Introducción, edición y notas de Miguel Ángel Esparza Torres & Ramón Sarmiento. Madrid: Fundación Antonio de Nebrija.

- Neve y Molina, Luis de. 1863[1767]. *Reglas de ortografia, diccionario y arte del idioma othomí. Instruccion para los principiantes que dicto D. – Catedrático propiciario de dicho idioma en el Real y Pontifico Colejio Seminario, examinador sinodal é intérprete del Tribunal de la Fé.* Ed. de 1863: México: Tipografía de Mariano Vill[...].
- Nieva, Domingo de. c. 1600–1650. *Bocabulario de lengua sangleya por las letras de el A.B.C.* [British Library, London. Ms Add. 25317.]
- Obicini, Franciscus. 1631. *Grammatica Arabica Agrumia appellata. Cum versione latina ac dilucida expositione. Adm. R.P.F. Thomae Obicini Noniensis, Diae. Nouariau, ord. Minorum Theologi, ac linguarum Orientalium in Collegio S. Petri Montis Aurei, de mandato Sacrae Congregationis Fidei Propaganda Magistri.* Romae: Typis Sac. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Oliveira, Fernão de (Oliveyra). 1975[1536]. *Grammatica da linguaagem portuguesa.* Ed. José Fernandes Junior. Lisboa: Tipografia Beleza. Re-edition of the edition by Rodrigo de Sá Nogueira & Aníbal Ferreira Henriques.
- Oliveira, Fernão de. 2007[1536]. Edição crítica, semidiplomática e anastática por Amadeu Torres e Carlos Assunção com um estudo introdutório do Prof. Eugenio Coseriu. Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro: Vila Real.
- Oliveyra, Selomoh. 5442=1688. *דל שפתים Gramatica breve da lingua chaldaica. Entrada para este Idioma, & principios de suas Regras. Tirada de outra maes dilatada do mesmo Autor Intitulada מורה ארמית Para meditação dos Estudiosos.* Amsterdam: David Tartas.
- Oliveyra, Selomoh. 5449. *יד לשון Livro da gramatica hebrayca & Chaldayca. Estilo breve & facil. Dedicado a os Ss. Parnasim de Talmud Torà, & Thezoureyro de Hes-Haym. Por –.* Amsterdam: Em casa de David Tartas, por Semuel Teyxeyra.
- Olmos, Andrés de. 1993[1547]. *Arte de la lengua mexicana. Concluido en el convento de San Andrés de Ueytlalpan, en la provincia de la Totonacapan que es en la Nueva España.* [Manuscript]. Vol. 1: Facsimilar edition. Vol. 2: Edición y estudio introductorio, transliteración y notas de Ascensión y Miguel León-Portilla. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Olmos, Andrés de. 2002[1547]. (Idem) México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. Instituto de Investigaciones Históricas. [Facsímiles de Lingüística y Filología Nahuas, vol. 9.]
- Oré, Luis Gerónimo de. 1607. *Rituale, seu Manuale Peruanum et Forma Brevis Administrandi apud Indios sacrosancta Baptismi, Poenitentiae, Eucharistiae, Matrimonii, & extremae unctionis Sacramentum. Juxta ordinem Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae. Per R.P.F. Ludovicum Hieronymum Orierium, Ordinis Minorum Concionatorem, & Sacrae Theologiae lectorem accuratum: et quae indigent versione vulgaribus Idiomatibus Indicis, secundum diversos situs omnium Provinciarum novi orbis Perù, aut per ipsum translata, aut ejus industria elaborata.* Neapoli: Jacobum Carlinum et Constatino Vitalem.
- Ortiz, Thomas. 1740. *Arte, y Reglas de la lengva tagala. Por el M.R. P. Lect. Fr. – Ex-Provincial de su Provincia. Nombre de JESVS del orden de N.P. S. Agustin en estas Islas Philipínas, y Prior de el Convento de Nra. S. de Guadalupe.* Sampiloc: Convento de Nuestra Señora de Loreto en el Pueblo de Sampiloc.
- Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchor. 1738. *Arte de la lengua japona. Dividido en quatro libros segun el Arte de Nebrixa, con algunas voces propias de la escritura, y otras de los languages de Ximo, y del Cami, y con algunas perifrasis, y figuras.* México: Joseph Bernardo de Hoyal. Ed. Zwartjes 2009a.
- Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchor. 1742. *Tagalysmo elucidado, y reducido (en lo possible) á la Latinidad de Nebrija, con su Syntaxis, Tropos, Prosodia, Passiones, &c. y con la allusion, que en su uso, y composicion tiene con el Dialecto Chinico Mandarin, con las Linguas Hebrea, y*

- Griega. México: D. Francisco Xavier Sánchez, en la Calle de San Francisco. Ed. Zwartjes (2010b).
- Pacconio, Franciscus (Francesco) & António de Couto. 1661. *Gentilis Angollae fidei mysteriis lusitano olim idiomate per r.p. Antonivm de Covcto Soc. Iesv theologum; nunc autem latino per fr. Antonivm Mariam Prandomontanum Concionatorem Capucinum ... instructus, atque locupletatus*. Romae: Typis S. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.
- Paz, Francisco da. 1773. *Compendio dos principios da grammatica hebraica, no qual se explicam breve e claramente as regras fundamentais d'esta lingua etc. Para uso das escholas da mesma Congregação* [franciscana da 3ª ordem]. Lisboa: na Regia Officina Typografica.
- Pellicer, Joseph. 1649. *Misión evangelica al Reyno de Congo por la Serafica Religión de los Capuchinos*. Madrid: Domingo García i Morrás.
- Pereszlényi, Pál [Paulus]. 1682. *Grammatica linguae ungaricae: Juxta hanc methodum concepta ac elaborata*. Tymaviae: Typis Academicis, excudebat Mahias Srnensky. Reprints: *Grammatica Lingvae Ungaricae a Paulo Pereszlényi é Societate Jesu, Juxta hanc methodum concepta ac elaborata. Et permissu Superiorum typis data*. Joannes Andreas Hörmann, 1702; Tyrnaviae: Typis Academicis, per Leopoldum Berger, 1738.
- Petraeus, Eskil. 1649. *Linguae Finnicae brevis institutio*. Turku: Peder Eriksson Wald.
- Podestà, Johannes Baptista. 1669. *Divino favente numine Assertiones de principiis substantialibus, accidentalibus proximis & remotis, diversisque differentiis linguarum: de Turcica, Arabica & Persica in communi & particulari; de influxu Arabicae in Persicam, utriusque in Turcicam, deque eorum arithmetica*. Viennae: Typis Joannis Baptistae Hacque Typographi Academici.
- Podestà, Johannes Baptista. 1703. *Cursus grammaticalis linguarum orientalium, arabicae scilicet, persicae et turcicae*. Viennae: Typis Leopoldi Voigt.
- Pope, George Uglow. 1883–1884[1855]. *A Tamil Hand-book or Full Introduction to the Common Dialect of that Language, on the plan of Ollendorf and Arnold*. Madras. Third edition: London: Allen.
- Prémare, Joseph Henri de. 2007[1847]. *Notita Linguae Sinicae*. Translation by J.G. Bridgman. Whitefish: Kessinger Publishing.
- Pretovio, Blas. (=Pablo Restivo) 1696. *Arte de la lengua guarani por el P. – de la compañía de Iesus*. En el Uruguay. (Copia del Ms CAJA-C-38 de la Biblioteca Universitaria de Granada). [with the subtitle on the first folio: “Sacado del P.^e Ant. Ruiz, Y P. Alonzo de Aragona de los papeles del P. Sim. Bandini y de otros”.]
- Priscianus Caesariensis. 1981[6th century A.D.] *Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII ex rec. Martini Hertzii*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms.
- Rau, Suriagy Amanda. 1875. *Grammatica da lingua maratha. Explicada em lingoa portugueza. Ordenada segundo as melhores grammaticas escriptas em lingoa maratha por autores hindus contemporaneos os mais abalizados, e por outros autores inglezes na presidencia de Bombaim, disposta por um methodo novo e dedicada aos estudiosos de Goa por ...*Nova Goa: Comp. imp. na Imp. Nacional.
- Restivo, Pablo. 1724[1996]. *Arte de la lengua guaraní*. Tercera edición. Presentación, transcripción y notas por Silvio M. Liuzzi: Pablo Restivo. *Gramática guaraní-jesuitico*. Ed. Online: <http://www.bibliotecademisiones.com> See also Blas Pretovio.
- Reuchlin, Johannes. 1974[1506]. *De rudimentis hebraicis libri III*. Pforzheim. Reprint: Hildesheim – New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Reyes, Antonio de los. 1976[1593]. *Arte en lengua mixteca*. México: Pedro Balli. Ed. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University.

- Rhodes, Alexandre. 1651a. *Lingvae annamiticae sev Tvnchinensi brevis declaratio*. In: Rhodes (1651b: ff. 1–31).
- Rhodes, Alexandre. 1651b. *Dictionarium annamiticum, lusitanum et latinum*. Romæ: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Rhodes, Alexandre. 1651c. *Catechismvs pro ijs, qui volunt suscipere Baptismvm in Octo dies diuisus. Phép giảng tám ngày cho kẻ muốn chịu phép rửa tội....* Romæ: Typis Sacrae Congregationis de Propaganda Fide.
- Ribeiro, Diogo. 2005[1626]. Vocabulario da lingoa Canarim feito pellos Padres da Companhia de Jesus que residem na Christandade de Salcete e novamente acrescentado com varios modos de fallar pello Padre – da mesma Companhia. Ms. Printed version compiled by Toru Maruyama. Private edition, based on a 697 carbon copied sheets of a typewritten manuscript and the original version. Nagoya: Nanzan University, Department of Japanese Studies.
- Rincón, Antonio del. 2005[1595]. *Arte mexicana compuesta por el padres – de la Compañía de Jesús dirigido al ilustrísimo y reverendísimo señor Don Diego Romano Obispo de Tlaxcala y del Consejo de su Mejestad, &c.* México: Pedro Balli. Ed. Ignacio Guzmán Betancourt (with Leonardo Manrique Castañeda, Miguel León-Portilla y Thomas C. Smith-Stark) [Edición conmemorativa IV Centenario, manuscrito de los editores.]
- Roboredo, Amaro de. 2007[1615]. *Verdadeira grammatica latina, para se bem saber em breue tempo, scritta na lingua Portuguesa com exemplos na Latina*. Lisboa: na Officina de Pedro Craesbeeck. Edição facsimilada com prefácio de Amadeu Torres e estudio introdutório de Gonçalo Fernandes, Rogelio Ponce de León e Carlos Assunção. Braga: Universidade de Tras-os-montes e Alto Douro. [=Collecção Lingüística, vol. 2.]
- Roboredo, Amaro de. 2007[1619]. *Methodo grammatical para todas as lingvas. Consta de tres partes. 1. Grammatica, exemplificada na Portuguesa, & Latina. 2. Copia de Palavras exemplificada nas Latinas, artifício experimentado para entêr Latim em poucos meses. 3. Frase exemplificada na latina, em que se exercitão as syntaxes ordinarias, & collocação rhetorica, como mostra a 3. & v. folha. Autor – natural da villa de Algosó*. Lisboa: Pedro Craesbeeck. Edição facsimilada com prefácio e estudio introdutório de Carlos Assunção e Gonçalo Fernandes. Braga: Universidade de Tras-os-montes e Alto Douro. [Collecção Lingüística, vol. 1.]
- Rodriguez, João. 1604–1608. *Arte da lingoa de Iapam composta pello Padre – Portugues da Cõpanhia de IESV diuidida em tres livros*. Nangasaqui: no Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de IESV. Facsimile edition: Tadao Doi, ed. 1976[1604–1608]. Tokyo: Bensheisha.
- Rodriguez, Ioam. 1620. *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa tirada da Arte Grande da mesma lingoa, pera os que começam a aprender os primeiros principios della. Pello Padre – da Companhia de Iesv Portugues do Bispado de Lamego. Diuidida em tres Livros*. Amacao: no Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de Iesv.
- Rodriguez, Ioam. 1993[1620]. *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa*. Fac-simile do original existente na Biblioteca Nacional da Ajuda, Lisboa, acompanhado da transcrição e tradução japonesa de Hino Hiroshi. Tokyo: Shin-Jinbutsu-Ōrai-Sha.
- Romero, Juan Antonio. 1799. *Gramatica Turca o Methodo breve, y facil para apreghender la Lengua turca con una coleccion de nombres, verbos, y phrases mas comunes, y varios dialogos familiares, por – Oficial tercero primero de la real Bibliotheca de S.M. y con honores del Inrterprete de Linguas Orientales*. (Ms). [Translation from the French grammar of Turkish composed by Holdermann 1730].
- Roth, Heinrich. 1988[1664 (?)]. *Grammatica linguae Sanscretanae Bramanum Indiae Orientalis*. Ed. Arnulf Camps, Jean-Claude Muller: *The Sanskrit grammar and manuscript of Father Heinrich Roth, S.J. (1620–1668)/with an introduction by –*. Leiden: Brill.

- Ruëll, Joannes. 1708[1700]. *Grammatica off Singalëse Taal-kunst, zijnde een korte methode om de voornaamste fondamenten van de Singaleese spraak te leren*. Ms Bibliotheek van de Theologische Universiteit Kampen. Edition 1708, Amsterdam: François Halma.
- Ruggieri, Michele & Matteo Ricci 2001[1583–1588]. *Dicionário Português-Chinês = Pu Han ci dian*. Ed. John W. Witek. San Francisco: Ricci Institute for Chinese-Western Cultural History, University of San Francisco.
- Ruiz de Montoya, Antonio. 1994[1640]. *Arte, y bocabulario de la lengua gvarani. Compvesto por el padre –, de la Compañía de Iesvs*. Madrid: Iuan Sanchez. Ed. Silvio M. Luizzi [sic]. 2 vols. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Sagard, Gabriel. 1632. *Dictionaire de la langve hyronne necessaire a ceux qui n'ont l'intelligence d'icelle, et ont a traiter avec les savvages du pays par Fr. – Recollet de S. François, de la province de S. Denys*. Paris: Chez Denys Moreau.
- San Augustin, Gaspar de. 1787[1703]. *Compendio de la Arte de la Lengua Tagala. Por el Padre Fr. –, Religioso de el mismo orden, Comissario de el Santo Oficio, Visitador de esta Provincia de Philipinas, y Prior de el Convento de Tambobong (Año 1703)*. Segvnda impression: Sampaloc: Imprenta de Nuestra señora de Loreto, 1787.
- San Buenaventura, Gabriel de. 1996[1684]. *Arte de la lengua maya, Compuesto por el R.P. Fr. – Predicador, y definidor habitual de la Provincia de San Joseph de Yucathan del orden de N.P.S. Francisco*. Mexico: Por la Viuda de Bernardo Calderon. [Biblioteca Nacional H.A. 1414.]. Edición René Acuña. México, D.F.: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México. [=Fuentes para el Estudio de la Cultura Maya, vol. 13.]
- Sánchez, Pedro. 2008[1610]. *Arte de grammatica, pera em breve saber latim: composta em lingoagem, e verso portvgues com hyn breve vocabulario no cabo, & algũas Phrases Latinas*. Lisboa: Vicente Alvarez.
- Sanctius [Brocensis], Franciscus (Sánchez de las Brozas, El Brocense). 1587. *Minerua: seu de causis linguæ Latinæ*. Salmanticae: Apud Ioannem, & Andream Renaut, fratres.
- Santo Thomas, Domingo de. 1951[1560]. *Grammatica o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Peru nuevamente compuesta por el Maestro Fray –*. Valladolid: Francisco Fernández de Córdova. Ed. Facsimilar de Raúl Barrenechea. Lima: Imprenta de Santa María.
- Santo Thomas, Domingo de. 1994[1560]. *Fray Domingo de S. Thomas. Grammatica o arte de la lengua general de los indios de los reynos del Perú*. Transliteración y estudio de Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino. 2 vols. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Sanvitores, Diego Luis de. 1954[1668]. *Grammaticae Institutiones Mariane Linguae*. Ed. E.J. Burrus: “Sanvitores’ Grammar and Catechism in the Mariana (or Chamorro) Languages (1668)” *Anthropos: internationale Zeitschrift für Völker- und Sprachenkunde: International review of ethnology and linguistics: Revue internationale d’ethnologie et de linguistique*. Freiburg: Anthropos-Institut (Paulusverlag), 49: 934–960.
- Sousa, João de. 1981[1789]. *Vestigios da lingua arabica em Portugal, ou Lexicon etymologico das palavras, e nomes portuguezes, que tem origem arabica, composto por ordem da Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa, por Fr. – Correspondente de Numero da mesma Sociedade, e interprete de S. magestade para a lingua Arabica*. Lisboa: Na Officina da Academia Real das Sciencias. A. Farinha de Carvalho, ed. [no place]: Gráfica Maiadouro.
- Sousa, João de. 1795. *Compendio da grammatica arabiga, abbreviado, claro e mais facil para a intelligencia e ensino da mesma lingua, collegido dos melhores grammaticos pelo P. Fr. – Religioso da Congregação da Terceira Ordem da Penitencia de Portugal. Professor, Secretario, e*

- Interprete da dita Lingua, e Socio da Academia Real das Sciencias de Lisboa.* Lisboa. Na Offic. Da Acad. Real das Scienc.: Com licença de S. Magestade.
- Stephens, Thomas (Thomaz Esteuaõ). 1640. *Arte da lingoa canarim composta pelo padre – & acrescentada pello Padre Diogo Ribeiro da mesma Cõpanhia E nouamente reuista & emendada por outros quarto Padres da mesma Companhia.* Rachol: Collegio de S. Ignacio da Companhia de Iesv.
- Templo, Selomoh Jehuda Leão. 5463=1703. ראשית חכמה (=Rešit ḥokmah) *Principio de Sciencia ou Gramathica Hebrayca. Por hum Methodo Breue, Claro, Facil, e Distincto ... para Uzo das Escolas como a ensina no Medrás em que assiste, No K.K. de Talmud Torah (5463 = 1703).* Amsterdam: Na Officina de Ymanuël Athias. A custa do Author.
- Tolomei, Claudio. 1539. *Versi e regole della nuova poesia toscana.* Roma: Antonio Blado D'Asola.
- Tuki, Raphael (Rūfā'il al-Tūkhī). 1778. *Rudimenta linguae coptae sive aegypticae ad usum collegii urbani de Propaganda fide.* Romæ: typis eiusdem Sacrae Congregationis.
- Urbano, Alonso. 1990[1605a]. *Arte breve de la lengua otomí, compuesto por el p[adre] fray – de la Orden de n[uestro] p[adre] s[an Francisco].* Ed. René Acuña: Alonso Urbano. *Arte breve de la lengua otomí y vocabulario trilingüe español – náhuatl – otomí.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Urbano, Alonso 1990[1605b]. *Vocabulario trilingüe.* Ed. René Acuña: Alonso Urbano. *Arte breve de la lengua otomí y vocabulario trilingüe español-náhuatl-otomí.* México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Valdés, Juan de. 1535[1737]. *Diálogo de la lengua.* Ed. Mayans y Siscar 1981[1737].
- Valdiuia, Luys de. 1606. *Arte y gramatica general de la lengva qve corre en todo el Reyno de Chile, con vn Vocabulario, y Confessionario. Compuestos por el Padre – de la Compañía de Iesus en la Prouincia del Piru. Ivtamente con la doctrina Christiana y Cathecismo del Concilio de Lima en Español, y dos traduciones del en la lengua de Chile, que examinaron y aprobaron los dos Reuerendissimos señores de Chile, cada qual la de su Obispado.* Lima: Francisco del Canto.
- Valdiuia, Luys de. 2008[1606]. Ed. Emilio Ridruejo. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional. [edición facsimilar de la copia de la Biblioteca Universitaria de Valladolid. 21–9–8393.]
- Valdiuia, Luys de. 1943[1607a]. *Arte y gramatica en dos lengvas de Indios Millcayac y Allentiac de las Ciudades de Mendoça y S. Iuan de la Frontera de la prouincia de Cuyo Cõ Cathecismos, Confessionarios, y dos breues Vocabularios en ambas lenguas. Compvesto por el Padre – de la Compañía de Iesus de la Prouincia del Peru.* Lima: Francisco del Canto. Ed. F. Márquez Miranda. La Plata: Universidad de la Plata.
- Valdiuia, Luys de. 1943[1607b]. *Vocabulario breve en lengva millcayac, en que estan los vocablos necesarios y suficientes para catequizar y confessar. Compvesto por el Padre – de la Compañía de Iesus, de la prouincia del Peru.* Lima: Francisco del Canto.
- Valignano, Alessandro. 1944[1542–1564]. *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias Orientales.* Herausgegeben und erläutert von Josef Wicki. Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I. [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. vol. 2.]
- Valle Flemmarum, Agapito à. 1687. *Flores Grammaticales Arabici Idiomatis collecti ex optimis quibusque grammaticis nec non pluribus arabum monumentis, ad quam maximam fieri potuit breuitatem atque ordinem revocati: Studio, & labore Fr. Agapiti à Valle Flemmarum Ordinis Minorum S. Francisci reformatorum Provin-ciae Tridentinae, in Semionario Patavino lectoris. Opus omnibus Arabicae Linguae Studiosis perutile, & necessarium.* Patavii: Ex Typographia Seminarii Opera Au-gustini Candiani.

- Varchi, Benedetto. 1562. *L'Ercolano, dialogo nel quale si ragiona generalmente delle lingue e in particolare della fiorentina e della toscana*. Published posthumously in 1570. Firenze: Filippo Giunti e Fratelli.
- Varo, Francisco. 2006[between 1677–1687]. *Vocabulario de la lengua Mandarin con el estilo y vocablos con que se habla sin elegancia. Compuesto por el Padre fray – ord. Pred. Ministro de China consumado en esta lengua esriuese guardando el orden del A.B. c.d.* Ed. W. South Coblin: *Francisco Varo's Glossary of the mandarin Language*. Vol. 1: *An English and Chinese Annotation of the Vocabulario de la Lengua Mandarin*. Vol. 2: *Pinyin and English Index of the Vocabulario de la Lengua Mandarin*. Nettetal: Sankt Augustin. [Monumenta Serica Monograph Series LIII/1 and LIII/2.]
- Varo, Francisco. 2000[1703]. *Arte de la lengua mandarina compuesto por el M.R.^o. P.^e – de la sagrada Orden de N.P.S. Domingo, acrecentado, y reducido a mejor forma, por N.^o H. fr. Pedro de la Piñuela P[redicad]or y Comisario Prov[incial] de la Mission Serafica de China. Añadióse un Confessionario muy vtil, y provechoso para alivio de los nueos Ministros*. Canton: [publisher unknown]. W. South Coblin & Joseph A. Levi, eds.: *Francisco Varo's Grammar of the Mandarin Language (1703). An English translation of 'Arte de la lengua mandarina'*. With an Introduction by Sandra Breitenbach. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [=Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 93].
- Varro, Marcus Terentius. 1958[116 A. de C.]. *De Lingua Latina*. Ed. Roland G. Kent: *Varro on the Latin Language*. London, etc.: Loeb Classical Library.
- Vetancurt, Agustín de. 1673. *Arte de lengua mexicana dispvesto Por orden, y mandato de N. R.^{mo} P. Fr. Francisco Treviño, Predicador Theologo, Padre de santa Provincia de Burgos, y Comisario General de todas las de la Nueva España, y por el Reverendo, y Venerable Diffinitorio de la Provincia del Santo Evangelio dedicado al Bienaventvrado S. Antonio de Padva. Por el P. Fr. – hijo de la dicha Provincia del Santo Evangelio, Predicador jubilado, ex lector de Theologia, y Preceptor de la lengua Mexicana, Vicario de la Capilla de S. Joseph de los Naturales en el Convento de N.P.S. Francisco de Mexico*. México: Francisco Rodriguez Lupercio.
- Viçiana (=Viziana), Martin de. 1574. *Libro de alabaças de las lengua Hebreá, Griega, Latina, Castellana y Valenciana*. Valencia: Joan Nauarro.
- Villalón, Cristóbal de. 1971[1558]. *Arte o gramática para saber hablar escribir en la lengua castellana; colegida de la auctoridad de los sabios, conforme a la costumbre y uso común de la lengua no corrompida*. Ambers: Guillermo Simon.
- Vittori da Rieti, Mariano. 1552. *Chaldeae seu Aethiopiae linguae institutiones, numquam antea a Latinis visae, opus utile aceruditum. Item omnium Aethiopiae regum qui ab inundato terrarum orbe usque ad nostra tempora imperarunt Libellus hactenus tam Graecis quam Latinis ignoratus, nuper ex aethiopica translatus lingua*. Romae: V. Doricus.
- Wemmers, Jacob[us]. 1638a. *Lexicon Aethiopicvm ad eminentiss. Principem S.R.E. Card. Antonivm Barberinvm*. Romae: Sac. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.
- Wemmers, Jacob[us]. 1638b. *Lexicon Aethiopicvm ad eminentiss. principe, S.R.E. card. Antonium Barberinum ...Cum eiusdem linguae institutionibus grammat. & indice vocum latinarum*. Romae: Sac. Congreg. de Propaganda Fide.
- Ximénez, Francisco. 1993[ca. 1710]. *Arte de las tres lengvas 3a3chiquel, qviche y 4vtvhill*. [Manuscrito Auer 1515, Newberry Library, Chicago]. Transcripción, notas y prólogo por Rosa Helena Chinchilla M: *Arte de las tres lenguas kaqchikel, k'iche' y tz'utujil*. Guatemala, C.A.: Academia de Geografía e Historia de Guatemala. [Biblioteca Goathemala, vol. 31.]

- Zeisberger, David & Peter S. Duponceau. 1827. "A Grammar of the Language of the Lenni Lenape or Delaware Indians". *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, new series, vol. 3.65–250.
- Ziegenbalg, Bartolomaeus, 1716. *Grammatica Damulica, quae pervaria paradigmata, regulas & necessarium vocabulorum apparatus, vian brevissimam monstrat, que lingua Damulica seu Malabarica...* Halle an der Saale: Orphanotrophei.

Secondary Sources

- Aarvig Paulsen, Kristine. 2004. Los problemas traductológicos en la lingüística misionera hispánica (siglos XVI-XVIII): Un estudio comparativo entre la gramática quechua de Ivan Roxo Mexía y Ocón y la gramática del pampango de Diego Bergaño. MA Thesis. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Aboh, Enoch & Norval Smith. In preparation. "Migrations, Ethnodynamics and Geolinguistics in the Eastern Aja-Tado cultural area". Pieter Muysken & Norval Smith, eds. (forthcoming). *The Transatlantic Sprachbund: Benin and Surinam*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Adelaar, Willem [F.H.]. 1993. "La categoría del plural inclusivo en las lenguas americanas: interpretación y realidad". Kerkhof et al., eds. 1993.207–216.
- Adelaar, Willem [F.H.]. 1997. "Las transiciones en la tradición gramatical hispanoamericana: historia de un modelo descriptivo". Zimmermann, ed. 1997.259–270.
- Ahlqvist, Anders, ed. 1992. *Diversions of Galway. Papers on the history of linguistics from ICHoLS V. Galway, Ireland, 1–6 September 1990*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 68.]
- Akamatsu, Paul et al., eds. 1976. *Études choisi de Charles Haguenauer*. Vol. 1. Japon. *Études de linguistique*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Alden, Dauril. 1996. *The Making of an Enterprise. The Society of Jesus in Portugal, its Empire, and Beyond 1540–1750*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Alençon, Edouard d'. 1914. "Essai de bibliographie Capucino-Congolaise". *Neerlandia Franciscana* (Iseghem, Belgium) 1:33–42.
- Alexandre, P. 1967. *Langues et langage en Afrique noire*. Paris: Payot.
- Alonso Romo, Eduardo Javier. 2003. "Portugués, castellano y latín en Japón (1543–1640)". Sánchez Miret, ed. 2003.5:3–16.
- Altman, Cristina. 1999a. "As gramáticas das 'línguas gerais' sul-americanas como um capítulo da historiografia lingüística ocidental". Fernández Rodríguez et al., eds. 1999.151–160.
- Altman, Cristina. 1999b. "From 'Insula Vera Crux' to 'Terra Brasiliensis': History, (hi)stories and the historiography of Brazilian linguistics". Cram et al., eds. 1999.71–80.
- Altman, Cristina. 2003. "As línguas gerais sul-americanas e a empresa missionária: linguagem e representação nos séculos XVI e XVII". Freire & Rosa, eds. 2003.57–83.
- Altman, Cristina. 2007. "Artigos e pronotes na tradição lingüística missionária da língua mais falada na costa do Brasil". Schrader-Kniffki & Morgenthaler García, eds. 2007.837–854.
- Altman, Cristina & Otto Zwartjes. 2005. "Introduction and Acknowledgements". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.1–2.
- Anderson, Gerald H. 1998. *Biographical Dictionary of Christian Missions*. New York: Macmillan Reference/Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

- Anderson, J.D. 1962. *A Manual of the Bengali Language*. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co. (Republished by arrangement with Cambridge University Press. First edition, 1920).
- Anderson, Stephan R. 1985. "Inflectional Morphology". Shopen, ed. 1985.3:150–201.
- Anderson, W.G. 1897. *An Introductory Grammar of the Sena Language spoken on the Lower Zambesi*. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Andronov, Mikhail S. 2003. *A Comparative Grammar of the Dravidian Languages*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Andronov, Mikhail S. 2004. *A Reference Grammar of the Tamil Language*. München: Lincom Europa.
- Anssens-Lestienne, Yannick. 1983. "L'arabe andalou. Sources et Bibliographie". *Matériaux arabes et sudarabiques (MAS): Recherches en cours* 1983. Paris: Paul Geuthner. 11–60.
- Arden, A.H. 1954[1942]. *A Progressive Grammar of Common Tamil*. Fifth edition revised by A.C. Clayton, with an appendix on Tamil phonetics by J.R. Firth. Madras: Christian Literature Society.
- Assunção, Paulo de. 2004. *Negócios Jesuíticos. O cotidiano da administração dos bens divinos*. São Paulo: Edusp.
- Atsuko Tashiro, Eliza. 2004. "As variedades do japonês nas Artes do Pe. João Rodrigues Tçuzu". *Boletim 7: Historiografia da Lingüística Brasileira*. São Paulo: Centro de Documentação em Historiografia Lingüística – Departamento de Lingüística & Universidade de São Paulo, 199–224. On line version: <www.fllch.usp.br/cedoch/textos/boletim7%5B199–224%5D.pdf> (Consulted: September, 19th, 2007).
- Auroux, Sylvain. 1989. *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Vol. 1. *La naissance des métalangages en Orient et en Occident*. Liège & Bruxelles: Pierre Mardaga.
- Auroux, Sylvain, ed. 1992a. *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Vol. 2. *Le développement de la grammaire occidentale*. Liège: Pierre Mardaga.
- Auroux, Sylvain. 1992b. "Introduction. Le processus de grammatisation et ses enjeux". Auroux, ed. 1992a.11–64.
- Auroux, Sylvain, ed. 2000a. *Histoire des idées linguistiques*. Vol. 3. *L'hégémonie du comparatisme*. Sprimont: Pierre Mardaga.
- Auroux, Sylvain. 2000b. "Introduction. Émergence et domination de la grammaire comparée". Auroux, ed. 2000a.9–22.
- Auroux, Sylvain, E.F.K. Koerner, Hans-Josef Niederehe & Kees Versteegh, eds. 2000. *History of the Language Sciences: An International handbook on the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present/Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Entwicklung der Sprachforschung von den Anfängen bis zur gegenwart/Histoire des Sciences du Langage: manuel international d'histoire des études linguistiques des origines à nos jours*. Vol. 1. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter & Co.
- Ayrosa, Plínio. 1952. "Notas prefaciais". In: Anonymous: *Vocabulário na Língua Brasileira*, pp. 9–11. (see primary sources).
- Ayrosa, Plínio. 1967. *Estudos tupinológicos*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Publicação do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros.
- Bae, Eun Mi. 2005. El sistema pronominal en la gramática del japonés del franciscano Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (siglo XVIII): ¿Tradición y/u originalidad? MA Thesis. Oslo: University of Oslo.
- Bagola, Beatrice, ed. 2000. *La lingüística española en la época de los descubrimientos. Actas del Coloquio en honor del profesor Hans-Josef Niederehe, Tréveris 16 a 17 de junio de 1997*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag. [Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart, Beiheft 5.]

- Baião, Domingos Vieira. 1938. *Elementos de Gramática Ganguela. Idioma falado na região do Cubango, província de Angola, segundo os estudos do Rev. P. L. Lecomte*. Lisboa: Centro dos Estudos Filológicos.
- Bailey, Don Clifford. 1960–1961. “The Rakuyōshū”. *Monumenta Nipponica* 16.3/4:289–376.
- Bailey, Don Clifford. 1960. “Early Japanese Lexicography”. *Monumenta Nipponica* 16:1/2.1–52.
- Balbi, Adriano. 1826. *Atlas ethnographique du globe, ou classification des peuples anciens et modernes d'après leurs langues, précédé d'un discours sur l'utilité et l'importance de l'étude des langues appliquée à plusieurs branches des connaissances humaines: d'un aperçu sur les moyens graphiques employés par les différens peuples de la terre: d'un coup-d'oeil sur l'histoire de la langue slave et sur la marche progressive de la civilisation et de littérature en Russie avec environ sept cents vocabulaires des principaux idiomes connus*. Paris: Rey et Gravier.
- Barriga Villanueva, Rebeca & Esther Herrera Zendejas, eds. (in preparation): *Estructuras, lenguas y hablantes. Estudios en Homenaje a Thomas C. Smith-Stark*. México, D.F.: El Colegio de México.
- Barriga Villanueva, Rebeca & Otto Zwartjes. 2009. “Bibliography of Thomas C. Smith-Stark (1973–2009)”. Zwartjes & Koerner 2009.213–221.
- Barros, Maria Cândida Drummond Mendes. 2003. “Tensão entre a norma e o uso nos manuscritos jesuíticos tupi da Amazônia portuguesa no século XVIII”. Paper presented at the First International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Oslo.
- Bartoli, Daniello. 1660–1663. *Dell'Historia della Compagnia di Giesu*. Vols 2–3. Roma: Stamperia del Varesse.
- Batibo, H.M. 2005. “Future Tense and Aspect Markings in Southern Bantu”. Voeltz, ed. 2005.1–12.
- Batista, Ronaldo. 2002. “A ‘língua de preto’ e os métodos de descrição na *Arte da língua de Angola*, de 1697 (The ‘Nigger Language’ and the methods of description in *Arte da língua de Angola*, 1697)”. *Estudos Lingüísticos* 21. CD-rom, São Paulo. Paper presented at the “49º Seminário do GEL”, São Paulo.
- Batista, Ronaldo. 2004. “Regras gerais e comparações na syntaxe da *Arte da língua de Angola* (General Rules and Comparisons in the *Arte da língua de Angola*)”. *Estudos Lingüísticos* 23. CD-rom, Campinas. Paper presented at the “51º Seminário do GEL”, Campinas, SP.
- Bawden, C.R. 1954. “An Eighteenth Century Chinese Source for the Portuguese Dialect of Macao”. *Silver Jubilee Volume of the Zinbun-Kogaku-Kek-Kyusho*, 12–33. Kyoto: Kyoto University Press.
- Bearth, Thomas. 2003. “Syntax”. Nurse & Philippson, eds. 2003.121–142.
- Becker, Alton L. 1995. *Beyond Translation: Essays towards a modern philology*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Bentley, William Holman. 1887. *Dictionary and Grammar of the Kongo Language, as spoken at San Salvador, the ancient capital of the old Kongo empire, West Africa*. London: Baptist Missionary Society.
- Besselaar, J. van den. 1981. *António Vieira: o homem, as obras, as idéias*. Lisboa: Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 1987. *A History of the Hindi Grammatical Tradition. Hindi-Hindustani grammar, grammarians, history and problems*. Leiden: E.J. Brill. [Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 2 South Asia. Ergänzungsband 4.]
- Bhatia, Tej. K. & Kazuhiko Machida, eds. 2009[1698]. *The Oldest Grammar of Hindustani: Contact communication and colonial legacy*. Vol. 1: *Historical and Cross-cultural Contexts Grammar Corpus and Analysis*; Vol. 2: *Lexical Corpus and Analysis* [Ketelaar's Section 1–45];

- Vol. 3: *Ketelaar: Original Manuscript [1698 A.D.]*. Tokyo: Research Institute for Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols. 2005. "Inclusive-Exclusive as Person vs Number Categories Worldwide". Filimonova, ed. 2005.49–72.
- Binotti, Lucia. 2000. "La lengua compañera del imperio». Observaciones sobre el desarrollo de un discurso de colonialismo lingüístico en el Renacimiento español". Zwartjes, ed. 2000b.259–288.
- Bleek, Wm. H.J. 1856. *The Languages of Mosambique. Vocabularies of the Dialects of Lourenço Marques, Inhambane, Sofala, tette, Sena, Quelimane, Mosambique, Cape Delgado, Anoaene, the Maravi, Mudsau, &c..* London: Harrison and Sons.
- Bodewitz, H.W. 1994–1995. "Ketelaar and Millius and their Grammar of Hindustani". *Bulletin of the Deccan College* 54–55.123–131.
- Bontinck, François & Ndembe Nsasi, eds. 1978. *Le catéchisme kikongo de 1624. Réédition critique*. Brussel/Bruxelles: Koninklijke Academie voor Overzeese Wetenschappen/Académie royale des Sciences d'Outre-Mer.
- Bonvini, Emilio. 1996. "Repères pour une histoire des connaissances linguistiques linguistiques des langues africaines. I. Du XVI^e siècle au XVIII^e siècle: dans le sillage des explorations". *Histoire Epistémologie Langage* 18:2.127–148.
- Bonvini, Emilio. 2008. "Línguas africanas e português falado no Brasil". Fiorin & Petter, eds. 2008.15–62.
- Bonvini, Emilio. 2009. "Revisiter trois siècles après, 'Arte da lingua de Angola' de Pedro Dias S.I. – grammaire kimbundu, rédigée au Brésil, mais publiée à Lisbonne en 1697". Petter & Beline, eds. 2009.15–45.
- Borao, José Eugenio. 2000. "The Catholic Dominican Missionaries in Taiwan (1626–1642)". *Leuven Chinese Studies* 10.101–132.
- Borges, José Elias Barbosa. 1984. "Indígenas da Paraíba (1). Classificação preliminar". *Educação e Cultura* 3:12.30–43.
- Borges, Luiz C. 2001. "A instituição de línguas gerais no Brasil". Orlandi, ed. 2001.199–222.
- Bossong, Georg. 1992. "Reflections on the History of the Study of Universals: The example of the *partes orationis*". Kefer & Auwera, eds. 1992.3–16.
- Bossong, Georg. 1998. "Le marquage différentiel de l'object dans les langues d'Europe". Feuillet, ed. 1998.193–258.
- Bossong, Georg. 2007. "The Influence of Missionary Descriptions of Far Eastern Languages on Western Linguistic Thought: The case of Cristoforo Borri, S.J. and Tommaso Campanella". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.123–143.
- Bossong, Georg. 2009. "The Typology of Tupi-Guaraní as Reflected in the Grammars of Jesuit Missionaries: Anchieta (1595), Aragona (c.1625), Montoya (1640), and Restivo (1729)". Zwartjes & Koerner, eds. 2009.225–258.
- Botelho, Sebastião Xavier. 1835. *Memoria estatistica sobre os dominios Portuguezes na Africa oriental*. Lisboa: Typ. de J.B. Morando.
- Bowser, Frederick P. 1974. *The African Slave in Colonial Peru 1524–1650*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Boxer, Charles R. 1949–1950. "Padre João Rodriguez Tçuzu S.J. and his Japanese Grammars of 1604 and 1620". *Miscelânea de Filologia, Literatura e História cultural à memória de Francisco Adolfo Coelho*, 2.338–363.
- Boxer, Charles R. 1967. *The Christian Century in Japan 1549–1650*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.

- Breitenbach, Sandra. 2004a. *Leitfäden in der Missionarslinguistik*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang. [Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXVII: Asiatische und Afrikanische Studien, vol. 93.] [Originally PhD Thesis, University of Göttingen, 1996.]
- Breitenbach, Sandra. 2004b. *Der Mandarin-Code. Sprache, Geheimsprache und Macht aus historischer und zeitgenössischer Perspektive*. Berlin: Dr. Köster.
- Breve-Claramonte, Manuel. 1983. *Sanctius' Theory of Language. A contribution to the history of Renaissance linguistics*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins [=Studies in the History of Linguistics, vol. 27.]
- Brockey, Liam Matthew. 2007. *Journey to the East. The Jesuit mission to China 1579–1724*. Cambridge, MA & London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Brøndal, Viggo. 1948. *Les parties du discours. Parties orations. Études sur les catégories linguistiques*. København: Munksgaard.
- Brown, Keith, ed. 2006. *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Second edition. Amsterdam, etc.: Elsevier.
- Buenaventura de Carroceria, O.F.M. Cap. 1945. “Los capuchinos españoles en el Congo y el primer Diccionario congolés”. *Missionalia Hispanica* 2:5.209–230.
- Buescu, Maria Leonor Carvalhão. 1971. “Introdução”. See primary sources (João de Barros 1971[1540]: vii–lxxxv).
- Buescu, Maria Leonor Carvalhão. 1983. *O estudo das línguas exóticas no século XVI*. Lisboa: Instituto de Cultura e Língua Portuguesa/Ministério da Educação. [Biblioteca Breve, vol. 71.]
- Calvo Pérez, Julio & Daniel Jorques Jiménez, eds. 1997. *Estudios de Lengua y Cultura Amerindias. Lenguas, literaturas y medios. Actas de las IV Jornadas Internacionales de Lengua y Cultura Amerindias. Valencia, 17–20 de noviembre de 1997*. València: Universidad de València.
- Câmara Jr. Joaquim Mattoso. 1979. *Introdução às línguas indígenas brasileiras*. Rio de Janeiro: Ao Livro Técnico.
- Camps, Arnulf. 1988. “Father Heinrich Roth, S.J. (1620–1668) and the History of his Sanskrit Manuscripts”. Camps & Muller, eds. 1988.5–12.
- Camps, Arnulf & Jean-Claude Muller, eds. 1988. *The Sanskrit Grammar and Manuscripts of father Heinrich Roth S.J. (1620–1668). Facsimile edition of Biblioteca Nazionale, Rome, MSS. Or. 171 and 172*. Leiden, etc.: E.J. Brill.
- Cancela, Luis L. 1920. *Elementos para o estudo do Kimbundu*. Malange: s.a.
- Candra Sena, Dineśa (Dinesh Chandra Sen). 1954[1911]. *History of Bengali Language and Literature: A series of lectures delivered to the Calcutta University*. Second edition: Calcutta: University of Calcutta.
- Cardona, George & Dhanesh Jain, eds. 2003. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Cardoso, Armando, ed. 1993. *Doutrina Cristã*. Vol. 1. *Catecismo Brasílico*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola.
- Cardoso, Armando. 1990. “Aditamentos”. In: *Joseph de Anchieta. Arte de gramática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil*. Edição fac-similar, Apresentação Carlos Drumond, 139–231. São Paulo: Edições Loyola. [Monumenta Anchieta: Obras completas do Pe. José de Anchieta, vol. 11.]
- Cardoso, Carlos Lopes. 1966. “Contribuição para a Bibliografia das línguas «Bantu» de Angola”. *Boletim Internacional de Bibliografia Luso-Brasileira* 7.512–539.
- Cardoso, Simão. 1994. *Historiografia gramatical: 1500–1920: Língua portuguesa – Autores Portugueses*. Porto: Faculdade de Letras do Porto. [Revista da Faculdade de Letras. Série Línguas e Literaturas, Anexo VII.]

- Cardoso, Suzana Alice, Jacira Andrade Mota & Rosa Virginia Mattos e Silva, eds. 2006. *Quinhentos anos de história lingüística do Brasil*. Salvador, BA: Secretaria da Cultura e Turismo do Estado da Bahia.
- Carvalho, A. Farinha de. 1981. “Nota Introdutória”. Sousa 1981[1789].11–32. (primary sources).
- Casacchia, Giorgio. 1989. “Les débuts de la tradition linguistique chinoise et l’âge d’or de la linguistique impériale”. Auroux, ed. 1989:1.431–448.
- Castro, Yeda Pessoa de. 2002. *A língua mina-jeje no Brasil, um falar africano em Ouro Preto do século XVIII*. Belo Horizonte: Sistema Estadual de Planejamento & Centro de Estudos Históricos e Culturais.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1994. “El Nebrija indiano”. See Domingo de Santo Thomas (primary sources). i–lxxvii. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 1995. *La lengua de naimlap. Reconstrucción y obsolescencia del mochica*. Lima: Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2000. *Lingüística aimara*. Lima: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos “Bartolomé de las Casas”. [Biblioteca de la Tradición Oral Andina, vol. 21.]
- Chandra Prasad, Ram (=Rāma Candra Prasāda). 1980. *Early English Travelers in India: A study in the Travel Literature of the Elizabethan and Jacobean periods with particular reference to India*. Delhi, etc.: Motilal Banarsidass Publ.
- Chatelain, Héli. 1888–1889. *Kimbundu Grammar/Grammatica elementar do Kimbundu ou Lingua de Angola*. Genebra: Typ. De Charles Schuchardt.
- Chaudhuri, Saroj Kumar. 2010. “A Study on the Grammar of John Rodriguez”. George, ed. 2010.525–535.
- Chevillard, Jean-Luc & Jean-Claude Passerieu. 1989. “La tradition grammaticale tamoule”. Auroux, ed. 1989.417–429.
- Chinchilla, Rosa Helena. 1993. “Introducción”. Francisco Ximenez, O.P. *Arte de las tres lenguas kaqchikel, k’iche’ y tz’utujil*. Guatemala: Academia de Geografía e Historia de Guatemala. [Biblioteca Goathemala, vol. 31.] 1993.ix–xxxii.
- Chomsky, William. 1952/5713. *David Kimhi’s Hebrew Grammar (Mikhlol). Systematically presented and critically annotated*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company.
- Coblin, W. South. 2000. “A Brief History of Mandarin”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120:4.537–552.
- Coblin, W. South & Joseph A. Levi. 2000. “Editor’s Foreword”. See Primary sources, Francisco Varo 2000[1703], ix–xviii.
- Coelho, Olga. 2010. “El aprovechamiento descriptivo del concepto de ‘caso’ en Dias (1697)”. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Cohen, Leonardo. 2009. *The Missionary Strategies of the Jesuits in Ethiopia (1555–1632)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag. [Aethiopistische Forschungen, vol. 70.]
- Cole, Desmond T. 1971. “The History of African Linguistics to 1945”. Sebeok, ed. 1971.1–29.
- Colombat, Bernard, ed. 2008. *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 30, 2. *Les langues du monde à la Renaissance*. Paris: Société d’Histoire et d’Épistémologie des Sciences du Langue.
- Considine, John. 2010. “Towards a History of Chinese Lexicography”. *Historiographia Linguistica* 27:1/2.133–143.
- Cooper, Michael. 1971. *The Southern Barbarians. The first Europeans in Japan*. Tokyo – Palo Alto, CA: Kodansha International – Sophia University.
- Cooper, Michael. 1976. “Review: The *Nippo Jisho*”. *Monumenta Nipponica* 31:4.417–430. [Review of the Facsimile edition of the *Vocabulario da Lingoa de Iapam*, Bensheisha, 1973, 1975.]

- Cooper, Michael. 2001. *João Rodrigues's Account of Sixteenth-Century Japan*. London: The Hakluyt Society.
- Corrales, Cristóbal, Dolores Corbella Díaz, Francisca del Mar Plaza Picón, Antonio Nelsi Torres González & Josefá Dorta Luis, eds. 2004. *Nuevas aportaciones a la historiografía lingüística*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Cowan, William. 1981. "Arabic Grammatical Terminology in Pedro de Alcalá". *Historiographia Linguistica* 8.2/3:357–363.
- Cram, David, Andrew Linn & Elke Nowak, eds. 1999. *History of Linguistics 1996. Selected papers from the Seventh International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences (ICHOLS VII). Oxford, 12–17 September 1996*. Vol. 1: *Traditions in Linguistics Worldwide*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 94.]
- Creissels, Denis. 2000. "Typology". Heine & Nurse, eds. 2000.231–258.
- Cruz, Aline da. 2005. O resgate da lingual geral. Modos de representação das unidades lingüísticas da Língua Geral Brasileira e do Tupi Austral na obra de Martius (1794–1868). MA These. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo.
- Cunha Rivara, Joaquim Heliodoro da Cunha. 1958[1858]. *Ensaio Historico da Lingua Concani*. Nova Goa. Translated from the Portuguese by Fr. T. Lobo: *An Historical Essay on the Konkani Language*. Priolkar, 1958.149–236.
- Cunha, Pérciles. 2008. "A Arte de Pedro Dias". *Jornal Irohin* 27-02-2008. On-line: <http://www.irohin.org.br/onl/new.php?sec=news&id=2984>
- Dahlmann, Joseph. 1891. *Die Sprachkunde und die Missionen. Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der ältern katholischen Missionsthätigkeit (1500–1800)*. Freiburg im Breisgau & St. Louis, MO, etc.: Herder. [Stimmen aus "Maria=Laach", vol. 50.] On-line: <http://www.archive.org/stream/sprachkundemiss00dahl#page/56/mode/2up>
- Dasgupta, Probal. 2003. "Bangla". Cardona & Jain, eds. 2003.351–390.
- De Clercq, L. 1921. *Grammaire du kiyombe*. Bruxelles: Goemaere, Imprimeur du Roi, Éditeur. [Bibliothèque-Congo, vol. 5.]
- De Clercq, Jan, Pierre Swiggers & Louis van Tongerloo. 1996. "The Linguistic Contribution of the Congregation De Propaganda Fide". Tavoni, ed. 1996.2:439–458.
- Debergh, Minako. 1982. "Les débuts des contacts linguistiques entre l'occident et le Japon". Włodarczyk, ed. 1982.27–44.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, Sabine & Lindsey Crickmay, eds. 1999. *La lengua de la cristianización en Lationamérica: Catequización e instrucción en lenguas amerindias/The Language of Christianisation in Latin America: Catechisation and instruction in Amerindian Languages*. Schwaben: Anton Saurwein [Bonner Amerikanistische Studien, 32/CIASE Occasional papers, vol. 29.]
- Depuydt, Leo. 2006. "Review: *Elementa linguae copticae. Grammaire inedite du XVIIe siècle*. 2005. Ed. by Sydney H. Aufrère and Nathalie Bosson. Geneva: Patrick Cramer (Cahiers d'Orientalisme, vol. 24)". *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 126:4596–598.
- Dickason, Olive Patricia. 2001. "The Sixteenth-Century French. Vision of Empire: The other side of self-Determination". Warkentin & Podruchny, eds. 2001.87–109.
- Dietrich, Wolf. 2000a. "Das Studium der Eingeborenen Sprachen Südamerikas: Guaraní". Auroux et al., eds. 2000a.960–966.
- Dietrich, Wolf. 2000b. "El problema de la categoría del adjetivo en las lenguas tupí-guaraníes". van der Voort & van de Kerke, eds. 2000.255–263.
- Ditters, Everhard & Harald Motzki, eds. 2007. *Approaches to Arabic Linguistics*. Presented to Kees Versteegh on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

- Dixon, R.M.W. 1997. *The Rise and Fall of Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, R.M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds. 1999. *The Amazonian Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Döhla, Hans-Jörg, Raquel Montero Muñoz & Francisco Báez de Aguilar González, eds. 2008. *Lenguas en diálogo. El iberorromance y su diversidad lingüística y literaria. Ensayos en homenaje a Georg Bossong*. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Doke, C.M. 1961a. "The Earliest Records of Bantu". Doke & Cole, eds. 1961.1–7.
- Doke, C.M. 1961b. "Early Bantu Literature. The age of Brusciotto". Doke & Cole, eds. 1961.8–26.
- Doke, C.M. & D.T. Cole, eds. 1961. *Contributions to the History of Bantu Linguistics. Papers contributed by C.M. Doke and D.T. Cole (1935–1960)*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- D'Orbigny, Alcide Dessalines. 1839. *L'homme américain*. In: *Voyage dans Amérique méridionale*. 9 Vols. Paris: Bertrand.
- Dror, Olga & Keith Weller Taylor, eds. 2006. *Views of Seventeenth-century Vietnam: Christoforo Borri on Cochinchina and Samuel Baron on Tonkin*. Ithaca, NY: Southeast Asia Program Publications/Cornell University.
- Drum[m]ond, Carlos. [On the cover: "Drummond"]. 1990. "Apresentação". *Joseph de Anchieta, Arte de Gramática da língua mais usada na Costa Brasil*, 7–17. São Paulo: Loyola. [Monumenta Anchieta: Obras completas do Pe. José de Anchieta, vol. 11.] (see also primary sources).
- Duyvendak, J.J.L. 1936. "Early Chinese Studies in Holland". *T'oung Pao* 32.293–344.
- Edmonson, Munro S., ed. 1974. *Sixteenth-Century Mexico. The work of Sahagún*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.
- Errandonea, I. 1945. "¿Erasmo o Nebrija?" *Revista de Filología Española* 29:65–96.
- Errington, Joseph. 2008. *Linguistics in a Colonial World. A story of Language, meaning, and Power*. Malden, Ma, etc.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Escavy, Ricardo, José Miguel Hernández Terrés & Antonio Roldán Pérez, eds. 1994. *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Historiografía Lingüística. Nebrija V Centenario*. 3 vols. Murcia: El Taller.
- Eschbach-Szabo, Viktoria. 1989. "La réflexion linguistique au Japon". Auroux, ed. 1989.459–464.
- Esparza Torres, Miguel Ángel. 2000. "Notas sobre el «Thesaurus verborum ac phrasium» de bartolomé Bravo". Bagola, ed. 2000.43–57.
- Esparza Torres, Miguel Ángel. 2007. "Nebrija y los modelos de los misioneros lingüistas del náhuatl". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.3–40.
- Farinha, António Lourenço. 1917. *Elementos de Gramática Landina (Shironga). Dialecto indígena de Lourenço Marques*. Lourenço Marques: Imprensa Nacional.
- Fernandes, Gonçalo. 2010. *A Arte da Língua de Angola* (Lisboa 1697) de Pedro Dias, S. J.: A primeira descrição gramatical da língua dos Ambundos. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Fernández Rodríguez, Mauro, Francisco García Gondar & Nancy Vázquez Veiga, eds. 1997. *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de la Sociedad Española de Historiografía Lingüística. A Coruña, 18–21 de febrero de 1997*. Madrid: Arco Libros.
- Feuillet, Jack, ed. 1998. *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Figinière, Jorge de. 1863–1864. "Notes on the Language of South Africa". *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society of London* 8:3.105–107.
- Filimonova, Elena, ed. 2005. *Clusivity. Typology and case studies of the inclusive-exclusive distinction*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Fiorin, José Luís & Margarida Petter, eds. 2008. *África no Brasil: A formação da língua portuguesa*. São Paulo: Contexto.
- Flores Farfán, José Antonio. 2007. "La variación lingüística vista a través de las artes mexicanas (con especial énfasis en el nahuatl)". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.59–74.
- Fonseca, Maria do Céu. 2006. *Historiografia lingüística portuguesa e missionária. Proposições e Posposições no Século XVII*. Lisboa: Edições Colibri. [Centro de Estudos em Letras/Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro. Coleção Estudos e Ensaio, vol. 1.]
- Franklin, Michael J., ed. 1995. *Sir William Jones: Selected poetical and prose works*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Freire, José Ribamar Bessa. 2003. "Língua Geral Amazônica: A história de um esquecimento". Freire & Rosa, eds. 2003.195–209.
- Freire, José Ribamar Bessa. 2004. *Rio Babel. A história das línguas na Amazônia*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade do estado do Rio de Janeiro/Atlântica editora.
- Freire, José Ribamar Bessa & Maria Carlota Rosa, eds. 2003. *Línguas Gerais: Política lingüística e Catequese na América do Sul no Período Colonial*. Rio de Janeiro: Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- Fretheim, Thorstein & Jeanette K. Gundel, eds. 1996. *Reference and Referent Accessibility*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Pragmatics & Beyond New Series, vol. 38.]
- Friedlander, Peter G. 2006. "Hindustani Textbooks from the Raj". *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 3:1.38–51. On-line: <http://e-flt.nus.edu.sg/v3sp2006/friedlander.htm>
- Fu-Mien Yang, Paul. 2001. "The Portuguese-Chinese Dictionary of Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci: An historical and linguistic introduction". Witek, ed. 2001.169–217.
- Fück, Johann. 1955. *Die arabischen Sudien in Europa bis in den Anfang des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Gadenne, Clotilde. 1997. "Martin de Nantes. Prédicateur Capucin, missionnaire apostolique dans le Brésil parmi les Indes Cariris". *Cahiers du Brésil Contemporain* 32.41–58.
- Garcia, Rodolfo [Augusto de Amorim]. 1942. "Explicação". In Mamiani 1942[1698].vii-xxix. [Introduction and presentation of Mamiani's *Catecismo* (see primary sources).]
- George, P. A., ed. 2010. *Japanese Studies. Changing global profile*. New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru University.
- Gérard, Albert S., ed. 1986. *European Language-writing in Sub-Saharan Africa*. 2 Vols. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Gérard, R.P. 1924. *La langue lebéo. Grammaire et vocabulaire*. Bruxelles: Vromant & C., Imprimeurs-Éditeurs. [Bibliothèque-Congo, vol. 13.]
- Gil, David. 2001. "Escaping Eurocentrism: Fieldwork as a process of unlearning". Newman, & Ratliff, eds. 2001.102–132.
- Gillespie, Raymond, ed. 2003. *Scholar Bishop. The Recollections and Diary of Narcissus Marsh, 1638–1696*. Cork: Cork University Press.
- Gilmour, Rachael. 2004. "Colonization and Linguistic Representation. British Methodist Grammarians' Approaches' to Xhosa (1834–1850)". Zwartjes & Hovdhauge, eds. 2004.113–140.
- Gilmour, Rachael. 2006. *Grammars of Colonialism: Representing Languages in Colonial South Africa*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Gimenes Parada dos Santos, Luciana. 1999. *As formas de saber sobre as línguas do Brasil no século XVI. Uma contribuição para a Historiografia Lingüística Brasileira colonial*. MA Thesis, Universidade de São Paulo.
- Glare, P.G.W., ed. 1994. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

- Goeje, C.H. de. 1938. “Das Kariri (Nordost-Brasilien)” (I). Paper presented at the 24th International Conference of Americanists (Hamburg 1930). Portuguese translation: “O Cariri (Nordeste brasileiro)”. *Revista do Instituto do Ceará* 52.201–215.
- Goeje, C.H. de. 1950. “Das Kariri (Nordost-Brasilien)” (II). *Revista do Instituto do Ceará* 64.210–251.
- Gomes Rodeles, Cecilio. 1913. “Earliest Jesuit Printing in India”. (Translated by L. Cardon and edited by H. Hosten). *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, 9:4.149–168.
- Gómez Platero, Eusebio. 1880. *Catálogo biográfico de los religiosos franciscanos de la Provincia de San Gregorio Magno de Filipinas desde 1577 en que llegaron los primeros a Manila hasta los de nuestros días*. Manila: Imprenta del Real Colegio de Santo Tomás.
- Gonçalves, Maria Filomena & Clotilde de Almeida Azevedo Murakawa. 2009. “Lexicografia implícita en textos del Padre Jesuita Fernão Cardim”. Zwartjes, Arzápalo, Smith-Stark, eds. 2009.235–250.
- González Luis, Francisco. 1994. “La gramática de la lengua tupí de José de Anchieta y su dependencia de la gramática Latina”. Escavy et al., eds. 1994:2.101–114.
- Gray, Edward G. 1999. *New World Babel. Languages and nations in Early America*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Gray, Richard. 1998. “Bonaventura da Sardegna”. Anderson, ed. 1998.75.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1987. *Language in the Americas*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Grendler, Paul F. 1989. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy. Literacy and Learning, 1300–1600*. Baltimore & London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- Guimarães, Eduardo & Diana Luz Pessoa de Barros, eds. 2007. *History of Linguistics 2002. Selected papers from the Ninth International Conference on the History of the Language Sciences, 27–30 August 2002, São Paulo – Campinas*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 110.]
- Haguenauer, Charles. 1976[1960]. “Études de linguistique japonaise I. Les enclitiques -WA et -GA en japonais ‘ancien’, ‘classique’ et ‘moyen’”. Akamatsu et al., eds. 1976.106–341.
- Haßler, Gerda. 2000. “El *Diálogo de la lengua* de Juan de Valdés y su redescubrimiento tardío”. Bagola, ed. 2000.59–72
- Haßler, Gerda & Peter Schmitter, eds. 1999. *Sprachdiskussion und Beschreibung von Sprachen im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen. [Studium Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 21.]
- Hanzeli, Victor Egon. 1969. *Missionary Linguistics in New France. A study of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century descriptions of American Indian languages*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Hauschild, Richard. 1988. “Notes on the Content of the Three Manuscripts of Heinrich Roth”. Camps & Muller, eds. 1988.13–19.
- Hein, Jeanne H. 1977. “Father Henriques’ Grammar of Spoken Tamil, 1548”. *Indian Church History Review* (Bangalore) 2.127–157.
- Heine, Bernd & Derek Nurse, eds. 2000. *African Languages. An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernández, Esther. 2001. *Fray Alonso de Molina. Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana. Estudio de –*. Vol. 2. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica – Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional.
- Higashibaba, Ikuo. 2001. *Christianity in Early Modern Japan. Kirishitan belief and practice*. Leiden – Boston – Köln: Brill. [Brill’s Japanese Studies Library, vol. 16.]
- Hohenthal, W.D. 1952. “Little Known Groups of Indians Reported in 1696 on the Rio de São Francisco in Northeastern Brazil”. *Journal de la Société des Américanistes* 41.31–37.

- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1992. "A Grammar without a Tradition? Fernando de la Carrera: *Arte de la lengua yunga* (1644)". Ahlqvist, ed. 1992.113–122.
- Hovdhaugen, Even, ed. 1996a. ... *and the Word was God. Missionary Linguistics and Missionary Grammar*. Münster: Nodus Publikationen. [Studium Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 25.]
- Hovdhaugen, Even. 1996b. "Missionary Grammars. An attempt at defining a field of research". Hovdhaugen 1996a.9–22.
- Hvenkilde, Anne. 1979. "Lærebøker i norsk som fremmedspråk". *Norskraft* 25.46–74.
- Hymes, Dell, ed. 1974. *Studies in the History of Linguistics: Traditions and paradigms*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Ishikawa, Hiroki, 2010. "The Origin and History of MS779 in the District Archive of Braga: New light on its importance in the study of Northern Ethiopian history. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Jacques, Roland. 2002. *Portuguese Pioneers of Vietnamese Linguistics Prior to 1650*. Bangkok: Orchid Press.
- James, Gregory. 1991. *Tamil Lexicography*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. [Lexicographica, Series Maior, supplementary Volumes to the International Annual for Lexicography, vol. 40.]
- James, Gregory. 2000. *colporul. A history of Tamil dictionaries*. Chennai: Cre-A:.
- James, Gregory. 2007. "The Terminology of Declension in Early Missionary Grammars of Tamil". Zwartjes, James, & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.167–190.
- James, Gregory. 2009. "Aspects of the Structure of Entries in the Earliest Missionary Dictionary of Tamil". Zwartjes, Arzápalo Marín & Smith-Stark, eds. 2009.275–303.
- James, Gregory & David Morgan, eds. 2003. *Through Spanish Eyes. Five accounts of a missionary experience in sixteenth-century China*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University of Science and Technology/Language Centre.
- Jeremiás, Eva M. 1999. "The Persian Grammar of Sir William Jones". Cram, Linn & Nowak, eds. 1999.277–288.
- Jones, Sir William 1786[1824]. *Discourses Delivered before the Asiatic Society: and Miscellaneous Papers, on the Religion, Poetry, Literature, etc., of the Nations of India*. 2 Vols. London: Charles S. Arnold.
- Jones, Sir William 1786[1995]. "The Third Anniversary Discourse, on the Hindus", delivered to the Asiatic Society, 2 February 1786. Reprint Franklin, ed. 1995.355–377.
- Kamen, Henry. 2008. *Imagining Spain. Historical myth and national identity*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Katamba, Francis. 2003. "Bantu Nominal Morphology". Nurse & Philippson, eds. 2003.102–120.
- Kefer, Michel & Johan van der Auwera, eds. 1992. *Meaning and Grammar. Cross-linguistic perspectives*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kerckhof, Maxim P.A.M., Hugo de Schepper & Otto Zwartjes, eds. 1993. *España: ¿Ruptura 1492?* Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Kishimoto, Emi. 2005. "The Adaptation of the European Polyglot Dictionary of Calepino in Japan: *Dictionarium latino lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum* (1595)". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.205–223.
- Kishimoto, Emi. 2006. "The Process of Translation in *Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum*". *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 27:17–26.
- Klein, Wolf Peter. 2001. "Die linguistische Erfassung des hebräischen, chinesischen und finnischen am Beginn der Neuzeit. Eine vergleichende Studie zur frühen Rezeption nicht-indogermischer Sprachen in der Traditionellen Grammatik". *Historiographia Linguistica* 28:1/2.39–64.

- Klötter, Henning. 2007. "Ay sinco lenguas algo diferentes. Chinese vernaculars in early missionary sources". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.191–210.
- Klötter, Henning. 2009. "The Earliest Hokkien Dictionaries". Zwartjes, Arzápalo Marín & Smith-Stark, eds. 2009.303–330.
- Klötter, Henning. 2011. *The Language of the Sangleys. A Chinese vernacular in missionary sources of seventeenth century*. Leiden & Boston: Brill. [Sinica Leidensia, vol. 98.]
- Klötter, Henning & Otto Zwartjes. 2008. "Chinese in the Grammars of Tagalog and Japanese of the Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688–1747). *Histoire, Epistémologie, Langage* 30:2.177–197.
- Koerner, E.F.K. 2002. *Toward a History of American Linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kohut, Karl & Maria Cristina Torales Pacheco, eds. 2007. *Desde los confines de los imperios ibéricos: Los jesuitas de habla alemana en las misiones americanas*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert; Madrid: Iberoamericana. [Textos y estudios coloniales y de la Independencia, vol. 16.]
- Kraisch, Adriana Machado Pimentel de Oliveira. 2008. "Os índios tapuias do Cariri paraibano no período colonial: ocupação e dispersão". *Anais do II Encontro Internacional de História Colonial. Revista de Humanidades* 9:2. On-line: www.cerescaico.ufrn.br/mneme/anais/st_trab_pdf/pdf_st2/adriana_kraisch_st2.pdf
- Krishnamurti, Bhadriraju. 2003. *The Dravidian Languages*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuno, Susumo. 1994. *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, MA & London: The MIT Press. (tenth edition. First edition 1973).
- Kukenheim, Louis. 1932. *Contributions à l'histoire de la grammaire italienne, espagnole et française à l'époque de la renaissance*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij.
- Labouret, Henri & Paul Rivet. 1929. *Le Royaume d'Arda et son Évangélisation au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Institut d'Ethnologie. [Université de Paris, Travaux et mémoires de l'institut d'ethnologie, vol. 7.]
- Larsen, Thomas W. 1984. "Case Marking and Subjecthood in Kipeá Kiriri". *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 10.189–205.
- Laver, John. 1994. *Principles of Phonetics*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Law, Robin. 1997. *The Kingdom of Allada*. Leiden: Research School CNWS.
- Law, Vivian. 2003. *The History of Linguistics in Europe. From Plato to 1600*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Legère, Karsten. 2009. "Missionary Contributions to Bantu Languages in Tanzania: James Thomas Last (1850–1933) and the Vidunda language". Zwartjes & Koerner, eds. 2009.393–406.
- Legère, Karsten. 2010. "J.L. Krapf and mid 19th century work on East African languages". Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Leite, Serafim. 1965. *Suma histórica da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil (Assistência de Portugal) 1549–1760*. Lisboa: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar. Reprinted as *Breve história da Companhia de Jesus no Brasil (1549–1760)*. Braga: Sociedade Gráfica, 1993.
- Leite, Yonne de Freitas. 2005. "Arte de gramática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil. A criterion for evaluation". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.191–204.
- Leite, Yonne & Bruna Franchetto. 2006. "500 anos de línguas indígenas no Brasil". Cardoso et al., eds. 2006.15–61.
- Lepschy, Giulio, ed. 1998. *History of Linguistics*. Vol. 3. *Renaissance and Early Modern Linguistics*. London and New York: Longman. Series edited by R.H. Robins, Geoffrey Horrocks & David Denison.

- Levi, Joseph Abraham. 2004. "Padre António Vieira". Rector & Clark, eds. 2004, 2.385–396.
- Levi, Joseph Abraham. 2007. "Padre Joaquim Afonso Gonçalves (1781–1834) and the *Arte china* (1829). An innovative linguistic approach to teaching Chinese grammar". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.211–231.
- Levi, Joseph Abraham. 2009. "Portuguese and Other European Missionaries in Africa: A look at their linguistic production and attitudes (1415–1885)". Zwartjes & Koerner, eds. 2009.363–392.
- Lipski, John M. 2005. *A History of Afro-Hispanic Language. Five centuries, five continents*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lois, Ximena & Valentina Vapnarsky, eds. 2006. *Lexical Categories and Root Classes in Amerindian Languages*. Bern, etc.: Peter Lang.
- Lopes, David de Melo. 1969. *A expansão da língua portuguesa no Oriente durante os séculos XVI, XVII e XVIII. 2.ª edição revista, prefaciada e anotada por Luís de Matos*. Porto: Portucalense Editora. (first edition 1936).
- López-Austin, Alfredo. 1974. "The Research Method of Fray Bernardino de Sahagún: the Questionnaires". Edmonson, ed. 1974.111–149.
- López-Gay, Jesús. 2003. "Saint Francis Xavier and the Shimazu Family". *Bulletin of Japanese/Portuguese Studies* 6.93–106. On-line: <http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/redalyc/pdf/361/36100605.pdf>
- Loukotka, Čestmír. 1968. *Classification of South American Indian Languages*. Edited by Johannes Wilbert. Los Angeles: University of California. [Reference Series, vol. 7.]
- Lourido Díaz, Ramón. 2005. "Estudio preliminar". In: *Fr. Bernardino González, OFM (c. 1665– c. 1735). Intérprete árabe, epitome de la gramática árabe [obras manuscritas]*. Madrid: Real Academia de la Historia/Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores y de Cooperación.
- Lourido Díaz, Ramón. 2006. *El estudio del árabe entre los Franciscanos españoles en Tierra Santa (Siglos XVII- XIX)*. Madrid: Editorial Cisneros.
- Lozano, Pedro. 1970[1755]. *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús de la provincia de Paraguay*. Madrid: Viuda de Manuel Fernández y Supremo Consejo de la Inquisición. Reprint: Westmead, Farnborough: Gregg International Publishers.
- Ludewig, Hermann Ernst. 2007[1858]. *The Literature of American Aboriginal Languages. With additions and corrections by Wm. W. Turner*. London: Trübner. Reprint Whitefish, Montana: Kessinger Publishing.
- Machado, Diogo Barbosa. 1965[1741]. *Bibliotheca Lusitana Historica, Critica, e Cronologica na qual se comprehende a noticia dos authores Portuguezes, e das Obras, que compuserão desde o tempo da promulgação da Ley da Graça até o tempo prezente*. 3 vols. Lisboa occidental: Antonio Isidoro da Fonseca. Reprint Coimbra: Atlântida Editora.
- Maës, Hubert, ed. 1975a. *Problèmes terminologiques*. Paris: Université Paris VII. [Travaux du groupe de linguistique japonaise, vol. 1.]
- Maës, Hubert. 1975b. "La terminologie grammaticale japonaise". Maës, ed. 1975a.45–58.
- Maës, Hubert. 1975c. "Un point d'histoire terminologique: *taigen* ~ *yôgen*". Maës, ed. 1975a.66–76.
- Maës, Hubert. 1975d. *Histoire de la linguistique. Morpho-syntaxe*. Paris: Université Paris VII. [Travaux du groupe de linguistique japonaise, vol. 2.]
- Maës, Hubert. 1982. "Les parties du discours dans la tradition grammaticale japonaise avant le XVIIIe siècle". Włodarczyk, ed. 1982.17–26.
- Maffei, Angelus Francis Xavier. 1886. *A Konkani Grammar*. New Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

- Maggs, Barbara Widenor. 2000. "Science, Mathematics, and Reason: The missionary methods of the Jesuit Alexandre de Rhodes in seventeenth-century Vietnam". *The Catholic Historical Review* 86:3.439–458.
- Maho, Jouni. 2003. "A Classification of the Bantu Languages: An update of Guthrie's referential system". Nurse & Philippson, eds. 2003.639–651.
- Mariani, Bethania. 2007. "Linguistic Ideas and the Discourse on Languages in Early Brazilian History". Guimarães & Pessoa de Barros, eds. 2007.27–40.
- Marsden, William. 1796. *Bibliotheca Marsdeniana Philologica et Orientalis. A catalogue of dictionaries, vocabularies, grammars and alphabets*. London: [No publisher.] Reprint London: J.L. Cox, 1827.
- Martín, Luis. 1968. *The Intellectual Conquest of Peru: The Jesuit College of San Pablo, 1568–1767*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1975. *A Reference Grammar of Japanese*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Martin, Samuel E. 1987. *The Japanese Language through Time*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Martins, M. de L. de Paula, ed. 1954. *Joseph Anchieta: Poesias, manuscrito do séc. XVI, em português, castelhano, latim e tupi*. São Paulo: Comissão do IV Centenário da Cidade de São Paulo/Serviço de Commemorações Culturais. [Museu Paulista, Documentação Lingüística, 4, Boletim IV.]
- Martius, Karl Friedrich Philipp von. 1867. *Beiträge zur Ethnographie und Sprachenkunde Amerikas, zumal Brasiliens*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Friedrich Fleischer.
- Maruyama, Toru. 2004. "Linguistic Studies by Portuguese Jesuits in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Japan". Zwartjes & Hovdhaugen, eds. 2004.141–160.
- Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Masini, Federico, ed. 1996a. *Western Humanistic Culture Presented to China by Jesuit Missionaries (XVII-XVIII centuries). Proceedings of the Conference held in Rome, October 25–27, 1993*. Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I. [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I., vol. 49.]
- Masini, Federico. 1996b. "Some Preliminary Remarks on the Study of Chinese Lexicographic Material Prepared by the Jesuit Missionaries in China in the Seventeenth Century". Masini, ed. 2006a.235–245.
- Maurer, Philippe. 2003. "Les marques TAM du créole portuguais de Batavia (Indonésie)". *Creolica* (23 avril). On-line: <http://www.creolica.net/maurer04.pdf>
- Maxwell, Judith M. & Craig A. Hanson. 1992. *Of the Manners of Speaking that the Old Ones had: The metaphors of Andrés de Olmos in the TULAL manuscript Arte para aprender la lengua mexicana 1547*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Meersman, Achilles. 1960. "Notes on the Study of Indian Languages by the Franciscans". *Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* 16.40–54.
- Meersman, Achilles. 1962. *The Franciscans in Tamilnad*. Fribourg, Switzerland: St. Paul's Press. [Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft/Nouvelle revue de science missionnaire, Supplémenta 12.]
- Messner, Dieter. 1999. "Ist das *Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum* ein Wörterbuch der portugiesischen Sprache? Zur Rezeption Calepinos in Portugal". *Lusorama* 38.48–52.
- Metzler, J. ed. 1971. *Sacrae Congregationis De Propaganda Fide Memoria Rerum. 350 anni a servizio delle missioni, 350 Jahre... 350 years ... etc.* Vol. I.1. 1622–1700. Rom, Freiburg & Wien: Herder.

- Mignolo, Walter D. 2003. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance. Literacy, territoriality and colonization*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press. Second edition with a new afterword by the author. (First edition, 1995).
- Mills, Douglas E. 1967. "Some Characters of Japanes Origin in the Ninth-Century Japanese Dictionary *Shinsen Jikyō*". *Journal of the Amercian Oriental Society* 87:3.297–300.
- Miranda, Rocky V. 2003. "Konkani". Cardona & Jain, eds. 2003.729–765.
- Möhlrig, Wilhelm J.G. 2000. "Das Studium der schwarzafrikanischen Sprachen". Auroux et al., eds. 2000.980–991.
- Monzón, Cristina. 2000. "La influencia del español en la conjugación. La Nueva España en el período de 1547 a 1574". Zwartjes, ed. 2000.107–122.
- Monzón, Cristina, ed. 2004. *Arte de la lengua de michuacán compilada por el muy reverendo Padre Fray Maturino Gilberti*. Vol. 2: *Transcripción, edición y notas por Cristina Monzón*. Zamora, Michoacán: El Colegio de Michoacán & Fideicomiso Teixidor.
- Monzón, Cristina. 2005. "Tarascan Orthography in the Sixteenth Century: The Franciscan sources of inspiration and their analysis". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.65–88.
- Monzón, Cristina. 2007. "Morphology in the Sixteenth-Century *Artes* of Tarascan: The case of the suffix *-tsi* or *-ts*". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.75–90.
- Monzón, Cristina. 2009. "The Tarascan Lexicographic Tradition in the Sixteenth Century". Zwartjes, Arzápalo Marín & Smith-Stark, eds. 2009.165–195.
- Moorty, Rama L. 2006. "European Impact and Paradigm Shift in Tamil Development. Stephen 2006.181–196.
- Moran, Joseph F. 1972. *A Commentary on the Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa of João Rodriguez S.J. with Particular Reference to Pronunciation*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Oxford: Bodleian Library.
- Moran, Joseph F. 1993. *The Japanese and the Jesuits. Alessandro Valignano in sixteenth-century Japan*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Moser, Gerald. 1986. "The Portuguese in Africa". Gérard, ed. 1986.43–48.
- Mosonyi, Esteban E. 1997. "Nuestros idiomas merecen vivir: el dilema lingüístico del Río Negro". Pachón & Correa, eds. 1997.587–661.
- Nagueira, Baptista Caetana d'A. 1877. "Ao leitor". In Mamiani 1877[1699]:v-lxxii. See Mamiani 1877[1699]. (Primary sources).
- Naik, Pratapananda. 2010. "Contribution of Missionaries to Konknni Linguistics". Paper delivered at the VIth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo.
- Navarro, Eduardo de Almeida. 1997. "Um marco da lingüística americana: A gramática tupi de Anchieta". *Estudos Lingüísticos (Anais do XLIV Seminário do GEL -1996, UNITAU, Campinas: IEL/UNICAMP)* 26.660–666.
- Navarro, Eduardo de Almeida. 1999. *Método moderno de tupi antigo. A língua do Brasil dos primeiros séculos*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes. (copyright 1998.)
- Navarro, Eduardo de Almeida. 1999–2001. "A expansão colonial e o estudo das línguas exóticas pelos europeus nos séculos XV e XVI: o caso da África". *África* (Revista do Centro de Estudos Africanos, São Paulo) 22/23:223–231.
- Neill, Stephen. 1984. *A History of Christianity in Índi: The beginnings to AD 1707*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Newman, Paul & Martha Ratliff, eds. 2001. *Linguistic Fieldwork*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nguyễn-Dang-Liêm. 1970. *Vietnamese Pronunciation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Norman, Jerry 1988. *Chinese*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.

- Norton, F. J. 1978. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Printing in Spain and Portugal 1501–1520*. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne: Cambridge University Press
- Nowak, Elke. 1992. "How to 'Improve' a Language: The case of 18th century descriptions of Greenlandic". Ahlqvist, ed. 1992.157–167.
- Nowak, Elke. 1996. "Considering the Status of Empirical Research in Linguistics. Approaches and attitudes since 1800". Hovdhaugen, ed. 1996.23–44.
- Nowak, Elke, ed. 1999a. *Languages Different in All Their Sounds... Descriptive approaches to indigenous languages of the Americas 1500 to 1850*. Münster: Nodus. [Studium Sprachwissenschaft, Beiheft 31.]
- Nowak, Elke, ed. 1999b. "«tempora sunt tria ...» Über die Begegnungen mit fremden Menchen und fremden Sprache". Haßler & Schmitter, eds. 1999.41–52.
- Nowak, Elke. 2000. "First Descriptive Approaches to Indigenous Languages of British North America". Auroux, et al., eds. 2000.973–979.
- Nurse, Derek. 2003. "Aspect and Tense in Bantu Languages". Nurse & Philippson, eds. 2003.90–102.
- Nurse, Derek. 2008. *Tense and Aspect in Bantu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nurse, Derek & Gérard Philippson. 2003. *The Bantu Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Nystedt, Jane, ed. 2000. *XIV Skandinaviska Romanistkongressen. Stockholm 10–15 augusti 1999*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International. [Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Romanica Stockholmiensia, vol. 19.] (CD-rom).
- Oesterreicher, Wulf & Roland Schmidt-Riese. 1999. "Amerikanische Sprachenvielfalt und europäische Grammatiktradition: Missionarslinguistik im Epochenumbbruch der Frühen Neuzeit". Schlieben-Lange, ed. 1999a.62–100.
- Olza Zubiri, Jesús. 1989. *El padre Felipe Salvador Gilij en la historia de la lingüística venezolana*. San Cristóbal: Universidad Católica del Táchira.
- O'Neill, Charles E. & Joaquín María Domínguez. 2001. *Diccionario histórico de la Compañía de Jesús: biográfico-temático*. 4 Vols. Madrid: Universidad Pontificia Comillas.
- Orlandi, Eni P., ed. 2001. *História das idéias lingüísticas. Construção do saber metalingüístico e constituição da língua nacional*. Cáceres, Mato Grosso: Unemat editora.
- Ostler, Nicholas. 1995. "Fray Bernardo de Lugo: Two sonnets in Muisca". Troiani et al. eds. Online: http://celia.cnrs.fr/FichExt/Am/A_19–20_10.pdf
- Pachón, Ximena & François Correa, eds. 1997. *Lenguas amerindias. Condiciones socio-lingüísticas en Colombia*. Edición dirigida por Elsa Benavides. Bogotá: Caro y Cuervo.
- Padley, G.A. 1985. *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500–1700. Trends in vernacular grammar*. Vol. 1. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Padley, G.A. 1988. *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe 1500–1700. Trends in vernacular grammar*. Vol. 2. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Pandharipande Rajeshwari. 1990. "Experience (Dative) NPs in Marathi". Verma & Mohanan, eds. 1990.161–179.
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari V. 1997. *Marathi*. London & New York. Routledge.
- Pandharipande, Rajeshwari V. 2003. "Marathi". Cardona & Jain, eds. 2003.698–728.
- Pandžić, Zvonko. 2005. "The Semantics of Traditional Grammar. A linguistic-philosophical *prolegomenon* to Bartul Kašić's *Institutiones*/Semantika tradicionalne gramatike. Jezično-filozofijska *prolegomena* za *Osnove* Bartula Kašića". Cassius 2005[1604].14–188 (see primary sources).

- Payne, Thomas E. 1997. *Describing Morphosyntax: A guide for field linguists*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Percival, W. Keith. 1994. "La obra gramatical de Nebrija en el contexto de la hegemonía mundial europea". Escavy et al., eds. 1994:1.59–84.
- Percival, W. Keith. 1999. "Nebrija's Linguistic Cēvre as a Model for Missionary Linguistics". Nowak, ed. 1999a.15–29.
- Pérez, Lorenzo. 1908. "Los franciscanos en el extremo Oriente. (Noticias bio-bibliográficas)". *Archivum Franciscanum Historicum periodica publicatio trimestris*. Tomus I.241–247. Firenze: Collegii PP.D. Bonaventurae.
- Petter, Margarida Maria Taddoni. 2006. "Línguas africanas no Brasil". Cardoso et al., eds. 2006.117–142.
- Petter, Margarida & Ronald Beline Mendes, eds. 2009. *Proceedings of the Special World Congress of African Linguistics: Exploring the African Language Connection in Americas*. São Paulo: Humanitas.
- Pfister, Louis. 1932–1934. *Notices biographiques et bibliographiques sur les Jésuites de l'ancienne mission de Chine, 1552–1773*. 2 vols. Shanghai: Imprimerie de la Mission Catholique.
- Phan, Peter C. 1998. *Mission and Catechesis. Alexandre de Rhodes and inculturation in Seventeenth-Century Vietnam*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Porter, David W. 2002. *Excerptiones de Prisciano: The source of Ælfric's Latin-Old English grammar*. Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Prezia, Benedito A. 2000. *Os indígenas do Planalto Paulista nas crônicas quinhentistas e seiscentistas*. São Paulo: Humanitas, Universidade de São Paulo.
- Priolkar, Anant Kakba. 1958. *The Printing Press in India. Its beginnings and early development being a quatercentenary commemoration study of the advent of printing in India (in 1556)*. With a Foreword by Shri Chintaman D. Deshmukh and an historical essay on the Konkani language by J.H. da Cunha Rivara, translated from the Portuguese by Fr. Theophilus Lobo. Bombay: Marathi Samshodhana Mandala. Mumbai Marathi Grantha Sangrahalaya.
- Queixalós, Francesc. 2006. "The Primacy and Fate of Predicativity in Tupi-Guarani". Lois & Vapnarsky, eds. 2006.249–287.
- Rafael, Vicente L. 1993. *Contracting Colonialism. Translation and Christian conversion in Tagalog Society under early Spanish rule*. Durham & London: Duke University Press. (third printing 2001).
- Raini, Emanuele. 2010. *Sistemi di romanizzazione del cinese mandarino nei secoli XVI-XVIII*. Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis, Studi Asiatici, XXII ciclo, Facoltà di Studi Orientali, Sapienza – Università di Roma.
- Ramajo Caño, Antonio. 1987. *Las gramáticas de la lengua castellana desde Nebrija a Correas*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad Salamanca. [Acta Salmanticensia, Estudios Filológicos, vol. 197.]
- Rector, Monica & Fred Clark, eds. 2004. *Dictionary of Literary Biography. Portuguese and Brazilian literature*. 2 vols. Detroit: Gale Thomson.
- Reid, Lawrence A., Emilio Ridruejo & Thomas Stolz, eds. 2011. *Philippine and Chamorro Linguistics Before the Advent of Structuralism*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag. [Koloniale und Postkoloniale Linguistik/ Colonial and Postcolonial Linguistics, vol. 2.]
- Remiro Andollu, Zacarias. 1971. "La Sagrada Congregación frente al Islám: Apostolado de la Prensa en lengua árabe". Metzler, ed. 707–731.
- Ribeiro, Madalena. 2006. "The Christian Nobility of Kyushu. A perusal of Jesuit sources". *Bulletin of Portuguese-Japanese Studies* (Lisbon) 13.45–64.

- Ridruejo, Emilio. 2004. "Del ff.: historia de una noción gramatical". Corrales et al., eds. 2004:2.1387–1398.
- Ridruejo, Emilio. 2005. "Las *ligaturas* en las gramáticas misioneras filipinas del Siglo XVIII". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005:247–272.
- Ridruejo, Emilio. 2009. "Notas sobre el verbo millcayac según el *Arte* (1607) de Luis de Valdivia". Zimmermann & Zwartjes, eds. 2009:137–160.
- Rietveld, Jan. 2002. "The Conversion of a Missionary. Reflections on the life of Martin of Nantes (1638–1714)". Wijsen & Nissen, eds. 2002:25–45.
- Ringmacher, Manfred. 1994. "Humboldt bei der Arbeit am 'Mexikanischen'. Von der Grammatik zum Wortschatz". Zimmermann, Trabant & Mueller-Vollmer, eds. 1994:43–78.
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 1942. *O artigo definido e os numerais na língua kirirí*. Curitiba: Empresa Gráfica Paranaense. [Offprint from Arquivos do Museu Paranaense, vol. 2.179–211.]
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 1997a. "Descripción del tupinambá en el período colonial: el *Arte* de José de Anchieta". Zimmermann, ed. 1997:371–400.
- Rodrigues, Aryon D.[all'Igna]. 1997b. "Nominal Classification in Karirí". *Opción. (Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales)* 22:65–79.
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 1999a. "Tupí". Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds., 1999:107–124.
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 1999b. "Macro-Jê". Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds., 1999:165–206.
- Rodrigues, Aryon Dall'Igna. 2002. *Línguas Brasileiras. Para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola. (First edition: 1994).
- Rosa, Maria Carlota. 1997. "Línguas bárbaras e peregrinas do Novo Mundo segundo os gramáticos jesuítas: uma comparação de universalidade no estudo de línguas estrangeiras". *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem* 6:2:97–148. On-line:<http://relin.letras.ufmg.br/revista/upload/05-Maria-Carlota.pdf>
- Rosa, Maria Carlota. 2006. "Reverendo uma das críticas às descrições missionárias". *Revista de Estudos da Linguagem* 14:1:205–230. On-line:<http://relin.letras.ufmg.br/revista/upload/09-Maria-Carlota-Rosa.pdf>
- Rosén, Victoria. 1996. "The Interpretation of Empty Pronouns in Vietnamese". Fretheim & Gundel, eds.1996:251–262.
- Rowe, John Howland. 1974. "Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammars". Hymes, ed. 1974:361–379.
- Russell-Wood, A.J.R. 1998. *The Portuguese Empire 1415–1808. A World on the move*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- Saldanha, Joseph L. 1912. "Thomas Stephens". *Catholic Encyclopedia*, vol. 14. On-line version: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14292a.htm> (consulted in February 2008).
- Saldanha, Mariano. 1936. "História de gramática concani". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8:2/3:715–735.
- Samain, A. 1923. *La langue kisonge. Grammaire, vocabulaire, proverbes*. Bruxelles: Goemaere, Imprimeur du Roi, Éditeur. [Bibliothèque-Congo, vol. 14.]
- Sánchez Miret, Fernando, ed. 2003. *Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Lingüística y Filología Románica. Salamanca, 24–30 septiembre 2001*. Vol. 5, Sección 8: *Historia de la lingüística, Mesas redondas*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Sánchez Pérez, Aquilino. 1992. *Historia de la enseñanza del español como lengua extranjera*. Alcobendas, Madrid: Sociedad General Española de Librería.
- Santos, Martins dos. 1974–1998. *Cultura, educação e ensino em Angola*. Edição digital: <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Troy/4285/ensino.html?200716>

- Satow, Ernest Mason. 1976[1888]. *The Jesuit Mission Press in Japan 1591–1610*. Privately printed in 1888. Facsimile edition Tokyo: Tenry Central Library.
- Schachter, Paul. 1985. "Parts-of-speech systems". Shopen, ed. 1985.1.3–61.
- Schäfer-Priess, Barbara. 2000. Die portugiesische Grammatikschreibung von 1540 bis 1822. Entstehungsbedingungen und Kategorisierungsverfahren vor dem Hintergrund der lateinischen, spanischen und französischen Tradition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. [Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie, Vol. 300.]
- Schebesta, P.P. 1919–1920. "Eine Bantugrammatik aus dem 17. Jahrhundert. Arte da lingua de Cafre. Ein sprachliches Dokument aus einer Bibliothek Lissabons, aufgefunden und veröffentlicht von P.P.Schebesta, S.V.D." *Anthropos* 14–15.764–787.
- Schippers, Arie & Liesbeth Zack, eds. 2011 forthcoming. *Middle Arabic and Mixed Arabic: Diachrony and Synchrony*. Leiden, etc.: Brill Academic Publishers/ Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte, ed. 1999a. *Katechese, Sprache, Schrift*. Stuttgart & Weimar: J.B. Metzler. [*Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 29, no. 116.]
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte, ed. 1999b. "Missionarslinguistik in Lateinamerika: Zu neueren Veröffentlichungen und einigen offenen Fragen". Schlieben-Lange, ed. 1999a.34–62.
- Schmidlin, Joseph. 1933. *Catholic Mission History*. Ed. Matthias Braun. Techny, IL: Mission P, S.V.D.
- Schmidt-Riese, Ronald. 1998. "Perspectivas diacrônicas brasileiras: O rastro das línguas gerais". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 49.307–335.
- Schmidt-Riese, Ronald. 2002. "Catégorisation cognitive et grammaticale au XVIIe siècle: propriétés des choses et mots de propriété en kariri". *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 53.383–407.
- Schmidt-Riese, Ronald. 2005. "Colonial Grammars on Nominal Case. The Quechua series". *Philologie im Netz* 33.84–116. On-line:<http://web.fu-berlin.de/phn/phn33/p33t4.htm>
- Schmidt-Riese, Ronald. 2008. "Port-Royal et les grammaires des langues sauvages. Contemporanéité et émergence théorique". *Histoire, épistémologie, langue* 30:2.141–176.
- Schrader-Kniffki, Martina & Laura Morgenthaler García, eds. 2007. *La Romania en interacción: Entre historia, contacto y política. Ensayos en homenaje a Klaus Zimmermann*. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Schreyer, Rüdiger. 1992. *The European Discovery of Chinese (1550–1615) or the Mystery of Chinese unveiled*. Amsterdam: Stichting Neerlandistiek. [Cahiers voor Taalkunde, vol. 5.]
- Schreyer, Rüdiger. 1999. "Gabriel Sagard's *Dictionary of the Huron Tongue* (1632)". Nowak, ed. 1999a. 101–115.
- Schurhammer, Georg. 1928. *Das kirchliche Sprachproblem in der japanischen Jesuitenmission des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts*. Tokyo: Deutsche Gesellschaft für Natur- U. Völkerkunde Ostasiens/Leipzig: Verlag der Asia Major. ["Mitteilungen" der deutschen Gesellschaft für Natur- U. Völkerkunde Ostasiens, Band 23.]
- Schütte, Josephus Franciscus. 1968. *Introductio ad historiam Societatis Jesu in Japonia 1549–1650 ac prooemium ad catalogos Japoniae edendos ad edenda Societatis Jesu Monumenta Historica Japoniae Propylaeum*. Romae: Institutum Historicum Societatis Jesu.
- Sebeok, Thomas A., ed. 1971. *Current Trends in Linguistics*. Vol. 7: *Linguistics in Sub-Saharan Africa*. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Seki, Luci. 2000. *Gramática do Kamaiurá. Língua Tupi-Guarani do Alto Xingu*. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp & Imprensa Oficial.
- Seuren, Pieter A.M. 1998. *Western Linguistics. An historical introduction*. Oxford, etc.: Blackwell Publishers.
- Shapiro, Michael C. 2003. "Hindi". Cardona & Jain, eds. 2003.250–285.

- Shibatani, Masyoshi. 1991. "Grammaticization of Topic into Subject". Traugott & Heine, eds. 1991.93–133.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1999. *The Languages of Japan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (First edition 1990).
- Shopen, Timothy. 1985. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*. Vol. 1: *Clause Structure*. Vol. 2: *Complex Constructions*. Vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidarus, Adel Y. 1978. "Coptic Lexicography in the Middle Age, The Coptic Arabic Scalae". Wilson, ed. 1978.125–142.
- Silva, António de Moraes. 1831. *Diccionario da lingua portugueza*. Lisboa: Na Impressão Regia.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 2000. "Rincón y Carochi: la tradición jesuítica de descripción del náhuatl". Zwartjes, ed. 2000.29–72.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 2005a. "Phonological Description in New Spain". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.3–64.
- Smith-Stark, Thomas C. 2009. "Lexicography in New Spain (1492–1611)". Zwartjes, Arzápalo Marín & Smith-Stark, eds. 2009.3–82.
- Sommervogel, Carlos, ed. 1960[1890]. *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*. (New edition of the first edition by Augustin and Aloys De Backer and Auguste Carayon.) Bruxelles & Paris: Oscar Schepens – Alphonse Picard.
- Spaulding, Jay. 2000. "Arcangelo Carradori's Dictionary of 17th Century Kenzi Nubian. The oldest dictionary of an African language". On-line: <http://www.yourdictionary.com/elr/nubi-anintro.html>.
- Spear, Richard L. 1975. "Introduction". See: Collado (primary sources), 1–30.
- Spix, Johann Baptist von & Carl Friedrich Philipp von Martius. 1966–1967[1823–1831]. *Reise in Brasilien in den Jahren 1817–1820*. Reprint in 3 vols.: Stuttgart: Brockhaus. Edition in Portuguese: *Viagem pelo Brasil, 1817–1820*. Vol. 2. São Paulo: Editora Itatiaia Limitada/EDUSP.
- Steadman-Jones, Richard. 2007. *Colonialism and Grammatical Representation: John Gilchrist and the analysis of the 'Hindustani' language in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries*. Oxford & Malden, Ma.: Blackwell. [Publications of the Philological Society, vol. 41.]
- Steever, Sanford B., ed. 1998a. *The Dravidian Languages*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Steever, Sanford B. 1998b. "Introduction to the Dravidian Languages". Steever, ed. 1998a. 1–39.
- Steever, Sanford B. 2005. *The Tamil Auxiliary Verb System*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Stephen, S. Jeyaseela. 2006. *Literature Caste and Society. The masks and veils*. Delhi: Kalpaz Publications.
- Streit, Robert. 1928. *Bibliotheca Missionum*. Vol. 4: *Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1245–1599*. Aachen: Aachener Missionsdruckerei A.-G. [olim Xaverius Verlagsbuchhandlung A.-G.].
- Streit, Robert. 1929. *Bibliotheca Missionum*. Vol. 5: *Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1600–1699*. Aachen: Franziskus Xaverius Missionsverein.
- Streit, Robert & Johannes Dindinger. 1931. *Bibliotheca Missionum*. Vol. 6: *Missionsliteratur Indiens, der Philippinen, Japans und Indochinas 1700–1799*. Aachen: Franziskus Xaverius Missionsverein.
- Subrahmanyam, P.S. 1971. *Dravidian Verb Morphology (A Comparative Study)*. Annamalainagar, Tamilnadu: Annamalai University.
- Sueiro Justel, Joaquín. 2003. *Historia de la lingüística española en Filipinas (1580–1898)*. Lugo: Editorial Axac.
- Sueiro Justel, Joaquín. 2005. "Análisis del *Arte de la lengua pangasinán* (1690) de Fray Andrés López". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 2005.247–272.

- Sueiro Justel, Joaquín, Miguel Cuevas Alonso, Vanessa Dacosta Cea & Rosa Pérez Rodríguez, eds. 2010. *Lingüística e Hispanismo*. Lugo: Axac. [Colección Thema, vol. 2.]
- Sullivan, Thelma D. 1974. "The Rhetorical Orations, or Huehuetlatolli, Collected by Sahagún". Edmonson, ed. 1974.79–109.
- Swiggers, Pierre. 2009. "David Zeisberger's (1721–1808) Description of Delaware Morphology (1827)". Zwartjes & Koerner, eds. 2009.325–344.
- Tamil Lexicon*. 1924–1939. Vols. 1–6. Madras: University of Madras.
- Tanner, Norman. 2011. *New Short History of the Catholic Church*. London: Burns & Oates.
- Tavoni, Mirko, ed. 1996. *Italia ed Europa nella linguistica del Rinascimento: confronti e relazioni/ Italy and Europe in Renaissance Linguistics: Comparisons and relations. Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Ferrara, Palazzo Paradiso, 20–24 marzo 1991*. Vol. 2: *L'Italia e l'Europa non romanza. Le lingue orientali*. Modena: Franco Cosimo Panini.
- Thani Nayagam, Xavier Stanislaus. 1954. "Tamil Manuscripts in European Libraries". *Tamil Culture (A Quarterly Review dedicated to the Study of Tamiliana)* 3:3/4.219–228.
- Thani Nayagam, Xavier Stanislaus. 1970. *Tamil Culture and Civilization. Readings: The classical period*. London: Asia Publishing House.
- Thekkedath, Joseph. 1982. *History of Christianity in India*. Vol. 2: *From the Middle of the Sixteenth to the End of the Seventeenth Century (1542–1700)*. Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, Church History Association of India.
- Thompson, H.R. 2006. "Bengali". Brown, ed. 2006.1:730–733.
- Tomassino, Pier Mattia. 2009. "Il 'dialetto romano' nella lessicografia missionaria e diplomatica italiana del XVII e XVIII secolo". (unpublished paper).⁴
- Torero, Alfredo. 2002. *Idiomas de los Andes. Lingüística e historia*. Lima: Instituto Francés de Estudios Andinos & Editorial Horizonte.
- Tormo Sanz, Leandro. 1978. "Método de aprendizaje de lenguas empleado por los franciscanos en Japón y Filipinas". *Archivo ibero-americano* 38.377–405.
- Torres, Amadeu & Carlos Assunção. 2007. "Introdução". Ed. Oliveira 2007[1536].3–77.
- Tozzer, Alfred M. 1977. *A Maya Grammar. With bibliography and appraisal of the works noted*. New York: Dover Publications. [First published in the Museum's papers of the Peabody Museum of American Archaeology and Ethnology, Harvard University, Cambridge Mass, vol. 9, 1921.]
- Traugott, Elisabeth Closs & Bernd Heine, eds. 1991. *Approaches to Grammaticalization*. Vol. 2: *Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Typological Studies in Language, vol. 19.2.]
- Troiani, Duna et al., eds. 1995. *La "découverte" des langues et des écritures d'Amérique. Actes du colloque international, Paris, 7–11 septembre 1993*. (Amerindia: Revue d'ethnolinguistique amérindienne, 19/20.) Paris: Association d'Ethnolinguistique Amérindienne.
- Tschudi, Johann Jakob von. 1884. *Der Organismus der Khetšua-Sprache*. Leipzig: Brockhaus.
- Tsujimura, Natsuko. 1996. *An Introduction to Japanese Linguistics*. Oxford & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.
- Tucker Childs, G. 2003. *An Introduction to African Languages*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Uhlig, Siegbert et al., eds. 2003. *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*. Vol. 1. A–C. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

4. I acknowledge the author for having sent me an electronic version of this paper.

- Uhlig, Siegbert et al., eds. 2007. *Encyclopaedia Aethiopica*. Vol. 3. He-N. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Valente, José Francisco. 1964. *Gramática umbundu. A língua do centro de Angola*. Lisboa: Junta de Investigações do Ultramar.
- Vekens, A. 1928. *La langue des Makere, des Medje et des Mangbetu*. Gand: éditions Dominicains «Veritas». [Bibliothèque-Congo, vol. 25.]
- Verdelho, Telmo. 1995. *As origens da gramaticografia e da lexicografia Latino-Portuguesas*. Aveiro: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica. [Série Lingüística, vol. 18.]
- Verdelho, Telmo. 2008. “Encontro do português com as línguas não europeias. Textos interlinguísticos”. In: *Encontro do português com as línguas não europeias. Exposição de textos interlinguísticos*. 1–60. Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal.
- Verdelho, Telmo, Ana Isabel Líbano Mongteiro & Manuela Rêgo, (pesquisa e selecção). 2008. “Catálogo”. In: *Encontro do português com as línguas não europeias. Exposição de textos interlinguísticos*. 63–99. Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal.
- Vermeer, Hans J. 1982. *The First European Tamil Grammar. A critical edition by Hans J. Vermeer*. English version by Angelika Morath. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.
- Voeltz, F.K. Erhard, ed. 2005. *Studies in African Linguistic Typology*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Vogel, Claus. 1979. *Indian Lexicography*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. [A History of Indian Literature, vol. 4, fasc. 4.]
- Vogel, J. 1935. “Joan Josua Ketelaar of Elbin, Author of the first Hindustani Grammar”. *Bulletin of the School of the Oriental Studies* 3.817–822.
- Voort, Hein van der & Simon van de Kerke, eds. 2000. *Ensayos sobre lenguas indígenas de las tierras bajas de Sudamérica. Contribuciones al 49º Congreso Internacional de Americanistas en Quito 1997/Essays on Indigenous Languages of Lowland South America. Contributions to the 49th International Congress of Americanists in Quito 1997*. Leiden: Research School of Asian, African, and Amerindian Studies (CNWS). [CNWS Publications, vol. 90/Indigenous Languages of Latin America (ILLA), vol. 1.]
- Walravens, Hartmut. 1987. *China illustrata. Das europäische Chinaverständnis im Spiegel des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*. Weinheim: Acta Humaniora. [Katalog & Ausstellung im Zeughaus der Herzog August Bibliothek vom 21. März bis 23. August 1987.]
- Warkentin, Germaine & Carolyn Podruchny, eds. 2001. *Decentring the Renaissance: Canada and Europe in multidisciplinary perspective (1500–1700)*. Toronto & Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.
- Weber, N.A. 1912. “João Rodrigues”. *Catholic Encyclopaedia*. Vol. 13. New York: Robert Appleton. On-line version: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13109c.htm> (consulted in January, 2008).
- Wesołowski, Zbigniew, ed. 2011. *The Sixth Fu Jen University International Sinological Symposium: Early European (1552–1814) Acquisition and Research on Chinese Languages. Symposium Papers*. New Taipei Xinzhuanqu: Fu Jen Catholic University Printing House.
- Wessels, C. 1924. *Early Jesuit Travellers in Central Asia 1603–1721*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Wetzer, Harrie. 1992. “«Nouny» and «Verby» Adjectivals: A typology of predicative adjectival constructions”. Kefer & Auwera, eds. 1992.223–262.
- Wicki, Josef, ed. 1944. *Alessandor Valignano. Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias Orientales*. Herausgegeben und erläutert von Josef Wicki. Roma: Institutum Historicum S.I. [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. vol. 2.]

- Wijzen, Frans & Peter Nissen, eds. 2002. *'Mission is a Must'. Intercultural theology and the Mission of the Church*. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi. [Church and Theology in Context of the Nijmegen Institute for Missiology, vol. 40.]
- Wilkinson, Robert J. 2007. Orientalism, Aramaic and Kabbalah in the Catholic Reformation: The first printing of the Syriac New Testament. Leiden & Boston: Brill. [Studies in the History of Christian Traditions, vol. 137.]
- Williamson, Kay & Roger Blench. 2000. "Niger-Congo". Heine & Nurse, eds. 2000.11–42.
- Wilson, R. McL., ed. 1978. *The Future of Coptic Studies*. Leiden, etc.: E.J. Brill.
- Winkler, Pierre. 2007. "The Birth of Functional Grammar in the 'Austronesian School' of Missionary Linguistics". Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 2007.329–344.
- Witek, John W., ed. 2001a. *The Portuguese-Chinese Dictionary of Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci*. Lisbon: Instituto Português do Oriente, National Library of Portugal
- Witek, John W. 2001b. "Introduction". Witek, ed. 2001a.151–167.
- Witkam, J.J. 1980. *Jacobus Golius (1596–1667) en zijn Handschriften*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wlodarczyk, André, ed. 1982. *La linguistique japonaise*. Paris: Librairie Larousse [*Langages*, vol. 68.]
- Wolfart, H. Christoph. 1967. "Notes on the Early History of American Indian Linguistics". *Folia Linguistica* (Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae) 1.153–171.
- Yates, W. 1843[1827]. *Introduction to the Hindoostanee Language*. Fifth reprint: Calcutta: The Baptist Mission Press.
- Zimmermann, Klaus, ed. 1997a. *La descripción de las lenguas amerindias en la época colonial*. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Zimmermann, Klaus, ed. 1997b. "Introducción. Apuntes para la historia de la lingüística de las lenguas amerindias". Zimmermann 1997a.9–17.
- Zimmermann, Klaus. 2003. "Historia de la elaboración de un sistema gráfico para la lengua otomí en época colonial". *Dimensión Antropológica* 10, 29.33–59.
- Zimmermann, Klaus. 2009. "La construcción discursiva del diccionario en la Lingüística Misionera: Interculturalidad, glotocentrismo e hibridez en diccionarios náhuatl y hñähñu-otomí de los siglos XVI–XVII (Alonso de Molina, Alonso Urbano, y autor anónimo 1640)". Zimmermann & Zwartjes, eds. 2009.161–186.
- Zimmermann, Klaus, Jürgen Trabant & Kurt Mueller-Vollmer, eds. 1994. *Wilhelm von Humboldt und die amerikanischen Sprachen. Internationales Symposium des Ibero-Amerikanischen Instituts PK 24.–26. September 1992 in Berlin*. Paderborn, etc.: Ferdinand Schöningh.
- Zimmermann, Klaus & Otto Zwartjes, eds. 2009. *Historiografía de las ciencias del lenguaje (ámbito hispánico y portugués)*. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana*, vol. 13. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Zubiaur Bilbao, José Ramón. 1989. *Las ideas lingüísticas vascas en el s. XVI (Zaldibia, Garibay, Poza)*. San Sebastián/Donostia: Universidad de Deusto.
- Županov, Ines G. 1999. "Religious Conversion, Cultural Translation in Early Modern South India". *IIAS Newsletter Online* 19. Online version, <http://www.iias.nl/iiasn/19/institutes/i11.html> (20th March, 2008).
- Zvelebil, Kamil V. 1990. *Dravidian Linguistics. An introduction*. Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 1993. "El artículo en las gramáticas pioneras de Antonio de Nebrija y Pedro de Alcalá y las gramáticas de la tradición grecolatina". Kerkhof et al., eds. 1993.261–286.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 1994. "Tradición e innovación en las gramáticas pioneras de Antonio de Nebrija y Pedro de Alcalá: la categoría gramatical del pronombre". Escavy et al., eds. 1994.3.651–665.

- Zwartjes, Otto. 1998. "La estructura de la palabra según las primeras gramáticas de lenguas mesoamericanas y la tradición greco-latina". Calvo Pérez & Jorques Jiménez, eds. 1998.99–121.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2000a. "Modo, tiempo y aspecto en las gramáticas de las lenguas mapuche, millcayac y guaraní de Luis de Valdivia y Antonio Ruiz de Montoya: la categoría de los «tiempos mixtos»". Zwartjes, ed. 2000b.205–256.
- Zwartjes, Otto, ed. 2000b. *Las gramáticas misioneras de tradición hispánica (siglos XVI y XVII)*. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2000c. "Norma y uso en las gramáticas misioneras hispánicas en la época colonial". Nystedt, ed. 2000.404–418.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2000d. "Review". Nowak, ed. 1999a. *Romansk Forum* (Klassisk og Romansk Institutt, Universitetet i Oslo) 12.123–139.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2001. "Reply to Elke Nowak". *Romansk Forum* (Klassisk og Romansk Institutt, Universitetet i Oslo) 13.61–64.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2002. "The Description of the Indigenous Languages of Portuguese America by the Jesuits during the Colonial Period: The impact of the Latin Grammar of Manuel Álvares." *Historiographia Linguistica*, 29:1/2.19–70.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007a. "Inflection and Government in Arabic according to Spanish Missionary Grammarians from Damascus (XVIIIth century): Grammars at the crossroads of two systems?" Ditters & Motzki, eds. 2007.209–244.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007b. "Agreement Asymmetry in Arabic according to Spanish Missionary Grammarians from Damascus (18th century)". Zwartjes, James & Zwartjes, Otto. 2003. "La lengua española y la teoría gramatical a través de las fuentes misioneras de la época colonial: la categoría del participio en las gramáticas del náhuatl". Sánchez Miret, ed.5.305–318.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2005. "Reseña". Ángel Cayo Atienza: *El idioma katío*. Edición de Ignacio Arellano y Gabriel Arellano. Estudio preliminar, revisión y notas por Julio Calvo Pérez. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 3.201–209.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2006. "History of Linguistics in Central and South America". Brown, ed. 2006:5.355–358.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007c. "Los 'romances' en las gramáticas andinas de la tradición misionera española". Schrader-Kniffki & Morgenthaler García, eds. 2007.817–835.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007d. "The Anonymous Grammar of the *Língua Geral do Brazil* (1750, Ms. 69, Biblioteca Municipal de Coimbra) and the Portuguese Grammatical Tradition. *Línguas e Instrumentos Lingüísticos* (Campinas) 19.55–77.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007e. "Las gramáticas misioneras de las lenguas indígenas de Brasil, Argentina, Paraguay y Chile". In: *Paradigmas de la Palabra. Gramáticas indígenas de los siglos XVI, XVII, XVIII*. Chapter III, 59–74. Madrid: Sociedad Estatal para la Acción Cultural Exterior (SEACEX) & Turner.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2007f. "Review". Lourido Díaz (2005 and 2006). *Aljamía* 19:451–471.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2008a. "El hebreo en las gramáticas del japonés y tagalo de Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688–1747)". Döhla, Montero Muñoz & Báez de Aguilar González, eds. 2008.393–424.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2008b. "Review". Astrid Alexander-Bakkerus (2005). *Antropological Linguistics* 49:2.188–191.
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Henning Klöter). 2008c. "Chinese in the Grammars of Tagalog and Japanese of the Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688–1747)". See Klöter & Zwartjes 2008.

- Zwartjes, Otto, ed. 2009a. *Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés. Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros según el arte de Nebrixa, con algunas voces propias de la escritura, y otras de los lenguages de Ximo, y del Cami, y con algunas perifrases, y figuras*. Transcripción y edición preparada por Otto Zwartjes, con un prólogo de Toru Maruyama. Frankfurt am Main & Madrid: Vervuert & Iberoamericana [Lingüística misionera, vol. 2.]
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2009b. "Tiempo y aspecto verbal en las primeras gramáticas de lenguas bantúes de las misiones católicas". Zimmermann & Zwartjes, eds. *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 13.233–261.
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Rebeca Barriga Villanueva). 2009c. "Bibliography of Thomas C. Smith-Stark (1973–2009)". [See Barriga Villanueva & Zwartjes.]
- Zwartjes, Otto & Konrad Koerner. 2009d. "Editor's Foreword". Zwartjes & Koerner 2009.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2010a. "Toward a History of Missionary Work by German-Speaking Jesuits in 16th and 17th century Latin America". *Historiographia Linguistica* 37:1/2.145–164.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2010b. *Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés. Arte de la lengua japona (1738), Tagalysmo elucidado (1742) y "Arte sínico, o mandarín (1742)*. Estudio a cargo de Otto Zwartjes. 3 vols. Madrid: Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2010c. "Incorporación de términos metalingüísticos no-occidentales en las gramáticas misioneras españolas y portuguesas (siglos XVI–XVIII)". Sueiro Justel et al., eds. 2010.67–92.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2011a. "Jacob Golius (1596–1667) and the *Vocabularium Hispanico-Sinense* (Bodleian Library, MS Marsh 696) and the study of Chinese in the Netherlands". Wesołowski, ed. 2011.305–382 (English version 307–346; Chinese version 347–382).
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2011b. "Oyanguren de Santa Inés's Grammar of Tagalog (*Tagalysmo elucidado*, 1742): Towards a reconstruction of 18th-century reflections on comparative typology". Reid, Ridruejo & Stolz, eds. 2011.63–86.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2011 (forthcoming a). "De studie van het Arabisch in de zeventiende eeuw. Een vergelijking tussen de werken van Thomas van Erpen (Erpenius 1585–1624) en de studies van Franciscanen in Zuid-Europa en het Midden-Oosten". Van Hal & Swiggers, eds. 2011. *De Tuin der Talen*.
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Anna Pytlowany). 2011. (forthcoming b) "Pre-modern Descriptions in Dutch of Languages in India: Ketelaar's grammar of Hindustani (1698) and Rüell's grammar of Sinhala (1700)". To appear in Rutten & Swiggers, eds.
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Manfred Woidich). 2011 (forthcoming c). "Damascus Arabic according to the *Compendio* of Lucas Cavallero (1703)". Schippers & Zack, eds. 2011 forthcoming.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2011 (in preparation a). "The Typology of Syntax according to Missionary Grammars of the Portuguese Tradition (16th–18th century): A comparison between Asian and Amerindian languages". Paper presented at the VIth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Tokyo, March 2010.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2011 (in preparation b). "Una comparación entre la *Gramática turca* (1799) de Juan Antonio Romero y la *Grammaire turque* (1730) de Jean-Baptiste Holdermann". Barriga Villanueva & Herrera Zendejas, eds. (2011 in preparation).
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Kerkhof & de Schepper), eds. 1993. *España: ¿Ruptura 1492?* See Kerkhof, de Schepper & Zwartjes.
- Zwartjes, Otto & Even Hovdhaugen, eds. 2004a. *Missionary Linguistics/Lingüística misionera [I]. Selected Papers from the First International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Oslo, March, 13th -16th, 2003*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 106.]

- Zwartjes, Otto & Even Hovdhaugen. 2004b. "Introduction". Zwartjes & Hovdhaugen, eds. 2004a.1–5.
- Zwartjes, Otto & Cristina Altman, eds. 2005. *Missionary Linguistics II/Lingüística misionera II: Orthography and Phonology. Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, São Paulo, 10–13 March, 2004*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 109.]
- Zwartjes, Otto, Gregory James & Emilio Ridruejo, eds. 2007a. *Missionary Linguistics III/Lingüística Misionera III. Morphology and Syntax. Selected papers from the Third and Fourth International Conferences on Missionary Linguistics, Hong Kong/Macau, 12–15 March 2005, Valladolid, 8–11 March 2006*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 111.]
- Zwartjes, Otto, Gregory James & Emilio Ridruejo. 2007b. "Foreword and Acknowledgements". Zwartjes, James, & Ridruejo, eds. 2007a:1–2.
- Zwartjes, Otto, Ramón Arzápalo Marín & Thomas C. Smith-Stark, eds. 2009. *Missionary Linguistics IV/Lingüística misionera IV. Lexicography. Selected papers from the Fifth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Mérida, Yucatán, March 2007*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. [Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 114.]
- Zwartjes, O. J. & E.F.K. Koerner, eds. 2009. *Quot homines tot artes: New Studies in Missionary Linguistics. Historiographia Linguistica* 36.2/3.
- Zwartjes, Otto (with Klaus Zimmermann), eds. 2009. *Historiografía de las ciencias del lenguaje. RILI* 13. See Zimmermann & Zwartjes.

Index of biographical names

A

Aben Ezra (see Ibn Ezra)
 Abreu, Lopo de: 236
 Acosta, José de (SJ; 1540–1600): 12, 145
 Adelung, Johann Christoph (1732–1806): 2, 5
 Aesop (c.620–564 BCE): 107, 142
 Aguilar, Gaspar de (SJ; 17th cent.): 44
 Aguilar, Mosseh Raphael de (*fl.*1661): 256
 Albuquerque, Jerónimo Fragofo de (d.1619): 177
 Albuquerque, João de (d. 1553): 25
 Alcalá, Pedro de (OESH; *fl.* 1491–1505): 248, 301
 Aldrete, Bernardo de (1560–1641): 6, 12
 Almeida, Miguel de: 274
 Álvares, João (18th. cent.): 236
 Álvares, Manuel (SJ; 1526–1582): 43, 49, 90, 93, 99, 100–103, 104, 121, 131, 134, 141, 159, 164, 170, 172, 174, 179, 182–185, 197, 202, 221, 224, 260, 270, 280
 Amaduzzi, Giovanni Cristoforo (1740–1792): 24, 80, 81
 Amaral, Gaspar do (SJ; 1594–1646): 8, 263, 282, 291
 Amaranate, Benjamin Francisco de (1812–1879): 45
 ANCHIETA, Joseph de (SJ; 1534–1597): 11, 20, 141, 143–163, 164, 166, 169, 174, 186, 190, 191, 195, 201, 203, 224, 263, 265, 266
 Anjirō (informant): 93, 118
 Antonio: 26, 283
 Appleyard, John Whittle (1814–1874): 208

Aquila, Antonio ab (OFM; ?–1679): 245, 247, 249
 Aragona, Alonso de (SJ; 1585–1652): 146, 147, 163
 Araújo, Antônio (SJ; 1566–1632): 144, 163, 164, 166, 178, 186, 225, 263, 296
 Arcamone, Ignazio (SJ; 1615–1683): 46, 272
 Argote, Jerónimo Contador de (1676–1749): 84
 Arnauld, Antoine (1612–1694): 19
 Assumpção, Manoel da: (OSA; *fl.*1743): 21, 23–25, 58–68, 90, 262, 264, 276
 Ayora, Juan de (OFM; d.1582): 8
 Azevedo, Luis de (S.J.; *fl.*1624): 26
 Azevedo, Joaquim de (see Joaquim de Encarnação)

B

Balbi, Adriano (1782–1848): 5
 Banha, Manuel (OFM): 47, 274
 Baptista [Abrantes], Antonio do Rosário (OFM; 1737–1813): 21, 243–256, 263, 301
 Baptista, Lado (OFM): 47
 Baptista, Manuel (OFM): 47
 Barbosa, Antônio (1594–1647): 8, 263, 282, 291
 Barradas, Manoel (*fl.*1639): 49
 Barreto, Manuel (SJ; 1564–1620): 278
 Barros, João de (1496–1570): 30, 43, 44, 52, 102, 103, 152, 154, 260, 270
 Barros, João de (author of a Kiriri grammar): 175
 Barth, Heinrich (1821–1865): 206

Bartoli, Daniello (SJ; 1608–1685): 97, 287
 Basilides (or Fasilides, =^cAlam Sagad) (1603–1667): 210
 Baupista, João (*fl.*1743): 61
 Bautista de Jesús, Juan (OP; *fl.*1560): 109
 Beligatti, Cassiano (Cassianus Beligattus) (OFM Cap.; b. 1708): 24, 51, 76, 80, 83, 84, 90, 253, 262
 Belmar, Francisco (1859–1926): 3
 Ben Gidhon [Abrediente], Mosseh (*fl.*1633): 256
 Bentley, W. Holman (Baptist Missionary Society; 1855–1905): 214
 Bertonio, Ludovico (SJ; 1557–1625): 6, 120, 141
 Beschi, Constanzo Giuseppe (SJ; 1680–1746): 44, 272
 Bettendorf(f), Johann Philipp (SJ; 1625–1698): 147, 163, 178
 Bischofinck, Bernard (Biscopio) (1689–c.1750/1759): 24, 273
 Blaeu, Joan (1596–1673): 288
 Blancas de San José (see San José)
 Bleek, Wilhelm Heinrich Immanuel (1827–1875): 206, 237
 Boaventura de Santo, Antônio: 147, 296
 Bonaventura da Sardegna (OFM Cap; c.1600–1649): 207
 Bonjour, Guillaume (=Shan Yao-chan) (OSA; 1670–1714): 209
 Borri, Cristoforo (SJ; 1583–1632): 292
 Botelho, Sebastiao Xavier (1768–1840): 237
 Boyce, William Binnington (1803–1889): 208

- Bras, Pedro de: 273
 Breithaupt, Christian (d.1783): 44
 Bruno, Ignacio (SJ; 1585–1659): 45, 272
 Brusciotto, Giacinto (Hyacinthus Brusciottus a Vetralla; Jacinto Brusciato de Vetrilha) (OFM Cap.; c.1600–*post* 1659): 205–220, 232, 233, 238, 239, 242, 297
 Buenaventura de Cerdeña (fl.17th cent.): 299
 Burnett, James (Lord Monboddo) (1714–1799): 13
- C**
 Caballus, Franciscus (fl.1637): 2
 Caldwell, Robert (1814–1891): 44
 Calepino, Ambrosio (1440–1510): 278
 Cannecattim, Bernardo Maria de (OFM Cap; fl.1804): 210, 300
 Cañes, Francisco (OFM; 1730–1795): 245, 247, 249, 301
 Canto, Francisco del (SJ; fl.1614): 6, 181
 Cárceres, Pedro (OFM; fl.1580): 91
 Cardim, Fernão (SJ; 1540/1548?–1625): 43, 149
 Cardoso, Jerónimo (c.1510–1569): 278, 286
 Cardoso, Mattheus (Mattheo) (SJ; 1584–c.1625): 206, 210, 212, 225, 226, 263
 Cardoso, Miguel (SJ; 1659–1721): 220
 Carlota Joaquina (de Borbón y Borbón) (1770–1830): 243
 Carochi, Horacio (SJ; 1579–1662): 140, 141
 Carpini, Giovanni da Piano (OFM; d.1252): 282
 Carrera, Fernando de (OSA; 1579–1662): 15, 146
 Catáneo, Valeriano: 45, 272
 Catherine (II) the Great (Sophie Friederike Auguste von Anhalt-Zerbst-Dornburg) (1729–1796): 2
 Cattaneo, Lazzaro (Lazarus Cataneus; SJ; 1562–1621): 287
 Cavallero, Lucas (OFM; fl.18th cent.): 247, 249, 276, 301
 Cavazzi da Montecuccolo, Giovanni Antonio (OFM Cap; d.1692): 208, 298
 Cerqueira, Luis (S.J.; Bishop of Funai between 1598–1614): 277
 Cerqueyra, Joannis: 272
 Chatelain, Héli (1851–1908): 207, 211, 222, 230, 235, 300
 Chirino, Pedro (SJ; 1667–1635): 288
 Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106–43 BC): 118
 Cinnamo, Leo (SJ; ?): 275
 Clenardus, Nicolaus (Nicolas Claeynaerts; 1495–1542): 256
 Cobo, Juan (OP; ? –1592): 110
 Collado, Diego (OP; d.1638): 130, 281
 Columbus, Christopher (1451–1506): 143, 283
 Comenius (Komenský), Jan (Joannes) Amos (1592–1670): 275
 Conceição, Gaspar da (OFM; fl.1555): 210
 Confucius (551–479 B.C.): 96, 101, 118, 269, 285
 Contreras, Geronymo de (SJ; fl.1629): 211
 Correia, Pero (SJ; fl.16th cent.): 186
 Costa, Balthasar da (1610–1673): 35, 45, 273
 Courtois, Victor José (SJ, fl. 1900): 300
 Couto, António (Antonius de Coucto) (SJ; fl.1661–d.1666): 211
 Croze, Maturin Veyssière de la (1661–1739): 81
 Cruz, Baltazar Esteves da (SJ): 273
 Cruz, Esteuão da (fl.1639): 49
 Cruz, Gaspar da (OP; d.1570): 284
- D**
 Daniel, João (SJ): 296
 D'Elia, Pasquale (SJ; 1890–1963): 286
 Deslandes, Miguel (?–1703): 177
 Despauterius, (Despauter; Van Pauteren, Ioannes) (c.1460–1520): 179, 180
 Dias, Pedro (SJ; 1622–1700): 21, 73, 205–208, 220–235, 239, 242, 266
 Díaz, Francisco (OP; 1606–1646): 289
 Dioscorus of Aphroditto: 296
 Donatus, Aëlius (4th cent. A.D.): 43, 159, 179
 D'Orbigny, Alcide Dessalines (1802–1857): 5
 Ducoeurjoli, S. (or Joly): (SJ; fl. 1802): 13
 Du Ponceau, Peter S. (1760–1844): 12, 19, 132
 Duret, Claude (1570–1611): 5
- E**
 Encarnação, João (OFM; fl. 1757): 258
 Encarnação, Joaquim (Joaquim de Azevedo) (OFM; fl. 1757): 257
 Encarnación, Juan de la (OFM; 18th cent.): 276, 301
 Erasmus Roterodamus, Desiderius (c.1467–1536): 180
 Ernesto, João (d.1732): 273
 Erpenius, Thomas (van Erpen): (1584–1624): 83, 245, 246, 248, 249, 253, 255, 260, 263, 287
 Esteuão, Thomas (see Stephens)
- F**
 Fabricius, Johann Philipp (1711–1791): 44
 Faria, João de: 27
 Faria Machado, António de (fl. 1639): 49
 Farinha, António Lourenço (fl.1917): 236
 Fārūzabādi, al- (d.1415): 288
 Febrès, Andrés (SJ; 1731–1790): 183
 Fergusson, James: 76
 Fernandes, António (SJ; 1570–1642): 26
 Fernandes, João (1526–1567): 94, 98

- Fernandes, Sebastian (SJ; 1562–1621): 287
- Ferreira, Gaspar (SJ; 1571–1649): 290
- Ferreira, Manuel (SJ; 1630–1699): 292
- Figanière, Jorge de (*fl.*1864): 207, 237
- Figueredo, Rodericus de: 97
- Figueira, Luis (SJ; 1575–1643): 21, 144, 151, 164–168, 169, 172–174, 186, 195, 201, 202, 224, 263, 265, 266
- Firūzābādī, al- (1329–1415): 282
- Forbes, Duncan (1798–1868): 89
- Fritzius (=Fritz), Johannes Frid. (*fl.*1784): 81
- Frois, Luís (SJ; 1532–1597): 94, 98
- Fucan Fabian: 107
- Fuentes, Pedro Antonio (OFM; *fl.*1776): 248
- Furtado de Mendonça, André: 236
- G**
- Gabelentz, Hans Conon von der (1807–1874): 177
- Gago, Balthazar (1515–1583): 118
- Gândavo, Pero de Magalhães (c.1540–c.1580): 152
- Gandhi, Mahatma (Mohan-das Karamchand) (1869–1948): 76
- Germanus (of Silesia), Dominicus (OFM; 1588–1670): 81, 301
- Gessner, Conrad (1516–1565): 5
- Gheel (Geel), Joris van (Jorge de G[h]ela, Giorgio di Ghela, *alias* Adriaan Willems; 1617–1652): 297, 298
- Gidhon, Mosseh ben (=Gideam Abrediente) (d. 1688): 256
- Giggeius, Antonios (*fl.*1632): 301
- Gilberti (Gylberti), Maturino: (OFM; 1498–1585): 19, 83, 146
- Gilchrist, John Borthwick (1759–1841): 89
- Gilij, Filippo Salvatore (SJ; 1721–1789): 5
- Glemona, Basilio de: 289
- Golius, Jacob (1596–1667): 249, 287, 288, 301
- Gómez Brizeño, Juan (*fl.*1684): 115
- Gonçalves, Jacome (1676–1742): 273
- Gonçalves, Joaquim Afonso (CM; 1781–1834): 290
- Gonsalves, João (SJ, 16th century): 27
- González, Bernardino (OFM; c.1665–c.1735): 247, 249, 301
- González Holguín, Diego (SJ; 1552–1618): 141
- González de Mendoza, Juan (OSA; c.1540–1617): 284
- Gouvea, Antonio de (1602–1677): 289
- Gouveia, Cristóvão de (JS; 1542–1622): 149
- Guadagnoli, Philippus (OFM; 1596–1656): 10, 246, 247, 249, 253, 263
- Guinness, Henry Gratan (1835–1910): 207
- H**
- Hadley, George (d.1798): 75, 76, 80, 262
- Halhed, Nathaniel Brassey (1751–1830): 58
- Hanxleden, Johann Ernst (SJ; 1681–1732): 24, 273
- Heckewelder, John (1743–1823): 12
- Henriques, Henrique (SJ; 1520–1600): 21, 23, 24, 28–45, 90, 136, 140, 141, 150, 169, 170, 261, 264, 272
- Herckman, Elias (c.1596–1644): 176
- Hervás y Panduro, Lorenzo (SJ; 1735–1809): 5
- Hideyoshi, Toyotomi (1536–1598): 95, 110
- Hodar, Paulo (1720–1780): 243
- Holdermann, Jean-Baptiste (1694–1730): 81, 160
- Hottinger, Johann Heinrich (1620–1667): 246
- Huerta, Alonso de (SJ; 1562–1640): 82
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von (1767–1835): 2, 5
- Hunt, Thomas (1696–1774): 245
- I**
- Ibn al-Ājurrūm al-Sanhājī (1273–1323): 247
- Ibn al-ʿAssal (*fl.*13th cent.): 296
- Ibn Ezra, Abraham ben Meir (Aben Ezra) (1092–1167): 246
- Ibn Kabar, Barakat (d.1324): 209
- Ibn Tumart (Abū Abdallāh Muḥammad Ibn Jaʿfar al-Qaysī) (12th cent.): 297
- Icazbalceta, Joaquín García (1824–1894): 3
- Ieyasu, Tokugawa (1543–1616): 95
- J**
- Jachia, David (16th cent.): 256
- Jawhari, al- (d. 1002 or 1008): 288
- Jesus, Christovam (Cristovão) de (OFM; *fl.* 1600–1637): 47
- Jesus, João de (*fl. post* 1718): 148, 296
- Jorge (Iorge), Marcos (SJ; 1524–1571): 147
- Jones, William (1746–1794): 4, 46, 58
- Jurjānī, ʿAbd al-Qāhir al- (d. c.1080): 247
- K**
- Kašić, Bartul (Bartolomaeus Cassius) (SJ; 1575–1650): 312
- Ketelaar, Jona Josua (1659–1718): 75, 78, 89, 262, 275, 276
- Khalil ibn Aḥmad, al- (d. c.791): 301
- Ḳimḥi, David (1160–1235): 246
- Kircher, Athanasius (SJ; 1601–1680): 209, 287, 289
- Koelle, Sigismund Wilhelm (1823–1902): 206
- Komenský (see Comenius)
- Krapf, Johann Ludwig (1810–1881): 206

L

- Lagunas, Juan Bautista [Bravo] de (OFM; d.1604): 19, 51
 Lancelot, Claude (pseud. Sieur de Trigny; c.1616–1695): 19
 Larramendi, Manuel de (SJ; 1690–1766): 9, 114
 Leam, Bertolameu (SJ; *fl.*1686): 164
 Leem, Knud (1696–1775): 9
 Leitão e Castro, Antonio Thomaz da Silva: (OFM Cap; 1848–1901): 207, 299
 León, Nicolás (1859–1929): 3
 Léry, Jean de (1534–1611): 143, 161
 Lima, Manuel de: 214
 Lipsius, Justus (1547–1606): 81
 Lobato, António José dos Reis (d. 1804): 84
 Lockman (Locumán): 245
 López, Francisco (OP; d. 1631): 17
 López, Luis (17th. cent.): 212
 López de Legazpi, Miguel (1502–1572): 109
 Loyola, Ignatius (Ignacio) de (SJ; 1491–1556): 29
 Lozano, Pedro (SJ; 1697–1752): 115
 Ludewig, Hermann Ernst (c.1810–1856): 5, 213
 Ludolf, Hiob (1624–1704): 209
 Lugo, Bernardo de (OP; *fl.* 1617): 11, 146

M

- Mã Jiànzhōng (1845–1900): 289
 Mabuchi, Kamo no (1697–1769): 106
 Madeyra, Domingos (1685–175?): 272
 Maecedo, Jorge Secco de (SJ; *fl.* 1639): 49
 Maffei, Angelus Francis Xavier (1844–1899): 50, 53, 56
 Magaurlua, Iacinto (*fl.*1630): 108
 Magdalena, Augustín de la (OFM; d. 1689): 116
 Majorica, Girolamo (SJ; 1591–1656): 292

- Mamiani, Luis Vicêncio (SJ; 1652–1730): 21, 43, 88, 143, 175–201, 202, 263, 296
 Mançano, Melchor de (*fl.*1620): 280
 Mancinelli, Antonio (1452–1505): 179
 Manutius, Aldus Pius (Aldo Manuzio) (1449–1515): 179, 186
 Marietti, Pietro (*fl.*1870): 277
 Mariz, Antonio: 149
 Marsh, Narcissus (1638–1713): 288
 Martellottus, Franciscus (OFM; d.1618): 247, 249, 252
 Martial (Marcus Valerius Martialis) (40–103): 26
 Martini, Martino (SJ; 1614–1661): 287, 288
 Martinus, Petrus (*fl.*1593): 301
 Martins, Manoel (?1597–?1656): 45, 272
 Martinz, Ignacio (Inácio Martins) (SJ; 1531–1598): 210
 Martius, Karl Friedrich Philipp von (1794–1868): 5, 176–178
 Mašāih Muhammad (14th cent.): 283
 Mascarenhas, Nuno: 90
 Mata, Pedro de la (*fl.*1748): 82
 Maya, João de: 45
 Mayans y Sísar, Gregorio (1699–1781): 3
 Melanchthon, Philip (1497–1560): 267
 Mendes, Affonso (Patriarch of Abyssinia 1622): 291
 Mentzel, Christian (1622–1701): 133, 293
 Mexia, Lourenço (*fl.*16th cent.): 115
 Michitoshi, Toganoi (1725–1785): 130
 Mills (Millius), David (1692–1756): 75, 89
 Molina, Alonso de (OFM; c.1514–1585): 8, 111, 113, 120
 Monserrate, António de (*fl.*1588): 209
 Monte Corvino, Giovanni (John) (OFM; 1247–1328): 25, 282

- Monteprandone Amici, Antonius-Maria (Antonio) da (Prandomontanus) (OFM Cap; 1607–1687): 298
 Montesarchio, Jerónimo (17th cent.): 298
 Münster, Sebastian (1488–1552): 302

N

- Nájera, Manuel de San Juan Crisóstomo (1803–1853): 3
 Nantes, Bernard de (OFM Cap; *fl.*1709): 178
 Nantes, Martin de (OFM Cap; 1638–1714): 176, 178
 Nariakira, Fujitani (1738–1779): 106, 130
 Nebrija, Antonio de (c.1444–1522): 3, 30, 51, 99, 103, 118, 180, 181, 278
 Neve y Molina, Luis de (*fl.*1767): 91
 Nieva, Domingo de (OP; 1563–1606): 110
 Nobili, Roberto de (SJ; 1577–1656): 45, 272
 Nóbrega, Manoel de (SJ; 1517–1570): 144, 148
 Norinaga, Motoori (1730–1801): 106
 Noronha, Paulo Francisco de (O.Carm.; 1780–1848): 45
 Nunes Barreto, João (c.1510–1562): 26

O

- Obicini, Thomas (OFM; 1585–1632): 247
 Oliveira (Oliveyra), Fernão de (OP; 1507–*post* 1581): 30, 52, 103, 114, 152, 186, 188, 260, 270
 Oliveira, Scheleno (Selemoh/Schelomão) (*fl.*1689): 256
 Olmos, Andrés de (OFM; c.1480–c.1568): 8, 29, 116, 146
 Oré, Hieronimo de (OFM; 1554–1620): 6
 Ortiz, Thomas (*fl.* 1730): 91
 Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchor (1688–1747): 1, 7, 9, 16, 37, 82, 108, 150, 183, 290

P

Pacconio, Franciscus (SJ; 1589–1641): 211, 212, 221, 222, 225–227, 263, 298
 Pais, Pero (SJ; 1563–1622): 209
 Pallas, Peter Simon (1741–1811): 2
 Pantoja, Diego (1571–1618): 287
 Pasio, Francesco (SJ; 1554–1612): 286
 Paul IV (Pope): 25
 Paz, Francisco da (b. 1731, *fl.* 1773): 21, 256–260
 Peixoto, Antonio da Costa (*fl.* 1731–1741): 210
 Pellicer de Tovar, José, (OFM-Cap: *fl.* 1649): 177, 208, 299
 Peñafiel, Antonio (1839–1922): 3
 Pereira, António: 45, 272
 Pereira, Bento (*fl.* 1634): 278
 Pereyra, Benedictus: 274
 Peres, Lourenço: 46
 Pereszlényi, Pál (SJ; 1631–1689): 9
 Pernambuco, José de (d. 1653): 298, 299
 Petraeus, Eskill (1593–1657): 9
 Pickering, John (1777–1846): 2
 Pillot, Jean (c. 1512–1592): 84
 Pimentel, Antão (bishop of Cranganor between 1721 and 1751): 24, 273
 Pimentel, Francisco (1823–1893): 3
 Pina, Francisco de (SJ; 1585–1625): 263, 282, 291, 292
 Pinpin, Tomás (?–*fl.* 1610–?): 108
 Pistoia, Arcangelo Carradori di (OFM; *fl.* 1650): 25, 296
 Pistoia, Nicholas: (OP): 25
 Platzmann, Julius (Julio) (1832–1902): 3, 178
 Podestà, Johannes Baptista (1625–1688): 81
 Poezold, Rev. Mr.: 309
 Polo, Marco (1254–1324): 283
 Pope, George Uglow (1820–1908): 44
 Prémare, Joseph Henri-Marie de (SJ; 1666–1736): 289

Priscian(us) Caesariensis (late 5th–6th cent.): 6, 61, 83, 141, 157, 159, 182, 185
 Proença, Antão de (1625–c. 1666): 44, 272
 Purchas, Samuel (c. 1575–1626): 149

Q

Qimhi, David (1160–1235): 6
 Qoninci (14th cent.): 283
 Quadros, Antonio de: 27
 Quintilian(us) Marcus Fabius (c. 35–c. 95 A.D.): 114, 117, 152, 186

R

Rada, Martín de (OSA; 1533–1578): 109
 Raphelengius, Franciscus (François Raphelengien, Frans van Ravelingen) (1539–1597): 245, 249
 Rau, Suriagy Amanda: 24
 Razilly, Chevalier Francis de (1578–1622): 177
 Restivo, Pablo (pseud. ‘Blas Pretovio’) (SJ; 1658–1741): 146
 Reuchlin, Johannes (1455–1522): 6, 232
 Reyes, Antonio de los (OP; c. 1520–1603): 116
 Rhodes, Alexandre de (JS: 1591–1660): 133, 207, 263, 282, 289–295
 Ribeiro, Diogo (SJ; 1560–1633): 23, 46, 49, 274
 Ricardo (Riccardi), Antonio (SJ; *fl.* 16th cent.): 196
 Ricci, Matteo (SJ; 1552–1610): 97, 282, 284–287
 Rincón, Antonio del (SJ; 1556–1601): 140
 Robredo, Amaro de (SJ; 1580/1585–*post* 1653): 138, 139, 228
 Robredo, Manuel (*alias* Francisco de São Salvador; 17th cent.): 298
 Rodrigues, Antônio (SJ; *fl.* 16th cent.): 148, 186
 Rodrigues, Francisco: 94, 277

Rodrigues, [Tçuzu; Tsuji] João (SJ; 1561–1634): 21, 22, 93–142, 277, 286, 289, 295
 Rodrigues, João (printer in India): 26
 Rodrigues, João [Giram]: 94
 Rodrigues, Pero: 146
 Rodríguez, Francisco: 27
 Roma, Juan Francisco de (17th cent.): 211, 297
 Romero, Juan Antonio (18th cent.): 81
 Rosa, Domingos Lopes (*fl.* 1642): 211
 Rosario, Euzebio (*fl.* 1772): 273
 Roth, Heinrich (SJ; 1620–1668): 27, 28
 Roxo Mejía y Ocón, Juan (SJ; d. 1702): 321
 Rubruck, William of (OFM; c. 1215–1270): 282
 Rüell, Joannes (c. 1660/63–1701): 75, 276
 Ruggieri, Michele (SJ; 1543–1607): 282, 284–287
 Ruiz de Montoya, Antonio (SJ; 1585–1652): 6, 146, 147, 156, 157, 160, 163

S

Sagard, Gabriel (Recollet; *fl.* 1614–1632): 144
 Sahagún, Bernardino de (OFM; 1499–1590): 11
 Saldanha, Antonio de (SJ; 1598–1663): 275
 San Agustín, Gaspar de (OSA; 1646–1724): 11
 San Buenaventura, Pedro de (OFM; d. 1627): 115
 San José, Francisco [Blancas] de (OP; 1560–1614): 158, 196
 Sánchez, Alonso (*fl.* 1583): 287
 Sánchez, Francisco, de las Brozas (see Sanctius)
 Sánchez, Pedro: (d. 1635): 62, 90
 Sanctius, Franciscus (Brocensis; Sánchez de las Brozas; 1523–1601): 114, 117
 Sancto Bartolomaeo, Paulinus a (O.Carm.; 1748–1806): 24
 Sandoval, Alonso de (1567–1652): 212, 223

- Santa Anna, Amador de (OFM): 47
- Santa Anna, Francisco Xaver (O.Carm.): 47
- Santo Thomas Navarrete, Domingo de (OP; c.1499–1570): 6, 114, 144, 146
- Santos, João de (d.1622): 207
- Sanvitores, Diego Luis (SJ; 1627–1672): 17
- São Miguel, Gaspar de (OFM; c.1595–1647): 47, 274
- São Salvador, Francisco (see Manuel Roboredo)
- Scaliger, Joseph (1540–1609): 109
- Schlegel, Karl August Wilhelm [von] (1772–1829): 5, 19
- Schlegel, Friedrich [von] (1772–1829): 5
- Scultuzius (=Schultius; *alias* Benjamin Schultze), Benjamin (1689–1760): 81
- Secco de Maecedo, Iorge (*fl.*1639): 49
- Semedo, Alvaro (SJ; 1586–1658): 290
- Seneca, Lucius (or Marcus) Annaeus, ‘The Elder’, c.55 B.C.–40 A.D.): 114
- Silva, Duarte da (1536–1564): 93, 94, 98
- Sin Sukchu (1417–1475): 282
- Sousa, Gabriel Soares de (1540–1592): 151
- Sousa, João de (OFM; 1735–1812): 22, 243–256, 263, 301
- Sousa, Luís de (SMOM; 1555–1632): 207, 208
- Spix, Johann Baptist von (1781–1826): 5, 176, 178
- Stephens, Thomas (Thomaz Esteuão) (SJ; c.1549–1619): 4, 22–24, 26, 29, 45–58, 68, 69, 90, 140, 141, 147, 173, 183, 262, 264
- Sylva, Francisco da (*fl.*1743): 23, 58
- T
- Távora, Francisco de (*fl.*1566): 257
- Templo, Selomoh Jehuda Leão (d. c.1733): 256, 259
- Teruel, Antonio (17th cent.): 298
- Thévet, André (OFM; 1512–1590): 143
- Töin (or Höin), Vicente: 109
- Tolomei, Claudio (1503–1565): 52
- Torres, Miguel de: 148
- Touche, Daniel de la Sieur de la Ravardière (1570–1631): 177
- Trigault, Nicholas (Niklaas, Nicola, SJ; 1577–1628): 119
- Tschudi, Johann Jakob von (1818–1889): 5
- Tuki, Raphael (Rūfā’il al-Tūkhi; 1701–1787): 209
- U
- Udine, Onorato de (Honoratus Utinensis (*fl.*1793): 274
- Uffenbach, Zacharias Conrad (1683–1734): 44
- Urbano, Alonso de (OFM; 1529–1608): 8, 91
- V
- Valdés, Juan de (c.1495–1541): 3
- Valdivia, Luis de (SJ; 1561–1642): 7, 146
- Vale, Elias José Francisco do (*fl.*1777): 295
- Vale, Leonardo do (1538–1591): 147, 186, 295, 296
- Valencia, Ángel de (Angelo) (17th cent.): 297, 298
- Valignano, Alessandro (SJ; 1539–1606): 26, 27, 29, 93–95, 115, 277, 279, 283, 285
- Valla, Lorenzo (1406–1457): 179
- Valle, Paulo de (d. 1552): 29
- Valle Flemmarum, Agapito à (OFM; 17th cent.): 249, 255, 301
- Varchi, Bendetto (1503–1565): 52
- Varo, Francisco (OP; 1627–1687): 118, 138, 289, 292, 293
- Varro, Marcus Terentius (116–27 B.C.): 131
- Vasco da Gama (1469–1524): 23
- Vater, Johann Severin (1771–1826): 2, 5
- Veas, Francisco de (17th cent.): 299
- Vega (“el Inca”), Garcilaso de la (Gómez Suárez de Figueroa; 1539–1616): 12
- Venerius, Achille (Achilles Venerius) (*fl.*1630): 209
- Vetancurt, Augustín de (OFM; 1620–1700): 140
- Veronese, Guarino (1374–1460): 179
- Vicianá, Rafael Martín de (1502–1582): 126
- Viegas, Manuel (SJ; 1533–1608): 147
- Vieira, Antonio (SJ; 1608–1697): 223
- Villalón, Cristóbal de (c.1505–c.1558): 114
- Virgil(ius) Maro, Publius (70–19 BC): 118
- Vittori da Rieti, Mariano (Marianus Victorius) (c.1518–1572): 209
- Vossius, Gerardus (1577–1649): 245
- W
- Walton, Brian (1600–1661): 246
- Wemmers, Jacob (O.Carm.; 1598–1646): 209
- Wilhelm, August (1767–1845): 5
- X
- Xavier, Franciscus (SJ; 1506–1552): 25–27, 29, 93, 269, 283, 285
- Ximénez, Francisco (1666–1730): 13
- Y
- Yates, William (1792–1845): 89
- Yōfo (=Yoho) Paulo, Irmão: 107
- Yoshishige, Otomo (“Don Francisco Otomo Sorin) (1530–1587): 95
- Z
- Zamakhshari, al- (1075–1144): 282, 301
- Zanetti, Luiz: 6
- Ziegenbalg, Bartolomaeus (1682–1719): 45
- Zeisberger, David (1721–1808): 132

Index of subjects & terms

- A
- ablative
- of cause 203
- instrumentalis* 35
- quietis* 35
- socialis* 35
- absolute 174
- absolutive (*absolutivus*) 99
- abstract (noun) 34
- accent 32, 49, 52, 63, 69, 80, 125, 155, 163, 182, 186–189, 191, 226, 227, 238, 293
- accento agudo~breve 124, 125, 190, 191
- accento breve~longo 52, 124, 125
- accident
- accidental letter 232
- accusative 280
- acre(s)centar, acrescentamen-
to 41, 232, 241, 242
- actio* (acção) 99, 136
- active ~ non active 161, 166, 201, 265
- active ~ stative 158, 161
- adjectivação, adjectivisation 239
- adjectival noun (adjective
noun) 130–132, 265
- adjectival verb 130
- adjective 99, 131, 161, 174, 193, 216, 229, 265
- adverb(o) (*adverbium*) 38
- demostrativo 174
- indiferente 198
- affirmative 35, 135, 160, 174, 239
- affix(ation) 6, 19, 127
- affixed personal pronouns 254, 258
- African languages 150, 205–242, 296–301
- agent (agente) 58, 162, 163, 199
- agentive marker 57, 198
- agglutination, agglutinating, ag-
glutinative 19, 53, 137, 219
- agreement 40, 56, 57, 66, 72, 87, 137, 139, 162, 167, 196, 197, 255, 230, 239, 255, 259, 265
- adjective-noun 57, 140, 228, 255, 259
- relative-antecedent 140, 228, 255, 259
- subject-verb 35, 140, 219, 228, 255, 259
- agreement marker 265
- Allentiac 7
- allomorph 135
- allophone 155, 188
- ambiguity 157, 162
- Ambundo 222, 224, 231, 235
- Amharic 80, 209, 210
- amphibologia 162
- amplitudo* 245
- analytic particles 53
- animacy 162, 216
- animate ~ inanimate 34, 162, 196, 265
- antecedente 131, 133
- anthropology 4, 11, 43, 12, 242, 270,
- antiquitas* 245
- aorist 28
- aphaeresis 195
- aportuguesadamente 113
- appellativo 228
- approximative translation 43
- Arabic 59, 81–83, 126, 141, 126, 141, 232, 243–256, 261, 262, 263, 276, 283, 284, 301
- Aramaic 7, 60, 100
- Arda 212, 213
- Armenian 80
- Aroa 147, 148
- article (articulus, artigo, arti-
colo, arthron) 17, 85–87, 128, 157, 166, 167, 173, 174, 191, 216, 217, 231, 242, 267, 281
- articolo (in)definitivo (indef-
inito) 87
- articulatory descriptions 18
- aspect 9, 65, 72, 217, 218, 232, 233
- aspect marker 54
- asper* 153
- aspero 153, 163–165, 186–188
- aspiration (aspiração) 50, 51, 63, 126, 153, 189, 262
- assimilation 126, 215, 262
- attitude 10–14
- attributive 131, 132
- auctoritas* (au[c]toridad) 111, 114
- augment 216
- Augustinians 25, 109, 143, 209, 269
- autores antigos 117
- auxiliary 36, 39, 72, 84, 127, 135, 264
- Aymara 6, 120, 141, 145, 222
- B
- Babel 13
- Bantu languages 144, 202, 205–242
- barbarian, barbarism 13, 82, 113, 115, 128, 167, 178
- base 128
- Basque 9, 114, 126, 183
- beicho 124
- Belgian missions 208
- Benedictines 143
- Bengali 58–67, 90, 262, 264
- Berber 297
- blaesum* (bleso) 83
- Bohemian 81
- Brahman (lingua bramana) 48, 49, 59, 68, 268, 272
- brando (brandamente) 187–189
- C
- Cafre 206, 226, 236, 237, 263, 300
- cami* 111, 112, 279
- cana* 105
- canarim 48, 49

- Cantonese 292
 Capuchins 177, 178, 205, 207, 211, 212, 213, 298
 Carmelites 47, 143, 298
 case 32, 33, 53, 156, 160, 162, 166, 191
 instrumental 53
 locative 53
 marker 129, 130
 original 53
 semantic 156
 syntactic 157
 case particle 127
 case suffix 70, 73
 caso commun 199
 caso (cazo) recto/ obliquo 53, 70
 Castilian (See Spanish)
 casual speech 128
catacana (see Katakana)
 Catalan 183
 causative 28, 37, 55, 133, 136, 137
 cedilha, cedilla, cédille, ce-rilla 154
 ceo do boca 51, 69
 cerebral 50
 Chaldaic 60, 245, 209, 232, 245, 256
 character (plain~empty) 106
 Chibcha 146
 children's speech 141
 Chinese 7, 8, 15, 26, 82, 96, 106, 112, 118, 119, 138, 150, 209, 225, 263, 265, 271, 276, 281–290
 Chinese linguistic tradition 106, 282
 Christian terminology 97, 118–120
 circumflex 63, 110, 124, 182, 186, 189, 191, 225, 238, 293
 circumloquio 96
 circumstantial 203
 classifier 202, 216
 clitic 174
 clusivity 194
 code-switching 41
Codex Cumanicus 283
 colocação (das partes) 98, 137, 168
 colloquial (style, register) 41, 47, 76, 77, 108, 111, 117, 222, 248, 249, 268, 277
 comparative 71
 comparative philology 4, 5
 composição 38, 150, 151, 198
 compound 38, 182
 concord (*concordantia*, *concordancia*) 57, 140, 217, 224, 228, 233, 239, 255 (see also agreement)
 conditional 28
 conjugation (conjugação) 35, 36, 135, 174, 194
 conjunction (*coniunctio*) 102, 127, 181
 conjunctivus 100
connexio 217, 242, 251
 construção (*constructio*) 151, 167
consuetudo 117, 248
 contemplativo 53
continuatio 219
 continuative 218
 contraction 222, 226
 contrastive focus 232
 convergence 145
 copious(ness) (*copia*, *copioso*) 4, 12, 115, 150, 245, 279
 Coptic 209, 296
 copula 72, 127
 corrupt 13, 122
 cortadillo 16
 cortesia 136
 costume 114
cotoba (*kotoba*) 105, 280
coye (*koe*) 109, 111–114, 128, 138, 265
 cremento 155, 160
 Creole 13, 214
 creolization 222
 Croatia 179
cugue (*cughe*) 111–113

 D
dativus pretii 169
 declension (*declinatio*) 32, 33, 100, 127, 192, 215, 227
 definite(ness) ~ indefinite 87, 216
 deixis 130
 demonstrative 54, 87, 127, 129, 180, 222, 265
 demonstrative adverb 174
 denotativo 129, 265
 derivative verbal stem 28
 descender 42
 descriptive linguistics 3
 desiderative 28
 Devanagari 48–50, 76, 262
 diachrony 114–118
 diacritic 50, 63, 77, 166, 173, 190, 191, 215, 224, 225, 238, 242, 262, 263, 287, 292
 dictio(n) (*dicção*) 19, 135
 didactic (see also pedagogical) 18, 20, 36, 38, 91, 103, 120, 121, 152, 174, 175, 202, 280
 diglossia (diglossic) 41, 111, 248
 digraph 51, 188
 diminutive 84
 dinamarquês 61
 diphthong 123, 124, 184, 185, 187
 diptota 254
 dispositive 99
 Dominicans 7, 25, 109, 110, 118, 207, 236, 269, 288, 289, 298
 Dravidian language, linguistic family 31, 48, 61, 67
 Dravidian studies 44
 Dutch 24, 61, 108, 177, 178, 183, 276, 288
 Dutch grammatical theory 106
 Dzubucua 176, 178

 E
 effective 55
 elegance (elegant style, *eleganter*, *eleganc/tia*) 12, 40, 41, 70, 71, 95, 101, 107, 112, 114–118, 121, 150, 167, 170, 171, 245, 248, 277, 279
 ellipsis 174
elocutio 138
 eloquence 116
 emphasis 174
 endo-grammaticalization 10
 energia 129
 English 24, 51, 253
 equivalent 10
 ergativity 57, 74, 75, 88, 89, 197, 198–201, 203, 265, 266
esse 72
 essential syllables (letters) 232
 eso-grammaticalization 10
 estrangeiro 123
 Ethiopian 26, 80, 126, 245
 ethnography 140
 Etruscan 80
 euphony 27
 Eurocentric 1, 3, 4, 10, 12, 14, 261
 European languages 98, 114, 126, 127, 137

- exclusive (exclusivity) 34, 158,
166, 172, 194
- exo-grammaticalization 10
- exotic 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 14, 16, 19, 28
- extra-grammatical informa-
tion 20, 140, 268
- extravagante (pronome) 174,
175
- F
- facere facere* (fazer fazer) 9,
37, 137
- fables of Aesop 107, 142, 245
- facilitas* 245
- factivo 136
- fala plebeian, forma de 49
- feminine 35
- field work 10–14, 30, 31
- figura 78, 105, 151, 159, 182, 188
- Finnish 9
- firogaru* (*firaqu*) 110, 141, 280
- Flemish 183, 253, 297
- Franciscan(s) 25, 29, 47, 118, 143,
243–260, 269, 275, 282, 283,
290, 282, 283, 290, 298
- French 61, 81, 126, 182, 187
- frequentative 65
- flap 51, 82
- formula 166
- functional elements 106
- future (futuro) 28, 219
- absolute 56
- contingent 56
- continuo 235
- interrogando 36
- mandativo 36, 85
- periphrastic 28
- simple 28
- G
- Ganguela 209
- garganta 127, 150, 151, 153, 165,
186, 188
- Gbe 210, 214
- geminate 50
- Ge'ez 80, 208, 209, 210, 232
- gender 30, 32, 40, 52–54, 57, 64,
70, 72, 74, 78, 84, 86, 127, 140,
156, 159, 167, 174, 193, 216, 228,
239, 254, 264
- genitive 39
- Georgian 74, 80
- German 81, 126, 183, 253, 283
- Germanic languages 9
- gerundium* (gerund
gerundio), 11, 60, 241, 280
- ghenzai* 106, 107, 133, 141, 265
- glide 225
- glossocentrist view 12
- glossonym 205
- glottal stop 16, 164, 187
- glottalisation 18
- Gothic 183
- Greco-Latin tradition, model,
etc. 3, 4, 7, 11, 14–17, 37, 103,
130, 138, 141, 152, 155, 159, 270
- Greek (grego) 4, 19, 46, 52, 81,
99, 100, 103, 114, 115, 126, 141,
154, 166, 167, 183, 187, 248,
281, 293
- Greenlandic 15
- grosseiro 114
- grosso 163–165, 182, 186
- guanhua* (*guānhuà*,
cuanhua) 284, 285
- Guarani 6, 115, 146, 156
- gueden* 136, 280
- Gujarati 46, 67
- guttural 77, 79, 82, 126, 150, 182,
185, 186, 189, 231, 252, 253, 262
- H
- habitual 72, 235
- hamza* 247
- head-final 39
- Hebrew 6, 60, 80, 81, 100, 126,
182, 232, 242, 244, 256–260,
262–264, 275–276, 283, 301,
302
- hiatus 164, 187
- Hindi 15, 60, 67, 75–89, 90, 198
- Hindustani 46, 75–77, 89, 269
- hiragana* 107
- historical linguistics 3
- Holland, holandês (see also
Dutch) 61, 177
- honorific(ity), honorification,
honrado 34, 35, 60, 66, 78,
133, 136–137, 141, 264, 265, 267,
279, 294
- huehuetlahtolli* 115
- human 34, 216, 255
- Hungarian 9
- I
- idolatry 10
- Ilocan 8
- Imāla* 249
- imitative 28
- immediate past 218
- imperative 101
- imperfect participle 56
- imperfective 218
- inclusive (inclusivity) 34, 158,
166, 172, 194
- inc(h)oativo 72
- incorporation, 19, 173
- increment 134, 232, 241
- indeclinavel 131, 132, 238, 265,
264
- Indian grammatical tradi-
tion 27–28, 141
- Indo-Aryan language(s) 61, 63,
66, 67, 82
- infinitivus (infinitive, infini-
tivo) 11, 96
- infinito 96, 100
- infix 173
- inflection(al) 91, 32, 35, 52, 70,
84, 127, 133, 135, 140, 159, 162,
167, 191, 201, 216, 219, 224, 255,
264, 265
- ingressive 72
- Inquisition 48
- instrumental (case) 53, 70
- intensive 28
- interjection (*interiectio*) 102, 181
- interlanguage 113
- interrogative 198
- invariable 33, 55, 57, 191, 193, 293
- iroha* 109
- Italian 96, 122, 126, 183, 216, 226,
247, 262, 286, 296
- iterative 72
- J
- Japanese 7, 8, 15, 93–142, 150,
261, 262, 263, 276–281, 289
- Japanese grammatical tradi-
tion 104, 110, 141
- jazm* 247, 249
- Jesuits *passim*
- jota (iota) subscrito 153, 163,
293
- K
- kana* 94, 105, 107, 109
- Kannada (Kanarese) 48, 67, 271
- kanji* 94, 107, 109
- katakana* 94, 105
- Kawi 271
- Kenzi-Nubian 209

- Ki-group 215
 Kimbundu 144, 205, 207, 211, 220–235
 Kipçak 283
 Kipeá-Kiriri 144, 175–201, 265
koinè 144, 145
 Kongo (Kikongo) 205, 214–220, 222, 224
 Konkani 45–58, 67, 96, 264, 274–275
kotoba 106, 141

 L
 ladino 170
 Landina 209
 Latin 4, 6, 10, 19, 46, 54, 60, 72, 81, 93, 99, 100, 103, 104, 114, 115, 117, 118, 127, 155, 167
 Latin model (See Greco-Latin model)
 Lazarists 290
 Lebéo 208
 left-branching 39, 66, 87, 137, 139, 265
 lene (*lenís*) 153, 253, 293
 lexicography 271–302
 ligatura 16
 lingua (lengua)
 brasílica 145
 de Europa 98
 franca 145
 geral (lengua general) 144–146, 176, 182, 223
 geral amazônica 143, 168–175
 geral paulista 145
 natural 117
 peregrina 98
 linguagem 11
 literary (form register style) 41
 loan(word) 119, 125, 187, 190
 locative 53, 70

 M
 Macro-Jê 147, 176, 192
madda 247
mai 107, 108
 Makere 208
 Malabar (língua) 29, 31
 Malayalam 24, 31, 48
 Malayan 276
 Manchu 271
 Mandarin 284
 mandative 55, 85
 Mangbetu 208

 Mapudungun (Mapuche) 7, 146, 183
 Marathi 46, 47, 67–75, 90, 198, 262, 264
 Maronite 243
 matrix language 60
 Maya 115
 Media lingua 170
 meditative 28
 Medje 208
 meta-language 41, 58
 Methodists 208
 Millcayac 7
mirai 106, 107, 133, 141, 265
 mixed language 76
 mixed style 111
 mixed tenses 7
 Mochica 6, 146
 modo de fal(l)ar 37, 106, 111, 113
monogatari 101, 107, 108
 monosyllabic 182
 Moravian(s) 12, 13
 morphology
 nominal 32, 52, 53, 64, 70, 84, 127–129, 216, 227–229, 238
 verbal 35, 54–55, 64, 71, 84, 133–136, 159–160, 217, 230–235, 239–240
 morphosyntax 18, 166, 191–196, 216, 227–235, 238–240, 264–266
 Muisca 11

 N
na (noun) 105, 106, 141, 281
 Nahuatl 3, 7, 8, 29, 111, 115, 116, 140, 141, 145, 284
naiden 136, 280
 nasal(isation), nasality 18, 127, 185, 190, 215, 262
 native speakers (role) 121, 225
 natural language 13, 115, 117
 Ndongo 206, 211
necessitas 245
 Nederduitsch 276
 negative 35, 235
 negative future
 negative particle 56
 negative suffix 36
 negative verb 56, 135, 174
 Negerhollands 13
 Neologism 247
 neutro verdadeiro 174
 Newari 271

nhe'engatu 146
nigoru 109, 280
 nombre (*nomen*, noun) 101, 159
 nomen adjectivum (nome adjectiuo) 130–132
 nome sustantivo 101
 nominal morphology (declension) 64
 nominativus (nominative, nominativo) 196
 non-inflectional languages 19
 normative 128
 noun-class (noun classification) 193, 202, 203, 206, 216–217, 224, 228, 238, 266
 Nsenga 236
 Nubian 209
 numeral 132, 193
 Nyungwe 236, 237

 O
 object marker 129, 216, 219, 230
 object reference 9
 oblique 32, 53, 70
 occulto 57
okiji 106
 Old Spanish 123, 262
 Old speech 114, 115
 optative 234
 oral corpus 1, 242
 ordinary speech 133
 original (case)
 orthography 18, 32, 49–51, 62, 63, 68, 69, 79–83, 121–126, 152–155, 165, 183, 215, 224–226, 238, 252, 253, 261
 other(ness) 10–14, 269
 Otomanguean languages 9, 225
 Otomi 8, 91

 P
 paciente 58, 163
 padroado 6
 paladar 127
 palatalisation, palatalised form 41, 122
 Pali 284
 participial nouns 35
 participle (*participium*, *participio*) 35, 159
 particle (partícula) 17, 41, 79, 103, 199, 229, 231, 234
 adversativa 138
 articular 96, 128

- demonstrativa 70
 distinctive 230, 234
 postpositive 38
 particula articular 103
 particula honorativa 136
 particula humiliativa 136
 nasbante/charrante/ches-
 mante 247
 parts of speech system 85, 86,
 103, 104, 106, 130, 141, 151, 169,
 242, 254, 258, 266
 passé simple ~ passé composé 9
passio 99
 passive 37, 54, 57, 66, 88, 199,
 235, 265
 patient 58, 162, 163
 patronato 6
 pecho 127
 pedagogical 1, 98, 103, 120, 135,
 156, 165, 168, 232
 perfect
 common 28
 periphrastic 28
 perfective 71, 74, 88, 218
 periphrasis (periphrastic) 37,
 234, 264
 permissivo 139, 171
 Persian 59, 81
 Perso-Arabic 76, 77
 personal prefix 152, 167
 Philippine languages 7, 16, 129,
 194
 pidgin, pidginization 13, 222
 pitch 225
 plática de los viejos 115
 plurality 33, 64, 66
 Podzo 236
 polarity 35
 polido 170
 Polish 81
 polite(ness) 54, 74, 136, 277
 polysynthesis 19
 pontinho 52, 262
 ponto 164, 165
 Portuguese 60, 61, 95, 96, 119,
 122, 123, 166, 187, 188, 189, 216,
 225, 226
 possessive 34, 39, 241
 construction 39, 67, 87, 138,
 197
 prefix 193
 pronoun 34
 postposition (postposição) 38,
 53, 57, 70, 106, 151, 156, 168
 postpositive 38
potestas 188
 pragmatics 129
praeteritum hodiernae diei 219,
 234
 precative 28
 predicate 131
 predicative adjectives 131, 174
 prefix (praeifixus) 6, 100, 158
 pre-nasalisation 125, 153, 155,
 225, 238
 preposition (*praepositio*, pre-
 posição) 100, 216
 prescriptive 111, 114, 277
 pretérito (in) definido 9
 continuo 25
 imperfecto 9
 primitive language 13
principiatio 215, 238, 242, 266
 printing (press) 26, 27, 46, 49,
 94, 97, 144, 208
 proclitic 158
 pro-drop 60, 61, 231
 progressive 218
 prolixity 246
pronomina articularia 141
 pronominal prefix 196
 pronoun (*pronomen*, pro-
 nome) 34, 102, 157, 173, 174
 demonstrative 180
 distal 34
 extravagante 174, 175
 possessive 34
 proximal 34
 relative 35, 157, 180
 pronunciation 122
*Propaganda Fide (Sacra Con-
 gregatio)* 6, 21, 23, 24, 67, 80,
 81, 178, 205, 207, 209, 210, 213,
 246, 247, 258, 277, 281, 291,
 299, 301, 305, 307, 308, 310,
 315, 316, 317, 319, 320
 prosody 89, 151, 215, 238
 Protestant 39, 45
 provokable (*provocabulum*,
 provocabulo) 131, 132
 Pukina 6
 Purépecha (Tarascan) 8, 146,
 284
 Q
quaco 106, 107, 133, 141, 265
 quantifier 193
 quantity 18
 quase adjectives 131
 quasi adverbio 43
 quasi analytic 53
 quasi category 43
 quasi declension
 (declinação) 216
 Quechua 3, 6, 141, 145, 146, 158,
 181, 196, 212
 Qur'an 244
 R
 radical letter 232, 254, 259
 radix 6, 19, 246
 raíz (rayz) 41, 131, 134, 182, 232
Rakuyōshū 94, 108, 109, 276, 277
 rational (racional) 33, 228
 Recollect Franciscans 25
 reduplicative 130
 relational elements 106
 relative (*relativum*) (noun)
 (pronoun) 102, 131
 remote/removed past 233
 retroflex 50, 51, 69, 79–83, 262
 rhetoric 116, 138
 right-branching 87, 197
 risca 163, 164
 risquinha 163, 164
 rodeo 120
 romance 11
 romanisation 49, 52, 62, 80,
 121–123
Rongo 101, 110, 209
 root 6, 41, 128, 134, 182, 232, 244,
 246, 254, 259
rudimenta 30, 151, 233
 Rue 236
 rustico 128
 S
 Sacaca 296
 saltillo 16
 Sami (Lappisk) 9
 sandhi 27, 126, 262
 Sangley 7, 288
 Sanskrit 4, 24, 31, 46, 59, 60, 76,
 272, 282, 284
 Saramaccan 214
 savage 2, 12–13, 150
 schwa 187
 semi-pronombre 43
 Semitic languages 7, 100
 Sena 205, 224, 226, 236–241
 señal de demostración 173
 Senga-Sena group 236

- senhal 154
 sentido suspenso 172
 servile letter 232, 254, 259
shizi 106
siàxuě 118
signum
 futuritionis 219, 242
 intransitionis 219, 242
 negationis 219, 242
 sinal (see also 'senhal') 52, 173, 262
 sinalefa 222 (see also synaloepha)
 Sinhalese 75, 273, 276
 Sino-Japanese literature 101
 Slavic languages 9
 sociolect 170
 sociolinguistics 270
 Songo 208
 Sonyo 214
 sonsonete 110, 112
 Southern Min 288
 SOV-type 39, 66, 87, 137
 Spanish 6, 7, 9, 10, 81, 122, 123, 126, 182, 189, 262
spiritus asper ~ *lenis* 153, 253
 split-ergative 57, 74
 Sranan 214
 St. Thomas Christians 25–27
 stem 28, 128, 135, 192, 254
 stem changes 33
 stress 190, 225
subaru, *suboru* 110, 280
 subject marker 128, 129, 130, 216, 230
 subject reference 9
 subjunctive 56, 234
suboru (*subaru*) 141
 subscript circumflex 63
 substantial letter 232
 suffix(al) suffixation 6, 38, 41
 Sundi 214
 superessive 54
 superlative 71
supinum (*supine*) 11, 28, 60, 99, 280
suppositum (*sup*[p]osto, *sup-*puesto) 19, 131, 132, 138
 suspensive
 sutegana 104, 106
 SVO-type 138, 219
 Swahili 230
 syllaba longa ~ breve 125
 syllaba essential
 syllabic duration
 synaloepha 215, 223, 226, 227
 synchronic 1
 syntax 56, 66, 72, 104, 112, 117, 137–139, 162, 167, 196, 219, 255
 syntaxis figurata 151
 Syriac 25, 26, 100, 126
 Syro-Chaldean rite 25
 T
 tacit 57
 Tagalog 7, 8, 11, 116, 150
 Tamil 28–45, 89, 96, 136, 150, 169, 261, 264, 271, 272
 Tamil grammatical tradition 30
 Tamoio 149
 tapuia (*tapuya*) 150, 176
 Tarascan (see *Purépecha*)
 Tartar 82, 150
 tašdid 247
 teaching 97
 tenifa 104–106, 128, 141, 280
 tenioha 106
 teniwoha (*tenifa teniuofa*) 104–106, 141
 Telugu 67, 271
 tense marker 39, 218
 mixed 7
 terminação 42, 55, 57, 74, 105, 111, 166, 192
 terminative 72
 Tete 236
 thema (*theme*) 232, 254
 theoretical linguistics 4
 Tibetan 80, 271
 til(de) 52, 164, 188, 190, 262
 Tolkapiyyam 28, 271
 toada (*tonada*) 150, 225, 292
 tone (*tono*) tonal system, tonality 8, 9, 18, 125, 224, 227, 241, 262, 263, 286–288, 292–293
 topic(alisation), topic marker 17, 128–130, 174
 Toscan 153
 Totonac 7
 transition (*transición*) 9
 translation 10–11, 38, 43, 118, 120
 frase por frase ~ *palaura* por *palaura* 120
 triptota 254
 Tulu 48
 Tunchinense 293
 Tupi-Guarani languages 144, 145
 Tupi(*nambá*) 143–175, 265
 Tupiniqum 146, 149
 Turkic 283
 Turkish 81, 160, 245
 typology (typological) 4, 9
 U
 Umbundu 205, 222, 230
 undecidable 127, 192
 universal 172
 Urdu 76
 usage, use (*uso*) 111, 114, 155, 164, 248
 utilitas 245
 V
 variation, varieties (linguistic) 40, 59, 112, 113, 154, 170, 171, 182, 183, 222, 242, 268, 279
 Vedic 27, 46
 verb(al) morphology (*inflection*) (*verbum verbo*) 64, 159
 active 172
 activo factivo 136
 active ~ passive 261
 adjective 62
 affirmative ~ negative 35, 135, 160, 164, 166, 174
 anomalo 131
 factivo 136, 137
 honrado 136
 intransitive 57, 74, 78, 89, 158, 167, 173
 neuter 57, 99, 135, 158, 167, 174, 196, 199, 265
 personal/ impersonal 43
 simplice/ composto 135, 182
 substantive 56, 62, 71
 transitive 158, 167, 173
 vernacular language 2
 vetustas 117
 vicio 128
 Vietnamese (*lingua annamitica*) 8, 207, 225, 263, 281, 290–295
 virgula 154
 visible ~ invisible 175
 vocabulo 135
 vocative 280
 vogal
 entremeya 184, 263
 guttural 185
 simplex ~ duplex 185

voquiji (*vokiji*) 104, 105
vowel quality ~ quantity 262
vowel stress 225
voz 128, 135
VS-type 197
vulgar 59, 77, 117, 248

W

women's speech 113, 136, 141,
279

word order 39, 56, 66, 72, 87, 137,
138, 168, 196, 255

X

Xhosa 208
ximo 112, 279
xuzi 106

Y

Yombe 208, 214

yomi 109, 111–114, 128, 138, 265
Yucatec Maya 115
Yunga 146

Z

zebura 154
zero anaphora 231
zero ending 249
zero vowel 249
zeura 154

