

## Two Colonial Grammars: Tradition and Innovation

Astrid Alexander-Bakkerus(ACLCLC)\*

- I . Introduction
- II . Grammatical tradition
- III . Colonial language descriptions
- IV . Traces of traditional language description in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and in the *Lengua de Maynas*
- V . Innovation
- VI . Conclusion

### I . Introduction

Descartes said: “Je pense, donc je suis”. So according to him, existence logically ensues from thinking: we exist because we think and our existence is based on our thoughts. Since thoughts are couched in words and sentences, viz. in language, it is not surprisingly that from time immemorial men have thought about language. The Spanish and Portuguese priest, who had to describe the languages of the inhabitants of the newly discovered territories, could thus fall back on a long history of treatises on language and a long tradition of language description, starting with the Greek philosophers and going through to Antonio de Nebrija. On the basis of two colonial grammars or *artes*, written by Spanish missionaries, we may work out not only to what extent these

---

\* 아스트리트 알렉산더-백커러스 (Amsterdam Centre for Language and Communication: ACLC, astrid@troll.demon.nl), “식민기의 두 문법: 전통과 혁신”.

missionaries carried on the tradition, but also which improvements they introduced in their grammars.

We begin this article with a brief survey of the history of language description (section II), commencing with the philosophies about language, or rather about poetic diction, of a number of Greek philosophers, through those of Latin and medieval grammarians, and ending with Nebrija's famous *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*. In this historical survey of the grammatical tradition we throw some light on the linguistic phenomena described in the different philosophical treatises and grammars, on the way the phenomena are described, and on the structure of those works. (For another historical overview of missionary linguistics, see also Zimmermann 1997, 9-17. In his article, Zimmermann discusses, for instance, the tradition of language description, beginning with Nebrija, the problems encountered by the missionaries when they had to describe an unknown Amerindian language, and the impact of Amerindian linguistics in Europe).

Section III is dedicated to the introduction and description of two colonial grammars: *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*, written by Fray Pedro de la Mata in 1748, and *Lengua de Maynas*, an anonymous eighteenth century manuscript. They function as material for comparison. Their contents, viz. the described subjects, the arrangement of the subjects, the models into which nouns and verbs are cast, the concepts used to indicate different linguistic phenomena + the way the phenomena are described, are compared with those of the works of their predecessors. This way we may discern tradition from innovation. (For a comparison between a number of colonial grammars, see also Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 1997, 291-319, and Masson 1997, 339-368. Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz also talks about the example of Nebrija. Subsequently, she treats three colonial grammars: the grammar of Santo Tomás, an anonymous grammar from 1586, and the grammar of González Holguín. Masson analyzes eight (!) grammars of Ecuadorian Quechua, including the

grammar of González Holguín, and the one *Lengua de Maynas* is based on).

In section IV are treated the traces of traditional language description occurring in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and in the *Lengua de Maynas*: the use of a Graeco-Latin ordering of subjects, and of Graeco-Latin models and concepts.

Section V describes the innovation encountered in the colonial language descriptions mentioned above: the addition of new subjects, models and concepts, and a new approach of language description: the description of a language instead of poetry.

It thus appears that the colonial grammarians did use traditional patterns to describe an indigenous language, but that the result (section VI) was highly innovative. The missionaries invented new models and concepts, not only to describe and indicate the strange linguistic phenomena encountered in the Amerindian language, but also to let come out well the structure of the language. The aim of the colonial writers was not to analyze and describe 'homeground' poetry, like their predecessors did, but to give a complete description of an exotic language.

## **II. Grammatical tradition**

In the long history of language description, we may discern, first, two important schools that strongly influenced the way the missionaries described indigenous languages: a Greek school and a Latin school (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005b, 45-46); next, in the Middle Ages, a group of philosophers, who called themselves Modistae (Bursill-Hall 1971). The Modistae also philosophized about language. However, the influence of their linguistic ideas on the colonial grammars is less significant than that of the Greek and Latin philosophers. Finally, in the

miraculous year of 1492, Antonio de Nebrija published his *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*, the first non-Latin grammar (Alexander-Bakkerus 2005b, 46-47). Nebrija has had many followers and his grammar undeniably left its mark on the missionary grammars.

## II.1. Greek models and concepts

Greek philosophers, such as Plato, Aristotle and Protagoras, already philosophized about voice or sounds, syllables, words and sentences. Their aim was to teach poetic diction and rhetoric, and to show the value of poetics, and so they ended their dissertations with a large section about prosody and poetry. This arrangement of subjects, i.e. sounds, syllables, words and sentences, is still followed in present language descriptions. Modern grammars also open with phonology, followed by morphology and ending with syntax.

Furthermore, many current linguistic concepts were already common property in classical antiquity. Plato, for instance, observed that time is segmented into past, present and future. Aristotle refined the above-mentioned ‘voice – poetry’ model by introducing the concepts of subject (noun) and predicate (verb), which he distinguished from the other constituents. He thus divides a sentence into three parts: noun, verb, and other categories. We shall come back to this tripartite model later. Aristotle also introduced categories like substance, quantity, quality, possession, situation, action and subjection; and Protagoras distinguished masculine from feminine and inanimate.

The *Technè* ‘Art’ of Dionysius of Thracia/ Thrax (1st century) was the first ‘grammar’ in which theory was exemplified. Dionysius distinguished seven vowels or ‘elements’: a, e, ē, i, o, ō, u; five moods: indicative, imperative, optative, conjunctive, infinitive; eight parts of the sentence: noun, pronoun, article, verb, participle, preposition, adverb, conjunction; and he gives the complete conjugation of the verb *τύπτω* ‘to beat/ hit/ strike’.

## II.2. Latin grammarians

The Latin philosophers continued and elaborated the ideas of their Greek predecessors. They also open their grammars with essays about sounds or elements and they also finish with poetry. Like Dionysius of Thrax, they also distinguished five moods and eight *partes orationes*, including the interjection, but excluding the article; and they also adopted Plato's philosophical observation about time consisting of past, present, and future. In addition, the Latin grammarians Varro (1st century), Donatus (4th century) and Priscian (6th century) crystallized the notions 'present', 'past', 'future' into tenses, subdividing the past into preterite perfect, imperfect and pluperfect. They also introduced the declension of nouns (see *ibid.*).

Priscian, observing that a sentence contains eight parts, classifies these eight parts into *sincategoremata* or *consignificantia*, i.e. parts that have no fixed meaning, and *significantia*, i.e. noun and verb. The significance of the words belonging to the former class is indefinite. It depends on the meaning of the noun and the verb, which have a definite significance.

## II.3. Concepts of the *Modistae*

In the Middle Ages, from 1250 till 1350 approximately, the *Modistae*, a group of grammarians, such as John of Dacia, Siger de Courtrai and Thomas of Erfurt, breathed new life into Aristotle's tripartite model, distinguishing noun + pronoun and verb + participle from the other parts of the sentence. The Modists considered noun/ pronoun and verb/ participle, to be the most important parts, if not, the only parts of the sentence. They called them *categorematic*, viz. declinable and significant (cf. Priscian). The other parts of the sentence: adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions and interjections, are just a matter of

secondary importance, because their significance depends on that of the subject (noun) and the predicate (verb). The Modists considered these parts to be syncategorematic, viz. co-significant or consignificant and non-declinable. The word ‘syncategorematic’ has been derived from Greek *σύν* ‘with’ and *κατηγορημα* ‘subject’ or ‘predicate’.

#### II.4. *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*

Antonio de Nebrija, the famous Spanish scholar who in 1492 wrote the first non-Latin grammar, the *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*, partly followed the Greek-Latin model. His innovation consisted, amongst other things, of the introduction of two new tenses: future perfect and imperfect, and of the use of a non-Latin terminology. However, the major innovation of Nebrija’s grammar was that it was not only written to teach and promote Spanish poetry, but moreover to teach the Spanish language to those who did not have Spanish as their mother tongue. He primarily wrote the book “for those who want to learn Spanish”. Therefore, Nebrija gives a thorough analysis of the Spanish vowels and consonants, an adapted version of the current spelling, several nominal paradigms and the conjugation of the verb *amar* ‘to love’. Since the Spanish noun has no case endings, Nebrija uses a preposition and the exclamation *o* to form a genitive/ dative/ accusative/ ablative and vocative case, respectively. Optative and subjunctive, for which Spanish does not have distinct paradigms, are formed by means of the exclamations *o si* ‘oh if’ and *oxalá* ‘I hope’, and the word *como* ‘since’, respectively.

### III. Colonial language descriptions

After the ‘discovery’ of America by Columbus in 1492, priests were sent to the ‘New World’ in order to preach the Word of God and to make as many converts as possible. For that purpose, the missionaries had to study the language of the native population. It is obvious that those missionaries, trained in Europe and acquainted with the works of the Greek and Latin grammarians, tried to continue along the same lines in their description of the language, and that they used the same models and the same terms as their predecessors. In the languages of this ‘New World’, however, the missionaries also encountered new phenomena, phenomena which surprised them and for which they had to invent new terms and new definitions. Consequently, in the colonial language descriptions or “artes” tradition and innovation go together. By means of the following “artes”, we may ascertain to what extent preceding models and concepts were followed, and to what extent these grammars were innovative:

- (i) *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* (British Library, Additional Ms. 25,322);
- (ii) *Lengua de Maynas* (British Library, Egerton Ms. 2881).

#### III.1. *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*

In 1748, in Trujillo, a town on the north coast of Peru, the Franciscan friar Pedro de la Mata, finished his *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*. Fray Gerónimo Clota transcribed de la Mata’s *Arte* in 1772, in a place called San Buenaventura del Valle, also situated in North Peru.

The codex Additional Ms. 25,322 is a small *in-octavo*. It is a brown, marocco-bound volume with red marbled end leaves. The manuscript is on paper and contains 132 pages. The British Library replaced the

original folio numbers by page numbers in pencil. The book also contains four lines in an unidentified language. The manuscript had belonged to Amadée Chaumette des Fossés (Paris, France) and to Baron Pierre Leopold van Alstein (Ghent, Belgium).

Cholón, the language described in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*, was spoken in North Peru in the valley of the Huallaga River, an affluent of the Marañón or Amazon. Cholón + neighbouring Híbito formed a small, isolated language family. Nowadays, both languages are extinct.

### III.2. *Lengua de Maynas*

The manuscript *Lengua de Maynas* is a small paper *in-quarto* with a vellum cover. It contains 81 folios and includes a letter of Paul Rivet. According to the British Library, the manuscript dates from the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It had belonged to D. Julio Valdez Longaray and Rudolf Schüller. Fray Eusebio Arias is supposed to be the author of the manuscript, consisting of three parts:

- (i) ‘Arte de la lengua de Maynas’: a compact grammar of the language spoken by the indigenous inhabitants of Maynas;
- (ii) ‘Vocabulario del Castellano al Indico’: a Spanish-Quechua vocabulary;
- (iii) ‘Doctrina Christiana’: a Christian Doctrine.

The language described in the *Lengua de Maynas* manuscript is Quechua, viz. Quechua as spoken in Maynas, the province of Quito in Ecuador. Ecuadorian Quechua or Quichua belongs to the QIIB branch of the Quechua dialects (see Adelaar 2004, 184; 186-187).



#### IV. Traces of traditional language description in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and in the *Lengua de Maynas*

In section IV.1 and IV.2, we take a closer look at the colonial grammars mentioned above and go in more detail into the traditional models and concepts found in both “artes”. (The spelling of the Spanish and the Amerindian words occurring in the following sections are that of the authors of the grammars).

##### IV.1. Traditional models and concepts in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*

Pedro de la Mata faithfully followed the order of subjects already used by the Greek philosophers, i.e. an arrangement starting with sounds and ending with prosody. He opens his grammar with a section about ‘missing letters’, viz. sounds which do not occur in the Amerindian language, and about letters representing sounds he is not familiar with; and he closes with a section about prosody: orthography, accent, pronunciation (Book 5). However, a large final section with examples of poetic diction or rhetoric, with which even Nebrija closes his grammar, is left out. After his opening paragraph de la Mata continues with the following sections:

Book 1:

- the noun + its declension;
- the verb + the conjugation of a ‘substantive’ (intransitive) verb: *c(o)t* ‘to be’, and two ‘active’ (transitive) verbs: *coll/ cole* ‘to love’ and *peñ(o)* ‘to want’;

Book 2:

- nouns, numerals, pronouns, nominal verb forms;

Book 3:

- transitive, neutral, impersonal, derived, compound verbs;

Book 4:

- “las quatro partes restantes de la oracion”: postpositions, adverbs, interjections,

conjunctions;

- sentences, or “modos de hablar”.

The survey of subjects above shows that Pedro de la Mata maintains a division of the sentence into eight parts: nouns, pronouns, verbs, nominalized forms, postpositions, adverbs, interjections and conjunctions. The survey furthermore shows that he considers nouns, pronouns, verbs and nominalized forms, viz. the declinable parts, to be the most significant parts of the sentence (cf. *Modistae*). A lot of space is devoted to these parts: three ‘books’: 195 folios. The non-declinable parts are clearly less important. De la Mata designates them as ‘the four remaining parts of the sentence’, and they only occupy one ‘book’: 46 folios. The influence of the Modists also manifests itself by the use of the term *sincategorematico* ‘syncategorematic’. The word occurs four times in de la Mata’s grammar.

Apart from the term ‘sincategorematico’ de la Mata employs the traditional Greek-Latin terminology to indicate cases, moods and tenses. He also declines the Cholón noun as a Latin noun, attributing to it a genitive, dative, accusative and ablative case, formed by means of several postponed particles; and a vocative case, formed by means of the exclamation *o* (cf. Nebrija). He also uses the traditional model to conjugate a Cholón verb, distinguishing:

- (i) five moods: indicative, imperative, subjunctive, optative and infinitive;

- (ii) three participles: present, past and future;
- (iii) a gerund + four cases: genitive, accusative, dative and ablative;
- (iv) two supines: supine 1 and 2;
- (v) five tenses: present; past perfect, imperfect and pluperfect; and future, including Nebrija's future imperfect and perfect.

Like Nebrija, de la Mata creates an optative paradigm by using the expressions *o si* and *ojala*, and a subjunctive paradigm by means of the conjunctions *como* 'since', or by means of a participle construction. Three more 'optative' paradigms, or rather 'irrealis' paradigms, are formed by means of the suffix *-moc* 'I wished', 'hopefully', and of the anteriority marker *-(qu)e*, suffixed to the nominalizers *-(c)te* and *-(ng)o*. De la Mata also creates two other 'subjunctive' paradigms by using the conjunctions *aunque* 'although' and *quando* 'when'.

The Latin model, with six cases and a profusion of moods, tenses and nominal forms, obviously does not fit. A Cholón noun does not have a stem + distinct case endings. In Cholón, nominal stems can be preceded by a person prefix and be followed by several suffixes, including case markers. The profusion of moods, tenses and nominal forms bring about an overlap of forms, so that some Latin moods, tenses and forms can be omitted. Basically, Cholón verbs have two moods: indicative and imperative, two tenses: past and future, and one incompletive aspect. De la Mata's optative and subjunctive paradigms are in fact nominalized and subordinated verb forms, functioning as independent or subordinated clauses. Cholón does not have distinct infinitive, participle and gerund forms either. It disposes of eight nominalizers. The nominalized forms may function as independent, subordinated, or even as main clauses. In addition, the following forms can be omitted in de la Mata's conjugation: supine, because it equals gerund; and 'pluperfect', which is actually a preterite followed by the anteriority marker *-(qu)e*.

#### IV.2. Traditional models and concepts in *Lengua de Maynas*

The anonymous author of *Lengua de Maynas* handles the models of his predecessors more freely than Pedro de la Mata does. He only partly follows the traditional ‘sounds-words-sentences-prosody/ poetry’ model. The grammatical part of the book, ‘Arte de Lengua de Maynas’, does not start with a description of sounds, but with an observation about the parts of the sentence. Observations about sounds, viz. ‘unused letters’, are encountered at the end of the grammar. The observations are followed by a prosodic item: accent. The grammar ends with sentences: (i) the explanation of sentences, (ii) sentences with *de*, (iii) sentences with infinitive, (iv) relative sentences, (v) sentences with *estando*, *por*, and *por haber*, (vi) sentences with *videor*, *videris*. The author furthermore adds a vocabulary of some 3000 items and a Christian Doctrine to his language description. It seems as if he has chosen to illustrate the preceding theories and explanations not by means of poetry, but by means of a religious text, and we may venture that, in this grammar, poetry has been replaced by the doctrine.

In ‘Arte de la Lengua de Maynas’, the subjects are not listed in books, chapters, sections and paragraphs, like in de la Mata’s the grammar. Each subject is ranged under a separate section. In the survey below, the order of the sections has been taken unaltered from the manuscript, but the separation and division in clusters is mine:

- noun, declension of a noun, pronoun;
- verb, conjugation of the intransitive verb *cani*, *cangui* ‘to be’, conjugation of the transitive verb *cuyani*, *cuyangui* ‘to love’ (cf. Nebrija and de la Mata), verbal particles (i.e. suffixes);
- nouns derived from verbs, relative and interrogative pronouns, comparatives and superlatives, numerals;
- prepositions, adverbs, interjections, conjunctions;
- several particles, terms of kinship;

- orthography, accent;
- sentences.

Like de la Mata, the author of the grammar, also divides the sentence into eight parts: noun, pronoun, verb, participle, proposition, adverb, interjection and conjunction. He also pays more attention (13 folios) to the declinable parts: noun and verb, than to the non-declinable parts (4 folios): prepositions, adverbs, interjections and conjunctions (cf. Modists and Pedro de la Mata). However, the term ‘sincategorematico’ does not occur in the grammar. The author also declines the Quechua noun as a Latin noun, distinguishing a nominative, genitive, dative, accusative and vocative case; and, he also treats the verb as a Latin verb. Unlike Nebrija and Pedro de la Mata, however, the author of *Lengua de Maynas* does not make a distinction between optative and subjunctive. In his grammar, the term optative is synonymous with subjunctive. He furthermore indicates that present tense of optative/ subjunctive is formed by means of the conjunction *quando* ‘when’ or by means of a present participle construction (cf. de la Mata), and observes that in Maynas preterite perfect of subjunctive is missing. The author distinguishes the following moods, tenses and verb forms:

- four moods: indicative, imperative, optative/ subjunctive, infinitive;
- three participles: present, past, future;
- a gerund + three cases: dative, accusative, ablative;
- one supine;
- five tenses: present, imperfect, perfect, pluperfect, future.

This model, containing six cases, four moods, five tenses and seven nominal forms, does not fit either. Like in Cholón, a Maynas noun does not have a stem + specific case endings. A nominal stem can be followed by several suffixes. The author of the grammar mentions a

number of nominal suffixes, including six case markers. Notwithstanding the fact that the conjugation of the verb has fewer paradigms than that of Pedro de la Mata, it still has an overlap of forms. Imperfect and pluperfect, for instance, have the same forms; supine and future participle equal present participle and future, respectively; and pluperfect and perfect are similar to past participle. Furthermore, a number of paradigms are in fact nominalized or subordinated forms, functioning as a clause (cf. de la Mata's paradigms above). When we omit the overlaps and leave out all the forms that may function as a clause, we are left with the following model: three moods: indicative, imperative, potential; and three tenses: present, past, future.

## V. Innovation

The most salient difference between the classic grammarians and the authors of a colonial grammar, mostly missionaries, is that the former wrote a book of art in order to show the supremacy of the poetry of their mother tongue, whereas the latter wrote a manual in order to master a foreign, indigenous language. (Their final goal was, of course, to christianize the native population). These missionaries inevitably met with strange, unknown sounds and structures the moment they study the indigenous language, and they were faced with problems when they had to describe them:

- (i) the letters of the Latin alphabet were sometimes inadequate to symbolize the strange sounds;
- (ii) the Greek and Latin terminology also fell short to designate the different linguistic phenomena encountered in the new languages;

- (iii) the structure of Greek and Latin did not match that of the language which they had to describe.

The missionaries, confronted with these difficulties, realized that the traditional way of describing a language did not do justice to the new language, and that they had to

- (i) describe the strange sounds as clearly as possible and, if necessary, introduce a new orthography for the transcription of these sounds;
- (ii) indicate or describe comprehensively the unknown phenomena found in the exotic language and eventually invent adequate terms to name them;
- (iii) make clear that the language is differently structured and reveal the different structures.

De la Mata's *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and the anonymous' *Lengua de Maynas* give evidence of this new approach of language description.

#### V.1. Innovation in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*

New approaches and insights in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* in field of sound representation, morphonology, morphosyntax and syntax are treated below in section V.1.1, V.1.2, V.1.3 and V.1.4 respectively.

##### **V.1.1. Representation of sounds**

De la Mata uses the letters of the Latin, or rather, of the Spanish alphabet to symbolize the Cholón language. In general, the author does not have difficulties with the transcription of the Cholón sounds, because in most of the cases the sounds are similar to those of Spanish. Consequently, the letters used to transcribe these familiar sounds have the same value as in Spanish and their use does not need to be explained.

In five cases, however, the characters have a deviant value or do not have exactly the same value as in Spanish, so that their use has to be clarified. About the characters *e* and *o* Pedro de la Mata observes: “La E la pronuncian entre E y Y, esto es, que es ni E claro, ni Y. La O la pronuncian entre O y U” (‘E is pronounced between E and I, i.e. it is neither a clear E, nor I. O is pronounced between O and U’). This observation seems to indicate that the vowels corresponding to the graphemes *e* and *o* may have had a higher or a more closed articulation than in Spanish. Concerning his alternative use of the graphemes *g*, *h*, and *j*, de la Mata remarks, amongst other things: “La G antes de E y de la Y, la pronuncian tan suave como J” (‘G before E and I is pronounced as softly as J’), viz.  $g/_e, i = j$ . He probably uses the word “suave” ‘soft’ to designate that the sound represented by the symbol *g* is not a stop, but a fricative. The sound symbolized by *g* may thus be a velar fricative instead of a velar stop, when occurring before *e* and *i*. Since *g* equals *j*, *j* possibly also symbolizes a velar fricative. Regarding the symbol *h*, de la Mata says: “La H â veces como J y â veces apenas se percibe” (‘H sometimes as J, and sometimes it is hardly perceived’), i.e. *h* = sometimes *j*, and sometimes almost  $\emptyset$ . This could mean that, now and then, *h* could also represent a velar fricative, just like the grapheme *j*, and, sometimes, a glottal fricative [h] that is ‘hardly perceived’, or even a glottal stop. In one case, Pedro de la Mata has some difficulties with the description of a sound, because in Spanish the sound in question occurs in complementary distribution and does not have a phonemic value nor a specific grapheme to symbolize it, whereas in Cholón it probably has a phonemic status. Pedro de la Mata calls the sound a “gutturacion” and he describes it as follows: “Usan guturacion [...] con todas cinco A E I O U” (‘Gutturalization is used with all five A E I O U’). He mostly uses the digraph *ng*, whether or not with a tilde, and sometimes the graphemes *n*, *n* with a tilde, or *g* with a tilde, to symbolize this ‘guttural’ sound. Since the symbol *n* and the tilde assumedly refer to a nasal, and the symbol *g* to a velar articulation, this



‘guttural’ is likely to be a nasal homorganic to [g], viz. to be a velar nasal. (For more details about the use and value of the graphemes *e* and *o*, see Alexander-Bakkerus 2000b, 51-53; 61-70. For more details about the use and the value of the graphemes *g*, *h*, *j*, and about the ‘guttural’ sound and its symbolization, see Alexander-Bakkerus 2000a, 181-190). Alongside these particular sounds, de la Mata also mentions some ‘missing’ sounds, viz. Spanish sounds which do not occur in Cholón: “No se pronuncia en esta lengua las letras B, D, F, y la R [...]” (‘In this language, the letters B, D, F and R [...], are not pronounced’). These graphemes tentatively represent a voiced bilabial stop [b], a voiced alveo-dental stop [d], an unvoiced labio-dental fricative [f], and an alveolar vibrant [r], respectively.

### V.1.2. Morphology

Concerning the morphological characteristics of Cholón, de la Mata notes the following phenomena: stem alternation, vowel suppression and vowel harmony. He describes stem alternation as follows: “[...] es muy ordinaria [...] la mutacion de unas letras en otras y tambien la adiccion de otras en otras” (‘[...] the mutation of some letters into others and also the addition of some letters to others [...] occurs very regularly’). This observation is followed by some specifications + a great number of paradigms showing these changes (in the examples below, the hyphens indicating a morpheme boundary are mine), such as:

- (i) “Los [nombres] que empiezan con *a, e, i, o, u*, [...], entre el posesivo y el nombre se les interpone una *n*” (‘Nouns beginning with *a, e, i, o, u*, [...] take *n* between the possessive [marker] and the noun’), ex. *el* ‘yucca’ > *a-n-el* ‘my yucca’, *me-n-el* ‘your yucca’;
- (ii) “Los nombres que empiezan con *c* ô *q* hazen el posesivo de tercera persona de singular en *nga, nge, ngo* [...]” (‘Nouns

- beginning with *c* or *q* make a third person singular with *nga*, *nge*, *ngo* [...]), ex. *cot* ‘water’ > *mi-cot* ‘your water’, *ngot* ‘his water’;
- (iii) “Los nombres que comienzan con *p*, [...] la mudan en *m*” (‘Nouns beginning with *p* change it into *m*’), ex. *pana* ‘way’ > *a-mna* ‘my way’, *mi-mna* ‘your way’, *ø-mana* ‘his way’;
- (iv) “Los que comienzan con *y* consonante la mudan en *z*. Otros la mudan en *t*” (‘Those beginning with *y* consonant, change it into *z*. Others change it into *t*’), ex. *yap* ‘wild pig’ > *a-zap* ‘my wild pig’, *yuxam* ‘armadillo’ > *a-tuxam* ‘my armadillo’, *mu-tuxam* ‘your armadillo’.

Vowel suppression is illustrated by means of the word *a-mna* (< *pana*), item iii. The instances *me-n-el* ‘your yucca’ and *mu-tuxam* ‘your armadillo’ in item i and iv, respectively, are illustrations of vowel harmony (*i* > *e*, *u*).

### V.1.3. Morphosyntax

Regarding the morphosyntactical particularities of Cholón, de la Mata clearly brings to light that,

- (i) Cholón is an agglutinative language, and that a word may consist of a nominal or verbal stem, which can be accompanied by one (in the case of nominal stems, cf. the examples in IV.1.2 above), or two (in the case of verbal stems, see the example *a-l-am-en* ‘I cause him/ her/ it to eat’ in point v below) prefixed person markers and several suffixes, “particulas” or “posposiciones” in his very words;
- (ii) second person singular is specified for gender: *pi-* for feminine and *mi-* for masculine;

- (iii) a nominal stem can be followed by twelve case markers, among which inessive *-man* and ablative *-(a)p*, by a combination of case markers, and by different other suffixes, such as a natural pair marker *-pullem*, ex.

<i>nun-lol-man-ap</i>	<i>nguch-pullem,</i>	<i>mul-pullem</i>
man-PL-IN-ABL	3s.father-pair	3s.son-pair
'from the men'	'father and son,	son and father'

- (iv) Cholón does not have a separate class of adjectives: “[...] en rigor de adjetivo no tiene ninguno esta lengua [...]” ([...] strictly speaking, there are no adjectives in this language [...]). However, the language does have nouns “quasi adjetivos” ‘almost adjectives’, because they indicate “calidad” ‘quality’ instead of “substancia” ‘substance’, such as *hualiu* ‘something beautiful, ‘beautiful’, *pallou* ‘goodness’, ‘good’;
- (v) numerals and quantifiers are necessarily followed by a classifier: “[...] cada cosa que se queira contar, para conocer lo que es, se necesita algun aditamento de particula distintiva” ([...] every object that one wishes to count needs the addition of a specific particle in order to know what it is’), ex.

*at-hil*  
 one-CL:speech  
 ‘one word’

*ana-pimoc-am*      *me-n-extec*      *me-mel-an*  
 how.many-CL:space-QM      2s-RFL-cloth      2sA-3sO.see-IA  
 ‘How many skirts do you see?’

- (vi) a verb stem can be followed by derivational suffixes, such as a causative marker *-(qu)e(h)* or a reflexive marker *-no*, with which it forms a compound stem, and by inflectional suffixes, marking aspect, tense, nominalization, and subordination (see the suffixes *-an* ‘incompletive aspect’, *-ct* ‘future’, *-o* ‘second future nominalizer’, *-cte* ‘infinitive’, and *-hu* ‘subordinator with switch-reference’ below):

<i>a-l-am-e-n</i>	<i>a-yoqueteh-no-ct-an</i>
1sA-3sO-eat-CAU-IA	1sS-revenge-RFL-F-IA
‘I cause him/her/it to eat’	‘I shall revenge myself’

<i>pallou</i>	<i>mi-cot-o-que-va,</i>	<i>a-m-peño-cte-que</i>
good	2sS-be-FN2-ANT-TOP	1sA-2sO-want-INF-ANT
‘If you had been good, I would have wanted you’.		

<i>capitan</i>	<i>mi-cot-hu</i>	<i>mi-soldado</i>	<i>a-ct-an</i>
captain	2sS-be-SUB.SR	2s-soldier	1sS-be-IA
‘When you are captain, I shall be your soldier’.			

- (vii) there are different kinds of verbs, such as “verbos activos” ‘transitive verbs’, “verbos substantivos” ‘intransitive verbs’, “verbos neutros” ‘impersonal verbs’, “verbos deribativos” ‘derived verbs’ (viz. verbs derived from nouns), and “verbos defectivos” ‘defective verbs’ (interjections actually). He also explains that a ‘neutral verb’ has no “passion”, viz. no direct object;
- (viii) Cholón disposes of six negators, and of a series of discourse markers (twenty-one), such as adverbial suffixes, question markers, exclamation markers, and speech markers (see the adverbial suffixes *-in* ‘yet’ and *-hin* ‘maybe’, question marker *-le*, and exclamation marker *-ah*, below):

<i>ma-in-le</i>	<i>into-ñ-pit-hin-ah</i>	<i>oc-ach-he</i>
NE-yet-QM	which-CMP-IND-maybe-EX	1s-REP-IS
‘Not yet?’	‘Maybe!’	‘it is said that I’

In addition, de la Mata uses the term “transiciones” to indicate that the action goes from one person to another, viz. that there is a transition from an agent to an object. He explains the concept of ‘transitions’ as follows:

Llamanse assi, porque compuestos sus romances con los pronombres ô con que se distinguen las personas de los verbos, ya antepuestas, ya interpuestas, las quales corresponden â los pronombres *me, te, illum*.

(‘They call it like this, because the forms are composed with pronouns or persons distinguished from verbs, sometimes preposed, sometimes postponed, corresponding to the pronouns *me, te, illum*’).

In a verbal form, this transition can be indicated by means of one or two (special) person markers: an agent marker and an object marker (see example *a-l-am-e-n* ‘I cause him/her/it to eat’ above). In the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* the transitions are exemplified in several different paradigms. In these paradigms the transitions are numbered, ex:

“transiciones de singular â singular” ‘transitions from singular to singular’:

- 1 - “de primera persona â segunda” ‘from first person to second’
  - 2 - “de segunda â primera” ‘from second to first’
  - 3 - “de tercera â primera” ‘from third to first’
  - 4 - “de tercera â segunda” ‘from third to second’
- (See Adelaar 1997 for a discussion in detail about transitions).

(The term ‘transition’ occurs for the first time in the anonymous grammar published in 1586 by Antonio Ricardo, see Adelaar 2004, 219).

#### V.1.4. Syntax

As stated in section IV.1.3, de la Mata’s ‘optative’ and ‘subjunctive’ forms actually are nominalized and subordinated verb forms, functioning as independent or subordinated clauses. Nominalized forms, including de la Mata’s infinitive, participle and gerund forms, may even function as a main clause:

*a-m-a-ym-eh-o*            *a-kot-o*  
 1sA-2sO-APL-teach-CAU-FN2            1sS-be-FN2  
 ‘I shall be able to teach you’.

However, subordinated clauses are mainly formed by means of nominalized verb forms, whether or not followed by case markers. In the following examples, the nominalized forms function as a causal clause and a temporal clause, respectively:

*mitah-la-ch*            *chi-po-xaych-an*  
 miss-3pA-FAC            3pA-3pO-whip-IA  
 ‘They whip them, because they miss it’.

*mi-pot-iy-ø-man-ap*    *ol-pit*            *ø-moh-p-an*  
 2sS-come-PA-NOM-IN-ABLwho-IND    3sS-go.up-NE-IA  
 ‘After you came, nobody has come’

A nominalized form can also express a wish, when occurring in combination with a suffix or an adverb meaning ‘hopefully’, ‘I wish’:

*pallou-moc*            *a-cot-te*            *ø-cot*  
 good-hopefully    1sS-be-INF    3sS-be  
 ‘I wished I had been good’

*inaham pallou a-cot-o-que/ a-cot-te-que*  
 I wished good 1sS-be-FN2-ANT/ 1sS-be-INF-ANT  
 ‘I wished I had been good’.

An ‘irrealis’ is also formed by means of a nominalized verb form (see the third example in item vi of section V.1.3). A conditional clause is formed by means of topic marker *-va*, suffixed to a nominalized verb form (see the third example in vi, section V.1.3, as well). The fourth example of vi in V.1.3 is an instance of a subordinate clause, formed by means of a subordinator. Cholón does not dispose of a separate class of conjunctions by means of which subordinate clauses can be formed. Co-ordinator *-pit* ‘and’, ‘also’ expresses ‘concession’, when suffixed to a subordinator or to a nominalized form:

*ixivah qui-cot-hu-pit mi-meño-pacna-que-pit*  
 badness 1pA-be-SUB.SR-COR 2sA-3sO.want-NE.NOM-ANT-COR  
 ‘even though we are bad’ ‘although you would not have wanted it’.

Pedro de la Mata was aware of the fact that a verb form, whether or not nominalized, could constitute an independent or a subordinated clause. He indicates a number of such forms by means of the word “romance” ‘phrase’, and he distinguishes, for instance, “romances impersonales” ‘impersonal forms/ phrases’, “romances del circumloquio en dus” ‘forms/ phrases of the circumlocution in dus’, “romances del circumloquio en rus” ‘forms/ phrases of the circumlocution in rus’:

*ø-m-a-llaw-an a-m-a-ym-ej-o a-l-o-lam*  
 3sS-2sO-APL-go.away-IA 1sA-2sO-APL-learn-CAU-FN2 1sA-3sO-do-FN1  
 ‘It goes away from you.’ ‘that I can teach you’ ‘that I have to do’

The terms ‘dus’ and ‘rus’ designate the Latin endings *-ndus* ‘gerundive’ and *-urus* ‘infinitive/ future participle’, respectively. The

term “circumloquio” probably indicates that the form at issue expresses a modality as well.

As for the order of the constituents, de la Mata’s description gives evidence that

- (i) the overall constituent order is subject-object-verb, SOV:

<i>Juan-tu-p</i>	<i>Pedro</i>	<i>i-ø-lam-i</i>
Juan-AD-ABL	Pedro	3sA-3sO-kill-PA
‘Juan killed Pedro’.		

(This order is also reflected in the verb form where the object marker follows the agent marker, and in the construction below where the modified element follows the modifier);

- (ii) the modifier precedes the modified element:

<i>chech</i>	<i>cot</i>	<i>ay-te-chu</i>	<i>hayu</i>
white water		background-AD-DIM	man
‘clear water’		‘a quiet man’, ‘a peaceful man’	

(For further information and details about Cholón and its structure, see Alexander-Bakkerus 2005b).

## V.2. Innovation in *Lengua de Maynas*

The language description in the *Lengua de Maynas* manuscript is succinct. It comprises 17 folios only (against 132 folios in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*). Nevertheless, the transcription + description of the sounds, and the morphological and syntactical observations and descriptions give us a good overall picture of the language.



### V.2.1. Representation of sounds

Like de la Mata, the author of *Lengua de Maynas* also uses the letters of the Spanish alphabet to symbolize the Quechua language spoken in Maynas. He also talks about ‘non-used letters’, i.e. sounds which do not occur in the language, and he also uses the term “suave” ‘soft’, opposing it, however, to “aspera” ‘hoarse’, ‘aspirated’. The ‘missing letters’ are *b, d, e, f, k, x*, assumedly representing a voiced bilabial stop, an alveo-dental stop, a close mid front vowel, a labio-dental fricative, a uvular stop, and a velar fricative, respectively. The concepts “suave” and “aspera” are connected with the pronunciation of a sound represented by the symbol *r*. The sound indicated by the expression “*r suave*” may be an unvoiced vibrant, the sound designated by “*r aspera*” may be a voiced vibrant.

### V.2.2. Morphosyntax

Maynas also is an agglutinative language. However, in contrast to Cholón, the language has no prefixes. With regard to person marking, Maynas does not make a distinction in gender (cf. Cholón *mi-* ‘2sm’, *pi-* ‘2sf’, section 5.1.3), but in exclusive versus inclusive. The language distinguishes first person plural exclusive: 1s + 2s/p, from first person plural inclusive: 1s + 2s/p + 3s/p. The author of the ms. defines the phenomenon as follows: “[...] *ñuca* suele tener dos plurales diferentes que son *ñucanchic*, nosotros, incluyendo à todos, [...] y *ñucaicu* que significa nosotros, excluyendo a los Gentiles” (“[...] *ñuca* has two different plural forms: *ñucanchic*, we, including everyone, [...] and *ñucaicu*, we, excluding the heathens’):

<i>ñuca-nchik</i>	<i>runa-cuna</i>	<i>ñuca-yku</i>	<i>christiano-cuna</i>
1s-PL	man-PL	1s-PL	christian-PL
‘we men’		‘we christians’	

The author of *Lengua the Maynas* furthermore distinguishes

- (i) eight nominal suffixes, among which plural marker *-cuna* (see the example above), benefactive *-pac* and augmentative *-sapa*: The plural marker may be followed by case markers:

<i>yutu-cuna-pac</i>	<i>uma-sapa</i>
partridge-PL-BEN	head-AUG
'for the partridges'	'a big head'

- (iii) four other suffixes, "particulas diversas" in his very words: question marker

- *chu*, restrictive *-lla* 'only', 'no one/ nothing else but', 'diminutive', reportative
- *shi* 'they say that', 'it is said that', and emphasis marker *-tac*. The suffixes
- *chu*, *-lla* and *-tac*, may also be attached to a verb stem. However, when occurring after a verb stem, *-chu* functions as a negator, and *-lla* as a kindness or courtesy marker:

<i>mana</i>	<i>rura-shac-chu</i>	<i>rima-hua-i-lla</i>
not	do-F-NE	talk-1sO-2sIMP-RST
'I shall not do it'.		'Please talk to me'.

- (iv) several verbal suffixes, including nominalizers (ex. *-shka* 'perfective'), nominalizing subordinators (ex. *-shpa* 'co-reference'), tense markers (ex. *-rca* 'past'), and derivational suffixes, or "particulas que varian la significacion del verbo" 'particles changing the meaning of the verb', such as causative *-chi* ("hacer que otro haga") and *-nacu* 'reciprocity' ("accion mutua"):

<i>Pedro Juan</i>	<i>shamu-shca-mi</i>	<i>ni-shpa</i>	<i>villa-rca-ø</i>
Pedro Juan	tell-PA.NOM-AF	say-NOM.SUB.CR	come-PA-3s

‘Pedro had told that Juan had come’.

<i>rima-chi-ni</i>	<i>rima-nacu-ni</i>
talk-CAU-1s	talk-REC-1s
‘I cause to talk’	‘He/ she/ it and I are talking with each other’

- (v) one “verbo sustantivo ... para los pasivos” ‘auxiliary verb for the passive voice’: *cay* ‘to be’, “verbos activos” or transitive verbs, ex. *cuyay* ‘to love’, “verbos neutros” or impersonal verbs, ex. *puñuy* ‘to sleep’, and “verbos defectivos”, interjections in fact (cf. de la Mata’s “verbos defectivos”, section V.1.3, item vii), ex. *ca* ‘Take!’
- (vi) two negators: a discontinuous negator *mana ...-chu*, and *ama*. The latter is used for the negation of an imperative:

<i>mana</i>	<i>rura-shac-chu</i>	<i>ama-pas</i>	<i>shamu-chun</i>
not	do-1sF-NE	not-IND	come-3sIMP
‘I shall not do [it]’		‘May he never come!’	

The anonymous author also mentions the phenomenon of transition in the following observation:

Verbo transitivo, en esta Lengua, es aquel en cuyo romance se enbebe su persona que padece, [...]; quando la persona que padece es segunda de singular, entonces corresponde al verbo en quien se embebe esta particula *iqui* [...]. Esta transicion [...].  
 (‘A transitive verb is a verb which in its forms includes a patient, [...]; when the patient is a second person singular, the particle *iqui* then corresponds to the person included. This transition [...]).’)

In the grammar occurs the following example:

*cuya-yki*  
 love-1sA.2sO  
 ‘I love you’

The transitions are not numbered.

In one of the final sections, the author of the Lengua de Maynas ms. gives an extensive list of kinship names. Besides the names *yaya* for father, *mama* for mother, *hatun yaya* for grandfather, and *hatun mama* for grandmother, he mentions, for instance, the following kinships:

<i>churi</i>	: father’s son	<i>turi</i>	: sister’s brother
<i>ushushi</i>	: father’s daughter	<i>ñaña</i>	: sister’s sister
<i>cari huahua</i>	: mother’s son	<i>huauqui</i>	: brother’s brother
<i>huarmi huahua</i>	: mother’s daughter	<i>pani</i>	: brother’s sister
<i>zypas huauqui</i>	: a full cousin		

### V.2.3. Syntax

The language spoken in Maynas does not dispose of a set of conjunctions with which different subordinate clauses can be formed (cf. Cholón). Subordinate clauses are mainly formed by means of nominalized verb forms, whether or not followed by a case marker. In the following examples the verb forms function as a temporal clause and a causal clause, respectively:

*misa-ta uia-shca-manta, yglesia-pac camachi-shca-ta*  
 mass-DO hear-PA.NOM-ABL church-BEN command-PA.NOM-DO  
*pactachi-rca-ni*  
 fulfill-PA-1s  
 ‘Since I attended Mass, I did my duty to the church’.

*Ñuca Dios-tacui-shpa hanac pacha-man ri-shac*  
 1s God-DO love-NOM.SUB.CR high world-AL go-1sF

‘When I love God, I shall be saved’. (lit. ‘When I love God, I shall go to heaven’.)

A wish or an ‘irrealis’ is expressed by means of the suffix *-man*, indicating a possibility or potentiality:

*Ñuca*            *alli*            *ca-y-man*  
1s            good            be-1s-POS  
‘Oh, I wished I had been good!’

The suffix *-man* can also be used to form a conditional clause:

*Ñuca*    *huañu-y-pi*    *yuia-i-man,*    *mana*    *hucha-lli-man-chu*  
1s            die-NOM-AD think-1s-POS not            sin-VB-POS-NE  
‘If I had kept my thoughts on death, I would not have sinned’.

A conditional clause is furthermore formed by means of topic marker *-ca*, suffixed to a nominalized form (cf. Cholón, section V.1.3, item vi: nominalized form + *-va* ‘topic marker’ > conditional clause):

*cai-ta*            *rura-c-pi-ca*  
this-DO            do-AG-AD-TOP  
‘if you do this’

Also like Cholón, the language described in the *Lengua de Maynas* ms. has only one conjunction: co-ordinator *-pas*:

*ñucaalli*    *runa,*            *Dios-ta-pas*            *manchac-mi*    *ca-shac*  
1s            good            man God-DO-COR            afraid-AF            be-1sF  
‘I have to be a good man and be afraid of God’.

This co-ordinator can also be used to form a concessive clause:

*ca-pti-n-pas*  
 be-NOM.SUB.SR-3s-COR  
 ‘although he is’

Like de la Mata, the anonymous author of *Lengua de Maynas* uses the word “romances” to indicate nominalized forms constituting a clause. He mentions, for instance, “romances de deseo” ‘clauses expressing a wish’ (see example *ñuca alli ca-y-man* ‘I wished I had been good’ above), “romances condicionales” ‘conditional clauses’ (see example *cai-ta rura-c-pi-ca* ‘if you do this’ above), “romances del preterito perfecto” ‘perfect form clauses’, and also “romances de estando” ‘clauses expressing being’:

<i>ca-shca-ni</i>	<i>ñucaca-c-pi</i>
be-PA.NOM-1s	1s be-AG-AD
‘(that) I had been’	‘when/ that I am’

The term “circumloquio” does not occur in the grammar.

The predominant constituent order is also SOV, and the modifier also precedes the modified element:

<i>Ñuca</i>	<i>can-ta</i>	<i>cuya-shpa</i>	<i>sinchi runa</i>
1s	2s-DO	love-NOM.SUB.SR	strong man
‘I love you’.			‘a strong man’

For further information about the structure of the language see Adelaar 2004, 207-254; data about Ecuadorian Quechua are to be found in Muysken 1977 and Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz 2004; for differences between Peruvian Quechua and Ecuadorian Quechua see Muysken 1999.

## VI. Conclusion

The voices of the Greek and Latin philosophers, of the Modists and of Nebrija are heard in the *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and in the *Lengua de Maynas*. De la Mata and the anonymous author traditionally

- (i) end their grammar with sentences, viz. syntax;
- (ii) divide a sentence into eight parts;
- (iii) decline the Amerindian noun as a Latin noun;
- (iv) conjugate the Amerindian verb as a Latin verb;
- (v) distinguish three participles, a gerund, and five tenses;
- (vi) give a great deal of prominence to the noun and the verb;
- (vii) produce several paradigms to illustrate nominal declension and verbal conjugation;
- (viii) form present of optative and subjunctive paradigms by means of a subordinated clause or a present participle.

Even though the model did not completely match the Amerindian verb, it served the purpose. The predominance of noun and verb vis-à-vis adverbs, interjections, postpositions, and conjunctions reflects the fact that, in both languages, noun and verb are the most important word categories. The nominal and verbal paradigms are also adequate and to the point. They clearly show not only the structure of the form, consisting of a stem + different affixes (agglutination), but also the function of these affixes, so that several elements are distinguished, such as person, case and plural markers; tense, aspect and modality markers; nominalizers and subordinators. The verbal paradigms also show that the verb does have different nominalized forms, and that these forms often function as a clause. They also elucidate, for instance, how to form a wish, a causal clause, a conditional clause, a concessive clause, or a temporal clause. In sum, the abundance of forms provides us with

enough data to analyze and sufficient material of comparison, from which much can be deduced.

However, the grammars of Pedro de la Mata and the author of *Lengua de Maynas* were not purely traditional. On the contrary, they were innovative. In contrast with their predecessors, de la Mata and the anonymous author did not aspire to analyze, explain and glorify the national poetry. Their aim was to analyze and describe the foreign language.

They were, for instance, aware of the fact that the classical division of a sentence into nouns, pronouns, articles, verbs, participles, prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions, did not correspond to what they observed in their languages. They thus substituted ‘prepositions’, a category that in both Cholón and Maynas is missing, for ‘postpositions’ (viz. suffixes). They also left out the category of ‘articles’, which do not occur in Cholón nor in Maynas, introducing ‘interjections’ instead. Cholón has a closed class of some twenty-five interjections, such as *anih*, an interjection expressing a malicious pleasure, ‘*ajuiain*’ ‘Hang on!’ *chim* ‘Please!’; and the author of *Lengua de Maynas* mentions some seventeen interjections, among which *atatai*, an interjection expressing repulsion, *amarac* ‘Wait a minute!’ *hacu* ‘Let’s go!’

The authors of *Arte de la Lengua Cholona* and *Lengua de Maynas* also had to invent a new orthography and a new terminology, when meeting with new sounds and new structures. Pedro de la Mata employs, for example, the words “guttural” and “gutturacion” to designate a velar nasal sound, which in Spanish does not have a morphemic status, but which in Cholón is obviously a phoneme. The author of *Lengua de Maynas* uses the terms “suave” and “aspera” in order to indicate two different articulations of the vibrant. Both authors classify the verb into different categories, such as: “verbos activos” ‘transitive verbs’, “verbos substantivos” ‘intransitive verbs’, “verbos neutros” ‘impersonal verbs’. Subsequently, de la Mata as well as the author of *Lengua de Maynas* use the word “romance” to indicate a verb form that may contain a clause,



and “transiciones” to designate the division of roles between the agent and the object.

In addition, with respect to Cholón, we see that de la Mata shows, amongst other things, that,

- (i) Cholón makes a distinction between an absolute form, viz. a form without personal reference marking, and a relative form: a form containing person marking (see stem alternation in section V.1.2); and between a feminine form and a masculine form in the second person singular;
- (ii) the language has particular suffixes, such as numeral classifiers and the suffix *-pullem*, designating a natural pair;
- (iii) in Cholón, subordination is merely a case of nominalization.

The author of the *Lengua de Maynas* ms. reveals, for instance, that,

- (i) Maynas Quechua makes a distinction between a ‘soft’ vibrant and an ‘aspirated’ vibrant; and between a first person plural inclusive form and a first person plural exclusive form;
- (ii) the language has a specific subclass of nouns: terms of kinship;
- (iii) in Maynas Quechua subordination is also merely a case of nominalization.

So, despite the fact that, at first sight, *Arte de la Lengua Cholón* and *Lengua de Maynas* seem traditional, the authors of the grammars did not slavishly follow their predecessors. Their object was no longer the description of the art of poetry, but the description of a language with all its characteristics, particularities and universals. They thus turned a book of art into a tool: a tool, worth to be studied. The fact is that the colonial grammars not only give us a good image of the language at issue, but also bring to light various unknown sounds and surprising linguistic phenomena and structures. These new means of expression may give

new insights in how language can operate and open new channels for linguistics.

### Abbreviations and symbols

A	agent	IND	indefinite marker
ABL	ablative	IS	indirect speech marker
AD	adessive	m	masculine
AF	affirmative	ms.	Manuscript
AL	allative	NE	negation
ANT	anteriority marker	NOM	nominalizer, nominalizing
APL	applicative	O	object
AUG	augmentative	p	plural
BEN	benefactive	PA	past
CAU	causative	PL	plural marker
CL	classifier	POS	possibility/ potentiality
CMP	comparative	QM	question marker
COR	co-ordinator	REC	reciprocal
CR	co-reference	REP	reportative
DIM	diminutive	RFL	reflexive
DO	direct object	RFM	relational form marker
EX	exclamation marker	s	singular
f	feminine	S	subject
F	future	SR	switch-reference
FN2	future nominalizer2	∅	zero
IA	imperfective aspect	1	first person
IMP	imperative	2	second person
IN	inessive	3	third person

## Abstract

The majority of the colonial grammars was written by priests, who were sent to new territories in order to christianize the native people. The colonial grammars did not appear out of thin air. They were a continuation of a long tradition. Their authors could thus fall back on older methods and on research of predecessors: Greek philosophers, Latin and mediaeval grammarians, and Antonio de Nebrija.

However, the missionaries who described the native languages met all kind of phenomena they were not familiar with and for which they had to invent new methods, viz. new models and concepts. Not surprisingly, in their grammars, imitation goes hand in hand with new perceptions.

The relationship between tradition and innovation is examined and explained on the basis of the following British Library manuscripts:

Ms. Additional 25,322: *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*, written by Fray Pedro de la Mata in 1748; Ms. Egerton 2881: *Lengua de Maynas*, anonymous, dating from the XIIIth century.

Key Words: Colonial Grammars, *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*, *Lengua de Maynas*, Tradition, Innovation / 식민기 문법, 『출론어 문법』, 『마이너스의 언어』, 전통, 혁신

논문투고일자: 2007. 12. 05

심사완료일자: 2008. 02. 02

게재확정일자: 2008. 02. 11

## Index

### Persons:

Adelaar, Willem F.H.  
Alexander-Bakkerus, Astrid  
Alstein, Pierre Leopold von  
Altman, Cristina  
Arias, Fray Eusebio  
Aristotle  
Bursill-Hall, G.L.  
Chaumette des Fossés, Amadée  
Clota, Fray Gerónimo  
Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, Sabine  
Descartes  
Dionysius of Thracia/Thrax  
Donatus  
John of Dacia  
Mata, Fray Pedro de la  
Muysken, Pieter C.  
Nebrija, Antonio de  
Plato  
Priscian  
Protagoras  
Ricardo, Antonio  
Rivet, Paul  
Huallaga  
Marañón  
Maynas  
Paris

Schüller, Rudolf  
Siger de Courtrai  
Thomas of Ehrfurt  
Valdez Longaray, Julio  
Varro  
Zwartjes O.

### Languages:

Cholón  
Greek  
Híbito  
Latin  
Maynas  
Spanish  
Quechua  
Quichua

### Geographical names:

Amazon  
Belgium  
Ecuador  
France  
Ghent  
Peru  
Quito  
San Buenaventura del Valle  
Trujillo

**Subjects:**

ablative	conjunction
accent	conjunctive
accusative	(con)significant
adverb	dative
affix	declinable
agent	<i>Doctrina Christiana</i>
agglutinative	<i>Egerton</i>
alveo-dental	(eight) parts of the sentence
anteriority marker	feminine
Arte de la Lengua Cholona	fricative
Arte de Lengua de Maynas	future
article	genitive
<i>aspera</i>	gerund
bilabial	guttural, gutturacion
British Library	imperative
case markers	inanimate
catagorematic	incompletive aspect
classifier imperfect	indicative
close mid front vowel	infinitive
interjections	poetic diction
irrealis	poetry
labio-dental	postposition
<i>Lengua de Maynas</i>	potential (mood)
masculine	predicate
Modistae, Modists	prefix
mood	preposition
morphology	present
nasal	preterite
nominalized	pronoun
nominalizer	prosody
nominative	rhetoric

noun	sentence
numerals	singular
object	sounds
optative	SOV
orthography	stop
particle	<i>suave</i>
participle	subject
past	subjunctive
perfect	subordinator
personal reference	suffix
person marker	supine
phonology	syllable
pluperfect	syncategorematic
syntax	verb
Technè	vibrant
tense	Vocabulario del Castellano al
terms of kinship	<i>Indico</i>
transition	vocabulary
(un)voiced	vocative
uvular	voice
velar	

<http://www.ajlas.org>

## References

- Adelaar, W.F.H.(1997), “Las transiciones en la tradición gramatical hispanoamericana: historia de un modelo descriptivo”, in Klaus Zimmerman (ed.), *La Descripción de las Lenguas Amerindias en la Época Colonial*, Frankfurt am Main - Madrid: Vervuert – Iberoamericana, pp. 259-270.
- Adelaar, W.F.H., with the collaboration of Pieter C. Muysken.(2004), *The Languages of the Andes*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005a), “Cholón sounds reconstructed: a symbol analysis”, in Zwartjes O. and C. Altman (eds.), *Missionary Linguistics II*, pp. 181-190.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2005b), *Eighteenth-Century Cholón*, Utrecht: LOT.
- Alexander-Bakkerus, A.(2007), *Pedro de la Mata, Arte de la Lengua Cholona (1748)*, Madrid/ Frankfurt: Iberoamericana/ Vervuert.
- Anonymous(18<sup>th</sup> century), *Lengua de Maynas*, Ms. Egerton 2881, London: British Library.
- Bursill-Hall, G.L.(1971), *Speculative Grammars of the Middle Ages. The Doctrine of Partes Orationes of the Modistae*, The Hague-Paris: Mouton.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, S.(1997), “La descripción gramatical como reflejo e influencia de la realidad lingüística: la presentación de las relaciones hablante-enunciado e intra-textuales en tres gramáticas quechuas coloniales y ejemplos de su uso en el discurso quechua de la época”, in Zimmermann (ed.), *La Descripción de las Lenguas Amerindias en la Época Colonial*, Frankfurt am Main - Madrid: Vervuert – Iberoamericana, pp. 291-319.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (2004), *Una Gramática Colonial del Quichua del Ecuador, Transcripción e Interpretación de un Manuscrito del Archivo*

- Histórico Nacional de Colombia*, Bonn: Bonner Amerikanistische Studien.
- Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, S. & L. Crickmay(eds.)(1999), *La Lengua de la Cristianización en Latinoamérica: Catequización e Instrucción en Lenguas Amerindias/ The Language of Christianisation in Latin America: Catechisation and Instruction in Amerindian Languages*, Markt Schwaben: Saurwein.
- González Holguín, D.(1607), *Gramática y Arte Nueva de la Lengua General de Todo el Perú, Llamada Lengua Qquichua, o Lengua del Inca*, Lima: Ciudad de los Reyes.
- Masson, P.(1997), “Gramáticas coloniales y más recientes de variedades quichuas ecuatorianas, elaboradas por lingüistas-misioneros: una comparación”, in Zimmermann (ed.), *La Descripción de las Lenguas Amerindias en la Época Colonial*, Frankfurt am Main - Madrid: Vervuert – Iberoamericana, pp. 339-368.
- Mata, Fray P. de la.(1748), *Arte de la Lengua Cholona*, Trujillo. Ms. Additional 25,322, London: British Library.
- Muysken, P.C.(1977), *Syntactic Developments in the Verb Phrase of Ecuadorian Quechua*, Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1999), “Fuentes misioneras del quichua ecuatoriano: Evidencia para su desarrollo histórico”, in Dedenbach-Salazar Sáenz, S. & L. Crickmay (eds.), *La Lengua de la Cristianización en Latinoamérica: Catequización e Instrucción en Lenguas Amerindias*, Saurwein: Markt Schwaben, pp. 89-113.
- Nebrija, A. de.[1492](1980), *Gramática de la Lengua Castellana*. Estudio y edición preparado por Antonio Quilis, Madrid: Editora Nacional.
- Santo Tomás, D. de.(1560), *Gramática o Arte de la Lengua General de los Indios de los Reynos del Perú*, Valladolid.
- Zimmermann, K.(1997), “Introducción: apuntes para la historia de la lingüística de las lenguas amerindias”, in Zimmermann, K.



(ed.), *La Descripción de las Lenguas Amerindias en la Época Colonial*, Frankfurt am Main - Madrid: Vervuert - Iberoamericana, pp. 9-17.

Zwartjes, O. and C. Altman(eds.)(2005), *Missionary Linguistics II/ Lingüística misionera II. Orthography and Phonology, Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Missionary Linguistics*, Saõ Paulo, 10-13 March 2004, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, Series "Studies in the History of the Language Science".

<http://www.ajlas.org>