

Colonial grammars. How to talk about difference [2010] *

Roland Schmidt-Riese (Catholic University of Eichstätt)

This paper is on the treatment given to linguistic difference in grammar books of Native American languages, written in Spanish and Portuguese in the colonial period. In section 1, I will treat three preliminary matters, first the concept of colonial grammars, then the period and territories under study, which determine the authors' possibilities of talking about difference, and finally the way of approaching historical scholarship. Section 2 focuses on the differences between Mediaeval and Humanist grammar and thus on the epistemic alternatives available for the authors. Section 3 retrieves the historical discourse strategies in treating linguistic difference on the levels of the organisation of subject matters, category labels and argumentation within the grammars. Section 4 gives a brief conclusion.

1. Preliminaries

Colonial grammars

The concept of colonial grammars is about to become established in recent research, but it still needs explanation.¹ Colonial grammars stem from colonial societies, which in turn, are split societies. Colonial societies are in fact composed of two culturally different societies occupying the same territory, one dominating the other. Situations of contact between the two, in which the criterion of domination and the one of cultural difference are blurred, do occur, but they do not determine the course of developments. Colonialism requires clear-cut lines of domination and difference.

The geographical territory is defined by the colonizing society, taking into account precolonial territorial organization, but not necessarily so. Colonial boundaries may coincide with boundaries of the colonized society, but they do not have to. The colonized

* I am grateful for suggestions on this paper by Christine Haunz and Judith Huber.

¹ Cf. Errington 2001, and, with regards to Mexico, Guzmán Betancourt 2001 and Hernández 2003; with regards to Peru, Lerner 1997; with regards to Brazil, Zwartjes 2002; with regards to Canada, Hanzeli 1969.

society has not necessarily existed as an entity before, it is defined by the colonizing one, and it is therefore by no means necessarily uniform. It may rather be composed of different ethnic groups, associated to adjacent territories in pre-colonial times. It may thus be *plural*. The colonizing society, on the contrary, which defines the territory, is *singular*. It even imposes its singular onto the different ethnic groups that organized the land formerly.

I now return to grammars. Can there be anything colonial about them except the societies of their origin? Grammars are texts which work on two different levels. Their aim is descriptive and analytical and what they describe is language structures, generally the structures of just one historical language. At a closer look, we might even say that grammars are what makes language structures be perceived as languages in history. Grammars are what transforms linguistic structures into culturally discernable objects and sets them apart from one another. Any grammar, colonial or not, gives the name of the language it describes in its title. So it creates that language as a discrete object. Grammar makes us sure that there is indeed a language of that name.

The point for our discussion is that grammars, while describing and analyzing languages, necessarily provide chunks of discourse produced in that language: clauses, phrases, paradigms, words or even just parts of words. Grammars then contain language structures on two different levels, one describing and the other one described. If it is a Latin grammar from the Middle Ages, discerning the chunks of cited text from description will not be easy, for (i) there is no special citation layout, and (ii) all the text is in the same language, in Latin.² If it is a modern English grammar, it is highly likely that it will be written in English, but the layout will help to distinguish examples from the rest.

While for us, description and the object described are clearly different matters and so are the describing language and the one described, even if it is Latin or English in both cases, the situation is less clear-cut in the Middle Ages. Call it Grammar or Latin, it is the same thing: object language and meta-language are easily confused. This does not occur, however, in colonial grammars, for the language of description and the languages described are different languages in the colonial context. The describing language is the

² For Mediaeval Latin Grammar see Law 1997.

one of the colonizing society and the language described is the one of the colonized, to be precise, the language of *one* colonized society. While the describing language is *singular* within one territory, say Spanish or Portuguese, the languages described may be *plural*, across a number of grammars. The structure is the same in both cases. The structure of colonial grammars mirrors the one of colonial societies.³

Missionary grammars

This paper focuses on texts written in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the American territories colonized by Spain and Portugal. Within this period and concerning these two colonial powers, there is no mission in the Americas. *Mission*, even if familiar to us, is by no means a common notion in the period. The word is simply absent from the grammars up to almost 1700, though it might be expected there, given the fact that the authors, without exception, are clerics. As the word *mission* does not show up in the texts, the concept cannot have been essential for their concerns. Apparently, different though possibly related concepts were involved.

Spanish and Portuguese (as well as French and Italian) friars went to the Americas in order to instruct the natives in their new faith and in order to baptize them. But they did not go in order to proselytize. Mission means to go and convince people. However, this is not what happened during this period, regarding the Spanish and Portuguese territories. Franciscans, Dominicans and Jesuits did not go to the Americas in order to convince, but in order to explain. Conversion itself was a civic duty taken to be a matter of course, imposed on the natives by legal authorities, and fulfilled by baptism. Thus, on the one hand, conversion concerned the interest of the king, and that of Native Americans, on the other. Friars went to give a hand to both. What they did was to explain the Christian faith to the autochthonous, be they already baptized or not. Baptism was not the point, for it went without saying. Conversion remained beyond individual choice, it was just fostered by explanation.

What happens with mission is exactly the opposite. When you engage in mission, you encourage individual choices. And in fact, the word starts to show up in the grammars

³ There certainly is always metalanguage and object language in grammar and the split is easily filled in by different languages. The grammar is colonial only, if the distribution of languages is triggered by the *colonial divide*, see Rabasa 2007.

from the end of the seventeenth century onwards. Curiously, at the same time, a second term arises, the one of *savages*. It appears that there have to be savages, when there is to be mission. Mission apparently requires savages as its target group. And as there were not any wild men in the discourse of the (Spanish) Americas up to some moment in the late seventeenth century, there could be no mission either. Mission in the modern sense of the word requires a conceptualization of the autochthonous Other in terms of cultural inferiority, a category by no means religious. Ultimately, when mission starts around 1700, conversion stops being a matter of politics, and starts to be based on a predefined cultural setting. As a consequence, calling the texts *missionary grammars* before approximately 1700 is inconvenient.

Talk about ancient grammars

Sofar, this paper is about authors who talk about structural differences between languages. But we might be directly interested in these differences, too.⁴ We might in fact be interested in them *as much as* they were, but hardly *the way* they were. For the authors are different from us. Thus, talking about the authors' talk about differences between languages, we are dealing with still another difference, a difference in time, i.e., the difference between their concerns and ours, and in the way of getting to know things. We should be aware of this. For it is our being keen on understanding the texts which prevents us from understanding them. Eagerness makes us approach them too rapidly, makes us recognize our own categories in what the authors say, erroneously. In order to understand the texts, we must inhibit ourselves from understanding. One means to achieve this is to roam about in the period, as if it were a foreign country, and to really become familiar with categories that just sound familiar at the start. This is in fact the next point of the paper: how do we get to know about the difference in theory which cuts us off the Renaissance? And: how did the authors get to know about the typological differences between the target languages and the languages they were proficient in, i.e., their native languages and Latin?

2. Competing approaches

The Renaissance is not homogeneous. No period really is, but periods of rapid change even less so. Regarding grammar, there certainly is a desire for renaissance, i.e., a desire

⁴ For the problems discussed in this section, see Rorty 1984, Schlieben-Lange 2000.

for the patterns of Antiquity to be reborn (and for those of the Middle Ages to be forgotten).⁵ What is born in the Renaissance, in any case, is the concept of the Middle Ages, for they come into being only by the very desire of ending them. Neither the concept of Antiquity nor the one of the Middle Ages existed before the Renaissance. Synchronically speaking, what the humanists try to finish with are not patterns of the past, but patterns of their very present. For the Middle Ages tenaciously remain. Cultural revolutions such as the Renaissance inevitably produce unsynchronized presents.

Humanist grammar

Grammatical renaissance was, first and foremost, a renaissance of antique methodology. Much less it was a renaissance of antique concepts. Concepts tend to resist historical change, even when challenged by competing concepts. Obliterating them is not an easy undertaking, especially if they can still be regarded as useful, as the concepts of Mediaeval grammar were. The humanists fell short of achieving their aim of confining Mediaeval grammatical theory to oblivion. Instead, they restarted grammar from its beginnings, by empirical work, studying the inherited texts in the way the grammarians of the Antiquity did, trying to reestablish the original versions, analyzing one piece of structure next to the other, classifying the pieces and deducing grammatical rules from them. Indeed, there were grammatical texts from Antiquity, too, and the humanists handled these with curiosity, respect and admiration like all other kinds of texts. They rarely challenged Antique authors. Things that had never been heard of in Antiquity were not likely to exist.

The humanists are interested in details, though, in any and every minor detail regarding Latin, and they come to be interested in the differences between Latin and their own native languages, too, and in the details of these. The point of humanist grammar for colonial grammar is the empirical nature of its starting point. Study the texts in order to get to the structures, and study the structures in order to get to the (correct versions of) the texts. Observed structures can even be maintained in discourse to a certain extent, as empirically given, even if incongruent with established categories. Now, while the texts (or versions of them) are at hand for the humanists, there is, to start with, the most complete lack of written texts to work on for the colonial authors.

⁵ For Renaissance Grammar, see Grendler 1989, Caravolas 1995, Colombat 1999, Percival 2004.

Modistae grammar

Difference, though, is not the only thing you may be interested in. The Modistae were not interested in differences at all. They studied only one language, Latin, and studied it as if it were their own language, a language of the present, not of the past. Grammarians of the thirteenth and early fourteenth century were interested in language structure as such, and they studied it as exemplified by Latin.⁶ They held Latin to be the most elaborated human language. Having singled out the most perfect language, why study all the others, the less perfect ones? Such a position makes sense, if there is a language capacity common to all humans. Access it from whatever language, but preferably from the most perfect one, and you will have it. Universal Grammar is, historically speaking, Modistae.

Consider that Universal Grammar is, above all, politically correct. Universal Grammar is to say that all humans share the same cognitive capacities, and the more they do, the more the theory is correct. Second, Universal Grammar is a useful heuristic tool. Start from the assumption that any language unknown to you relies on universal categories you do know, and you will find out something about the language. Third, Universal Grammar is a convenient hypothesis within language teaching. Establish correspondences from source language to target language structures, in the most precise manner you can, and you will soon have your students utter statements in the target language.

Now, what is the point of Universal Grammar for our concern? First, grammatical studies and, even more, grammatical teaching continues from the Middle Ages into the Renaissance. Mediaeval grammar books are being printed, bought and read in the Early Modern Period, just as Antique grammar books are. There is competition on the market. Next, there is a renaissance within the Renaissance. Certainly it is a partial one, but it is important for our concern, for it is a renaissance of Mediaeval grammar. Modistae positions start to be taken seriously again from the end of the sixteenth century onwards. Universal Grammar is just a common idea in the thirteenth century, in fact it is hardly ever applied to any language different from Latin. In the sixteenth century, however, it is applied to more and more different languages as time progresses. Just why did the Renaissance, when it comes to its end, take the side of its enemies?

⁶ For the Mediaeval theory of Universal Grammar see Fredborg 1980, Kneepkens 1995.

Humanists never had been just messing around with language data. They had always been interested in coherent and, even more, in elegant principles of ordering texts and organizing knowledge. They even strove to exceed the Mediaeval authors in this respect. The ever increasing amount of language data, though, and the increasing amount of differences of all kinds produced an increasing desire for a reliable, transparent order. Transparent order, however, turns out to be traditional order – it is, in a cognitive sense, the one you were familiar with first. The urgent need for reliable order prevails over the curiosity for all the different ways of being human, of telling something. Thus, humanism ends, but grammar continues.

Colonial grammar

Colonial grammars have been said to impose Latin categories onto languages different from Latin. But this, the supposed imposition of Latin onto the colonized languages, may easily be related to the theory of Universal Grammar, the one we found out to be both politically correct and extremely useful for the describing languages unknown. In any case, as grammar and Latin were the same thing in the period, colonial authors did not impose Latin onto the languages, but grammar. In historiographical perspective, the reproach of having imposed Latin does not make sense, for it takes the statements of Early Modern authors literally, and ignores their methodological concern.

Yet, observing colonial grammar in its diachrony, we detect that it grows closer to Latin with time. Despite what the idea of scientific progress might suggest, it is simply not the case that colonial grammars cancel Latin categories, one by one, growing continuously away from them. On the contrary, colonial grammars get back to the Latin categories in the Late Renaissance. Not uniformly so nor at the very same moment in different regions and within the different religious orders – more and earlier so in the Jesuit order, in Brazil and in the Andean region. But grammars tend to adopt the Latin categories across the board, not the reverse.

Thus, the Renaissance is heterogeneous, geographically and temporally. The grammatical concerns of the period are unfamiliar for us. Ultimately, what were the authors' most basic possibilities to investigate differences in language structures? The first one is to retrieve the categories of Universal Grammar, inherited from the Modistae, and to see

what happens in the languages under study. You normally find structures corresponding to them. The second possibility is to work on texts written in the target languages, even if the texts have to be produced first. Work on the texts, observe the structures and try to get to the categories.⁷ This kind of proceeding, the properly humanistic one, is employed rather in earlier grammars.

Under the first option, working with Universal Grammar, the authors will encounter differences, when retrieving given categories does not work, when retrieving runs into problems. Under the second option, starting from the forms observed, they encounter differences when trying to grasp structures not immediately evident. The first option then is form-oriented, it is to start from the categories and get to the forms. The second option is the opposite, it is category-oriented – start from target forms and then reach the category level. Grammars do not have to be uniform in their methodology. Both options might indeed come in handy at different times. But both are not equally trendy in different periods in history. Starting from target forms is trendy first, starting from the established categories is trendy then, from the end of the sixteenth century onwards.

3. Discourse strategies

The authors cannot simply say what they have in mind. They have to take into account their readers, i.e., possibilities of understanding and probabilities of their statements to be approved. At a closer look, there are two kinds of readers to be considered: those endowed with sufficient institutional power such as to support or inhibit printing, and those who read the book for its proper purpose, when published, and then might recommend it or advise against it. Printing is attractive during this period, perhaps more than today. The notion of immortality is closer at hand, and to be read is to be remembered.

Printing is limited by economic conditions. Colonial grammars do not sell well, and someone has to incur the costs of printing. In addition it is limited by formal licences. As printing expands the possibilities of both diffusion and permanence of texts, Renaissance societies are interested in controlling access to printing, in order to avoid the storage of nonsense. The discourse on difference is therefore limited by what might be accepted as

⁷ For the problem of categories in contemporary research in linguistic typology, see Gil 2000.

probable. In order to have your book printed, you'd better renounce anything merely probable and confine yourself to what is proven.

You might still say things never heard of, if (a) you present them as already heard of sometime, and if possible, heard of in Antiquity, or (b) you do not really present them, but mention them in passages the average reader would not read or (c) write them down in manners the average reader would not understand. Only the reader interested more than average would, but there would be no danger, because he would be confidential.

Grammatical texts are excellent hosts for hidden transcripts.⁸ They are made up of so many different parts that contradictions are hard to avoid. If contradictions can hardly be controlled, they are in a sense admitted, and thus, you may introduce contradictions intentionally. You may sow truth in uncertainties. Variation including the variation of statements is more readily tolerated in the Renaissance than it is today. Different viewpoints were not looked upon as contradictions, but as illuminating, even within the same text. And in fact, intended contradictions are hard to set apart from unintended ones.

Consider that grammars consist of target language materials, presented in paradigms, sentence format or as isolated words or phrases, with category labels attached to them or listed apart, definitions of these labels, statements, comments on the statements, argumentation, rules, exceptions to the rules, citations from other grammars, comments on the citations, headings at different levels, the organization of the grammatical topics and means of indicating it – such as numberings, indexes, content tables, marginals and heading lines – further addresses to the reader and to the dedication addressee, content approvals, printing licences, subtitle, title, cover layout, printing material, size.

As an example, I will focus on discourse strategies related to just three of all these parts or building blocks. Other parts are implied, because contradictions arise from their interplay. The parts in focus are the overall organization, category labels, and argumentation.

⁸ For the notion of hidden transcripts see Scott 1990. *Hidden transcripts* means ways of introducing statements from a minority position into the storing systems of the majority society, where they may be preserved without having been recognized and cancelled by the discourse control mechanisms.

Organization of subject matters

The first author quoted is Andrés de Olmos, *Arte de la lengua mexicana*, 1547.⁹ In his first chapter, he lists seven parts of speech instead of the canonical eight parts. Olmos leaves out the adverb, on this occasion. Next, he treats in his grammar seven parts of speech, but not the seven parts listed in the beginning. In his text, he omits the participle from among the canonical number. Of course, Olmos might have been just careless. Still, the point is the text, not the author. It is a grammar which does not care much about tradition, most evidently, even though its author knows it very well.

Similar carelessness can be found in just one other grammar, José de Anchieta, *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais usada na costa do Brasil*, 1595. Anchieta discusses just four traditional parts of speech, noun, pronoun, verb and preposition. Despite its late publication date, the text was written not long after Olmos 1547, which in turn is the first Native American grammar that has come down to us. Carelessness about tradition, it appears, was en vogue at the moment. It stops being en vogue by 1600. Colonial grammars of the seventeenth century might still claim that there were less than eight parts of speech in their target languages, but would have to argue for such a point.

Olmos, for all his apparent carelessness, informs the reader that he revised the ordering of his text after having asked in prayer for advice on the matter. He may not have been that careless in the end. The point is that Olmos cuts his text into three parts, but gives no headings to the parts, as could be expected. Still, he explains to the reader in his foreword that the first part is on nouns, the second on verbs and the third part on indeclinable items.¹⁰ Olmos certainly did not deduce the structure of his grammar from the structures of the target language, for in his view, nouns are indeclinable in Nahuatl. Thus no first part would be needed. If there is a first part of the grammar, it is because nouns were meant to be a separate part of speech from the start.

Olmos did not deduce his structure from the Roman tradition of grammatical arts, for although they are threefold as is his grammar, the distribution of topics in the Roman arts is completely different. Olmos might have known Latin-written humanistic grammars of

⁹ Olmos' target language is Nahuatl, Anchieta's is Tupinambá. For basic information on American Indian languages, see Campbell 1997.

¹⁰ For a perspective on forewords, see Genette 1987.

Hebrew. In fact, he further treats pronouns before nouns, again in accordance with Hebrew grammar. Ordering pronouns before nouns is irreverent, it is unprecedented in the Western tradition and it is followed by no other colonial author. The reason is not that it does not make sense. On the contrary, Olmos looks upon cliticized pronouns as a cue to agglutinative morphology, and he is perfectly right. Yet being right does not alleviate irreverence. Despite the Latin-written address to the Franciscan general commissioner of the Indies, implored for patronage, the text went into print only centuries later.

Category labels

A second rather conspicuous author is Alonso Huerta, *Arte de la lengua Quechua general de los yndios de este Reyno del Piru*, 1616. The point with Huerta is category labels. In order to appreciate the author's way of proceeding, one should be aware that Quechua is a suffixing language, case-inflecting, and that it prefers head-final orderings in general. Relational items thus follow their nominal arguments, but may consist of a single consonantal segment up to bisyllabic stress-bearing terms. This difference in size and prosody is most obviously the result of unsynchronized grammaticalization processes.

The descriptive problem with this scale of possibilities is to categorize the items as either case-inflections or adpositions.¹¹ A dividing line between these categories is suggested by grammar, but should one draw it, and if so, at which point of the scale? Case-inflections and adpositions are clearly different phenomena in Latin. Former Quechua grammars are by no means unanimous on the matter, so different solutions had been proposed up to Huerta.¹² This author draws no dividing line at all, he avoids the cut. Huerta recovers the traditional term *preposition*, taking advantage of its Antique semantics, which covers both independent lexical heads and *prefixes on* lexical heads. Huerta clearly forms a new category which points to Quechua morphotactics, to the fact of agglutination, and is thus perfectly adequate. His ruse is to call it *preposition*.

Argumentation

A third author is Maturino Gylberti, *Arte de la lengua de Michuacan*, 1558. The topic here is argumentation and silence, and the structure in focus is again the case category. Gylberti

¹¹ For this problem see DeLancey 1997, with regards to Quechua and within colonial grammar Schmidt-Riese 2005.

¹² For details of the treatment within the grammars prior to Huerta see Schmidt-Riese 2005.

offers in the first part of his book, right at the beginning, a case paradigm with six case items, but only five slots. Dative and accusative share a slot, as there is just one target item for both. In the second part, the author states that in the target language there are three nominal cases. He does not at all justify this claim. Instead, he proceeds to discuss target structures corresponding to the Latin case categories, seven in number. Contradiction seems obvious.

But in fact, there is no contradiction. Gylberti merely distinguishes the form-oriented and the category-oriented procedure. He cautiously gives preference to the former in organizing his text and in his paradigm, but preference to the latter in his discussion. Latin categories remain unchallenged, as the paradigm and the organization of his text adhere to them. But the Latin categories serve just as a retrieving inventory. In fact, the structures of the target match this inventory only three times. So there are three cases. The author's observations on Purepecha would have left little room for the Latin categories, had he proceeded consistently within the category-oriented approach. Gylberti handles tradition carefully, though. He nevertheless makes an unambiguous point on the target, when he states that there are three cases in Purepecha, nominative, genitive and accusative.

4. Conclusion

As a conclusion, I will give two citations from colonial grammars. In these passages the authors reflect upon their own undertaking, upon their possibilities to render the structural difference they clearly perceive. The first citation is from Olmos, again, the second one is from Fernando de la Carrera, *Arte de la lengua Yunga*, 1644. Both authors go beyond anything said thus far. They manifest that the grammar they write is not the one they would like to write.

Olmos' point is that loyalty to the Latin terms guarantees for the grammar to be understood without problems. On the other hand, using the Latin terms is defending the dignity of the target language against its adversaries. Explaining things apart from the Latin categories would be too difficult and take too much time:

Esto esta claro a los *que* tienen algunos principios de gramatica, *pero para* los que no los saben es menester declararlo. Y ansi van tambien otras cosas en esta arte,

que no se pueden bien sacar de los terminos latinos, y ponerlo en terminos interligibres [= inteligibles] a todos no se puede bien hazer. Y ansi [en] muchas cosas lleua la traça de la gramatica latina asi porque se vea el artificio de la lengua no *ser tan barbara como* algunos dicen, *como* porque con gran dificultad y *prolixidad*, no se pudiera dar todo a entender por solo *nuestro romance*, sin mezclar algo del latin, etc. (Olmos 1547: fol. 50r–v)

This is evident for those who have some principles of grammar, but for those who do not know them it is important to explain it. And this is the way other matters are in this art, which could not well be drawn from the Latin terms and you could not well put them in terms intelligible to all. And thus, in many respects, it bears the makeup of Latin grammar, in order to prove the language's artifice is not as barbarous as some people say, and it would be with great difficulty and long-winded to explain it in Romance, without mixing any Latin into it. (Olmos 1547: fol. 50r–v, translation mine)

Carrera on the contrary, some 100 years later, deliberately admits that the target language, Mochica, is barbarous.¹³ Still, this is not to say he actually thinks it is, he rather concedes to the reader that it might be looked upon this way. Further, he relies on the topic that there are things impossible to be said. Sure for himself that there is but one verb in the target language, he considers this state of affairs too difficult to be explained. He could still manage to explain it, he says, while lecturing, but not in writing. As to the analysis itself, there can be no doubt on its adequacy. Future research will confirm this:

Yo estuuue determinado, de no poner en esta lengua mas verbo que el substantiuo, pero dejelo de poner, por no añadir confusion a la que la misma lengua tiene, que cierto es barbara e irreducible a terminos, en la qual el que mas sabe ignora mucho. Pero si yo fuera el que la leyese, por este arte, o por otro si lo hubiera, yo diria el modo como gobernarse, con el verbo substantiuo, platicandole y dandolo a entender, y esto no es possible poder escriuir, si no es llenando de confusion, lo que quisiera hazer facil, y assi no ay que reparar en esto sino seguir los preceptos que

¹³ Mochica is the current language name in the modern scholarly literature. Cerrón-Palomino (1995: 36) argues that the Quechua term *Yunga* groups both Mochica and Quingnam, neighbouring, but unrelated languages of northern Peru.

se ponen, que algun dia, el que la llegare a saber, conocera que no voy descaminado. (Carrera 1644 [1939: 52])

I was determined not to put in this language any other verb but the substantive, but I did not do this, in order not to add confusion to the one the selfsame language has, which is certainly barbarous and irreducible to terms, and in which who knows most about it, ignores a lot. But if I were the one who lectured on it, by this *art* or by another, if there were any, I could tell how to get along with the substantive verb, talking to them and explaining it, and it is impossible to write this down without filling with confusion what I wished to make simple, and this is why you'd better forget about this, and follow the precepts given, for some day, whoever achieves to know it, will recognize I do not go astray. (Carrera 1644 [1939: 52], translation mine)

Both citations point to the limits of talking about difference. Certain things cannot be said for the moment, but might be said in the future, and in fact, the authors already announce their ideas, only they do not insist. Using Latin categories in the sense of a starting point for inquiry, as Gylberti does, using Latin category labels while reshaping the categories, as Huerta does, reorganizing grammar on principles borrowed from other grammatical traditions, as Olmos does, allows for identifying structural differences, even though somewhat hidden statements will not always be perceived.

Bibliography

Colonial authors

Anchieta SJ, Ioseph de 1595. *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais usada na costa do Brasil*, Coimbra: per Antonio de Mariz.

Carrera [y Daza], Fernando de la 1644. *Arte de la lengua Yunga de los valles del obispado de Truxillo del Peru, con un confessionario, y todas las oraciones christianas, traducidas en la lengua, y otras cosas*, Lima: impresso por Ioseph de Contreras. [Tucumán: Universidad Nacional de Tucumán 1939].

- Gylberti OFM, Maturino 1558. *Arte de la lengua de Michuacan*, [Mexico]: en casa de Iuan Pablos, impressor.
- Huerta, Alonso de 1616. *Arte de la lengua Quechua general de los yndios de este Reyno del Piru*, Los Reyes: impresso por Francisco del Canto.
- Olmos OFM, Andres de [1547]. *Arte para aprender la lengua mexicana*, ms. *Arte de la lengua mexicana*, Madrid: Cultura Hispánica/Instituto de Cooperación Iberoamericana 1993, 2 vols., edición facsimilar.

Modern scholars

- Campbell, Lyle 1997. *American Indian languages. The historical linguistics of Native America*, New York/Oxford: OUP.
- Caravolas, Jean Antoine 1995. „Apprendre à parler une langue étrangère à la Renaissance“, *Historiographia linguistica* 22.3, 275–310.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo 1995. *La lengua de Naimlap. Reconstrucción y obsolescencia del mochica*, Lima: PCUP
- Colombat, Bernard 1999. *La grammaire latine en France à la Renaissance et à l'Âge classique. Théories et pédagogie*, Grenoble: Université Stendhal.
- DeLancey, Scott 1997. „Grammaticalization and the gradience of categories. Relator nouns and postpositions in Tibetan and Burmese“, in: Joan L. Bybee/John Haiman/Sandra A. Thompson eds., *Essays on language function and language type. Dedicated to T. Givón*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins, 51–69.
- Errington, Joseph 2001. „Colonial linguistics“, *Annual Review of Anthropology* 30.1, 19–39.
- Fredborg, Karin Margareta 1980. „Universal Grammar according to some 12th-century grammarians“, *Historiographia Linguistica* 7.1/2, 69–84.
- Genette, Gérard 1987. *Seuils*, Paris: Seuil.
- Gil, David 2000. „Syntactic categories, cross-linguistic variation and universal grammar“, in: Petra M. Vogel/ Bernard Comrie eds., *Approaches to the typology of word classes*, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 173–216.
- Grendler, Paul F. 1989. *Schooling in Renaissance Italy. Literacy and learning*, Baltimore: John Hopkins UP.
- Guzmán Betancourt, Ignacio 2001. „La investigación lingüística en México durante el siglo XVII“, *Dimensión Antropológica* 21, 33–70.

- Hanzeli, Victor Egon 1969. *Missionary linguistics in New France. A study of Seventeenth- and Eighteenth-Century descriptions of American Indian languages*, Den Haag/Paris: Mouton.
- Hernández de León-Portilla, Ascención 2003. „Las primeras gramáticas mesoamericanas. Algunos rasgos lingüísticos“, *Historiographia Linguistica* 30.1/2, 1–44.
- Kneepkens, Corneille Henri 1995. „The Priscianic tradition“, in: Sten Ebbesen ed., *Sprachtheorien in Spätantike und Mittelalter*, Tübingen: Narr, 239–264.
- Law, Vivien A. 1997. *Grammar and grammarians in the Early Middle Ages*, London: Longman.
- Lerner, Isaias 1997. „La colonización española y las lenguas indígenas de América“, *Colonial Latin American Review* 6, 7–15.
- Percival, W. Keith 2004. *Studies in Renaissance grammar*, Aldershot/Hampshire: Ashgate.
- Rabasa, José 2007. „The colonial divide“, *Journal of Mediaeval and Early Modern Studies* 37.3, 511–529.
- Rorty, Richard 1984. „The historiography of philosophy: four genres“, in: Richard Rorty/John B. Schneewind/Quentin Skinner eds., *Philosophy in history*, Cambridge: CUP, 49–75.
- Schlieben-Lange, Brigitte 2000. *Idéologie. Zur Rolle von Kategorisierungen im Wissenschaftsprozess*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Schmidt-Riese, Roland 2005. „Colonial grammars on nominal case. The Quechua series“, *Philologie im Netz* 33, 84–116. [<http://www.fu-berlin.de/phn/phn33/p33t4.htm#ver05a>].
- Scott, James C. 1990. *Domination and the arts of resistance. Hidden transcripts*, New Haven: Yale UP.
- 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.