

## THE ANONYMOUS GRAMMAR OF THE *LÍNGUA GERAL DO BRASIL* (1750, MS. 69, BIBLIOTECA MUNICIPAL DE COIMBRA) AND THE PORTUGUESE GRAMMATICAL TRADITION

Otto Zwartjes

University of Amsterdam/ NIAS, Wassenaar<sup>1</sup>

**RESUMO:** *Otto Zwartjes apresenta uma detalhada análise do manuscrito anônimo de uma gramática da Língua Geral do Brasil, de 1750, comparando-o com as gramáticas de Anchieta (1595) e Figueira (1687). Zwartjes mostra as filiações da gramática anônima aos dois predecessores, e também seu caráter inovador, por exemplo, ao ser a primeira a considerar diferentes registros de uso da língua. A comparação entre as três obras permite, entre outros resultados interessantes, observar mudanças na Língua Geral ao longo do período estudado.*

**ABSTRACT:** *Otto Zwartjes presents a detailed analysis of the anonymous manuscript of a grammar of the “Língua Geral do Brasil”, from 1750, in which he compares it to the grammars of Anchieta (1595) and Figueira (1678). Zwartjes shows the relation between the anonymous grammar and its predecessors, but also shows its innovative character, for instance, in being the first one to consider different registers of language use. The comparison between the three works, among other interesting results, allows to observe some changes in the “Língua Geral” in the period covered.*

### Introduction

In Portuguese America four grammars have survived in printed form: three of Amerindian (Tupinambá and Kiriri)<sup>2</sup> and one African language of the Bantu family (Kimbundo, “the language of Angola”), all written by Jesuits and without exception printed in Portugal. In a recent study (Zwartjes 2002) I analysed the grammars of Joseph de Anchieta (1595),

Luis Figueira (second edition 1687) and Luis Vincêncio Mamiani (1699) with the aim to find traces of the Latin grammar of Manuel Álvares (1572). The main questions raised were how the Portuguese missionaries adapted this Latin grammar, which definitions were selected and which elements they discussed, added or omitted. A secondary aim was to evaluate the 'innovative' metalanguage compared with the earliest Portuguese grammars of Fernão de Oliveira (1536) and João de Barros (1540). We concluded that the influence of the Latin grammar of Álvares was clearly visible in the grammars of Figueira and Mamiani and that the latter could have had some knowledge of the Portuguese grammar of João de Barros too. Probably many more grammars, dictionaries and catechisms circulated in Brazil in the form of manuscripts during the colonial period, but many works are lost.<sup>3</sup>

The subject of this article is an anonymous manuscript, entitled *Grammatica da lingual geral do Brazil. Com hum Diccionario dos vocabulos mais usuaes para a intelligencia da dita Lingua* (1750). I shall analyse the grammatical section of this manuscript in relation to the grammars analysed in Zwartjes (2002). This anonymous work has not been analysed yet satisfactorily in relation to the history of Linguistics. In this grammar most definitions, pedagogical and descriptive techniques are completely in agreement with its predecessors. On the first place, this anonymous grammar gives us some information concerning language variety and language change, not found in the grammars of Anchieta and Figueira. When discussing the paradigms of the eight parts of speech, not all parallels will be summed up here for reasons of space, but some examples will be given with the aim to get a more precise idea how missionaries were relying on each other and how they tried to give in some case their own 'creative' solutions. More interesting are some remarkable adaptations or deviations from the traditional descriptive model which will be analysed and discussed here, with the main focus on the pronominal system, with the specific terms 'artigo', 'particula' and 'pronomes extravagantes'. How can we explain the differences between the three grammars of languages of the Tupian family? Are they based on a different interpretation of the linguistic facts or was the author re-writing some sections for pedagogical reasons?

## 1. The author

We know almost nothing about the author. The anonymous admits that he was not a very good 'master' in grammar, as we can read in the following section:

Todo o Gramatico saberá que as partes da oração são oito, e não trato aqui dellas porque não componho por hora a Arte, e nem mestre sou della, mas sim so trato do adverbio. (f. 361)

In another section of his grammar, the anonymous reveals that he has some knowledge of other Amerindian languages, as the following quotation indicates:

Não me parece mal esta opinião; porém a mim me parece, que são pronomes, porque *tendo noticia de outras Línguas* as acho nellas claramente feitas pronomes. (f. 132, emphasis is mine)

The anonymous author does not mention the names of the grammarians he used, but he mentions an “arte antiga” in his grammar (f. 148). The grammar does not give specific information concerning the education of the author, which language the anonymous author speaks and we do not find any comparisons with other languages than Latin and Portuguese.<sup>4</sup>

## 2. The manuscript

The manuscript has 407 numbered folios, probably written by three scribes (Barros, forthcoming) whose writings are clearly recognizable as eighteenth century products. The first scribe wrote the grammar, the two others the rest (dictionary, the religious texts, such as ‘confessionario’, ‘doutrina’, etc. and several word lists). In one of the last pages of the third scribe the date is given: “20 de Abril de 1750, Vale” (f. 397). The grammar is not dated but was written probably in the same period. A prologue is missing and the work starts with some folios numbered with Roman numerals (i-iv), which contains a list of words of family relationship (‘graos de parentesco’), the ‘artigos’, the ‘pronomes’, to be discussed below, and the ‘dativos de proveito’.<sup>5</sup> The first folio numbered with Arabic numerals starts with the conjugation of the verb *Jucá* (‘matar’), the same verb used in Anchieta and Figueira. It does not start directly with the more usual opening chapter on orthography and pronunciation. The section with the paradigms of the verb occupies not less than 105 folios of the grammar and after the conjugations a chapter follows entitled ‘Partes de oração’, the Parts of speech, with many notes, comments and observations (‘anotações’, ‘advertencias’ and ‘regras’). On folio 195 a chapter on syntax (‘syntaxe’) is attached (ff. 195-205), followed by some phrases dealing with the syllable (‘syllaba’, f. 205), just as Figueira did earlier, on the last page of his grammar, following



Álvares, also directly after ‘syntax’ (Figueira 1878[1687]: 167). After the dictionary some paradigms are appended (‘Artigos’, ‘pronomes’, and the ‘dativos de proveito’, f. 355), apparently superfluous since this has been dealt with earlier in the opening section of the grammar. Such inconsistencies can be explained by the fact that this is a manuscript which usually does not have the same status as printed works.

### 3. The language. Language variety and language change

#### 3.1 The ‘*línguas gerais*’

As indicated in the title, the language described in the anonymous grammar is called the ‘General language’ (‘*língua geral*’), different from the title of his predecessors which are labelled as ‘*a língua mais usada na Costa do Brasil*’ (Anchieta) and ‘*língua Brasília*’ (Figueira). In the classification of Rodrigues, three ‘general languages’ can be distinguished, (1) the ‘*Língua Geral do Sul*’ or ‘*língua Geral Paulista*’ (Tupi or Tupininquim) which originated from the Tupis from São Vicente, the language of the ‘bandeirantes’ closely related to Guarani, (2) the ‘*Língua Geral*’ which originated from Tupinambá, spoken in Rio de Janeiro, Bahía and Espírito Santo, the language ‘of the coast’, and (3) the ‘*Língua Geral Amazônica*’ which originated from the Tupinambá from the north, from which the so called ‘*nhe’engatú*’ (= “the good language”) has been derived, which still has native speakers today (Rodrigues 2002: 102-103) in the regions around São Gabriel and Cucuí, the Río Negro, Içana and Xié rivers, not only in Brazil but also in Colombia and Venezuela.<sup>6</sup> Several tribes who speak languages of the Arawak family, such as the Baniva and Werekena communities, still use this so-called *língua geral*, a variant of Tupi. Until the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century this ‘general language’ was even more dominant than Portuguese or Spanish. This anonymous work is a grammar and dictionary of the ‘*Língua geral Amazônica*’ (Rodrigues 1997: 371).<sup>7</sup>

The Portuguese called all indigenous tribes who did not speak Tupi ‘Tapuias’. It is remarkable that we find a reference in the anonymous grammar to these tribes: “Os nomes de animaes, que os Tapuyas crião em suas cazas, tambem não mudão letra alguma....” (f.115).

#### 3.2 *Language variety*

In the grammar of Anchieta, regional differences are recorded (Anchieta 1990[1595] 1v.), whereas Figueira does not mention any regional differences at all, which illustrates the fact that the latter attempted to describe one uniform Brazilian language, probably



for pedagogical and political reasons. The anonymous grammar does not give us any information concerning regional differences – comparisons are never made, for instance, between the ‘Língua Geral Amazônica’ and other variants - but it contains two aspects which are different from the grammars of Anchieta and Figueira: two different registers or stylistic varieties are referred to and this grammar even contains observations related to the frequency of certain expressions, a language which is ‘menos polida, e mais usada’ opposed to another register which is ‘muy polida, e pouco usada’ (ff.4-5). Another distinction is made between a language of those who are beginners, and those who are more advanced in learning the general language (“os que são poucos versados no lingual geral”, or “os que sabem pouco” versus “os bons linguas”).<sup>8</sup> In the word list of the adverb, we find also information about the register or ‘sociolect’ of the ‘ladinos’: “oman – He o mesmo, ainda que com menos uzo da gente ladina”. (f. 181). In the chapter which deals with the pronouns, the anonymous author describes pronouns which are “mais engraçados de que uzao os ladinos, ebriosos por melindre” (f.129),<sup>9</sup> to be discussed below. As happens in many other missionary grammars, we find also the term “polido”:

... ainda que este modo de uzar so’os muito polidos, e ladinos o sabem, que os outros dizem Xeurú, ndeurú, &c. e muitas vezes aosque sabem he necessario fallar por este modo charro, assim nisto, como em outras frases, para que os que não sabem entendão oque se lhes diz... (f. 117).

### 3.3 Language change

The anonymous grammarian not only comments on registers, but he also mentions an “arte antiga”, and in this passage he tells us that certain forms are not longer in use, since they are used in older days:

Nos catecismos, e na Arte antiga se acha em lugar de oé esta dicção *má*, a qual ainda que ao parecer he muy elegante, e algumas pessoas há, que ainda dão razão della, não ha hoje pessoa alguma, que a uze, e as mais dellas não a entendem; e por isso uzem desta, que acima declaro (f. 148).<sup>10</sup>

Different from the Mexican tradition - where the Old speech (*huehuetlatolli*) – seems to be the norm, we do not find any trace of any comments in the anonymous grammar which reveal any preference for the “Old speech” as the norm or standard language.

### 3.4 Observations concerning the characteristics of the language and language acquisition (*arte / uso*)

As observed by Pozuelo Yvancos (1986), any Renaissance grammarian reveals explicitly or implicitly his opinion on language use and language norms. The anonymous author does not form an exception, as the following fragment demonstrates (cf. Zwartjes 2000):

Outras muitas palavras há, que levão o verbo ao Gerundio, as quaes se aprenderão com u uso, que para exemplo estas só bastão, porque o uso e continuação são as cousas, que melhor ensinaõ sem mestre. Pode-se aprender qualquer Língua sem uso, e continuação de nenhuma Arte. O uso, e collocação das partes nesta Língua he muy vario... (ff.203-204).

The anonymous manuscript also tells us something about attitudes towards the practice of second language teaching. It is stressed in several paragraphs that the quantity of the rules might seem high, since there is a lot of ‘variation’. Nevertheless, the learner must not be discouraged, since the author several times adds that these “general rules” are not difficult: “porque ainda que isto tem muita variedade, não tem nenhuma difficultade, só se adverte por ora o seguinte....” (f.118).

The indigenous language which the novices had to learn is characterized as follows:

Não se faça muito reparo nos modos que tem os Indios para se explicarem, e nas rusticas composições de vocabulos, que entre si tem, como vg. Para dizerem, sou forte, costumão dizer *xe py-rantam* que em bom Portuguez, cononstruido diretamente, quer dizer, a minha pelle he dura; porque *pyra* significa pelle e *antam* couza dura. (f. 119)

For didactic-pedagogical reasons, translations are sometimes given “ao pé da letra”, in order to demonstrate how such “rústicas composições” are construed (f. 119). Another impression of the language is given in the following citation:

Quasi em todas as frases, e perifrases de que uzão, parecem tão for a de proposito, e tão for a doque querem dizer por ellas, que fazem admirar aque as considera”. (f.119)



## 4. The grammar

### 4.1 Introduction

In the sections describing ‘partes declinables’ we see many parallels between the anonymous work and the grammar of Figueira, for instance the use of the ‘modo permissivo’ (f.149) described in Zwartjes (2002:44). When comparing the anonymous grammar with those of Anchieta, Figueira and Mamiani, we can see that the so-called ‘partes indeclinables’ contain very few extensions, or independent characteristics. The definition of the preposition by the anonymous is almost verbatim the same as Anchieta’s and Figueira’s.<sup>11</sup> The anonymous follows strictly the subclasses of the adverb of Figueira,<sup>12</sup> although the anonymous adds some more, and it is important that the anonymous gives in these subparagraphs quite a few examples which are not found in Figueira. The anonymous does not give all the interjections mentioned by Figueira, but it is clear that he copied from the latter.<sup>13</sup> Figueira’s list of conjunctions is reduced by the anonymous (only 5 examples without definitions). The chapter on syntax in the anonymous manuscript copies almost verbatim Figueira’s corresponding chapter on syntax (particularly, the ‘regras’ 1-6) and almost nothing significant has been added. In the following paragraphs some important differences between the anonymous grammar and his predecessors will be analysed.

### 4.2 The eight parts of speech and language universals

Most definitions in the grammar can be found in the chapter on the traditional eight parts of speech. The author enlists the eight parts of speech (nome, pronome, verbo, participio, preposição, adverbio, interjeição and conjunção), and different from his colleagues, a definition of the parts of speech is given:

Chamão-se partes de Oração, não porque estas concorrão sempre todas juntas na oração, mas sim porque não pode haver oração, em que não haja algumas dellas, e oração succede muitas vezes, em que concorrem todas juntas. (f. 107)

When the author describes the subclasses of the nouns, he claims that these features are universal for all the languages of Brazil:

Todos os nomes dessa Língua, e de outros qualquer idioma dos do Brazil, se podem reduzir em Substantivos, adjectivos, absolutos, verbaes, possessivos, relativos, comparativos e superlativos. (f. 107, emphasis is mine)

The noun in the *Língua Geral Amazônica* has also ‘universal’ characteristics:

Os substantivos se conhecem *em qualquer idioma* por declararem bastantemente seu significado sem dependencia de algum outro nome, vg. *Yby* significa terra, e com este seu significado bastantemente se explica, sem deixar o sentido suspenso, nem ter necessidade de outro nome para ajuda de sua explicação (ff. 107-108, emphasis is mine).<sup>14</sup>

Contrarily, the adjective “needs a substantive” (“que necessita de nome substantiuo para declarar sua significação”). The expression “sentido suspenso” reflects the two definitions of Álvares and Figueira.<sup>15</sup> The definition of the verb also reveals that the author attempts to consider this word class as the base for learning and understanding any language.<sup>16</sup> When describing the active verbs, we see a comparable language universal: “...se concluem os verbos activos em todas as linguas (f. 136).

#### 4.3 *The comparative and superlative*

When the anonymous author deals with the comparative and the superlative in the *língua geral*, a different metalanguage is used according to the language the author is referring to:

Comparativo se chama aquelle nome, que acrescenta, ou diminue o significado a algum positivo. Conhece-se este no Latim levando a *syllaba*, or, acrescentada ao seu positivo, vg. *amans*, *amantior*; *adolescens*, *adulescentior*; *magnus*, *maior*. No Portugues se diz comparativo aquelle positivo, a que acrescentamos esta **palavra**, *mais*, vg. *amante* he positivo; para fazermos comparativo acrescentamos-lhe a palavra *mais*; vg. *mais amante*. Isto supposto, digo que nesta *Língua geral* se formão os comparativos, ajuntando aqualquer positivo a **particula**, *pyrib*, que quer dizer *mais*; vg. *cantam* he hum positivo, que significa cousa forte, ou dura: para dizermos *mais dura*, diremos: *cantam pyryb* (f. 119-120, emphasis is mine).

Schematically, the metalanguage used is as follows:

Latin	‘-or’	= ‘syllaba’
Portuguese	‘mais’	= ‘palavra’
Língua Geral Amazônica	‘pyrib’ (or: ‘pyryb’)	= ‘particula’



The Latin synthetic comparative form is formed by adding the ‘syllable’ –or, the Portuguese analytic comparative is formed with the ‘word’ ‘mais’<sup>17</sup> whereas the General Language uses *pyryb*, which is a particle according to the anonymous, probably because he realised that this word cannot stand alone. With the two particles *eté* and *pyryb* - according to the terminology of the anonymous - added to the positive form (f.122), the superlative form can be constructed. As far as I could trace neither *eté*, an intensifying adverb, nor *pyryb* (‘a little bit more’) are mentioned by Anchieta or Figueira, as the forms for the comparative<sup>18</sup> The anonymous author is not consistent in the use of his terminology, since in his chapter on prepositions we find the same item *pyryb* (“que significa mais, mais grande, maior, e assim se forma o comparativo... Não ha mais comparativos, nem superlativos nesta Língua”) (f.176). The definition “Maiorzinha, ou tem alguma *vantagem*, ou maioria mais que aquella” (f.121) reminds us João de Barros: “superlativo, que e o mais alto gráo de priminência e *uentaem* que se pode dar a alguma cousa” (1971[1540]: 8v., emphasis is mine).

## 5. The pronominal system

### 5.1 Introduction

The Tupi language Anchieta described has the following pronominal system:

Yxê, endê, peê sempre são substantivos, seruem de suppostos em todos os tempos que tem articulos, vt

Yxê açô	eu vou
Endê ereçô	tu
Peê peçô	vos (11v.)

*Orê, yandê*, são também adiectiuos, noster, a, um, differem nisto assaber que *Orê*, exclue a Segunda pessoa cõ que falamos daquelle acto, de que se trata, vt, *orê oroçô*, nos imos, & tu não, *orêmbaê*, nossas cousas, & não tuas, porem, *yandê*, incluie a segunda pessoa vt *ya ndêyaçô*, nos imos & tu também *yandêmbaê*, nossas cousas, & tuas também. (f. 12r.).

Figueira gives us a similar description of the inclusive and exclusive pronominal clitics and independent pronouns.<sup>19</sup> The anonymous grammar does not distinguish between the inclusive and the exclusive forms in the first person plural in his paradigm of the ‘pronomes’ where we find only *Iandê* (‘nos’), whereas we still find the distinction in the paradigm of the ‘artigos’ (*ya* = ‘nos todos’ and *oro* ‘nos sem vos’) (f. v. and f. 355).

Since we find the same paradigm on two different places in the grammar, it is not probable that the scribe made a mistake. It is possible evidence for the gradual disappearance of the opposition between inclusive and exclusive independent pronouns, as Schmidt-Riese already observed (1998: 326).

## 5.2 *The article and the participle. Active and inactive*

### 5.2.1 *Barros and Oliveira*

Since the Greek language has definite articles, Greek grammarians ‘invented’ a name for it, the ‘arthron’. Since the Latin language does not have articles, this category was not relevant in Latin school grammars at all and the term became redundant in the metalanguage as long as Latin was described. In Europe, the term was re-introduced in the Renaissance and the definitions of the article vary considerably (gender marker, case marker, etc.).<sup>20</sup> In the Portuguese tradition, the ‘artigo’ is described as follows:

<p>...os artigos na nossa lingua diuersificação ou varião a forma de sua voz em generos, numeros e casos. (Oliveira 1933[1536]: 91)</p>	<p>E bem como da liança e ligadura dos neruos se sostem o corpo, assy do aiuntamento do artigo aos casos do nome, se compoem a oraçam. (Barros 1971[1540]: 79, f. 12r.)<sup>21</sup></p>
---	--

Barros’ grammar of Portuguese mentions even the Hebrew article and probably he is one of the earliest:

Ésta dificuldade [de declinar] máis é entre os latinos e gregos pola variaçam dos cásos que àcerca de nós e dos hebreus ... Os latinos conheçem o género ... uns pela sinificaçam, outros pela terminaçam, ... Os hebreus per artigos e terminaçam (Barros 1971[1540]: 74, 80).<sup>22</sup>

### 5.2.2 *The article and participle in the grammars of Anchieta, Figueira and the Anonymous (1750)*

In Tupi, there are neither definite nor indefinite articles.<sup>23</sup> Missionaries began right from the beginning to use the term ‘artigo’ for other purposes. Since the pronominal system in Tupi is totally different from the traditional ‘Romance’ and Greco-latin system, missionaries began to differentiate between several categories. In the first Tupi grammar of Anchieta, the term ‘articulo’<sup>24</sup> is described as follows:



Todos os ver. Actiuos, & muitos neutros se conjugão com estas pessoas, as quaes chamamos articulos á differença das pessoas expressas, que são os pronomes, com os quaes se conjugão muitos verbos neutros, & não com os articulos, mas na mudança, & variação do fim seguem a conjugação por que não ha mais que hua... (Anchieta 1990[1595] 20v.)

The distinction between pronouns and ‘artigos’ has been further developed by Figueira, who distinguishes between two classes of verbs, one containing ‘artigos’ and another with ‘pronouns’:

E avemos logo de advertir, que os verbos huns se começam por artigos, outros se começam por pronomes, & polos artigos, & pronomes se conhecem, & distinguem as pessoas, & numeros dos verbos: porque a voz nua dos taes verbos he sempre a mesma sem distincção alguma. Mas os artigos, & os pronomes respondem igualmente aos pronomes latinos, Ego, Tu, Ille, Plur. Nos, Vos, Illi. (Figueira 1878[1687] 10-11)

1. Art. A, Ere, O.	Plur. Ia, Oro, Pe, O.
2. Art. Ai, Erêi, Oî,	Plur. Iâi, Oròi, Pêi, Oî
Pronome, Xe, Nde, I,	Plur. Iande, Ore, Pe, I

According to Figueira, the first class of ‘artigos’ are combined with ‘neutral verbs’ (intransitive) and the second class co-occur with ‘many active’ verbs (transitive). The Anonymous grammar of Tupi gives the paradigms of the ‘artigos’<sup>25</sup> and the ‘pronomes’ before the large section of the conjugation of the verb. These paradigms differ from Figueira’s:

ARTIGOS Singular A, Ere, O.	Plur. Ya, Oro, Pe, O.
PRONOMES Singular Ixe, Indé, Aé	Plur. Iandé, Penhé (ou pé), Am-ôá <sup>26</sup>

Only one series is given by the anonymous of the ‘artigos’ and the ‘pronouns’ are not the same as in Figueira’s grammar. The examples given under ‘Pronouns’ in Figueira (*Xe, Nde, I*, etc.) are given in the paragraph on the ‘possessive’ in the anonymous grammar. Figueira translated them as *Ego, Tu, Ille* (Figueira 1878[1687]:10) and the anonymous as *Meu, teu, seu*, etc. (f. 110). The anonymous gives us in continuation more pronouns, only used by the “ladinos, ebriosos por melindre”: *Icé, iné, ahé, jáné, penhé*.

How can we explain the differences between the anonymous and Figueira? Figueira gives two series of ‘artigos’, the first co-occur with intransitive verbs, and the second with transitive verbs. In Tupi, the direct object can be placed on three different places. Before the verb (*Tembi’u a-î-monhang* “I prepare the meal”), incorporated (*A-tembi’u-monhang*) or after the verb (*A-î-monhang tembi-’u*). If the substantive in the direct object position is not incorporated in the verb, the third person pronoun *-î-* must be infixed:

a-î-monhang tembi’u  
 ere-î-monhang tembi’u  
 o-î-monhang tembi’u  
 oro-î-monhang tembi’u  
 îa-î-monhang tembi’u  
 pe-î-monhang tembi’u  
 o-î-monhang tembi’u  
 (Navarro 1997: 49).

All these personal prefixes were considered as the second class of the ‘artigos’ (*ai, erêi, oi*, etc.) by Figueira. In the eyes of the anonymous, the use of *-î-* was redundant<sup>27</sup> and probably for this reason he gives only the first series at the beginning for didactic reasons. The anonymous classifies two different conjugations of verbs, one which combine with the ‘artigos’ (*a-*), and the second which correspond with pronouns (*xe-*), whereas in Anchieta’s grammar only one conjugation is given, with affirmative and negative forms (1990[1595]: 17v.). Anchieta made the distinction ‘activo’ versus ‘neutro’ but in his grammar they do not form separate conjugations. The anonymous distinguishes between two ‘genders’: ‘activo’ and ‘não activo’. The ‘não-activos’ can be classified according to the dichotomy ‘passivos’ and ‘absolutos’. The ‘real neutral’ verbs (‘neutros verdadeiros’) combine with the pronominal clitics *xe, n[d]e, i*, etc. and these forms are left out in the initial scheme, since the author discusses these later in his grammar (f. 137). The anonymous prefers to start with the pronouns *ixé, endé* (or *indé*), which are used in the position of the subject and in circumstances of elipsis, emphasis, topicalization or contrast (Navarro 1997: 4; cf. Seki 2000: 62).<sup>28</sup> The second series *xe, nde* (or *ne*), *i, oré, îande, pe, i* is used with predicative adjectives (*xe porang*: “I (am) nice”), *nde porang*, etc.). Independent possessive pronouns or adjectives do not exist in Tupi. The pronouns from the second series correspond with ‘possessives’: (*xe anama* “my family”). The ‘empoverishment’ of the pronominal system in the anonymous grammar of the *língua geral amazônica* – compared with the paradigms of Anchieta and Figueira



– can be the result of the second language acquisition process of any non-Tupi speakers - or maybe more specifically – of interference or contact between the *Língua geral* and Portuguese, as Schmidt-Riese observed (1998: 213 and 326).

### 5.2.3 Articles and particles in other grammars from the Portuguese tradition (Mamiani, Estevão, Rodrigues)

In the Kiriri grammar of Luis Vicêncio Mamiani, we can see that the ‘artigo’ also plays a central part in the paradigms. In ‘traditional’ grammars the article marks case, gender and number; in the Kiriri language it is a ‘declension marker’, according to Mamiani:

Os pronomes relativos *Hic, Iste, Ille, Ipse, Is*, se são nominativo do verbo, se explicão com o artigo proprio da terceira pessoa do verbo. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 8)

In another section, the ‘particle’ is used as synonym for ‘artigo’, which can be appended both to nouns and verbs:

Os pronomes possessivos *Meus, Tuus, Noster, Vester*, se explicão com hum artigo, ou particular [...]. Porém, tem alguma variedade entre si assim os nomes como os verbos em alguns artigos, ou particulas, que se ajuntão diversamente, & servem aos nomes de pronomes possessivos *Meus, Tuus, Suus*, & aos verbos de pronomes substãtivos *Ego, Tu, Ille*. A diversidade destes artigos he o fundamento de dividirmos os nomes, & verbos em diversas Declinações: & porque os mesmos artigos servem assim aos nomes, como aos verbos, a mesma divisão serve de regra commua a huns, & a outros. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 9-10)

According to Mamiani, modes, tenses are not morphologically distinguished (“todos os verbos quantos ha, se conjugão por hum estilo, & com a mesma terminação em cada hum dos modos, & tempos”, Mamiani 1877[1699]: 26). They are distinguished by ‘artigos’:

A diversidade toda que tem huns dos outros, consiste nas tres pessoas, que se fórmão com os artigos compostos com os mesmos verbos, & correspõdem a *Ego, Tu, Ille*... De maneira que todos os verbos são de huma conjugação, & se dividem em cinco Declinaçoens pelos artigos dos pronomes, que são varios conforme a diversidade dos Verbos.... Que serve tambem aos verbos, & lá dissemos que he commum aos Nomes, & Verbos. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 26-27)

In another section, Mamiani gives examples of the use of isolated, or ‘free pronouns’ opposed to the clitical ‘artigos’, probably inspired by the Tupi grammars:

Dissemos que os verbos trazem comsigo compostos os artigos dos Pronomes conforme as cinco Declinaçoens. Porém não sempre se usam deste modo, mas recebem tambem o Pronome Substantivo separado: v.g. *Hibýsapri*, Eu sou açoutado, se póde dizer tambem, *Býsapri hietçã*. *Ecotò*, tu furtas, ou *Cotò ewatçã*”. (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 71)<sup>29</sup>.

In Asia we see also that both ‘artigo’ and ‘particula’ are used for particular aims and in specific contexts. For Thomas Stephens, the particles are used to mark cases (“as particulas, que diuizaõ os casos... Esteuão 1640: 25r.). Rodrigues in his Japanese grammars added two independent parts of speech, the ‘artigo’ and the ‘particula’ to the traditional eight parts, breaking with tradition where the smallest part of any ‘part of speech’ must be a word, not a smaller unit as a case ending, or what we call today ‘morphemes’. Rodrigues’ creative solution is as follows:

O artigo compreende certas particulas, que respondem aos casos latinos juntas aos nomes: de modo que artigo he huma parte da oração, que junta aos nomes mostra em que caso esteja o tal nome, conforme ao Latim. (Rodrigues 1604-1608: 167)

Several classes of particles are also described, among others, the so-called ‘particulas articulares’,<sup>30</sup> and there are very few examples in other grammars where attempts are made to subclassify the ‘particles’.<sup>31</sup> The grammars in Brazil did not go so far as Rodrigues; they still allow eight parts of speech, but they used the ‘artigo’ in well-considered circumstances.

### 5.3 *The pronomes extravagantes*

The definition of the pronoun in the anonymous grammar is as follows: “Pronome he aquelle, que se põe em lugar do nome de qualquer cousa”, which is an exact copy of Figuera’s (1878[1687]: 84-85) and different from Álvares’s (1972[1572]: 51r;). A novelty, however, is the use of the category of the so-called “pronomes extravagantes”:

Uíá uíae	“aquelles, aquellas”
Masá	“qual”
Eboquói, Eboquéi	“esse, essa”, etc., “eis la vai”, “certamente” <sup>32</sup>

Uieépe, mîeépe	“aquillo que lá está longe a perder de vista”
Acoí, Aquei, aquieoaé	“aquelle”
Aipó	“este”, “aquillo em que tinhamos fallado”
Ipó	“isso” (ff. 132-135)

This new category is an extension of the list given by Figueira, since the latter is far from instructive; any explanation is missing:

Aé, Aéäé, Aëmémé, elle, elles. Có, Icó, este estes. Cóbäe, Ang, Iang, Anga, Vi, I, Guí, Ebuí, Ebuínga, esse, esses. Akér, Aquéia, Eboquéi, Eboquéia, Aipó, Aipóbäe, este, esse, esses, estes. Os quaes todos, & alguns mais, que se acharem deste genero, servem a ambos os numeros, a qualquer pessoa, & genero. (Figueira 1878[1687]: 85)

How can we explain the term “pronomes extravagantes”? The anonymous introduced this term since he felt the necessity to give some more detailed explanations (ff. 132- 135), which is lacking in the grammars of Anchieta and Figueira. Some are quite precise (“distinction between visible and not visible”), others are rather vague and often the criteria used are far from clear. The Tupi language distinguishes between demonstratives for referring to ‘visible’ objects or persons: *kó* (or *ikó*) = (Port. ‘este’), *ebokûei*, *eboûing*, *eboûi*, *ûi* (Port. ‘esse’), and *kûei*, *kûe*, *ûi*, etc. (Port. ‘aquele’, etc.) and not visible ones, which are only in the mind: *a*, *ang*, *i’a*, *i’ang*, etc. (Port. ‘este’), also used for visible beings, *aîpó*, *a’e*, *akó*, *akûei*, (Port. ‘esse’, etc. ‘aquele’, etc.). (Navarro 1997: 20-21). The fact that the Portuguese language does not make the distinction between visible and invisible, explains why these pronouns are labelled as ‘extravagantes’. The anonymous invented a new subclass, probably for didactic reasons. The term ‘extravagantes’ can be interpreted literally as an adjective derived from “extravagar” (=‘andar fora de certo ordem’, which means, beyond the rules and subcategorisations of traditional grammar).

## 6. Conclusion

The anonymous grammar is written in the same style as the other grammars of indigenous languages of Brazil; the same descriptive techniques and didactic methods are used. Definitions of the parts of speech are almost always verbatim the same as those of Figueira. Different from Anchieta and Figueira is the information about language use, variation and frequency. However, no distinction is made between



regional dialects, as happens in Anchieta. It is not so very probable that this anonymous author ever used the Latin grammar of Álvares. “Alvaristic elements” are probably copied from Figueira who was his most important source. It is significant that the author mentions that he has seen other sources and that he knew more than one Amerindian language, but it is difficult to ascertain which works he could have seen, apart from the grammars discussed here. It is not impossible that the anonymous author had access to the Kiriri grammar of Mamiani.

Concerning the metalanguage, we can conclude that the definition of the “comparativo” of the anonymous can be related to Barros “tem alguma vantagem ou maioria mais que aquella” and it is significant that a different metalanguage is used for the comparative and superlative forms for every language (‘syllaba’ for the construction of the Latin synthetic form, ‘palaura’ for the analytical Portuguese construction with ‘mais’ and finally the ‘particula’ *pyrib* for the *Língua geral amazônica*). In this case, any language had its own ‘metalinguistic’ terms.

There are not only some extensions in the anonymous grammar, but in other cases we see reductions, for instance in the lists of interjections and conjunctions. In the description of the pronoun, the anonymous apparently did not use Álvares, but again Figueira was his model, but in the section concerning the so-called ‘pronomes extravagantes’ a more detailed analysis is given of the system of the demonstratives than Figueira did. This section was confusing and unclear in the grammar of Figueira and missing in Anchieta’s grammar. This subclass has been added for didactic reasons and they are labelled as ‘extravagantes’ since they did not match the Portuguese system.

The extensions of the anonymous are significant, although most sections are copied almost verbatim from Figueira. These extensions reflect some ‘innovative’ aspects, which we can label as individual or creative solutions. The anonymous did not write an entirely new grammar, but it contains some remarkable details.

I wish to observe that comparing the Portuguese grammars with those of the Spanish tradition shows a slightly different tendency: The Spanish tradition basically relied on the Latin grammar of Antonio de Nebrija, and not so significantly on his Castilian grammar. In the Portuguese tradition, however, we find more traces of the vernacular grammars or their approaches, in particular the vernacular grammars by Oliveira and Barros, although the macrostructure always has been, directly or indirectly, the model of Álvares. This tendency becomes visible in the creative solution of the “non-Alvaristic” elements, such as the ‘artigo’, which came from the vernacular grammars. Since this ‘empty class’ in Latin grammar became available in vernacular grammars, most

missionaries from the Portuguese tradition attempted to use the term for several linguistic phenomena which enabled them to describe: (1) in Portuguese the absence of an inflected noun and the contraction of the article and the prepositions which substituted the Latin case system, (2) in Japanese the ‘case markers’, and (3) in Portuguese America where the ‘artigo’ has been used for the personal prefixes, distinct from the free personal pronouns.

Finally, these sources can be studied with two different purposes: the history of linguistics and the history of language. From the first century of the pioneer work of Anchieta up to 1750, the year of completion of the anonymous grammar, not only the grammars gradually changed; the linguistic facts themselves also have been changing continuously. The descriptions of the pronominal system from different periods are important evidence of these changes. The anonymous author demonstrates in his grammar that the ‘common’ speech of his own days was different from the registers of earlier periods, although it was ‘menos polida’ it was still ‘mais usada’, whereas a register which was ‘muy polida’, was ‘pouco usada’. Without any doubt, this is one of the most important contributions of the anonymous author, since earlier authors never paid attention to different registers or ways of speaking, but only commented on regional variety.

## Notas

1. This article is an elaborated version of my lecture presented at the XIth International Conference on the History of Language Sciences, University of São Paulo and the University of Campinas, August 29<sup>th</sup> – September 1<sup>st</sup> 2002. Participation at the conference has been made possible by the Department of Classical and Romance Languages (KRI), University of Oslo and the Norges Forskningsråd.
2. The Kiriri language is also called Kariri or Kipeá, an extinct language of the Macro Jê family, once spoken between the Itapicuru and the São Francisco river in Bahia and southern Sergipe.
3. Mention has been made of a grammar written by Manuel Viegas (ca. 1533-1608) of the Maromomi language of the Guarulhos Indians, East of São Paulo in cooperation with Joseph de Anchieta, but this grammar is lost. (Rodrigues 1977: 371; Barros 1995: 8, Ayrosa 1967: 40, 43-44).
4. Figueira compares the pronunciation of <k> with Greek: “K, he proprio: porque fere asperamente E.I.Y. como o profirimos na diçaõ Grega Kyrie (1878[1687]:3). When Figueira discovered that agreement between the subject and verb in Tupi was not according to the rules of Latin grammar, he prefers not to call such different features ‘barbarisms’, because there is an excuse for Tupinambá: “Parecera barbaria, concordar terceira pessoa no singular, com a primeira do plural. Mas naõ he de estranhar, pois tambem na lingua Grega elegantissima temos exemplo semelhante, porque comumente os nomes neutros no plural, pedem o verbo no singular: ut Zóa tréki, Animalia currit” (1878[1687]:99) and Figueira even adds that such fe-



- atures are “modos de fallar de varias linguas” which is also evidence for the fact that Figueira knew something about more languages. Although he doesn’t specify which languages share this feature, but it is not impossible that he refers here to other Amerindian languages than Tupinambá. Note that agreement asymmetry in Arabic is also explained in terms of ‘elegance’ (cf. Zwartjes (2007)).
5. It is not so clear why we find this subject on one of the first pages. It is remarkable that in the Tamil grammar of Enriques, a similar paragraph concerning the ‘dativus pretii’ is also appended in a section where we don’t expect this. This subject has been called a ‘page filler’ by Vermeer (1982: xx). The anonymous grammar includes the same ‘dativo de proveito’ once again at the end (f.355), a quite strange practice.
  6. The use of the Língua geral is decreasing in the Spanish-speaking countries and is more persistent in the Brazilian territories (Mosonyi 1997:603).
  7. This can explain the differences in, for instance, the lexicon (cf. the table of Rodrigues 2002: 104 with the dictionary of the anonymous manuscript).
  8. This distinction is also made in two Portuguese Jesuit grammars written in India: cf. (Enriques f.39r. and f. 55r.; Vermeer 1982: xx).
  9. Cf. “...algumas vezes succede ser elegantissimo ambas juntas [the particles *ra*, *racó*], como fazem os ladinos por melindre nesta” (f. 131) and “alguns indios mais ladinos nos imitão no optativo” (f.148).
  10. It is difficult to say which grammar (whether Anchieta’s or Figueira’s) has been referred to as the “arte antiga”. Anchieta describes the use of *mã* as follows: “Optativo. O primeiro tempo do optativo (vt supa) sempre significa futuro, o se eu matasse cõ algumas partes praeteriti temporis pode significar, perfeito & plusquã perfeito, o segundo sempre significa preterito. Alem disto, notesse que a particula, *mã*, sempre ha dir no fim, ainda que se interponhão outras partes, vt *Açõtemo ibã-cupe mã*, o se eu fosse ao Ceo, *Açõmeimo ibãcupemã*. Please note that Anchieta describes the optionality of *mã* which can be omitted in the future of the optative and in that case *mã* is “sub intellecto” (Anchieta 1990[1595]: 24v, cf. Figueira 1878[1687]: 16-17) who also could have been the source of inspiration, since we find the same forms as in Anchieta).
  11. Anonymous (f. 174), Anchieta (1990[1595] f. 40r.) and Figueira (1878[1687]: 120-121).
  12. Anonymous (f. 179), cf. Figueira (1878[1687]: 126). Figueira’s subclasses can be found in (1878[1687]: 136).
  13. Anonymous (f. 194), cf. Figueira (1878[1687]: 147) and Zwartjes (2002: 51).
  14. Cf. the observations concerning the verb ‘to be’. “o verbo sum tem tres significações mais precisas, e necessarias a todos os idiomas” (f.141).
  15. Álvares (1972[1572]: 48r.) and Figueira (1878[1687]: 68-69).
  16. “Verbo he huma ordem de palavras, que per si fallão, que a subtileza dos homens tem inventado para saberem com fundamento *todos os idiomas* (f.135, italics are mine).
  17. João de Barros is more precise in his metalanguage, labelling ‘mais’ as an adverb (1971[1540]: 8r.).
  18. *I marangatu-eté nde sui* (“Ele (e) mais bondoso que tu”); *I marangatu-pyryb-í nde sui* (“Ele (e) um pouquinho mais bondoso que tu”) (Navarro 1997: 416). No trace of *pyryb* in Anchieta’s grammar under (*çui*), where for the comparative *ete* is mentioned (1990[1595]: 43r.); cf. Figueira’s example on f. 123 (*çui*) where no trace of *pyryb* is found either, nor in the Kamaiurá language, where comparisons are expressed with a *’ia ’ip* (Seki 2000: 307-308). For *ete* in Guarani see also Ruiz de Montoya (1994[1640]:7).



19. “Assi os artigos, como o pronome, tem duas terminações, ou formulas na primeira pessoa do plural, como vemos. A primeira formula inclue em si a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos; ut Iajucá, nos matamos, s. nos, & vos tambem con nosco. A 2. formula exclue a pessoa, ou pessoas, com que fallamos: ut Orojucá, nós outros matamos, não entrando vos nisso” (Figueira 1878[1687]: 11).
20. See Zwartjes (1993) and Ramajo Caño (1987: 65-66). The Greek word ‘arthron’ means link, joint and sometimes the term was used for such a purpose, being a link between verb and noun. The proposition has this function, as described by Philip Melanchthon (quoted in Padley 1976:51).
21. The declension of the ‘artigo’: nom. *o*, gen. *dos*, dat. *ao*, etc. Pedro de Alcalá, the same as Barros, did not separate the prepositions from the articles, also called ‘conocimientos’: *mital*, *lal*, *lil*, *bal*, etc., see Zwartjes 1993: 279).
22. In Hebrew the article, several prepositions and the clitic personal and possessive pronouns are graphically attached to the noun, forming a graphical and phonological unit. It is possible that Barros took his information from the *Biblia Políglota*, where the Hebrew article is described. (*Introductiones* in: *Biblia Políglota* f. XVr.).
23. For a more complete description of the pronominal system in Tupi, see Navarro (1997:7), Reich (2003), Rodrigues (1999:117-118) and Leite (2005:195-197).
24. Sometimes, the Latin term is used: ‘articulum’.
25. The Anonymous also gives the synonym ‘sinais’, (f.143) cf. the ‘señal de demostración’, a synonym for the article in the Arabic grammar of Pedro de Alcalá (Zwartjes 1993).
26. Also on (f. 129) and (f. 355).
27. To be translated to Portuguese as “Faço-a a comida”, cf. Spanish “La comida la preparo”.
28. Example: *Abá-pe o-so? –Endé*. “Who was it? ; You”.
29. A remarkable feature of the Kiriri language is the fact that the ‘artigo’ can also be ‘infixed’ instead of ‘prefixed’ when the verb is a composite: “Ha alguns verbos nesta lingua compostos, que mudão o artigo dos Pronomes conforme as pessoas, não no principio do verbo como os mais, mas no meyo; a saber, no principio do segundo membro da composição, assim como se disse nos Nomes compostos com composição direita, v.g. *Craráunù*, roncar; se diz, *Crarádzunù*, eu ronco, *Craraanù*, tu roncas, *Crarásunù*, elle ronca” (Mamiani 1877[1699]: 72).
30. Cf. Maruyama (2004).
31. An exception is the grammar of Aymara by Bertonio who introduces the terms ‘particulas generaliter symbolas’, the ‘particulas particulariter symbolas’ and the ‘particulas dyssymbolas’ (Bertonio 1612: 115-116), a novelty.
32. In Figueira’s grammar, ‘eboquei’ is an ‘adverbio demonstrativo’ (1878[1687]: 134) and the anonymous appears to be inconsequent, since he does the same in his dictionary where he classifies ‘Eboquói’, ‘Eboqueí’ and ‘Aquoi’ as ‘demonstrative adverbs’ too.

## Bibliographical References

### A. Primary sources

- ÁLVARES, M. 1972[1572]. *De Institvtione grammatica libri tres*. Olyssipone: Excudebat Ioannes Barrerius, Typographus Regius. (Facsimile ed. prepared by J. Pereira da Costa, Funchal: Junta Geral do Distrito Autónomo do Funchal).

- ANCHIETA, J. de. 1990[1595]. *Arte de grammatica da lingoa mais vsada na costa do Brasil*. Coimbra: Antonio de Mariz. (Edição fac-similar de Carlos Drumond. São Paulo: Edições Loyola).
- ANONYMOUS. 1750. Gramatica da lingua geral do Brasil. Com hum Dicionario dos vocabulos mais uzuaes para a intelligencia da dita Lingua. Ms, códice 69 da Biblioteca da Universidade de Coimbra.
- BARROS, J. de. 1971[1540]. *Grammatica da lingua portuguesa*. Olyssipone (Lisbon): Apud Lodouicum Rotorigum Typographum. (Ed. facsimilada por Maria Leonor Carvalhão Buescu, *Gramática da língua portuguesa: Cartinha, gramática, diálogo em louvor da nossa linguagem e diálogo da viciosa vergonha*. Lisboa: Publicações da faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa).
- BERTONIO, L. 1612. *Arte de la lengva aymara, con vna silva de Phrases dela mesma lengua, y su declaracion en Romance*. Iuli: Francisco del Canto.
- ENRIQUEZ, E. 1982[1548]. *Arte da Lingua Malabar*. Ed. Hans J. Vermeer. English version by Angelika Morath. Heidelberg: Julios Groos Verlag.
- ESTEUÃO, T. 1640. *Arte da lingoa canarim, composta pelo padre Thomaz Esteuão da Companhia de Iesvs & acrecentada pello Padre Diogo Ribeiro da mesma Cõpanhia e nouamente reuista & emendada por outros padres da mesma Companhia*. Rachol: Collegio de S. Ignacio da Companhia de Iesv.
- FIGUEIRA, L. 1878[1687]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. (Facsimile da edição de 1687 por Julio Platzmann. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1878).
- Introductiones artis grāmāticae hebraice* [1515]. In: *Biblio políglota complutensis* [1514-1517] 1983-1984. By the direction of Francisco Ximénez de Cisneros and Diego López de Zúñiga. Alcalá de Henares: Arnaldo Guillermon de Brocardo. Facsimile edition: Rome: Gregorian University Polyglott Press. Vol. VI ff. 1-15v.
- MAMIANI, L. V. 1877[1699]. *Arte de grammatica da lingua brasilica da naçam Kiriri*. Lisboa: Miguel Deslandes. Segunda edição publicada a expensas da Biblioteca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro. Rio de Janeiro: Typ. Central de Brown & Evaristo.
- OLIVEIRA, F. de. 1933[1536]. *Grammatica da lingoagem portuguesa*. Ed. Rodrigo de Sá Nogueira. Lisboa: Tipografia Beleza.
- RODRIGUEZ, J. 1604-1608. *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam*. Nagasaki: Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de Iesu.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1620. *Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa da arte grande da mesma lingoa, pera os que começam a aprender os primeiros principios della*. Macao: Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de IESV.



RUIZ DE MONTROYA, A. 1994[1640]. *Arte, y Bocabvlario de la lengua gvarani*. Madrid: Iuan Sanchez. Ed. S.M. Liuzzi. Madrid: Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica (2 vols.).

### **B. Secondary Sources**

- AYROSA, P. 1967. *Estudos tupinológicos*. São Paulo: Universidade de São Paulo, Publicação do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros.
- BARROS, M. C. D. M. 1995. "Os 'línguas' e a gramática tupi no Brasil (século XVI)". Troiani, *et al.*, eds. 3-14.
- DIXON, R.M.W. & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, eds. 1999. *The Amazonian Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- FREIRE, J. R. B., eds. 2003. *Línguas gerais. Política lingüística e Catequese na América do Sul no Período Colonial*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora da Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.
- KERKHOF, M. P.A.M., Hugo de Schepper & Otto Zwartjes, eds. 1993. *España: ¿Ruptura 1492?*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi.
- LEITE, Y. 2005. "Arte de gramática da língua mais usada na costa do Brasil: A criterion for evaluation". Zwartjes & Altman, eds. 191-204.
- MARUYAMA, T. 2004. "Linguistic Studies by Portuguese Jesuits in Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Japan". Zwartjes & Hovdhaugen, eds. 141-160.
- MOSONYI, E. E. 1997. "Nuestros idiomas merecen vivir: el dilema lingüístico del Río Negro". Pachón & Correa, eds., 587-661.
- NAVARRO, E. de A. 1999. *Método moderno de tupi antigo. A língua do Brasil dos primeiros séculos*. Petrópolis: Editora Vozes. (first edition 1998).
- NYSTEDT, J., ed. 2000. *XIV Skandinaviska Romanistkongressen. Stockholm 10-15 augusti 1999*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International (Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Romanica Stockholmiensia 19).
- PACHÓN, X. & FRANÇOIS CORREA, eds. 1997. *Lenguas amerindias. Condiciones socio-lingüísticas en Colombia*. Edición dirigida por Elsa Benavides. Bogotá: Caro y Cuervo.
- PADLEY, G.A. 1976. *Grammatical Theory in Western Europe. 1500-1700. The Latin Tradition*. Cambridge, etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- POZUELO YVANCOS, J. M. 1986. "Norma, uso y autoridad en la teoría lingüística del siglo XVI". Quilis & Niederehe, eds., 77-94.
- QUILIS, A. & NIEDEREHE, Hans-J., eds. 1986. *The History of Linguistics in Spain*. Amsterdam- Philadelphia: John Benjamins.



- RAMAJO CAÑO, A. 1987. *Las gramáticas de la lengua castellana desde Nebrija a Correas*. Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca.
- REICH, U. 2003. “Mudança sintática e pragmática na Língua Geral Amazônica (LGA): Marcação de caso e sistema pronominal”. Freire & Rosa, eds. 167-184.
- RODRIGUES, A. D. 1997. “Descripción del tupinambá en el período colonial: el *Arte* de José de Anchieta”. Zimmermann, ed., 371-400.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. “Tupí”. Dixon & Aikhenvald, eds., 107-124.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. *Línguas Brasileiras. Para o conhecimento das línguas indígenas*. São Paulo: Edições Loyola. First edition: 1994.
- ROSA, M. Ca. 1995. “Acerca das duas primeiras descrições missionárias de língua geral”. Duna Troiani, et al., eds., 273-284.
- SCHÄFER, B. 1993. “Die Verbalmodi in den Grammatiken von Manuel Alvares (1572) und Bento Pereira (1672)”. *Historiographia Linguistica*, 20, 2/3: 283-308.
- SCHMIDT-RIESE, R. 1998. “Perspectivas diacrônicas brasileiras: O rastro das línguas gerais”. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch*, 49:307-335.
- SEKI, L. 2000. *Gramática do Kamaiurá. Língua Tupi-Guarani do Alto Xingu*. Campinas – São Paulo: Editora da Unicamp – Imprensa Oficial.
- TROIANI, D., et al., eds. 1995. *La “découverte” des langues et des écritures d’Amérique. Actes du colloque international, Paris, 7–11 septembre 1993. (= Amerindia: Revue d’ethnolinguistique amérindienne, 19/20.)* Paris: Association d’Ethnolinguistique Amérindienne.
- VERMEER, H. J. 1982. *The First European Tamil Grammar. A Critical Edition by Hans J. Vermeer. English Version by Angelika Morath*. Heidelberg: Julios Groos Verlag.
- ZIMMERMANN, K., ed. 1997. *La descripción de las lenguas amerindias en la época colonial*. Frankfurt am Main/ Madrid: Klaus vervuert/ Iberoamericana.
- ZWARTJES, O. 1993. “El artículo en las gramáticas pioneras de A. de Nebrija y P. de Alcalá y las gramáticas grecolatinas”. Kerkhof, et al., eds., 261-286.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. “Norma y uso en las gramáticas misioneras hispánicas en la época colonial”. Nystedt, ed., 404-418.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 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 Alvares”. *Historiographia Linguistica* 29:1/2.19-70.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. “Agreement Asymmetry in Arabic according to Spanish Missionary grammarians from Damascus (XVIIIth century). Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, eds. 273-303.

\_\_\_\_\_. & ALTMAN, C., eds. 2005. *Missionary Linguistics II / Lingüística misionera II. Orthography and Phonology. Selected Papers from the Second International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, São Paulo, 10–13 March 2004*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

\_\_\_\_\_. & HOVDHAUGEN, E. eds. 2004. *Missionary Linguistics [I] / Lin-güística misionera [I]. Selected Papers from the First International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Oslo, 13–16 March 2003*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

\_\_\_\_\_. JAMES, G. & RIDRUEJO, E. (eds.). 2007. *Missionary Linguistics III: Morphology and Syntax. Selected papers from the Third and Fourth International Conferences on Missionary Linguistics, Hong Kong/ Macau, March 12-15, 2005, Valladolid, March 7-11, 2006*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

**Palavras-chave:** “Língua geral”, partes do discurso, comparativo, superlativo

**Key-words:** “Língua geral”, Parts of speech, comparative, superlative

