



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Chinese in the grammars of Tagalog and Japanese of the Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688-1747)

Klöter, H.; Zwartjes, O.

**Publication date**  
2008

**Published in**  
Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Klöter, H., & Zwartjes, O. (2008). Chinese in the grammars of Tagalog and Japanese of the Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688-1747). *Histoire, Épistémologie, Langage*, 30(2), 177-197.

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

**CHINESE IN THE GRAMMARS OF TAGALOG AND JAPANESE  
OF THE FRANCISCAN MELCHOR OYANGUREN DE SANTA INÉS  
(1688-1747)**

**Henning Klöter & Otto Zwartjes**

National Taiwan Normal University / University of Amsterdam, NIAS, Wassenaar

**RÉSUMÉ :** Le franciscain d'origine basque Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés, né en 1668, a œuvré comme missionnaire en Cochinchine, aux Philippines et au Mexique où il est décédé en 1747. Il a composé une grammaire du japonais (1738) et une grammaire du tagalog (1742) qui contiennent un nombre considérable de sections dévolues à l'enseignement du chinois, le sujet de cet article. Oyanguren est l'un des premiers érudits à avoir développé une théorie qui distingue la suffixation de la flexion, comparant un grand nombre de langues typologiquement différentes, telles que le basque, le tagalog, le japonais, le chinois, le grec, le latin, l'hébreu, le nahuatl et les vernaculaires romans. Son œuvre précède les ouvrages de Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (1735-1809) et Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835). En respectant ce qui était déjà connu à partir de sources telles que Francisco Varo (1627-1687), les paragraphes dédiés au chinois ne fournissent pas un éclairage nouveau, ni des approches innovantes dans l'analyse. Néanmoins, les comparaisons linguistiques transversales d'Oyanguren sont uniques pour la période en question. En particulier, ses tentatives de décrire des coïncidences entre deux langues agglutinantes sans relation, le basque et le japonais, et une langue à préfixes et suffixes comme le tagalog, en les mettant en contraste avec les traits typologiques d'une langue isolante comme le chinois, doivent être considérées comme une contribution importante dans l'histoire de la linguistique.

**MOTS CLÉS :** Linguistique missionnaire ; Basque ; Chinois ; Japonais ; Tagalog ; Typologie linguistique ; Linguistique comparative ; Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchior ; 18<sup>e</sup> s.

**ABSTRACT :** The Franciscan Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés of Basque origin was born in 1668. He worked as a missionary in Cochinchina, the Philippines and in Mexico, where he died in 1747. He composes a grammar of Japanese (1738) and Tagalog (1742), containing a considerable number of sections devoted to the teaching of Chinese, the subject of this article. Oyanguren is one of the first scholars who developed a theory which distinguishes suffixation from inflection, comparing a great number of typologically different languages, such as Basque, Tagalog, Japanese, Chinese, Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Náhuatl and Romance vernaculars, antedating the works of Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (1735-1809) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835). With respect to what was already known from sources such as Francisco Varo (1627-1687), the paragraphs dedicated to Chinese do not provide any new insights or innovative analytical approaches. Nevertheless, his cross-linguistic comparisons are unique for the period in question. Particularly his attempts to describe coincidences between two unrelated agglutinative languages, Basque and Japanese, and a language which has prefixes and suffixes as Tagalog, contrasting them with the typological features of an isolating language as Chinese, are to be considered an important contribution in the history of linguistics.

**KEYWORDS :** Missionary linguistics ; Basque ; Chinese ; Japanese ; Tagalog ; Typological linguistics ; Comparative linguistics ; Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchior ; 18<sup>th</sup> century.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As has been observed by Schreyer (1992, p. 1), the history of the discovery of the Chinese language in the West has not yet been written. The Catholic missions to China go back as far as the thirteenth century when Franciscans such as Giovanni da Piano Carpini (died in 1252), William of Rubruck (ca. 1215-1270) and Giovanni da Monte Corvino (1247-1328) set foot in China. There is no evidence for any linguistic studies of Chinese by the Franciscans during the middle ages, as is the case of the medieval practical handbook *Codex Cumanicus*, which contains several glossaries in Italo-Latin, Persian, German and Cuman Kipçaq, a Turkic language, together with a grammatical compendium and Cuman riddles. The traveller Marco Polo (1254-1324) did not mention the Chinese language, which explains why Christopher Columbus (1451-1506) took on his way to “Cathay” a Jewish interpreter who could speak Hebrew and Arabic (Schreyer 1992, p. 3). In Asia, the ‘linguistic discovery’ started in the sixteenth century. There, European priests encountered languages with a long-standing literary tradition and high cultural prestige. They could benefit from the knowledge of teachers who taught their languages to foreigners. Language teaching involved the teaching of non-European writing systems and native linguistic models which had been developed not only for the languages in question, but also for other languages which were absorbed into the cultures where these languages became prestigious for several reasons. This happened with Arabic in the Muslim world, Sanskrit and Pali in association with Buddhism, and Chinese, which became the prestigious literary language of Japan, Korean and Vietnam (cf. Bossong 2007, p. 126). The Asian-European linguistic encounter contrasts sharply with missionary linguistics in the Americas, where the priests could not rely on any written material and had to develop their own.

The Jesuit Francis Xavier (1506-1552) is one of the first missionaries who mentioned the difference between Chinese and Japanese. The languages were not mutually intelligible but he concluded that “when they write they understand each other only by writing, for they know the signification of the letters, but the pronunciation always remains different” (Nachod 1922, p. 257 n. 3<sup>1</sup> *apud* Schreyer 1992, p. 5).

The Jesuits became engaged in writing Chinese dictionaries in the late sixteenth century, although it is curious that no comprehensive grammars were published, as it happened in Japan (for details, see Brockey 2007). The Jesuit

---

<sup>1</sup> Oscar Nachod (1858-1933): “Die ersten Kenntnisse chinesischer Schriftzeichen im Abendlande”. *Hirth Anniversary Volume* 1922, p. 235-273. London, Asia Minor. Compare also the observation of Nicolas Trigault (1577-1628) cited from the English translation entitled *China in the Sixteenth Century. The Journals of Mathew Ricci: 1583-1610*. 1953 [1615]. New York, Random House: “For instance the Japanese, the Koreans, the people of Cochin, and the Leuhians have books which are common to all, but they differ so widely in their spoken languages that no one of them can understand the others. [...] I have heard that over and above the symbols which they have received from the Chinese, the Japanese also have an alphabet and certain elements similar to our own, which enables them to write their own vernacular without the endless series of Chinese ideographs”, cited from Schreyer (1992, p. 16).

Michele Ruggieri (1543-1607) focused on learning Mandarin (*guanhua*)<sup>2</sup> the quasi standard of the literati-officials, and did not attempt to describe one of the regional vernaculars. Unlike the Portuguese Jesuit João Rodrigues (1561-1634), who could benefit from earlier attempts of missionaries to describe the Japanese language, Ruggieri could only rely on native speakers and had no earlier descriptions by missionaries at his disposal. Unable to find a bilingual Mandarin-Portuguese tutor, he was left learning Mandarin on his own, a “ridiculous task”, as he conceded. He decided to learn Chinese in the same manner as the Chinese learned themselves and also learned Chinese from his Chinese master drawing pictures (Brockey 2007, p. 246). Later he started to study Chinese books in Canton.

Matteo Ricci (1552-1610) and Francesco Pasio (1554-1612) could benefit from the work of their predecessors. Ricci realised that the Chinese language had “neither articles, nor cases, nor numbers, nor genders, nor tenses, nor modes” (Brockey 2007, p. 247), but as far as we know, he did not attempt to write a grammar. Together with Ruggieri, Ricci compiled his *Dicionário Português-Chinês* a dictionary of Portuguese words, Chinese characters, and their romanizations between 1583 and 1588. As has been observed by Brockey, “the first missionaries employed the same texts that Chinese children learned by rote to increase their vocabulary and practice writing characters” (Brockey 2007, p. 248-249). Serious study of the Mandarin tone system started later, around 1598/1599, when Lazzaro Cattaneo (1560-1640) and Sebastian Fernandes (1562-1621), under Ricci’s direction, devised a Mandarin tone marking system (Witek 2001, p. 160). The importance of Macao gradually diminished in the missionary enterprise, since Jesuits abandoned the college of Macao for language training (Brockey 2007, p. 251), which explains why grammars of Chinese written in Portuguese are non-existent. The most important early descriptions of Chinese are particularly those written in Spanish by the Dominicans and Franciscans who “spent their formative years amid the Fujianese sojourners in Manila” (Brockey 2007, p. 259).

In various respects, Manila was an important place in the history of Chinese missionary linguistics. In the early seventeenth century, Manila-based Dominicans translated parts of the Christian doctrine into the language of the overseas Chinese community (for details, see Van der Loon 1966, 1967). The Chinese in the Philippines spoke dialects of the Southern Mǐn group. As they are mutually unintelligible, Southern Mǐn and Mandarin can be considered two different languages. Most Chinese in the Philippines were merchants and labourers. They were commonly referred to as “Sangleyes”, which possibly derives from the word *seng-li* “business” in Southern Mǐn. Aside from translations, Dominican priests also compiled a number of Spanish-Southern Mǐn dictionaries and at least one grammar (cf. Klöter 2007 and 2009 forthcoming). When the Dominicans succeeded in expanding their missionary activities to Southern China in the 1630s, they also shifted their focus of language learning from Southern Mǐn to Mandarin. This shift was largely motivated by social

---

<sup>2</sup> Mandarin at Ruggieri’s time referred to the court language of the Nanjing area and was thus not based on the pronunciation of the Beijing area, as modern Mandarin.

considerations. In their social intercourse with the Sangleyes, Mandarin had little if no communicative utility.<sup>3</sup> In China, by contrast, the Dominicans, like their Jesuit confrères, were required to communicate in Mandarin, the prestigious language of the literati-officials (Menegon 2002, p. 58-59).

It is known that the author of one of the first Mandarin grammars, the Dominican Francisco Varo (1627-1687) (Varo 2000 [1703]), studied Mandarin in Manila for one year before embarking for China in 1649 (Coblin & Levi 2000, p. x). However, as stated above, it is hard to conceive that Varo's first steps in Mandarin learning benefited from the linguistic environment of Manila. We must therefore assume that he received some kind of formal schooling organized by the Dominican order. Thus far, however, little research has been done on the installation of Mandarin education by Dominicans in Manila after the 1630s. The shift from Southern Mǐn to Mandarin language learning and documentation is just one aspect of early missionary linguistics in the Philippines. All in all, grammars and dictionaries of many different Philippine languages and even of Japanese appeared during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

In the following pages we shall focus on the work of Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés, the author of three different grammars and one dictionary. The trilingual dictionary *tagalo-castellano-cántabro* (Tagalog-Castilian-Basque), probably composed in the 1740's is lost and the same happened with his grammar of the Basque language entitled *Cantabrisimo elucidado* which has been completed in 1715.<sup>4</sup> His grammars of Tagalog and Japanese, both printed in Mexico are still extant. The Tagalog grammar contains separate sections dedicated to Chinese, and in his Japanese grammar, the author often compares several Asian languages, Japanese, Tagalog, Chinese, and occasionally Malay, Arabic, the language of Siam, one Amerindian language, Nahuatl, with European vernaculars like Castilian, Basque, Italian, etc. and classical languages, such as Greek, Latin and Hebrew. In Zwartjes (2008) we concentrated on those sections dedicated to Hebrew and here we shall analyse the sections in which Mandarin is analysed. The main research questions are the following:

- Which sources did Oyanguren use for his linguistic analysis?
- What does he know about the typology of Chinese and how can we evaluate his theories and observations in the context of the 18<sup>th</sup> century?
- What does he contribute to our knowledge of the Chinese language?

---

<sup>3</sup> As the spread of Mandarin outside the capital was largely restricted to high echelons of society, it seems hard to conceive that the Sangleyes could speak it. It thus seems safe to assume that the linguistic competence of Sangleyes during the first half of the seventeenth century was comparable to that of the overseas Chinese in Malacca two hundred years later. Describing his experience in Malacca during the early nineteenth century, the English Congregationalist Walter Henry Medhurst (1796-1857) writes “that no man in five hundred knows any thing of the Mandarin tongue, or can carry on a conversation of more than ten words in it” (1832, p. v). Alessandro Valignano (1539-1606) also reported a comparable situation in the College of Goa: “de manera que vino a quedar él solo con Antonio de Sancta Fee, que era un moço criado en el colegio de Goa, el qual, aunque era china, no sabía quasi nada de la lengua mandarín, y la lengua usada del vulgo común en Cantón hablava piadosamente. También trahya otro moço de servicio, que tampoco sabía la lengua”. (Valignano 1944 [1542-1564], p. 211)

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Oyanguren (1742, p. 70).

- How can we characterize and classify his Chinese examples? Did Oyanguren rely only on written Mandarin sources, or did he also attempt to include data from the Sangleys in Manila?
- What did he know and understand of Asian languages in general and Chinese in particular?
- What does Oyanguren contribute to the history of linguistics, particularly the history of comparative linguistics, in a period which is considerably earlier than the pioneers Lorenzo Hervás y Panduro (1735-1809) and Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835)?
- Are there other aspects which we can attribute to individual features of language description? For instance, how can we characterize the pedagogical-didactical methods used by Oyanguren, compared with his predecessors?

## 2. OYANGUREN DE SANTA INÉS. HIS LIFE AND WORK.

Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés was born in Salinas (Guipúzcoa) in 1688. He arrived in 1717 in the Philippines. After having worked as a missionary in Cochinchina he returned to the Philippines in 1725 and in 1726 he became ‘doctrinero del pueblo de los Baños de Aguas Santas’ and ‘Ministro’ in Saryaya until 1736. For health reasons he decided to return to Spain, where he never arrived. On his journey back to Europe he passed Mexico where he became ‘Presidente’ of the ‘Hospicio del convento de San Agustín de las Cuevas’ (today in Tlalpan). There he died in 1747.

His Japanese grammar entitled *Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros según el arte de Nebrixa, con algunas voces propias de la escritura, y otras de los lenguages de Ximo, y del Cami, y con algunas perifrases, y figuras* was published in Mexico (Joseph Bernardo de Hoyal) in 1738 and his second grammar of Tagalog appeared in 1742 under the title *Tagalysmo elucidado, y reducido (en lo posible) a la Latinidad de Nebrija. Con su sintaxis, tropos, prosodia, pasiones &c. y con la alusión, que en su uso y composición tiene con el Dialecto Chinico, Mandarin con las lenguas Hebrea y Griega*. This work was partially written in Latin and completed in 1723, Oyanguren completed an earlier version, which was partially written in Latin, but he decided to publish a version completely in Spanish since the first version was criticised (“no fue bien recibido” 1742, p. 3). This second version was printed in 1742 in Mexico (D. Francisco Xavier Sánchez).

The most important grammatical sources for his Japanese *Arte* were the Latin grammar of Antonio de Nebrija (c.1444-1522) and the grammar of Japanese written by the Spaniard Diego Collado (died in 1638) - who has been inspired mainly by the works of Antonio de Nebrija and João Rodrigues(1561-1634). Oyanguren’s linguistic data of Japanese are mainly derived from the anonymous *Vocabulario de Japón declarado primero en Portugués por los padres de la Compañía de Jesús de aquel Reyno, y agora en castellano en el Colegio de Santo Thomás de Manila*, printed in 1630 in Manila (Colegio de Santo Tomás), a Spanish translation of the *Vocabulario da Lingoa de Iapam com a declaração em Portugues, feito por alguns Padres, e Irmãos da Companhia de Iesu* completed in 1604 in Nagasaki. As the title indicates, the work of the Spanish grammarian

Antonio de Nebrija served as the linguistic framework which shaped his analysis of the Japanese data. Before Rodrigues, the Jesuit Duarte da Silva (1536-1564) wrote an *Arte da Lingua Japoneza* and a *Vocabulario da Lingua Japoneza* which have been lost (Streit 1928, p. 380). After the expulsion of the Christians from Japan many Christian books were burnt, and some were brought to the Philippines. Nevertheless, it is not known if these works ever reached the Philippines and could have been sources for Oyanguren. The Catholic mission in Japan came to an end when Japanese authorities started to persecute the Christians. Christians continued their language training programme outside Japan after the expulsion, but it is also documented in historical sources that even before the expulsion, Japanese teaching manuals were brought to Manila, as we can read in the letters written by Alessandro Valignano (Moran 1993, p. 157).

The grammar of the *Tagalysmo elucidado* mentions some predecessors who served as the main sources of his Tagalog data, sometimes called “los primeros Tagalistas” (1742, p. 11), and in other cases they are mentioned by name: Francisco Blancas de San José (1560-1614), Oliber de N.H.S. Gregorio de N. H. Sta Anna – not identified yet – and Gaspar de San Agustín (1646-1724) who wrote a short compendium of Tagalog in 1703. Blancas de San José has the nickname “El Cicerón Tagalog” since he wrote one of the most important pioneering works of Tagalog, although he was not the first. We have reports that around 1580, an *Arte del idioma Tagalog* was written by Juan de Plasencia Portocarrero (died in 1590), and other works are written in the period before Blancas by Bernardino de Jesús (died in 1604), Juan de Quiñones (1551-1587) (Streit 1928, p. 332, 363, 366). We cannot exclude the possibility that Oyanguren also had access to these works, and that these authors are one of these “primeros Tagalistas”. It is remarkable that Oyanguren has used mainly grammars of his predecessors but his examples are selected from dictionaries. In his Japanese grammar we find numerous references to the *Vocabulario* printed in Manila in 1630 and for his Tagalog grammar he followed the same strategy. The grammatical descriptions are mainly from Blancas de San José and Gaspar de San Agustín, but his examples are derived from the *Vocabulario* of Fr. Domingo de los Santos (died in 1695) printed in 1703.<sup>5</sup> In his prologue Oyanguren explains the reader why he preferred to use this dictionary:

Este Arte vá en un medio ni corto, ni largo, vá arreglado al Vocabulario de N. Hermano Fr. Domingo de los Santos, que mandó imprimir N. Hermano, y Padre Fr. Francisco de Santa Ynés, Chronista de la Provincia de San Gregorio, por ser este Vocabulario el mas seguido, y claro para todos: Y con esto se evitarán tantos gastos en la translacion de tantos Artes, pues estâmos obligados á la pobreza Evangelica. (1742, p. 2)

For the Chinese material, we will show that Oyanguren heavily relied on the Mandarin grammar of Varo. There are no references to Chinese vocabularies in Oyanguren’s grammar of Tagalog. We find Varo’s name in a reference where he advises to consult his work, particularly those learners who wish to advance in their acquisition of the Mandarin language, as we can read in the following citation:

---

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Sueiro Justel (2003, p. 98-99 and p. 101).

Por quanto en este Arte Tagalog, vá como encajada la substancia del Arte Chinico, ó Mandarin; declinaciones, composicion nominal, y conjugacion, y aver en él muchos vocablos, debajo de dos advertencias se insinúa su prolacion, por no dilatarme, pues se puede recurrir á los Artes<sup>6</sup> del P. Varo, de la Sagrada Religion de N.P. Santo Domingo: ò à los del P. la Piñuela, ó Fr. Basilio Glemona Recoletos de Nuestro Padre San Francisco. (1742, p. 8)

In short, Oyanguren gives regularly at the end of his comments on Tagalog an additional paragraph, often marked with an asterix, where he includes his descriptions of Chinese and he particularly focuses on the tone system, ‘declensions’, ‘nominal compositions’ and ‘conjugations’. We find often paradigms organised in two columns, on the left the Tagalog examples and on the right the Chinese examples, both accompanied with a Spanish translation (see for instance 1742, p. 178-179).<sup>7</sup>

We can infer from this citation that Oyanguren was familiar with the work of Varo and his recently published *Arte de la Lengua Mandarin* completed in 1682, but printed in Canton in 1703. Varo was not the first missionary grammarian who described Chinese. The earliest known grammars are supposed to be written by the Dominicans Juan Cobo (died in c. 1592), another by Francisco Diaz (1606-1646). The latter was written in the Philippines and a third by Juan Bautista de Morales (1597-1664) (Coblin & Levi 2000, p. ix-x). The Franciscan Pedro de la Piñuela was born in Mexico in 1650 and served as a deacon in the San Diego Province of Mexico. He arrived in Fújiàn in 1676 and proceeded to Quánzhōu and Níngdé where he had to escape the Manchu armies. He studied Chinese with Francisco Varo mainly in Mùyáng and continued his mission in Jiāngxī. He was elected Provincial Commissary of the Franciscan China mission in 1699 and he rearranged the original grammar manuscript of his teacher Francisco Varo, and added a *confessionarium* to the work by Basilio de Glemona. He died in Zhāngzhōu in 1704 (Coblin & Levi 2000, p. xii). The Franciscan Basilio Brollo de Glemona was born in Italy in 1648 and wrote also in Chinese under the name Yè Zōnghián. He also composed a *Dictionarium Sinico-Latinum*. There are reports which mention other sources of Chinese *Artes* and dictionaries composed before Varo. Streit (1928, p. 364-365 and 367) lists an *Arte de la lengua Mandarin* written by Juan Bautista de Jesús, a grammar written in Latin by Domingo de Nieva (1563-c.1606) entitled *Linguae Sinicae Grammatica* and a *Dictionarium Sinicum*, which are probably lost.

As occurs with the Japanese grammar, the Tagalog grammar was ‘shaped’ in agreement with the Latin grammar of Antonio de Nebrija, although it will be difficult to ascertain which edition exactly has been used.

<sup>6</sup> It is not impossible that Oyanguren knew other grammars of Chinese than Varo’s, since he often uses the word “artes” in plural, as in the following citation: “Las particulas proprias de muchas cosas se pueden ver en los Artes Chnicos, y otras enseñará el uso”. (1748, p. 27)

<sup>7</sup> It is remarkable that we find sometimes in the left columns Tagalog examples and on the right the Chinese equivalents of these examples (as on page 176), whereas in other cases we find Chinese examples which are not translations from the Tagalog examples in the left column (1742, p. 178). Possibly, the author was not able to translate the Tagalog examples into Chinese. He tried to find comparable examples in Varo’s grammar and inserted them in the corresponding paragraph.



### 3. OYANGUREN'S DESCRIPTION OF CHINESE

Oyanguren's references to 'Chinese' display some subtle, but nonetheless significant differences. In many instances, his wording is "the language of China, or the Mandarin dialect" ("la lengua de China, ó dialecto mandarino"), but then he also mentions the "Chinese dialects" ("dialectos Chinos"). This indicates that he had some idea of China's linguistic diversity.<sup>8</sup> However, as we will show, data from Chinese dialects other than Mandarin did not enter his analysis.

According to Oyanguren, the Chinese language is a 'short and easy' language, although he admits that the use of the tones is difficult.

Assimismo en algunas advertencias va encajada la substancia Grammatical de la Lengua Caraya, Mandarin, ò China; para que pueda servir â los Ministros Evangelicos, que Administran en las Provincias de las Yslas de Luzon; pues muchas veces succede morir algunos Chinos Christianos en los Pueblos Tagalos con el gran desconsuelo, de no aver, quien les Administre el Santo Sacramento de la Penitencia, por no entender su language; y en este breve resumen, con un poquito de comunicacion con ellos, para la comprehension de las tonadas; puede con facilidad el Missionario hacerse capaz de su language, y dâr á muchas Almas esse Consuelo; pues la Lengua Caraya es breve, y facil; aunque sus frases, y tonadas son dificultosas. (1742, p. 3)

As we have mentioned in the introduction, Oyanguren refers to Varo, Piñuela and Glemona in his grammar for those learners who wish to learn Chinese more profoundly. This makes it very probable that Oyanguren also used Varo as his main source. For reasons of space, we will not be able to give a complete analysis of all similarities and differences, but we shall limit ourselves to some illustrative parallels. In some cases, we find almost *verbatim* the same descriptions and definitions, while in others Oyanguren prefers to give a free paraphrase:

---

<sup>8</sup> Oyanguren informs the reader that Chinese can be divided into a great number of "dialects" which all derive from the same 'Matrix': "multitud de Dialectos, que ay en el Imperio derivados de una Matriz" (1742, p. 9).

## OYANGUREN

El genitivo se conoce por la partícula *tie* pospuesta (1742, p. 23)

El datibo se conoce por al partícula *in* con los verbos de dar, y si es persona superior que dá se le antepone... (1742, p. 24)

El acusativo entre los Carayos, ó Chinos no tiene partícula, ó articulo, que lo determine; y se conoce porque es regido del verbo, y se le sigue ordinariamente aunque tal vez lo anteponen... (1742, p. 24)

Lo segundo se debe advertir, que los Chinos usan de muchas voces corteses *inter loquendum*... (1742, p. 27)

Y lo mismo podíamos discurrir de los plusquamperfectos Chinos, â quienes componen con las partículas pospuestas *hûon*, *leào*, y enotras Provincias en lugar de *hûon* usan de *vûon*. (1742, p. 77)

## VARO

El genitivo se haze con la partícula *tië* pospuesta (2000 [1703], p. 56)

El dativo, en las oraciones que el verbo tiene significacion de dar, se forma con la partícula *in*... si el que da es superior se añade y antepone... (2000 [1703], p. 62)

El acusativo como se vido en las declinaciones no tiene partícula que lo determine... que le da el verbo que lo rije... algunas vezes suelen poner antes [del verbo]... (2000 [1703], p. 62)

De las palabras corteses *inter loquendum* y cortesias de las visitas... (2000 [1703], p. 196)

El Preterito plusquamperfecto se haze con estas partículas *huôn leào* o *kuó leào* pospuestas... Suelen usar en algunas partes de la partícula *vuôn* en lugar de *huôn*. (2000 [1703], p. 118).

In a separate paragraph (see below) we shall give a more detailed comparison between Oyanguren's and Varo's descriptions of the Chinese tone system.

– Notwithstanding, there are also differences between Varo and Oyanguren, which can be explained as follows:

– Oyanguren used a broader variety of sources than Varo. In his work we see remnants of his predecessors of the Tagalog and Japanese grammatical traditions. The consequence is that some divergences can be explained in that way, since there is no direct evidence for the fact that Varo also made extensive use of these Japanese and Tagalog grammars.

– In other cases, the differences can be explained as pure individual merits of Oyanguren himself. This seems to be the case – just to mention one example – with the use of the metalinguistic term 'proparticula' which – as far as we could trace – is not recorded in any source.

Aquí se debe advertir, que los Chinos tienen unas voces propartículas propias de muchas cosas, y estas son las que se colocan en la oración, como en los numerales, los cuales se hacen con la partícula *Kó* pospuesta al numeral... Las partículas propias de muchas cosas se pueden ver en los Artes Chinos, y otras enseñará el uso. (1742, p. 27)

## 4. THE FIRST STEPS TOWARD COMPARATIVE LINGUISTICS AND TYPOLOGY

Schreyer's study (1992) on the European discovery of Chinese in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries focuses on the European discovery of Chinese characters. Most citations quoted by Schreyer reflect the 'unveiling' of the so-

called mysteries of the Chinese writing system. Very little is said in this study about the typology of the Chinese language itself, apart from some observations about the assumed monosyllabic character of the language and some observations related to the tone system. Nevertheless, Europeans were encountering serious problems when they started to describe Asian languages such as Chinese, which is a language almost without derivational morphology.

Investigations in the field of morphosyntax has its parallels in the Americas where priests also came to the conclusion that many ‘European’ categories were ‘missing’ in the indigenous languages of America, such as gender, the infinitive, the gerund, etc. Chinese, in contrast, can be characterised as an “isolating language which constitutes a typological extreme (Bossong 2007, p. 127). As Bossong concludes, the study of Chinese was thus as a kind of an “eye-opener” and such languages “enable the linguist to distinguish what is essential from what is only accidental in language” (*ibid.*). Until today, one of the most important early contributions in the history of linguistics which analyses the lack of derivational morphology on the basis of traditional speech categories is Christian Mentzel (1622-1701):

- ... Ideoque characteres eorum non per grammaticae partes, v.g. nomen, pronomen, verbum, participium, adverbium, etc. possunt examinari... Sic *yen* denotat, verbum, vocem, loquelam, loqui, inquam, etc. quae omnia ex antecedentibus et non consequentibus characteribus sunt haurienda. (Mentzel 1685, p. § 23, *apud* Klein 2001, p. 49)
- ... daher können ihre Symbolzeichen auch nicht gemäß den grammatischen Redeteilen, d.h. also Nomen, Pronomen, Verb, Partizip, Adverb, usw. untersucht werden... So bedeuten das Zeichen [...] Ort, Stimme, Rede, sprechen, ich sage, usw. All dies muss aus den vorhergehenden Symbolzeichen und nicht aus beigefügten entnommen werden. (Translation by Klein 2001, p. 49)

Andreas Müller (1630-1694) came to a similar conclusion: Chinese does not have ‘grammar’. Only the ‘lexicon’ is sufficient. There are no declensions, nor conjugations, and a word can hardly be classified as a noun, a verb or whatever part of speech:

Lingua sinica nulla indiget Grammatica, sufficit Lexicon. Nulla enim hic declinatio: nulla coniugatio. Eadem vox nominis, mox verbi, mox syncategorematis vicem sustinet. (Müller, *apud* Klein 2001, p. 50)<sup>9</sup>

Klein also quotes in his article the text of Tomasso Campanella (1568-1639) as published by Bossong (1992):

In lingua Chinensium et Cochiniensium verba non declinantur personis, nec temporibus variantur, sed notulis: ergo accidunt haec verbo, non essentiant verbum... Et ideo omne verbum est instar impersonalis, vel infinitivi. Distinctio autem fit per adverbia temporalia, ut si dicerem ‘nunc amo’,

---

<sup>9</sup> Andreas Müller. 1674. *Monumenti sinici*... Berlin, Runge.

imposterum amo, ante amo'... (Campanella 1638<sup>10</sup>, quoted by Bossong 1992, p. 12)

Im Chinesischen und Vietnamesischen werden Verben nicht nach Person und Tempus flektiert, sondern durch Partikel, also sind dies alles Akzidentien, nicht Essentien des Verbs... Das Verb ist sozusagen stets impersonal oder infinitiv. Eine Unterscheidung geschieht hier aber durch Temporaladverbien, als wenn ich sagen würde: 'nun – ich liebe', 'später – ich liebe', 'vorher – ich liebe'... (Translation by Klein 2001, p. 51)

In this description Campanella describes two Asian languages, Chinese and Vietnamese, and he compares the non-existence of nominal declension in these languages with Hebrew, Arabic, Spanish and French (*ibid.*). Oyanguren's description of Chinese adds another dimension to the 'discovery' of Chinese typology since he includes even more Asian languages and also Basque in his attempts to find similarities and differences between Asian languages themselves and between Asian languages and European languages, which is as far as we can trace, the first of its kind in the history of linguistics.

#### 4.2. Morphosyntax

**4.2.1 General features.** In the first half of the eighteenth century isolating languages were not yet recognised as a separate typological subclass. Oyanguren, whose native language was Basque, an agglutinative language, detected similarities between Japanese and his own mother tongue (see Zwartjes 2008 forthcoming). Comparing Chinese with Tagalog, Oyanguren concluded that both languages shared the same feature, the lack of agreement between the nominative (subject) and the verb. Such an agreement is lacking, since these languages are not inflected:

Aunque los Tagalos no tienen concordancias de nominativo y verbo; por no tener los verbos inflexion de personas imitan a los Japones, y Chinos en no tener personas el verbo y suelen tener alguna indiferencia en la cõcordancia del sustantivo, y adjetivo; pues tal vez concuerdan; y tal vez las voces son tambien indiferentes para singular, y plural [no obstante tienen articulos de pluralidad]. (1748, p. 34)

Oyanguren also describes differences between Chinese and Tagalog, the former possesses 'less compound forms' than the latter:

Aunque los Chinos no tienen tantas composiciones como los Indios de las Yslas de Luzon, ó Philipinas, no obstante tienen algunas particulas muy usadas, de que con brevedad daré noticia. La particula *te*, significa poder, o alcanzar (como en el Tagalog *Maca*) y quando es negativo, se pospone á la negacion *po*: *lay po te*; venir no puede. (1742, p. 172)<sup>11</sup>

**4.2.2 Inflection, declensions and conjugations.** Oyanguren also compares Japanese with Chinese and concludes that the two languages do not have case systems. He also points at a difference between these two languages: Japanese has more particles than Chinese:

<sup>10</sup> *Philosophia rationalis pars prima, continens Grammaticalium libros tres*. In: *Tutte le opere* I. 433-713. A cura di Luigi Firpo. Milamno (Milano): Arnoldo Mondadori. See also Bossong (2007).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Varo (2000 [1703], f.46 and f.81).

La lengua Japona es invariable, y no tiene casos, en lo qual imita al dialecto Chino, ô Mandarinico, que no tiene casos, aunque no le imita en las particulas, porque la lengua Japona tiene distintas, y muchas particulas, y la lengua China tiene pocas, ut sieng, seng: seng tien: tie, men &c. solo se advierte, que la lengua Japona en la mayor parte es subjuntiva como lo es nuestra lengua Vascongada, “De qua egimus in sua arte”. (1738, p. 6)<sup>12</sup>

Oyanguren also observes that Chinese and Tagalog verbs differ from Latin verbs:

Ordinariamente en estas lenguas Asiaticas como no ai preposiciones, de que se compongan los nombres, y verbos como en la lengua Latina, la inventiba de sus dialectos usa de otras particulas verbales, y otras partes de la Oracion en sus composiciones, como sucede en la lengua Tagala, y dialectos Chinos. (1742, p. 30)

4.2.3 *Gender*. Differences between European and Asian language features is also noted with regard to the gender system. Neither Tagalog nor Mandarin distinguish morphologically masculine, feminine, and neuter genders.

Esta lengua es como nuestra lengua Vizcaïna, ó como la lengua tagala, ó como la lengua de China, ó dialecto mandarino, que no tienen generos masculinos, femeninos, &c. para las concordancias, como sucede en la lengua Latina, y su dialecto la castellana, ó en los dialectos de la lengua griega: por lo qual careciendo de generos grammaticales, algunas de estas lenguas tienen sus generos philosophicos, como sucede en la lengua Vascongada. En la lengua mandarina no obstante ser los adjetivos comunes de tres: distinguen á los machos por la particula kung, y â las hembras por la particula mù, y aun tienen otros nombres particulares (hablando de animales) distintos de los machos de las hembras: y lo mesmo sucede en esta lengua Japona, en la qual los generos son comunes de tres, ó comunes de dos. (1742, p. 52)

4.2.4 *Reduplication in Tagalog and Chinese*. To be sure, Oyanguren’s comparison goes beyond merely pointing out the absence of Latin features in Asian languages. For example, he claims that Tagalog and Chinese have similar patterns of reduplication to indicate superlative:

El Segundo modo de formar los Tagalos sus superlativos es duplicando o geminando la raíz, ò absoluto, quando es adgetivo compuesto con *ma*: *vt*, *magaling na maling*, bonissimo, *mabuting mabuti*: este modo aluda á la frase Hebraica *are arim, hoc est, in plurimas civitates: hit tammehu temahu*, &c. Este modo tambien es alusivo á la composicion Chinica, en la qual suelen duplicar, ó geminar el adgetivo, posponiendo la particular *tie*: *vt*, *pe pe tie*, blanquissimo; *xin xin tie*, profundissimo. (1742, p. 54)

4.2.5 *Word order*. Oyanguren followed his predecessors Collado and Rodrigues in describing word order in Japanese, although he adds that Japanese shares some features with Basque. He recognises that Japanese is a SOV language:

---

<sup>12</sup> In the romanisations of Chinese and Japanese Oyanguren simplifies, reduces or even eliminates the more sophisticated sets of diacritics as developed by the Portuguese Jesuits for Japanese and by Varo for Chinese. It is possible that Oyanguren had limited knowledge about the correct use of them, but part of these simplification can also be classified as printing errors, since these works were printed in Mexico, where probably no native speakers of Chinese and Japanese or advanced learners of these language were available.

Ponese el nominativo al principio de la oracion, y el verbo suele finalizar, ó terminarla, como se vee en muchos exemplos, que tiene el Vocabulario, el adverbio no suele seguir al verbo, antes le suele anteceder, las otras partes de la oracion se colocan segun cupieren, y el uso lo demuestra, aunque los adverbios de tiempo suelen posponer. (1742, p. 138)

Oyanguren describes Chinese word order as follows:

El verbo activo Chino rige acusativo despues de si, aunque no tenga particula, que lo determine á dicho caso: v.g. *gò gai tien chù*, yo amo a Dios. (1742, p. 201)

In his chapter on compound adjectives, Oyanguren concludes that Chinese follows the opposite order compared to Tagalog:

El dialecto Chinico mandarin ordinariamente compone sus adgetivos al contrario de los Tagalos; posponiendo la particula *tie*, *pe tie*, blanco: *he tie*, negro... (1742, p. 49)<sup>13</sup>

4.2.6 *Towards a theory which distinguishes suffixation from inflection.* Since the nineteenth century, scholars began to develop theories concerning the typological differences between agglutinative, inflectional and isolating languages. Probably – as far as we could trace – Oyanguren is the first in the history of linguistics who compared his native tongue Basque with Japanese, which he classifies both as ‘lenguas subjuntivas’, an equivalent for ‘agglutinative’ (see Zwartjes 2008). In his grammar of Tagalog, we can find another innovative metalinguistic term. Oyanguren classifies Tagalog as a language which has words (‘voces’) which are invariable (‘indiferentes’) using the absolute forms (‘los absolutos’) which are to be considered ‘simple roots and without composition’ (‘raizes simples y sin composicion en muchas ocasiones’). Tagalog is:

Un idioma compuesto por agregacion de partes, u assi la consideran los Tagalystas (no obstante que tienen su inflexion, y incremento los verbos) como los Chinos tambien hacen la misma consideracion de la suya. (1742, p. 37)

Es el verbo segun Nebrija una parte de la oracion, que tiene modos, y tiempos, y no tiene casos: esto se entiende del Verbo latino, porque en el Tagalysmo ay muchissimas raizes indiferentes, (como tambien en el Dialecto Mandarin Chinico) y aunque algunas raizes *ex parte modi significandi* parezcan verbos, *vt, labas* pr. sacar, ò salir: *labis* pp. derramarse,&c. no obstante esto, estas conjugaciones, é inflexiones parecen mas hazerse por agregaciones de particulas antepuestas; y postpuestas, segun la opinion de los primeros Tagalystas, y en este caso el verbo Tagalog no tiene modos: Mas à ello se podia responder, que la lengua Tagala tiene sus tiempos philosophicos con sus incrementos como se vè claramente en los presentes, y futuros con la geminacion de la primera sylaba de la raíz, ó particula. (1742, p. 71)

## 5. PHONOLOGY, ORTHOGRAPHY AND PRONUNCIATION

### 5.1 Introduction

Oyanguren compares the pronunciation of several Asian languages. The pronunciation of Tagalog resembles that of European languages, it is less ‘dental’

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Varo (2000 [1703], ff.28-29) where find almost the same examples.

as Basque, it is ‘guttural’, more ‘voiced’ than Arabic, and less difficult than Chinese, or the Mandarin dialect:

Es el Dialecto Tagalog muy abundante, sonòro, elegante, y que en la mayor parte imita a la pronunciacion Europea, aunque no es su pronunciacion dental como es la Cantabrica, y tiene, y consta de pronunciacion guttural mas Sonora, que la Arabiga, y menos difìcil que la China, ò Dialecto Mandarin, sin la molestia de sus tonadas: en lo qual imita el *n̄gna in gangoso* del Hebreo. (1742, p. 1-2)

However, the pronunciation of Japanese is less difficult compared with Chinese, since Oyanguren believes that the Chinese language was less pure as a consequence of the contact with the Tartars:

El dialecto Nison, ô Japòn es dialecto, que procediò del Imperio Chinico, como tambien sus habitadores, segun consta de sus historias: es dialecto, que se divide en otros muchos dialectos, segun distintos Reynos, que ay en el Japòn: es mas puro, menos difìcil, que los dialectos Chnicos, pues estos con el dominio Tartaro han dejado introducir en sus dialectos distintas voces, tonadas, guturales, &c. (1738 Preludio al lector)

Chinese phonology is different and it follows another course than other languages. Unlike European languages, Chinese ‘abandons’ the quantitative<sup>14</sup> system and renders semantic differences with ‘intonations’ or ‘tones’:

Advertencia tercera. En el Dialecto Chinico Mādarin van por otro rumbo los Chinos, pues dejando la cantidad de las syllabas, que es propria de la voz, y con ella identificada; porque necessariamente ha de constar de tiempo breve, ó largo para su pronunciacion en la qual se funda la cantidad breve, ò larga de la syllaba: se explican por entonaciones, ò tonadas sin inteligencia de la musica. (1742, p. 13)

### 5.2 Distinction of tone types

Traditional Chinese terminology distinguishes the tonal categories *píng* (‘level’), *shǎng* (‘rising’), *qù* (‘departing’), *rù* (‘entering’). Each of these four categories has two registers, resulting in eight tonal categories (Norman 1988, p. 52-54). In traditional Chinese phonology, tones are distinguished from other parts of the syllable, such as initials and finals (Baxter 1992, p. 6-7). Missionary grammar compilers must have been aware of this distinction at a very early stage. Chinese terminology is, for example, cited by Varo (1703), Martini (1689), and Intorcetta (ca. 1660). The anonymous Hokkien grammar of the early 17th century (Anonymous, 17th century, hereafter: London Ms.; de Mançano, ?1620,<sup>15</sup> hereafter Barcelona Ms.) lists words exemplifying tones according to the

<sup>14</sup> Note that we find here clear reminiscences of Classical prosody which is based on different suprasegmental features (quantitative, or syllable and vowel length) instead of the distinction between stressed and unstressed syllables or vowels, which is the phonemically distinctive one in Spanish, for instance.

<sup>15</sup> The contents of both manuscripts are largely identical, but they were obviously written by different hands. The Barcelona Ms is signed by Melchor de Mançano. In historical sources, the Dominican friar Melchor de Mançano (died around 1630) is not mentioned as the author of a Chinese grammar. It is likely that he copied another manuscript. The date of compilation can be inferred from an example sentence in the grammar. It is, however, not explicitly mentioned on the first folio or elsewhere.

traditional Chinese sequence without explaining the sequence. This indicates that the compiler had either consulted Chinese rime books or had been informed by a Chinese tutor. Interestingly, although reference to Chinese terminology was quite common in grammars written after 1650, it does not surface in Oyanguren's grammar.

It is worth noting that neither Varo's nor Oyanguren's use of the term *tonada* is used in reference to tones as defined by traditional Chinese philology only. Tone categories cited by Oyanguren are largely reminiscent of Varo. Varo (2000 [1703], p. 32] distinguishes four categories ("quatro generos, que son simples, guturales, ò aspirades, con puntillo, y guturales con puntillo"), so does Oyanguren (1742, p. 14) ("tonadas simples, guturales, tonadas con puntillo, tonadas gutturales con puntillo"). Of these only the "simple tones" ('tonadas simples') are actually tones, the other terms ('guturales', 'tonadas con puntillo', 'tonadas gutturales con puntillo') refer to features of initials and finals. Similar distinctions can neither be found in Martini (1689), nor in Intorcetta (ca. 1660) nor in the Hokkien *Arte*. The latter devotes its first chapter to the 'modes of pronouncing' ('modo de pronunciar'), distinguishing ten different modes (Barcelona Ms, ff. 2r-3b). Within these ten modes of pronunciation, level, rising and departing tones are categorized as the first mode (without using the Chinese terms); entering tones belong to the third (London Ms, ff 314v-315r) and fourth (Barcelona Ms, ff. 2v-3r) modes of pronunciation respectively.

### 5.3 Description of "simple tones"

For the sake of brevity, our analysis focuses on the descriptions of 'simple tones'. Only these correspond to tones in the traditional Chinese sense and in the modern linguistic sense. There are some obvious similarities between Varo and Oyanguren in the description of simple tones. These can be observed on four different levels: (1) the sequence of tones, (2) the use of diacritics, (3) wording of the explanations, (4) examples.

On the basis of these similarities we may assume that Oyanguren's account is largely based on Varo's grammar.

5.3.1 *Sequence of tones.* Both sources distinguish five Mandarin tones. These correspond to two registers of the level tone, the rising tone, the departing tone and the entering tone. In modern Mandarin, the entering tone has become obsolete. Varo introduces the five tones in the canonical sequence and also refers to the Chinese terminology. Without referring to Chinese terminology, Oyanguren also presents the tones in the canonical sequence. The sequence of presentation differs from that in Martini and Intorcetta who both use a departing – rising – entering level (upper and lower register) sequence.

5.3.2 *Tone diacritics.* Varo and Oyanguren also use the same set of tone diacritics. In contrast to Oyanguren, Varo does not identify tone diacritics by name. Both indicate the upper level tone with a horizontal stroke, the lower level tone with a circumflex, the rising tone with a grave accent, the departing tone with the acute accent and the entering tone with a wedge. The same set of diacritics is used in Martini and Intorcetta. It is identical to the system which was



developed in the late sixteenth century (see Introduction). In other words, Oyanguren's diacritics were quasi-standard in the early eighteenth century.

5.3.3 *Wording of the explanations and examples.* In the following paragraphs, the upper level tone is referred to as first tone, the lower level tone as second tone, the rising tone as third tone, the departing tone as fourth tone and the entering tone as fifth tone.

The first tone is described by Varo as “pronounced by prolonging the voice evenly, without raising or lowering anything” (“pronuncia prolongando la voz igualmente, sin leuantar, ni baxar cosa alguna”) (2000 [1703], p. 32-33). Oyanguren (1742, p. 14) uses a slightly different wording, describing the first tone as “se ha de pronunciar llanamente sin alto, ni baxo”. There is, however, little doubt, that both descriptions refer to a level tone (cf. Coblin 1996, p. 48). The term “llanamente” (plainly) is not used by Varo. It is, however, attested in at least one other missionary linguistic source on a Chinese language, i.e. the anonymous *Bocabulario* of the seventeenth century. One of Varo's examples for the first tone is *sī guā* ‘sandia’ (‘watermelon’), which is also used by Oyanguren.

The second tone is, in the words of Varo, pronounced “by slightly lowering the voice in the second syllable if the word has two syllables. If it has only one...one prolongs the voice with some delay and must pronounce it as if it were two” (“baxando un poco la voz en la segunda syllaba, se el vocablo tubiere dos, y si tubiere solo una...se ha de prolongar la voz con alguna mora, y pronunciarla como si fueran dos”) (2000 [1703], p. 32-33). Similarly, Oyanguren (1742, p. 14) notes that it is pronounced by “baxar un poco la voz en la segunda syllaba, si es dissyllaba: y si es monosyllaba se pronuncia con dos tiempos, ò como si fueran dos syllabas.” The distinction of two different ways of pronouncing this tone depending on whether a monosyllabic or disyllabic expression is involved seems to be quite uncommon. Neither Martini nor Intorcetta present a comparable description. The Hokkien sources likewise do not explain tone contours in terms of syllabicity. Oyanguren gives no example for the second tone.

Oyanguren (1742, p. 14) describes the third tone as “levantando un punto en la vocal y luego baxar una tercera con algun enfado”. Using a similar wording, Varo's description goes as follows: “luego baxar una terçera con algun desgaire, o enfado”. According to Coblin, the tone described by Varo “was clearly a sharply falling tone” (1996, p. 48). The comparison of the tonal feature “sharply falling” with an angry manner of speaking is quite common in Chinese grammars of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. Similar terminology can be found in the *Arte* (London ms.) and in Intorcetta's grammar. Oyanguren's example for the third tone is *ieù kàn*,<sup>16</sup> ‘tentar, ò iniciar’. The same example is used by Varo.

Similar terminological overlap is evidenced in the description of the fourth tone. According to both sources, the fourth tone is pronounced by taking up a point in the first syllable and raising it up a third (Varo 2000 [1703], p. 35).

<sup>16</sup> Oyanguren gives *Ièu* where Varo has *ieù*. Misprints are recorded frequently, as occurs with the Japanese grammar. Both grammars were printed in Mexico, where probably no native speakers of Japanese and Chinese were available. For the Japanese misprints in Oyanguren (1738) see Toru Maruyama (2009, forthcoming).

Varo's original words are "se pronunçia tomando un punto en la primera silaba, y subir hazia arriba una terçera". Oyanguren (1742, p. 14) writes that the fourth tone "que se ha de pronunciar tomando un punto en la primera sylaba, y subir azia arriba una terçera". In both sources, the fourth tone is exemplified by the expression *lí hài* 'pernicious, dangerous'.

Varo and Oyanguren both describe the fifth tone as the same as the fourth, differing from the former by being pronounced with strain in the chest and smoothness. In Varo's words, "algun hincó con el pecho, pero con suavidad" (2000 [1703], p. 34ff.). A similar description surfaces in Oyanguren who writes "esta prolacion es algo pectoral con suavidad" (1742, p. 14). We may assume that Varo adopted the description of the entering tone in terms of articulation from earlier manuscript grammars. In the Hokkien *Arte*, for instance, the entering tone is described as being "pronounced with a zeal which seems to come from the heart" ("se pronunçia con un ainco que parece salir del coraçon", Barcelona Ms., f. 2r). This explanatory feature neither occurs in Intorcetta nor in Martini.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The first question was which sources Oyanguren used for his linguistic analysis. When we consider the sections describing Chinese, it is obvious that there is significant overlap between Varo and Oyanguren.

Oyanguren's understanding of the typology of Chinese reflects more or less the knowledge which was already available in Europe. Although he never abandoned the grammatical model of Antonio de Nebrija, he was completely aware of the fact that Chinese was a language without declensions or conjugations. The lack of derivational morphology implies that agreement between subject and verb, between adjective and substantive were not morphologically marked in Chinese, and thus different from Latin.

The cross-linguistic comparisons of Oyanguren are unique for the period in question, not only in quantity but also in quality. Particularly his attempts to describe coincidences between two unrelated agglutinative languages, Basque and Japanese and a language which has prefixes and suffixes like Tagalog, contrasting them with the typological features of an isolating language, Chinese, are to be considered an important contribution in the history of linguistics.

With respect to what was already known from sources such as Varo, the paragraphs dedicated to Chinese do not provide any new insights or innovative analytical approaches. Varo describes a high prestige variety known as Mandarin, so does Oyanguren. This and the fact that the Chinese minority in Manila spoke Southern Mǐn dialects sheds some light on the nature of Oyanguren's linguistic research. He was certainly not a linguistic fieldworker, but rather a student of written sources. There is no trace of language variation in his work which is certainly not to be considered a documentation of the Chinese spoken in Manila. As demonstrated in Zwartjes (2008), the same applies to his knowledge of Japanese, a country he never visited. We have the impression that his analysis and language examples from Tagalog to a higher degree reflect the

language of the common people and Oyanguren even mentions explicitly that he checked language data with native speakers.<sup>17</sup> In the Chinese and Japanese teaching manuals, much attention is devoted to the study of written sources. This was not the case with Tagalog. Oyanguren's proficiency in Tagalog is a topic which falls beyond the scope of this article and this will be the topic of the forthcoming edition of the *Tagalysmo elucidado*.

The question why Oyanguren focused on Mandarin and did not write anything about the Southern Mǐn dialects of the Manila Sangleyes cannot be answered with certainty. As pointed out above, a lack of quotable Southern Mǐn grammars and dictionaries is an unlikely reason, as written material had long been available (Klöter 2007 and 2009 forthcoming). We must therefore assume that the reason can be found in the historical context of Oyanguren's sources. When he wrote his comparative language studies in the first half of the eighteenth century, the Franciscans, like the aforementioned Dominicans, had entered China for more than one hundred years. As mentioned above, the Dominican expansion to China in the 1630s came along with a linguistic reorientation from Southern Mǐn to Mandarin. The same is likely to apply to the Franciscans. One hundred years later, Mandarin must have achieved the status of a default language of missionary linguistics. This situation would remain unchanged until the early nineteenth century, when Chinese dialects were re-discovered by Protestant missionaries of different orders (Klöter 2005, p. 89-130).

Finally, we come to the conclusion that Oyanguren did not find a balance – seen from the point of view of a modern linguist or a modern language learner – between two sometimes opposite objectives: theory and practice. As demonstrated in Zwartjes (2008), observations and comparisons between Basque, Tagalog and Japanese will never be useful for those missionaries who did not know Basque. Why should a learner of Tagalog also compare this language with Japanese? How much theory does a learner need? Apart from the paradigms, which are often very didactic and well structured, Oyanguren found it necessary to 'educate' his learners, instructing them in comparative linguistics 'avant la lettre'. While diverging from traditional grammar and teaching methods, Oyanguren's work not only reflects the linguistic thought of the period in question but it also invites the learner to reflect upon language itself.

## REFERENCES

### *Primary sources*

- Anonymous (1981 [End of the 13th- first decades of the 14th century]). *Codex Cumanicus*, Edited by G. Kuun, with the prolegomena to the Codex Cumanicus by Louis Ligeti, Budapest. Kőrösi Csoma Társaság, Magyar Tudományos Akadémia Könyvtára.
- Anonymous (17th Century). *Arte de la lengua chiochiu*, Ms Add. 25317, British Library, London, 23 ff. [*Grammar of the Language of Zhāngzhōu*]

---

<sup>17</sup> "Los Indios (à quienes yo he preguntado, y examinado sobre este assumpto, y se suelen enbobar, respondiendoy a cesta ya ballesta)"... (1742, p. 141).

- Anonymous (17th Century). *Bocabulario de la lengua sangleya por las letraz de el A.B.C.*, Ms. 222 ff, Ms Add. 25317, British Library, London.
- Blancas, Francisco de S. Joseph (1997 [1610]). *Arte y reglas de la lengua tagala*, en el Partido de Bataan, por Thomas Pinpin Tagalo. [Edición facsímil de la edición princeps con Estudio de Antonio Quilis. Madrid, Ediciones de Cultura Hispánica]
- Intorcetta, Prospero (ca.1660). *De Sinarum literas*, 17 unprinted pages on the Chinese script reproduced and translated in Knud Lundbæk (1986), *The Traditional History of the Chinese Script from a Seventeenth Century Jesuit manuscript*, Aarhus, Aarhus University Press.
- Magdalena, Avgvstin de la (1679). *Arte dela lengva Tagala, sacado de diversos artes por Fr . —, Religioso Descalço del Señor S. Diego coProcurador General de la Provincia de S. Gregorio de las Islas Philipinas*, México, Francisco Lupercio.
- Mançano, Melchior de (?) (1620?). *Arte de la lengua Chio Chiu*. Ms Biblioteca de la Universidad de Barcelona, 20-9-26, 33 ff. [Grammar of the Language of Zhāngzhōu]
- Martini, Martino (1689). *Grammatica Linguae Sinicae*, Ms Hunter 299, University of Glasgow. [Transcript : Franco Demarchi (éd.) (1998). *Martino Martini S.J. (1614-1661). Opera omnia. Volume II: Opera minori*. Trento, Università degli Studi di Trento]
- Medhurst, Walter Henry (1832). *A dictionary of the Hok-kèèn dialect of the Chinese language, according to the reading and colloquial idioms: containing about 12,000 characters, the sounds and tones of which are accurately marked: and various examples of their use, taken generally from approved Chinese authors: accompanied by a short historical and statistical account of Hok-kèèn: a treatise on the orthography of the Hok-kèèn dialect; the necessary indexes, &c*, Macao, East India Company
- Oyanguren de Santa Ynes, Melchor (1738). *Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros segun el arte de Nebrixa. Con algunas voces proprias de la escritura, y otras de los lenguages de Ximo y del Cami, y con algunas perifrases y figuras*, México, Joseph Bernardo de Hogal. [Edición facsimilar : Tenri Central Library, Japan, *Classica Japonica, Facsimile Series*. Ed. Makita Tominaga, Section I : Linguistics, vol. 5] [Edition Otto Zwartjes (éd.) (2009, à paraître).]
- Oyanguren de Santa Ynes, Melchor (1742). *Tagalysmo elucidado, y reducido (en lo posible) a la Latinidad de Nebrija. Con su sintaxis, tropos, prosodia, pasiones &c. Y con la alusión, que en su uso y composición tiene con el Dialecto Chinico, Mandarin con las lenguas Hebrea y Griega*, México, La imprenta de D. Francisco Xavier Sánchez.
- San Augustin, Gaspar de (1787 [1703]). *Compendio de la Arte de la Lengua Tagala. Por el Padre Fr. —, Religioso de el mismo orden, Comissario de el Santo Oficio, Visitador de esta Provincia de Philipinas, y Prior de el Convento de Tambobong (Año 1703)*, Segvnda impression : Sampaloc, Imprenta de Nuestra señora de Loreto.
- Santos, Domingo de los (1794 [1703]). *Vocabulario de la lengua tagala primera y segunda parte. En la primera, se pone primero el castellano, y despues el tagalo. Y en la segunda al contrario, que son las rayzes simples con sus acentos*, Reprint N.S. de Loreto de Sampaloc.
- Valignano, Alessandro (1944 [1542-1564]). *Historia del principio y progreso de la Compañía de Jesús en las Indias Orientales*, Herausgegeben und erläutert von Josef Wicki, Roma, Institutum Historicum S.I. [Bibliotheca Instituti Historici S.I. vol. 2].
- Varo, Francisco (2000 [1703]). *Arte de la lengua mandarina compuesto por el M.R. P<sup>e</sup> — de la sagrada Orden de N.P.S. Domingo, acrecentado, y reducido a mejor forma, por N<sup>o</sup> H. fr. Pedro de la Piñuela P[redicad]or y Comisario Prov[incial] de la Mission Serafica de China. Añadiose un Confessionario muy vtil, y provechoso para alivio de los nueos Ministros*, Canton, [publisher unknown], W. South Coblin & Joseph A. Levi (éd.), *Francisco Varo's Grammar of the Mandarin Language (1703). An English translation of 'Arte de la lengua mandarina'*, With an Introduction by

Sandra Breitenbach, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins. [=Studies in the History of the Language Sciences, vol. 93]. [Facsimile of Ms 1682, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana R. G. Oriente III, 246 int. 7.]

Varo, Francisco (2006 [between 1677-1687]). *Vocabulario de la lengua Mandarin con el estilo y vocablos con que se habla sin elegancia. Compuesto por el Padre fray — ord. Pred. Ministro de China consumado en esta lengua esriuese guardando el orden del A.B. c.d.*, W. South Coblin (éd.), *Francisco Varo's Glossary of the Mandarin Language*. Vol. I: *An English and Chinese Annotation of the Vocabulario de la Lengua Mandarin*. Vol. II: *Pinyin and English Index of the Vocabulario de la Lengua Mandarin*, Nettetal, Sankt Augustin. [Monumenta Serica Monograph Series LIII/1 and LIII/2.]

#### Secondary sources

- Auwers, Johan van der & Michel Kefer (éd.) (1992). *Meaning and Grammar: cross-linguistic perspectives*, Berlin & New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baxter, William Hubbard (1992). *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*, Berlin, New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bossong, Georg (1992). « Reflections on the History of Universals. The example of the “partes orationis” », Auwers, Johan van der & Michel Kefer (éd.) (1992), 3-16.
- Bossong, Georg (2007). « The Influence of Missionary Descriptions of Far Eastern Languages on Western Linguistic Thought : The case of Cristoforo Borri, S.J. and Tommaso Campanella », Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, Emilio (éd.), 123-143.
- Brockey, Liam Matthew (2007). *Journey to the East. The Jesuit mission to China 1579-1724*, Cambridge, MA- London, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Coblin, W. South (1996). « Tone and Tone Sandhi in Early Qing Guanhua ». *Yuen Ren Society of Chinese dialect data* 2, 43-57.
- Coblin, W. South & Joseph A. Levi (2000). « Editor's foreword », In Varo (2000 [1703]), ix-xviii. (see primary sources).
- Döhla, Hans-Jörg, Raquel Montero Muñoz & Francisco Báez de Aguilar González (éd.) (2008, forthcoming). *Lenguas en diálogo. El iberorromance y su diversidad lingüística y literaria. Ensayos en homenaje a Georg Bossong*, Frankfurt am Main & Madrid, Vervuert & Iberoamericana.
- Klein, Wolf Peter (2001). « Die linguistische Erfassung des Hebräischen, Chinesischen und Finnischen am Beginn der Neuzeit. Eine vergleichende Studie zur frühen Rezeption nicht-indogermanischer Sprachen in der Traditionellen Grammatik », *Historiographia Linguistica* 28/1-2, 39-64.
- Klöter, Henning (2005). *Written Taiwanese*, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- Klöter, Henning (2007). « “Ay sinco lenguas algo difrentes”, China's local vernaculars in early missionary sources », Zwartjes, James & Ridruejo, Emilio (éd.), 192-210.
- Klöter, Henning (2008). « The Earliest Hokkien Dictionaries », Zwartjes, Arzápalo Marín & Smith-Stark (éd.) (2008, forthcoming).
- Maruyama, Toru (2009, à paraître). « Prólogo », Oyanguren 1738, Zwartjes ed. (2009 à paraître).
- Menegon, Eugenio (2002). *Ancestors, Virgins, and Friars: The localization of Christianity in late imperial Mindong (Fujian, China), 1632-1863*, PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Moran, Joseph F. (1993). *The Japanese and the Jesuits. Alessandro Valignano in sixteenth-century Japan*, London – New York, Routledge.
- Nachod, Oscar (1922). “Die ersten Kenntnisse chinesischer Schriftzeichen im Abendlande”, *Hirth Anniversary Volume*, London, Asia Minor, 235-273.
- Norman, Jerry (1988). *Chinese*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Schreyer, Rüdiger (1992). *The European Discovery of Chinese (1550-1615) or the Mystery of Chinese unveiled*, Amsterdam, Stichting Neerlandistiek. [=Cahiers voor Taalkunde, vol. 5.]

- Streit, Robert (1928). *Bibliotheca Missionum*, Vol. IV, *Asiatische Missionsliteratur 1245-1599*, Aachen, Aachener Missionsdruckerei A.-G. [olim Xaverius Verlagsbuchhandlung A.-G.].
- Sueiro Justel, Joaquín (2003). *Historia de la lingüística española en Filipinas (1580-1898)*, Lugo, Axac. [Second edition, Lugo (2007)]
- Van der Loon, Piet (1966). « The Manila Incunabula and Early Hokkien Studies » (part 1), *Asia Major* 12, 1-43.
- Van der Loon, Piet (1967). « The Manila Incunabula and Early Hokkien Studies » (part 2), *Asia Major* 13, 95-186.
- Walravens, Hartmut (1987). *China illustrata: Das europäische Chinaverständnis im Spiegel des 16. bis 18. Jahrhunderts*, Weinheim, Acta Humaniora.
- Witek, John W. (2001). « Introduction », J. W. Witek (éd.), *The Portuguese-Chinese Dictionary of Michele Ruggieri and Matteo Ricci*, Lisbon, Instituto Português do Oriente, National Library of Portugal, 151-167.
- Zwartjes, Otto (2008). « El hebreo en las gramáticas del japonés y el tagalo de Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés (1688-1747) », Döhla, Montero Muñoz & Báez de Aguilar (éd.), p. 393-424.
- Zwartjes, Otto (2009, à paraître). *Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés. Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros según el arte de Nebrixa, con algunas voces propias de la escritura, y otras de los lenguages de Ximo, y del Cami, y con algunas perifrases, y figuras*, Transcripción y edición preparada por Otto Zwartjes, con un prólogo de Toru Maruyama, Frankfurt am Main & Madrid, Vervuert & Iberoamericana. [=Lingüística misionera, vol. 2.]
- Zwartjes, Otto Gregory James & Ridruejo, Emilio (éd.) (2007). *Missionary Linguistics III/Lingüística Misionera III. Morphology and Syntax. Selected papers from the Third and Fourth International Conferences on Missionary Linguistics, Hong Kong/Macau, 12-15 March 2005, Valladolid, 8-11 March 2006*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins. [=Studies in the History of the Language Sciences vol. 111.]
- Zwartjes, Otto, Arzápalo Marín, Ramón & Smith-Stark, Thomas C. (éd.) (2009, forthcoming). *Missionary Linguistics IV/ Lingüística misionera IV. Lexicography. Selected papers from the Fifth International Conference on Missionary Linguistics, Mérida, Yucatán, March 2007*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins.