

THEORETICAL ESSAY

The word classes in *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* by RODRIGUES João: between tradition and innovation

Carlos ASSUNÇÃO 

Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro (UTAD)

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this work is to verify the heritage of the Greek-Latin grammatical tradition in Rodrigues' *Artes* and in particular, Álvares' *Artes*, and the innovation it brings mainly regarding the description of word classes. To this end, we propose to (i) go through the classifications of the parts of a sentence from the beginning up to Álvares, highlighting the word classes in Alvaresian grammar; (ii) to analyze the word classes in Rodrigues' *Artes* highlighting those that seem to have new features that the European tradition did not previously consider; and (iii) to draw conclusions.

RESUMO

O objetivo nuclear deste trabalho é verificar a herança da tradição gramatical greco-latina nas *Artes* de Rodrigues que recebeu, em particular, das *Artes* de Álvares, e a inovação que traz sobretudo no respeitante à descrição das classes de palavras. Para tal, propomo-nos (i) percorrer as classificações das *partes orationis* desde os primórdios até Álvares pondo em evidência as classes de palavras na gramática alvaresiana; (ii) fazer uma análise das classes de palavras nas *Artes* de Rodrigues destacando aquelas em que nos parecem existir novos rasgos que a tradição europeia não considerou; (iii) apresentar conclusões.

KEYWORDS

Grammatical tradition. Innovation. Latin. Japanese.



OPEN ACCESS

EDITED BY

- Gonçalo Fernandes (UTAD)
- Leonardo Ferreira Kaltner (UFF)
- Ronaldo Batista (UPM)

REVIEWED BY

- Rolf Kemmler (UTAD)
- Marcelo A. Limeira dos Anjos (UFPI)

DATES

- Received: 09/15/2021
- Accepted: 09/29/2021
- Published: 12/07/2021

HOW TO CITE

Assunção, C. (2021). The word classes in *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* by RODRIGUES João: between tradition and innovation. *Revista da Abralín*, v. 20, n. 3, p. 360-374, 2021.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Tradição gramatical. Inovação. Latim. Japonês.

Some notes

Of all the metalinguistic works published in Japan by Portuguese missionaries, the best-known work is *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* by Father João Rodrigues, published in Nagasaki between 1604-08, and of which there was a shorter version, published in Macao in the year 1620.

It was the grammar published by Álvares—the only book that was followed in Jesuit schools around the world—that mostly influenced *Artes* by João Rodrigues. The Japanese edition of Father Manuel Álvares' grammar (1594) is an Eastern version of the Lisbon edition (1573), which, in turn, is a concise version of the best-known edition of this work, *De Institutione Grammatica libri tres* (Lisbon, 1572), which was transformed into the official text of the entire Society of Jesus in Europe, Asia, and America. The Amakusa edition served as a mandatory textbook for all Japanese students who studied in Nagasaki and Amakusa schools. To aid this pedagogical function, a contrastive description of the word classes was made, including verb conjugations of Latin and Portuguese with translations into Romanized Japanese (ASSUNÇÃO; TOYOSHIMA, 2021). Rodrigues copied Álvares by making a “small” *Arte* from his “large” *Arte* but did not just cut the explanatory texts (called *escholio*) and some justifications. In fact, the 1620 edition is not merely a concise version of *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam*. According to Shishida, “the author elaborated and revised the contents as a textbook of the Japanese language. We can see the improved aspects in the method of grammatical description, which became more elaborate and laconic, and in the heritage of Japanese cultural elements as much as in his earlier *Arte* (1604-8).

Above all, we must pay attention to the first part that deals with his pedagogical theory of teaching Japanese. The book exerted considerable influence on the beginning of Japanese research in Europe in the nineteenth century, as it was translated into French in 1825 by M.C. Landresse. This publication, surprisingly, was the reason Wilhelm von Humboldt started a series of Japanese investigations. The second grammar influenced European researchers and had a pioneering role for nineteenth-century studies¹ (SHISHIDA, 2009, p. 158-158).

1 Translated from “el autor elaboró y revisó los contenidos como un libro de texto de la lengua japonesa. Se pueden ilustrar los aspectos mejorados en el método de descripción gramatical, que se hizo más elaborada y lacónica, y en la herencia de los elementos culturales japoneses tanto como en su *Arte* anterior (1604-8). Sobre todo, debemos prestar atención a la primera parte que trata de su teoría pedagógica de la enseñanza del japonés. El libro ejerció una considerable influencia sobre el inicio de las investigaciones japonesas en Europa en el siglo XIX, ya que fue traducido al francés en 1825 por M.C. Landresse. Esta publicación, sorprendentemente, fue el motivo para que Wilhelm von Humboldt comenzara una serie de investigaciones japonesas. La segunda gramática influyó en los investigadores europeos y tuvo un papel pionero para los estudios del siglo XIX”. (My translation).

1. Journey through the Greco-Latin tradition on the description of word classes

After these brief notes, let us now focus on the first topic of our work. The parts of a sentence, *partes orationis*, are a common designation to refer to word classes that date back to Greek philosophers—better systematized by the Greco-Latin grammarians—and represent one of the most relevant nuclei of the content of grammars, if not the most relevant, as well as one of the most important factors of formal structure.

The first grammatical drafts, concerning the study of word classes, are seen in Plato's *Sophist*, where the two classes, noun and verb, are mentioned.

Aristotle, his disciple, seems to present a tripartite classification of the parts of the sentence. In *De Interpretatione* (Latin version of *Perí Hermeneias*, 2nd part of the *Organon*) he mentions the noun and the verb (1949, chapters 2 and 3), in *Poética* (1932, chapter 20) and in *Retórica* (1953, book 5) he adds another one, which he designates as particles. Later, Dionysius Thrax—stoic, grammatical, and rhetorical—developing the declination, conjugation, voices, and verb tenses of Crispinus' terminology, and the parts of speech of Aristarchus, was the first author of a grammar of Western civilization, *Téchnè Grammatiké*. He considered as word classes, in correspondence with the logical categories of judgment, according to the Stoics, the noun, the verb, the participle, the article, the pronoun, the preposition, the adverb, and the conjunction; he considers the interjection as an integral part of the adverb. The phrase has eight parts: noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition, adverb, and conjunction (DIONYSIUS THRAX, 1989, p. 48).

This first systematized classification of word classes distinguishes between the parts of a sentence that have inflection and those that do not. Semantic and morphological criteria for the noun, verb, and participle are used in the definitions; morphological and syntactic criteria are used for the article and pronoun; for the others—preposition, adverb, and conjunction—a syntactic criterion of position is used, which the Harris and Hockett school call distributional.

This system presented by Dionysius proved to have a key influence on all subsequent linguistic descriptions.

Thus, the Latin grammarians, except for Varro, follow the model presented by Dionysius. To exemplify, we transcribe Donatus' words: "Partes orationis quot sunt? Octo. Quae? Nomen, pronomen, verbum, adverbium, participium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio" (KEIL, 1981, IV, p. 355). This division was followed, with some changes, by Charysius, Probus, Consentius, Cledonius, Pompeius, Sergius, and Priscian.

Diomedes follows Donatus, but subdivides the categories into two groups, stating: "ex his primae quattuor [nomen, pronomen, verbum, participium] declinabiles sunt, sequentes indeclinabiles [adverbium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio]" (KEIL, 1981, I, p. 400). This division into two groups is based on morphological criteria. Pompeius gives continuity to the division presented by Donatus. However, he presents a different classification of the criteria, although morphological; it is

different because he presents the word classes depending on the case, time or neither: “tres sunt partes orationis quae casibus serviunt [nomen, pronomen, participium], una quae temporibus servit [verbum], quattuor quae omnino nec temporibus nec casibus serviunt [adverbium, coniunctio, praepositio, interiectio]” (KEIL, 1981, V, p. 135).

Reading Priscian’s work, we can infer that he maintains the eight classes of words: *nomen*, *interiectio*, *adverbium*, *verbum*, *participium*, *praepositio*, *coniunctio*, *pronomen* (KEIL, 1981, II, p. 54-60); this classification proposal is the same as Donatus’ and is very similar to Dionysius’ (he omits the article, which does not exist in Latin, and recognizes the interjection as an integrating word class).

The classifications presented by Dionysius and Priscian allow us to identify some guiding principles: the centrality conferred on the word in the sentence; a certain concern about a word class classification system that will be followed by many of the later Latin grammarians, such as Thomas of Erfurt, Nebrija, Estêvão Cavaleiro, Nicolau Clenardo (Nicolas Cleynaerts), and Manuel Álvares.

The Greco-Latin tradition is bequeathed to the Middle Ages, considering the medieval grammarians’ two parts of speech: the higher and the lower parts. The former integrated nouns (common and adjectives), verbs, and adverbs; and the latter, those that establish relationships, such as prepositions and conjunctions.

Going back in time, we can verify that Varro occupies an old position singularly by dividing the sentence into four parts—noun, verb, participle, and indeclinable parts—which Diomedes would later follow, presenting the distinction between declinable and indeclinable parts, which we have already referred to: “in eam quae habet casus et quae habet tempora et quae habet neutrum et in qua est utrumque” (Varro, 1967, II, p. 44).

This classification proposal by Varro is taken up, in part, by Sánchez de las Brozas in *Minerva*, concerning the separation of the declinable parts from the indeclinable ones. In this way the Brocense defends the existence of three classes—noun, verb, constitutive pillars of the phrase, and particles: “Sunt autem haec [partes orationis] tria, nomen, verbum, particulae” (SÁNCHEZ DE LAS BROZAS, 1976, p. 10).

Álvares presents the division according to tradition: “Partes orationis sunt octo, Nomen, Pronomen, Verbum, Participium, Praepositio, Adverbium, Interiectio, Coniunctio” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 47 v.). He analyzes each part of the sentence, always following the perspectives of the previous grammarians.

The *nomen* is, for Álvares, “pars orationis, quae casus habet, neque tempora adsignificat ut Musa, Dominus” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 48 r.), subdivided into five types: name, appealing, collective, noun, and adjective, and being divided into multiple categories.

The *pronomen* “est, quod loco nominis positum, certam finitamque personam adsignificat” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 52 r.) and can be classified as demonstrative, relative, possessive, and reciprocal.

The *verbum* “est pars orationis, quae modos & tempora habet, neque in casus declinatur” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 53 r.) and can be analyzed in two genres: personal (active, passive, neutral, common, and deponent) and impersonal (active and passive), but also adds other forms (“de variis verborum formis”), such as intransitive, perfect, indicative, regular, and diminutive.

The *participium* “est pars orationis, quae tum casus, tum tempora habet” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 56 v.), may be present in time, “in Ans, vel Ens,” past, “in Tus, sus, xus,” and future, “in Rus, tum in Dus.”

The *praepositio* “est pars orationis, quae caeteris partibus aut separata, aut cōiuncta fere praeponitur” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 59 r.), which governs accusative, ablative, accusative, or ablative case.

The *adverbium* “est pars orationis, quae vocibus addita, earum significationem explanat, ac definit: ut Raro loquitur, bene peritus, vehemēter iratus, parum diligenter” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 59 v.), and may not only modify the meaning of verbs, “sed etiam participiis, nominibus” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 60 r.), not forgetting that, for Álvares, the adjective, for example, is integrated into the noun. Among the various possible meanings of the adverb, Álvares presents twenty-five categories, of which, in our view, the first two stand out: “optandi, ut utinam, utinam, si. Vocandi, ut ô, heus, eho” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 59 v.).

The *interiectio* “est pars orationis, quae varios animi affectus indicat” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 60 r.) and has several forms and meanings, of which Álvares highlights twenty.

Finally, *coniunctio* is, for Álvares, “pars orationis annectens, ordināsque sententiam” (ÁLVARES, 1572, fol. 60 v.), which can be classified as copulative, disjunctive, adversative, collective, or ilactive or rational, causative, and expletive.

2. Partes orationis in Rodrigues’ Artes

Let us now move on to an analysis of the word classes in *Arte breve* by Rodrigues. According to João Rodrigues, although the *Iapoens* “understand all parts of the sentences, under three words, in their own language (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 r.), namely, ‘Na,’ meaning ‘name’ and which covers ‘all substantive names, conjunctions, interjections, prepositions [...] or pospositions [...] & any other words, which has its own letter, which are not verbs’ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 v.), ‘Cotoba,’ meaning ‘verb’ and including all sorts of verbs as well as nouns, like all of the others, & the adjective verbs,’ and ‘Te, Ni, Fa,’ or ‘Te, Ni, Vo, Fa,’ or ‘Sutegana,’ or ‘Vokiji,’ which cover the articles of noun cases . . . & all kinds of particles, like time or any other sort [...] that exist [that do not have their own letter, but are of the natural Iapoa language’ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 v.), the Japanese language integrates, ‘speaking properly’ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 v.), ten ‘parts of a sentence,’ namely, a noun, a pronoun, a verb, a participle, an affix, an adverb, an interjection, a conjunction, a particle and an article (cf. RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 v., fol. 58 r.), which can be reduced to the ‘eight ordinary of the Latin language’” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 52 v.).²

² Translated from “compreend[a]m todas as partes da oraçam da sua lingoa de baixo de três palauras” (Rodrigues, 1620, fol. 52 r.), a saber, “Na,” que significa “nome” e que abrange “todos os nomes substantivos, as conjunçoens, interjeiçoens, preposiçoens [ou posposiçoens] & quaes quer outros vocábulos, que tem propria letra, que nam sam verbos” (Rodrigues, 1620, fol. 52 v.), “Cotoba,” que significa “verbo” e que compreende “toda a sorte de verbos assi substantivos, como todos os de mais, & os verbos adiectivos,” e “Te, Ni, Fa,” ou “Te, Ni, Vo, Fa,” ou “Sutegana,” ou “Vokiji,” que abrangem “os artigos dos casos dos nomes . . . & todo o género de partículas, assi dos tempos, como todas as de mais de qualquer sorte [...] que sejam [...] que nam tem letra própria, mas sam da lingoa Iapoa

Concerning the *noun*, the grammarian states that this “part of the sentence” is subdivisible into “common noun” and “adjective noun,” being one and the other, from a formal point of view, be it “simple” or “composed” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 53 r.).

Regarding the *noun*, Rodrigues points out that it is likely to be subject to the same semantic divisions to which, in Latin, the common “noun” is submissible, namely to the “divisions [...] in proper noun, & appellative, collective, &c.”³ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 53 r.). He then points out, according to a criterion that we would now call morphologically “various modes” of noun formation (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 53 r.), namely by adding a given “syllable” to the “root. In doing that to the verb, he gives rise to *verbal nouns* meaning “the agent” of these verbs, that is by adding “a noun” to the “root of the verb,” “the ante part” or “the post part,” becomes “the agent” or “the instrument of the action” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 53 v.).

About the so-called *adjective*, João Rodrigues gives an account of the existence, in Japanese, as for the “ending of the word,” and therefore, from a formal point of view, that there are two general “genres” of adjectives: some end in “No”, such as “Moromomorono” (“all”), “Cazucuzuno” (“many”), “Amatano” (“many”), “Macotono” (“true”), constituting, properly, “common nouns to genitive nouns.”⁴ Others either, “are properly irregular verbs, which under one voice include in their significance an adjective [...] & the verb to be,”⁵ ending in the syllables “Ai, ei, ij, hi, ui”, or are formed from them, “losing all the ultimate [...] I, taking the ending syllables in [...] Oi, which sometimes change the [...] Oi [...] in [...] A” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 54). He also points out, in a morphological and semantic perspective, that the Japanese language lacks “adjectives derived from nouns,”⁶ as well as “possesives that mean possession of something, or belonging to others”⁷ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 54 r.), “and which place of the genitive with No [...] or Ga [...]”⁸ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fols. 54 r., 54 v.), and that often, he says, the language in question supplies *adjectives* “with two nouns with no genitive particle,

natural” (Rodrigues, 1620, fol. 52 v.), o japonês integra, “fallando propriamente” (Rodrigues, 1620, fol. 52 v.), dez “partes da oração,” a saber, *nome, pronome, verbo, participio, posposição, advérbio, interjeição, conjunção, partícula e artigo* (cf. Rodrigues, 1620, fols. 52 v., 58 r.), susceptíveis de serem reduzidas às “oito ordinárias da lingua Latina” (Rodrigues, 1620, fol. 52 v.). (My translation)

3 Translated from “divisoens [...] em nome próprio, & appellatiuo, collectiuo, &c” (My translation)

4 Translated from “substantiuos a Genit.” (My translation)

5 Translated from “sam propriamente verbos anómalos, que de baixo de hua sr voz comprehendem em seu sinificado hum nome adiectiuo [...] & o verbo substantiuo, Sum, idest, ser, ou estar,” (My translation)

6 Translated from “adietivos materiaes deriuados de nomes substantiuos” (My translation)

7 Translated from “dos possessiuos, que sinificam cousa possuida, ou pertecête a outras” (My translation)

8 Translated from “ê cujo lugar vsam do substantiuo em Genitivo com [...] No [...] ou [...] Ga” (My translation)

which sometimes the first one loses a syllable [...] or changes it into another one”⁹ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 54 v.).

It also considers the existence, in Japanese, of the “interrogative word,” which describes, in semantic and pragmatic terms, as a linguistic item that “is either of substance, which we designate as noun [...] or demonstrative pronoun,” “or is of incidence, which we call adjective”¹⁰ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 54 v.).

He also states, according to a functional criterion (syntaxis), that in the language that he analyzed, there are ‘pronouns’ which many times [...] are relative pronouns, when there are two distinct sentences”¹¹ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 r.), considering, from a semantic point of view, the existence of either a “relative pronoun” of “substance,” or of a “relative pronoun” of “incidence” likely to represent “continuous quantity,” or “discrete quantity,” or “quality” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 r.).

Rodrigues refers, additionally, to what he defines as “comparative nouns” and “superlatives,” described by adopting a functional criterion (syntactic): the “comparative noun” is formed by adding a given form of an adverb to a form of “positive adjective noun”; the “superlative noun” is formed by adding a given “particle” to a form of “positive adjective noun” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 r.).

About the *pronoun*, he considers that in Japanese there are only “pronomes primitivos” (*primitive pronouns*) (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 r.), referring to the existence of “pronouns for the first,” “second,” and “third person,” which he characterizes according to a criterion that highlights Japanese linguistic attitudes resulting from the belief that the pronouns “sam de si honrados” (“have a honorable status”) or “baixos” (“a lower status”) (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 v.) and including in the context of the so-called “third-person” pronouns, some of which he classifies as “demonstrative” (cf. RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 v.), which he defines, in terms that today, we would call pragmatical, such as those that “show the thing” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 55 r.), while presenting forms of Japanese corresponding to what, in the Latin language, he classifies as “reciprocal pronouns” (cf. RODRIGUES, 1620, fols. 55 r., 55 v.).

As for verbs, the grammarian, adopting a formal and semantic point of view, begins by dividing them into “affirmative,” which “affirm the action that they represent,” and in “negative,” which “for all tenses [...] & modes and voices, which in itself negate the action [...] that represent the affirmative”¹² (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 56 v.), to subdivide both, later, into “personal” and “impersonal.” About the “personal verb,” which “in every verb tense of all modes there is one only voice, in which will be

9 Translated from “com dous substantiuos sem partícula de Genitiuo, dos quaes ás vezes o primeiro perde algũa syllaba [...] ou a muda em outra.” (My translation)

10 Translated from “ou he de substancia, ao qual respondemos por nome substantiuo [...] ou pronome demonstratiuo”, “ou he de accidente, ao qual respondemos por nome adiectivo” (My translation)

11 Translated from “[m]uitas vezes[...] seruem de [‘nome’] relatiuo, quando sam duas oraçoens distintas” (My translation)

12 Translated from “por todos os tempos [...] & modos tẽ proprias vozes, que em si incluem negaçam da aççam [...] que sinificam os affirmatiuos.” (My translation)

used the first, second [...] & third person of singular and plural"¹³ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 56 v.), he asserts that it can be subdivided, in turn, into “active”–“current” (the one in which the “passive verb” is formed) or “factive” (the one that means doing something or letting it be done, not becoming “passive”)– in “passive”–formed of so-called “active”– in “neutral”– “root,” “absolute” (one that says “derived from active verbs” and who claims to have “absolute meaning and independent of an external thing”) or “adjective noun” (meaning an “adjective” or “some animal action” and a “noun verb”)– and in “common”– of “active and neutral meaning” and likely to “be passive”–(RODRIGUES, 1620, fols. 56 v., 57 r.). About the “impersonal verb,” he states that it “does not refer to a specific person,” “has a passive meaning” and is formed of “active verbs,” “neutral,” and “common” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 56 v.). In accordance with a purely formal criterion, João Rodrigues additionally points out the existence, in Japanese, of three types of *verb* conjugations (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 57 v.).

Still from a formal point of view, Rodrigues understands that Japanese *verbs* are “simple” or “composed,” adding that, from a morphological and semantic perspective, the latter are “of four types” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 57 r.): (i) composed of two forms of verbs, of which the former is the “root, which means the mode [...] or action of the verb” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 57 r.); (ii) composed with “particles of honor” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 57 r.) or with “particles of inferiority [...] or respect”; (iii) composed of “particles [...] that alter the significance”; or (iv) composed of “particles [...] that only give strength & vigor to the verb” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 57 v.).

As far as the *participle* is concerned, it only adds, from a formal point of view, “the voice of the past” with a given termination (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.), observing, once again according to a syntactic criterion, that the “present participles” and the “future participles” “sam properly oraçoens de relatiuo” (“are really relative sentences”) (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.).

Regarding *prepositions*, the author states, in terms of functions (syntax), that “they are before the nouns” and in semantic terms, that “in his interpretation [...] they correspond to our prepositions” (cf. RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.). He points out, later, that while some “are nouns that can take all articles like other nouns,” others or “are verb participles, that govern the case of its verb,” or “are simply particles,” among these, “some want the article [...] No, others [...] Ni, others none”¹⁴ (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.) He also adds, in line with a functional criterion (syntactic), that some “inflect on the genitive” case, others “on the dative” case and others “respond to the ablative” case (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.).

About *adverbs*, Rodrigues merely indicates, from a semantic perspective, that such linguistic items, abundant in the language he analyzes, “not only in person they explain the mode of things,

13 Translated from “em cada tempo de todos os modos tem hũa só voz, que serue às primeiras, segundas [...] & terceiras pessoas de ambos os numeros.” (My translation)

14 Translated from “sam propriamente nomes substantivos, q[ue] admitem todos os artigos, como os de mais nomes,” outras ou “sam participios de verbos, que regem os casos de seus verbos”, ou “sam puramente particulas,” sendo que, de entre estas, “hũas querem o artigo [...] No, outras [...] Ni, outras nenhum”. (My translation)

but also the sound, or noise, or movement, or position of the thing¹⁵, concluding about “several forms” (“*varia formaçam*”) and the “genres” (“*varios generos*”), by referring the reader to the “great art” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 v.).

Regarding *interjections*, he points out its “great abundance” in Japanese, and observes from a semantic point of view that “they show several inner states of mind, such as joy, sadness, pain, fear, anger, admiration [...] and others similar.”¹⁶ (RODRIGUES, 1620, vol. 58 r.).

As for what is referred to as *conjunctions*, he points out the existence, in Japanese, of (i) “copulative” (which are equivalent to the Portuguese forms “E, Item, more,” “*Tambem*”), (ii) “disjunctive” (which corresponds to “Ou” or the discontinuous conjunction “Ou, Ou”) (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 r.), (iii) “adversative” (which are equivalent to the Portuguese linguistic items “*Porem*,” “*Mas*,” “*Toda via*,” “*Mas que*,” “*A inda que*,” “*Dou lhe que*”), (iv) “causal” (which he considers corresponding to the forms of the Portuguese “*Por que*,” “*Por quanto*” and the sequence “*A causa he por que*”), (v) “collective” (which makes it equivalent to “*Por tanto*,” “*Por isso*,” “*Assi que*”), (vi) “inceptive of the sentence” or “period” (which claims to correspond to the Latin form “*Itaque*”), (vi) “conjunctions” that “serve to fill the sentence,” (vii) “conditional” and (viii) “subjunctive” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 58 v.).

Of the particles,¹⁷ the grammarian says there is “a lot of variety” in Japanese “in these words, *Te, Ni, Fa* [...] or *Te, Ni, Vo, Fa*”, depending on their “good use” the “right, correct [...] & proper speaking” and their “misuse,” “informal & improper [speaking]” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 v.). He notes that some are to “articulate,” while others are to show “honor only,” and that others are still “part of the verbs [...] & nouns” or “because of a question of honor,” or “to beat,” or “to give more strength [...] & energy to verbs,” or to alter “the significance of the verb,” or to have more “tenses [...] & modes for the verbs” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 r.). He also mentions that there are particles that are “negative” and others that, when “separated,” “or are adverbs, conjunctions, or nouns [...] that have the same function as a verb” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 v.). Rodrigues breaks down the traditional classification of Latin grammar, distinguishing, for example, honorific and humble or despicable particles. He does not distinguish these particles amongst the (current designations of) prefixes and suffixes. For Rodrigues, they were postponed to the radicals or roots of the nouns or verbs. For instance, the four most frequent Japanese prefixes for Rodrigues were “*nite-*,” “*ni-*,” “*de-*,” and “*goza-*”:[...] “As for particles, they postpone the radicals of all particles, which they connect to verbs. This is the case for honorifics as well as despicable, which signify to *do* without changing its meaning, as in *naravaresoro, yumi mōxisoro, aque mairaxesoro, cacaxeraresoro*. [...]” Among particles, which properly

15 Translated from “*naõ somente ao viuo explicam o modo das cousas, mas tambem ate o som, ou estrondos, ou meneo, ou postura da cousa*”. (My translation)

16 Translated from “*mostraõ varios affeitos interiores do animo, como sam alegria, tristeza, dor, temor, ira, admiraçam [...] & outros semelhantes*.”(My translation)

17 See Fernandes; Assunção (2018).

compose the verbs, there are four, which we ought to know: Nite, Ni, De, and Goza, as in Nitesoro, Nisoro, Desoro, Gozasoro”¹⁸ (RODRIGUES, 1604-1608, fol. 52v).

Rodrigues analyzes likewise the most common address forms used amongst the Japanese people in different writing styles, such as in *naiden* (religious) and *gueden* (secular) texts. For example, Rodrigues says that the suffix “-sama” was the most common “particle” for the nouns: “Sama, i.e., *Yōna*, i.e., *identical*, as well as *manner*, etc. This particle formerly did not have a grade of honor. Now it is the most common and the most used, and it is only used for people and not things, as in *Vyesama*, *Vyeno Yōna*, *The Lord of the bership*, *Yacatasama*, *Tono sama*, *Padre Sama*, etc. We can say that in the use that is now common, it means *Lord*, *Lordship*, *Your Highness*, *Mercy*, *Reverence*, etc., according to the person to whose name it is joined.”¹⁹ (RODRIGUES, 1604-1608, fol. 159v, my translation).

In early seventeenth-century Japan, according to Rodrigues, the most common forms of address or particles of honorable degree were the suffixes “-dono,” “-tono,” and “-cō,” and “-quiō” (used only between the nobles who lived in the king’s palace at Kyoto): “Dono, Tono. It is a word that signifies a *lord* or *gentleman*, and they postpone it to the first names of the people when they nominate as in the letters in ordinary speech, especially in the presence of or in front of their servants and duty people”.²⁰ (RODRIGUES, 1604-1608, fol. 160r).

“Cō, Quiō, i.e., *Quimi*. These two expressions signify Sir, Dominus. Cō postpones to noble people’s names, especially in the letters [...]”²¹. Quiō serves only amongst the Cugues.²² (RODRIGUES, 1604-1608, fol. 160r)

Nevertheless, the most important form of address, used only to address the king, was the prefix “yei-”: “Yei, i.e., *Chocu*. These particles serve only for the king and mean the king himself, i.e., *Vō*, and they

18 Translated from [...] “em quanto particula se pospoem às rayzes de todas as particulas que se juntão a os verbos, assi honorativas, como humilativas, como tambem às que significação fazer, sem alterar nada sua significação. Vt, *Naravaresoro*, *Yumi mōxisoro*, *Ague mairaxesoro*, *Cacaxeraesoro* [...] As particulas com que propriamente se compoem quanto verbo são quatro conuem a saber. Nite, Ni, De, Goza, Vt Nitesoro, Nisoro, Desoro, Gozasoro.” (My translation)

19 Translated from “Sama, id est, *Yōna*, id est, *semelhante*, assim como, modo, et cetera. Esta particula antigamente nam tinha grao de honra, mas agora he a mais comum, e vsada de quantas ha, e soamente se pospoem a pessoas, e nam a outras cousas, ut *Vyesama*, id est, *Vyeno Yōna*, id est, *O Senhor da Tença*. *Yacatasama*, *Tono sama*, *Padre Sama*, et cetera. Podemos dizer que no vso em que agora anda tem sentido, de *Senhor*, *Senhoria*, *Alteza*, *Merce*, *Reuerencia*, et cetera, conforme a pessoa a que se pospoem.” (My translation)

20 Translated from “Dono, Tono. He hũa voz que parece significar como entre nos, *senhor*, ou *fidalgo*, e se pospoem aos nomes proprios de pessoas, quando se nomeam, assi nas cartas, como no falar ordinario mormente em presença, ou diante de seus criados, e pessoas de obrigaçam.” (My translation)

21 Translated from Cō, Quiō id est *Quimi*. Estas duas vozes significam propriamente *Senhor*, *Dominus*. Cō, se pospoem aos nomes de pessoas nobres commummente nas cartas . . . Quiō, serue soamente entre Cugues.

22 The Cugues were the noble families who lived and served in the palace of the king at Miyako, the “capital” (Kyoto).

are placed before the names of the Coye, as in *Yeiran* and *Vio*, the King, *Yeican*, *Guiocan*, and *Lolucu*, the King, *Yeirio*, *Yeixin*, and *Micocoro*, the king's heart . . .]"²³ (RODRIGUES, 1604–1608, fol. 160v).

Of particular interest is Rodrigues' specific analysis of the address forms used by women. Recent research carried out by Ide (2005, p. 61) notes, for instance, that women still continue to use polite expressions, and women with a higher status use them more than the women of a lower status: "[F]emale executives use more elaborate honorable forms than do women of lower status in the same corporation. . . . The findings show that women of higher status show their dignity or elegance by using more elaborate, higher honorable forms than those used by lower status women." Clarke (2009, p. 61) adds, however, that the younger generation uses fewer forms of address than in previous times, and they are speaking increasingly like men, and they overuse the prefix *-o*²⁴: this remains true despite the protestations of older Japanese that young women these days speak more like men and young males are speaking more like women. The differences between men and women's language are less apparent in the polite conversational style, though, even here, women tend to use more honorable expressions than men and many overuse the elegant noun prefix *o-*.

However, at the beginning of the seventeenth century, João Rodrigues had already described, for instance, that the suffix or the (postponed) particle "*-vye*" was used only with women's names and meant the "highest superior":

"Vye: This particle means supreme superior, etc., as when we say *Vye*, *Vye sama* [...] It is used as an honorific particle for speaking of women, and they postpone it to people names, which they honor, as in *Fauavye*, *Mother Lady*, *Vovye*, *the Lady of the House*, and *Tono's wife*"²⁵ (RODRIGUES, 1604–1608, fol. 159 v).

Likewise, the suffix "*-goien*" was used only between women, showing reverence to their noble family. "*-Goien*" can be considered as equivalent of the masculine "*-sama*":

"*Goien*, *Go*. The first particle of these two is used only for women and to honor them, in the manner of *Sama* and out of respect for noble people who own such women, as in *Fauagoien*, *Foioquegoienm Toquinagoien*."²⁶ (RODRIGUES, 1604–1608, fol. 160 v).

Unfortunately, Rodrigues describes female particles used only by the lower to the higher status women and not by the opposite, as Ide does, and he does not have the perspicacity of how the

23 Translated from "Yei, id est, Chocu. Estas particulas seruem soamente pera el rey, e significam o mesmo rey. id est. Vã, e se antepoem aos nomes do Coye. Vt, *Yeiran*, id est, *Vio el Rey*, *Yeican*, id est, *Guiocan*, *Lolucu El Rey*, *Yeirio*, id est, *Yeixin*, id est, *Micocoro*, o coraçam del Rey.[...] (My translation)

24 Coelho; Hida (2010, p. 894) say that the prefix *-o* indicates admiration, respect, veneration, and delicacy, and is also used as a prefix for some female proper names.

25 Translated from "Vye. Esta particula significa superior supremo, et cetera. Como quando dizemos *Vye*, id est, *Vye sama* [...] He vsada por particula de honra falando de molheres, e se pospoem aos nomes das pessoas que honra. Vt, *Fauavye*, *A Senhora mãy*. *Vovye*, *a senhora da casa*, ou *mulher do Tono*."(My translation)

26 Translated from "*Goien*, *Go*. A primeira particula destas duas serue soamente pera molheres, e as honra a modo de, *Sama*. por respeito das pessoas nobres a quem pertencem as taes molheres. Vt *Fauagoien*, *Foioquegoienm Toquinagoien*."(My translation)

seventeenth-century younger generation spoke, as Clark describes for the contemporary era. In effect, they are discussing different phenomena of women's language, but it is remarkable that a Jesuit missionary at the beginning of the seventeenth century had a real concern with women's language and how to use the correct form of address or particle, in his designation, when speaking with women.

About the *article*, the author only states, in line with a mainly functional criterion (syntactical), that such a linguistic item includes "certain particles . . . that respond to Latin cases with nouns, showing in which case such noun is present" (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 v.). As for the morphological treatment of the "gender . . . & mode in which they distinguish the feminine, & masculine, & neutral," the author refers to the "*arte grāde*" (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 v.).

3. Conclusion

It seems to us that from the presentation of the parts of the discourse, despite following Álvares, Rodrigues is influenced on the one hand, by the Aristotelian division, followed later by Varro and in his time by the Brocense; and on the other hand, by the tradition of Japanese treatises of poetic art where some principles of the grammatical tradition that date back to the Middle Ages appeared consecrated. This idea appears even more reinforced in *Arte Grande*. Percival states that "at the end of the Middle Ages there were many linguistic traditions: the Chinese linguistic tradition in the Far East and the Hindu grammatical tradition in India²⁷ (PERCIVAL, 1992, p. 62). It is worth highlighting the importance granted to the verb in *Arte Grande* because of its centralizing position in the sentence and from which everything depends: "*The Japanese divide the sentence into three parts, from which the others are included, that is, Verbo; Tenifa, Teniuofa, Sutegana, Voquiji, under which they learn, the articles of the nouns, and all the particles of tenses and modes of verbs, as well as others.*"²⁸ (RODRIGUES, 1604-1608, fol. 58 r.). This aspect is what we find today in surviving and dependent grammars, thus proving to be a truly pioneering element for its time.

Another novelty in relation to the Latin tradition is the inclusion of the article, which does not exist in Latin, and which is, in our view, inherited from the Greek language; in the Japanese language either classical or modern, there are no articles. It could have arrived through vulgar grammars, a hypothesis that we consider implausible, for the time being, unless, during his stop in India, Rodrigues had become aware of the grammar of João de Barros that had been circulating. He could have had contact with the Castilian grammar of Nebrija, if eventually the Franciscans and Dominicans—who arrived in Japan in the second half of the sixteenth century—had taken it with them.

27 Translated from "al fin de la Edad Media existían varias tradiciones lingüísticas: la tradición lingüística china en el Extremo Oriente, la tradición gramatical hindú en la India" (My translation)

28 Translated from "Os Iapões dividem as partes da oração em tres, de bayxo das quais comprehendem as demais, convem a saber, Verbo; Tenifa, Teniuofa, Sutegana, Voquiji, debayxo da qual comprehendem, os artigos dos nomes, e todo o genero de particulas assim dos tempos e modos dos verbos, como todas as de mais". (My translation)

In any case, for Maruyama (2006, p. 63) the declension of the articles corresponds to the Japanese particles GA, NO, NI, WO, etc., as can be seen in the following table:

Japanese	Portuguese	J.	P.
Joao-GA aruku.	O Joao anda.	(GA = O)	- Nom.
Joao-NO hon	o livro DO Joao	(NO = DO)	- Gen.
Joao- NI ageru	dar AO Joao	(NI = AO)	- Dat.
Joao-ga hon-WO kau.	Joao compra O livro.	(WO = O)	- Acu. etc.

The declension of the nouns in Latin corresponds to the “declension” of articles in Portuguese, and the particles designating cases in the Japanese language (DOI, 1976, p. 497), as shown below:

Latin	Portuguese	Japanese
nom. dominus	o senhor	aruji ga
gen. domini	do senhor	aruji no
dat. domino	ao senhor	aruji ni
acu. dominum	o senhor	aruji wo

It is also an innovative aspect to include particles in the parts of discourse due to the influence of contemporary philological studies in Japan. Even today, grammarians call particles the words that do not integrate into any of the word classes. Rodrigues already sees his pragmatic-conversational value: “in these words, *Te, Ni, Fa* [...] or *Te, Ni, Vo, Fa*,” depending on their “good use” the “right, correct [...] & proper speaking,” and their “misuse,” “informal & improper [speaking]” (RODRIGUES, 1620, fol. 59 v.). These particles, in addition to this pragmatic value, according to Fonseca, “are units of different paradigmatic status, which combine syntactically with nouns and verbs, or by adding, by way of fixed particles, or as independent elements, and can then assume the values of adverbs, conjunctions and nouns. In either case, it is possible to perform simple determinants or relationship elements” (FONSECA, 2000, p. 236).

To sum up, Rodrigues was one of the most original grammarians and deserves to be classified as the father of the Japanese linguistics studies, as Boxer (1950) had done. He was also one of the five best Jesuits grammarians of the whole colonial period, as Zwartjes (2011) stated. He presented many linguistic innovations and created a new metalanguage derived from his knowledge of Japanese society, mainly from Kyoto, and classical Japanese literature, paying special attention to how social relationships between the interlocutors worked in oral and written speech. He described many honorific and humble particles, pronouns, verbs, and other forms of address, ways of reverence or courtesy, and polite titles, not only in oral language but also in different writing styles among men and as well between women, such as, the “particle” (suffix) “-goien,” which was equivalent to the men’s “particle” (suffix) “-sama.”

Acknowledgements

This research project was funded by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT), through the Center for Studies in Letters (CEL), reference no. UIDP/00707/2020, Portugal.

REFERENCES

ÁLVARES, M. Prologo. In: ÁLVARES, M. *Copia de algunas cartas que los padres y hermanos de la compañía de Iesus que andan en la India y otras partes orientales escriuieron a los de la misma compañía de Portugal desde el año de MDLVII hasta el de lxxj*. Coimbra: Joan de Barrera. 1562.

ÁLVARES, M. *De Institutione Grammatica libri tres*. Olyssipone: Joannes Barrerius. 1572.

ÁLVARES, M. *De Institutione Grammatica libri tres. Coniugationibus accessit interpretatio Iapponica*. Amacusa. 1594.

ARISTOTELES. *De Interpretatione: The Organon*. I. London: The Loeb Classical Library. 1949.

ASSUNÇÃO, C.; TOYOSHIMA, M. A gramática de Álvares (1594): a edição de Amakusa". *Confluência. Especial* 30 anos, p. 436-462, 2021.

BARROS, J. de. *Grammatica da Lingua Portuguesa*. Introdução e notas de Maria Leonor Carvalho Buescu. Lisboa: Publicações da Faculdade de Letras, 1971 [1540].

BOXER, C. R. Padre João Rodriguez Tçuzu S.J. and his Japanese Grammars of 1604 and 1620. *Boletim de Filologia*, Lisboa, n. 11, p. 338-363, 1950.

Cartas dos Jesuítas do Oriente e do Brasil 1549-1551, reprodução fac-similada. Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional, 1993.

COELHO, J.; HIDA, Y. *Shogakukan Dicionário Universal Japonês-Português Edição Compacta*. Tokyo: Shogakukan, 2010 [1997].

COOPER, M. *Rodrigues, O Intérprete*. Lisboa: Quetzal, 2003 [1974].

DIONYSIUS THRAX. *Grammatikh Tecnh*, tradução francesa de Jean Lallot, *La grammaire de Denys le Thrace*. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989.

DOÍ, T. *Notas explicativas ao livro facsimilado Arte da Lingoa de Japam de João Rodrigues*. Tokyo: Benseisha. 1976.

FERNANDES, G.; ASSUNÇÃO, C. da. First grammatical encoding of Japanese Politeness (17th century). *Boletim do Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi. Ciências Humanas*, v. 13, n. 1, p. 187-203, 2018.

FRÓIS, L. *História de Japam*. (ed. crítica de José Wicki). Lisboa: Biblioteca Nacional, 5 vols., 1563 1976-1984.

FONSECA, M. do C. B. da. *Historiografia Linguística do Século XVII: As unidades de relação na produção gramatical portuguesa*. Dissertação de Doutoramento em Linguística Portuguesa. Évora: Universidade de Évora. 2000.

IDE, S. How and why honorifics can signify dignity and elegance: the indexicality and reflexivity of linguistic rituals. In: LAKOFF, R. T.; IDE, S. (Eds.). *Broadening the horizon of Linguistic Politeness*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005, p. 45-64.

KEIL, H. *Grammatici Latini, vol II, III e IV*. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1981.

LABORINHO, A. P. Da descoberta dos povos encontro das línguas: o português como língua intermediária a Oriente. In: *Humanismo Latino nas Culturas do Extremo Oriente*. Macau: Fondazione Cassamarca, p. 71-91, 2005.

MARUYAMA, T. Importância dos estudos recíprocos entre o japonês e o português dos séculos XVI e XVII. *Revista de Letras Vila Real*, v. 5, p. 59-73, 2006.

PERCIVAL, W. K. La obra gramatical de Nebrija en el contexto de la hegemonía mundial europea. In: Escavy, R.; Hernández Terrés, J. M.; Roldán Pérez, A. (Eds.). *Actas del Congreso Internacional de Historiografía Lingüística: Nebrija V Centenario (1492-1992)*. Vol. I. Murcia: Universidad de Murcia, 1994, p. 59-84.

RODRIGUES, J. *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam*. Nangasaqui: Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de IESV, 1604-1608.

RODRIGUES, J. *Arte Breve da Lingoa Iapoa*. Amacao: Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de IESV, 1620.

SÁNCHEZ DE LAS BROZAS, Francisco. 1976 [1562]. *Minerva*. Madrid: Cátedra.

SHISHIDA, M. *Estudio diacrónico y contrastivo de los pronombres de cortesía en español con referencias al portugués*. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá (tesis doctoral), 2009.

VARRO. *De lingua latina II*. London: Loeb Classical Library. 1967.

ZWARTJES, O. *Gramáticas Missionárias Portuguesas na Ásia, África e Brasil, 1550-1800*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2011.