

The conjunction between coordination and subordination in missionary grammars of Aymara and Quechua

Annamaria Bartolotta
Università degli Studi di Palermo

Although coordination is a basic and universal syntactic construction, the conjunction is a grammatical category or part of speech that has often been neglected in the history of linguistics. The cause can be traced to the lack of correspondence between the morphosyntactic features and the functional meanings of this category, which should rather be placed on a grammatical *continuum* between coordination and subordination. The difficulty of an unambiguous definition is already evident in the reflections of ancient grammarians. The case of missionary grammarians at the beginning of the modern era represents a turning point, given the difficulty of adapting the classifications of the European tradition to indigenous languages characterized by a completely different morphosyntactic system. The aim of this paper is to analyze the first grammars of Aymara and Quechua written by missionary grammarians working at the school of Juli, which has been described as a true ‘linguistic laboratory’ of the Society of Jesus. Given that the notions of subordination and dependent sentence are commonly attributed to the Port-Royal grammarians (1660), and thus an explicit distinction between subordinating and coordinating conjunctions had not yet been formalized at the time, I attempt to reconstruct this distinction by analyzing the types of clauses that are explicitly defined as dependent and associated with specific conjunctions. The textual analysis suggests that, as early as the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, European grammarians were already aware of the distinction between coordination and subordination, thus challenging prevailing assumptions in the historiography of linguistic thought.

1. Introduction

The history of linguistics provides insight into how a grammatical category is constructed within a linguistic theory, revealing the difficulties that arise when attempting to identify a universally valid definition. These difficulties still emerge

today, particularly when linguists are challenged by a great crosslinguistic variation. An emblematic case is that of the conjunction, a grammatical category or part of speech often neglected in the history of linguistics (Berry-Rogghe 1970:5), precisely because the boundaries of this category are difficult to draw in a clear and comprehensive way. Despite the fact that it has indeed been classified as one of the indeclinable parts of speech since antiquity, first by Greek and later by Latin grammarians (cf. Lenker 2010; Swiggers & Wouters 2015; de Jonge 2008; Gutiérrez Galindo 1989; Suto 2012), the definition of conjunction still shows the lack of a unanimous agreement among linguists (cf. among others Berry-Rogghe 1970; Haspelmath 2004; cf. among others also Prandi 2007; Laury 2008; Salvi 2014; De Cesare 2019; 2022). In fact, conjunctions behave as a multifunctional category that encodes different relations (from coordination to causality, conditionality, etc.) at different syntactic levels (single words, phrases, clauses, sentences). The cause of the lack of such agreement is ultimately to be found in the mismatch between the morphosyntactic and functional properties inherent to this category, which should be placed in a grammatical *continuum* between coordination and subordination (cf. Cristofaro 2003; Mauri 2008) and is therefore of crucial importance in our understanding of how the syntactic system of a given language works. Thus, despite the fact that coordination is a basic and universal syntactic construction (Mithun 1988:331; 2003:567), the world's languages show a great variety in the way they grammaticalize coordination strategies. The consequence is the lack of a one-to-one correspondence between functions and forms, making it almost impossible to define a set of universally valid morphosyntactic and functional criteria. This issue has been constant throughout the history of linguistics, starting with the reflections of ancient grammarians (cf. Schad 2007:85–86). For example, in the category of σύνδεσμοι Aristotle includes conjunctions (both coordinating and subordinating), adverbials, and also prepositions (Orlandini & Poccetti 2014:268). More recently, some linguists (Prandi 2007; Salvi 2014; De Cesare 2019, 2022) have even argued in favour of eliminating this invariable part of speech, proposing to redistribute it in the class of adverbs (e.g. *also*), prepositions (e.g. *after*, *because*), and logical or syntactic operators (e.g. *and*, *or*, *but*, *if*, *that*).

What about missionary linguistics? The case of European missionary grammarians at the beginning of the modern era represents a major opportunity, being a turning point in the history of linguistics. These grammarians were faced with the difficult task of adapting the classifications and definitions of the Graeco-Latin tradition to languages that were previously unknown, characterized by a morphological and syntactic typology completely different from the languages the European missionaries spoke or knew. Moreover, lacking a system of alphabetic writing, indigenous languages rarely made use of conjunctions to combine clauses

or sentences but exploited other strategies, including mere juxtaposition, presumably intonation, the use of adverbs, suffixes, case morphemes, and nominalization (cf. Mithun 1988: 356; 2003: 571). The analysis of the first grammars of South American indigenous languages, written in Spanish or Portuguese between the 16th and 17th centuries, shows a great variety in both terminology and classification of conjunctions, depending on the language being described. Furthermore, one should not disregard that, according to linguistic historiography, the notion of subordination and the distinction between main and dependent clauses would not be codified until 1660, when the grammar of Port-Royal was published. In fact, while in ancient grammarians subordinate clauses, for example those in the subjunctive, were explained not as clauses governed by other clauses, but in terms of individual verbs governed by other verbs, Port-Royal grammarians explained that a whole sentence, referred to as *proposition incidente*, can be included in another sentence, referred to as the main sentence (*proposition principale*) (Arnauld & Lancelot 1660: 67-68; see Graffi 2019: 88; 2021: 35). Nonetheless, it has been recently shown how some Jesuit missionary grammarians extended the traditional word-level notion of determination and government (cf. Luhtala 2020: 43; Colombat 2020) to the inter-clausal domain, that is, to the relationship between the governing clause (*oración determinante*) and the dependent clause (*oración determinada*), which are seen as operating on distinct levels of syntactic dependency (Bartolotta 2023). This suggests that, contrary to previous claims (Percival 1990; Auroux 2000; Graffi 2021), a distinction between linear and structural order may have emerged before its formal systematization in the syntactic theory of the Port-Royal grammarians.

This study investigates how, starting from the traditional models (cf. Galán Sánchez 2006; Medina Montero 2015), Jesuit missionary grammarians based at the same school in Juli, an important religious center near Lake Titicaca in the Andes, sought to address theoretical challenges that still challenge the classification of conjunctions while describing Aymara and Quechua. Indeed, there is general agreement that the school of Juli became a fundamental institution as a true ‘linguistic laboratory’ of the Society of Jesus (cf. Segovia Gordillo 2016: 126 and references therein). The Fathers of the Society of Jesus were Ludovico Bertonio (1557–1625), who wrote the first grammar of Aymara in 1596 (published in Rome in 1603), Diego González Holguín (1560–1620), who wrote a grammar of Quechua (1607), and Diego de Torres Rubio (1547–1638), who wrote a grammar of both Aymara (1616) and Quechua (1619).

The main research questions addressed in this study are: (i) is there continuity or discontinuity between missionary grammars and traditional models of Graeco-Latin heritage in defining the ‘conjunction’? (ii) How do missionary grammarians try to adapt traditional classifications of conjunctions to the syntac-

tic system of indigenous languages? And most importantly, (iii) are they somehow aware of the difference, which had never been explicitly mentioned or explained in ancient and medieval grammars, between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions at the sentence level, in Latin as well as in the Romance and indigenous languages? The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, I first describe Bertonio's contribution to the traditional definition and classification of conjunctions as a part of speech, distinguishing among morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels. I will analyze Bertonio's treatment of conjunctions, highlighting the extent to which he adheres to traditional grammatical approaches while also introducing innovative elements to more accurately describe Aymara conjunctions. I will also consider Diego de Torres Rubio's and Diego González Holguín's contributions to highlight any overlapping traits or differences from Bertonio's definitions. Section 3 is mostly devoted to the second and third research questions, focusing on conjunctions marking independent and those marking dependent or subordinate clauses. In particular, I dwell on those sentences that are explicitly defined as dependent and marked by a specific conjunction, namely the completive (3.1), the relative (3.2), and the conditional clauses (3.3). I will investigate whether those grammarians recognized the distinction between coordination and subordination, based on their description of different types of conjunctions and their syntactic functions, which will serve as a litmus test. Section 4 presents concluding remarks and offers suggestions for future research.

2. *Conjunctions as a part of speech in Jesuit grammarians*

In the first grammar of Aymara, *Arte y Grammatica muy copiosa de la lengua aymara* (1603), Ludovico Bertonio deals with conjunctions in the second chapter, which is devoted to syntax. The latter is defined in the prologue to the grammar as:

el modo de construyr y juntar las ocho partes de la oracion: en lo qual se ha tenido atencion no tanto a la grammatica Latina, quanto a la dependencia que ay en esta lengua. (Bertonio 1603: 13)

[‘the way of constructing and combining the eight parts of the sentence: in which attention has been paid not so much to Latin grammar, as to the dependency that exists in this language.’]

In this first definition, it is already evident how Bertonio is fully aware of the distance between the syntax of Latin and that of Aymara, and therefore of the need to treat the latter specifically, without relying on the traditional grammatical categories (cf. Zwartjes 2000: 404; Bartolotta 2023: 46). In the first chapter of his *Arte*,

he describes the eight parts of speech, in order, nouns, pronouns, verbs (including gerund and supine), participles, prepositions, adverbs, interjections, and conjunctions.¹ He provides a detailed description of the morphology of the first four variable parts of speech, including noun declension and verb conjugation, while only the last four pages are devoted to the remaining indeclinable parts of speech. Unlike other grammarians of his time, Bertonio does give a definition of conjunction, which is initially classified as the last, i.e., the eighth part of speech (Bertonio 1603: 52). The same classification of the parts of speech is found in Diego de Torres Rubio's (1616) grammar of Aymara. Indeed, working at the same school, it is highly plausible that the missionary grammarians collaborated and influenced each other (Calvo Pérez 1997: 324; Cerrón Palomino 2000: 46; Peetermans 2020: 283; Bartolotta 2022: 48).² Differently, in the more recent version of his grammar, *Arte de la lengua aymara, con una silva de phrases dela misma lengua, y su declaracion en Romance*, Bertonio (1612: 77) classifies the conjunction no longer as the last, but as the seventh part of speech, followed by the interjection. This change seems to reflect a renewed consideration of conjunctions as if they had been given greater importance among the other indeclinable parts of speech, thus marking a first distance from the traditional Latin model, which was familiar in Europe through Nebrija's *Introductiones Latinae*. Indeed, in his *Introductiones*, Nebrija (2022 [1523]: 115) described conjunctions as the last of the eight parts of speech. While Bertonio's 1603 grammar focuses almost exclusively on the morphological and syntactic properties, the 1612 grammar shows greater attention to the logical-semantic properties of the conjunction. Let us compare the two definitions.

- (1) La conjunction es vna parte dela oracion, que sirue para trauar bien las de mas partes vna con otra, y no se declina como casi todas las de mas de que hasta

1. The division into eight parts of speech is based on the general descriptive model used by the School of Lima (Calvo Pérez 1997: 326; Segovia Gordillo 2016: 131). This model refers to the Latin tradition and terminology, which was well known and studied at the time, especially through Antonio de Nebrija's *Introductiones Latinae* (Salamanca 1481) (Calvo Pérez 1997: 321; Zwartjes 2002: 19; Esparza Torres 2007: 13). Nebrija himself translated this work into Spanish in 1486 to make Latin easier to learn for more people (*Introducciones latinas. contrapuesto el romance al latín*). However, this model is different from the one used in Nebrija's *Gramática Castellana*, which identified ten parts of speech in the language. That model included not only the article, but also the gerund, the infinite participial noun, and treated interjections as a type of adverb (Nebrija 2023 [1492]: 75; cf. Segovia Gordillo 2016: 131).

2. As remarked by an anonymous reviewer, missionary grammarians drew on both their practical experience with previously undocumented languages and the work of earlier missionaries. As a result, their metalanguage evolved, incorporating new descriptions and terminology, that could be transmitted from grammar to grammar (cf. Esparza Torres 2023: 96).

aquí hemos tratado, por que en las preposiciones podemos decir, *manquena*, *manquepana*, *ro*, *ta*, donde se ve que la preposicion se declina: *hani* es adverbio y podemos decir *hanina hanipa* [...]. En la conjunction no ay esto sino que *totalmente es indeclinable*. aquí tratare della segun diuersas especies, y segun requiere la neccidad dela lengua. (Bertonio 1603: 243) (emphasis is mine) [‘The conjunction is a part of speech, which serves to connect the other parts well with one another, and it does not decline like almost all the others we have discussed so far, because within prepositions we can say *manquena*, *manquepana*, *ro*, *ta*, where it can be seen that the preposition declines; *hani* is an adverb, and we can say *hanina hanipa* [...]. In the conjunction this does not happen, as it is *completely indeclinable*. Here, I will discuss it according to its various types and as the need of the language requires’]

In the earlier version (1), the first defining criterion is syntactic, as it pertains to the connective function of the conjunction, whose primary role is to link the other parts of speech. In this citation, Bertonio echoes an ancient tradition that extends from the ancient Stoics to Priscian and through him to medieval and Renaissance grammarians, according to which the conjunction serves to connect single words and not entire sentences.³ The second criterion is morphological, as the conjunction does not follow a declension like other variable or declinable parts of speech. Here, it is important to notice that Bertonio is aware of the main difficulty underlying the definition of the category of conjunction. He makes explicit what is not found in other grammars, that is the close contiguity among the three parts of speech, namely, conjunction, preposition, and adverb. He gathers these parts together, focusing his attention on a topic still debated in contemporary linguistics. Depending on the context, the same lexical item can indeed fulfill more than one function. It is no coincidence that some sixteenth-century grammarians even placed both conjunction and preposition as belonging to the part of speech of the adverb (Galán Sánchez 2005: 342).⁴ Instead, Bertonio tries to explain that Aymara morphology allows for a neat distinction between those categories. By giving concrete examples in the definition, he clarifies that while both prepositions and adverbs exhibit a morphological inflection, the conjunction is fully invariable. He then closes the definition by deferring to a further descrip-

3. It has been observed how Renaissance grammarians, depending on the tradition they followed, provided three different interpretations of the conjunction, i.e., a part of speech that joins (i) only words, (ii) only sentences, or (iii) both words and sentences (Galán Sánchez 2005: 340). In his *Gramática de la lengua castellana*, Nebrija (2023 [1492]: 107) writes that conjunctions serve “para ayuntar palabras y sentencias”.

4. Also for Quechua, González Holguín (1607: 256) notes that the same word can be an adverb but also a conjunction if it serves to connect two words.

tion of each specific type of conjunction found in Aymara. A different perspective emerges in the grammar published a few years later, as shown in the passage below (2).

- (2) Es tan necessario saber el vso delas conjunciones, assi en esta como en todas las lenguas, que sin ello por muchos vocablos, y Phrasis que vno sepa no hablara cosa digna de ser oyda con la claridad que combiene, ni que tenga que ver con buen lenguaje, polido, y elegante [...]. Dos cosas se han de mirar en las conjunciones, la *fuërça* que cada vna tiene, si es causal, si condicional, si aduersatiua, si disjunctiua, si copulatiua, si es a minore ad maius, si a maiore ad minus &c. Y la otra, qual es el *modo* que pide, si indicatiuo o optatiuo: si subiunctiuo, o gerundio &c. (Bertonio 1612: 77) (emphasis is mine)
- [‘It is so necessary to know the use of conjunctions, both in this and in all languages, that without it, despite the many words and sentences that one knows, one will not speak anything worthy of being heard with the convenient clarity, nor that has to do with good, polished, and elegant language [...]. Two things must be observed in conjunctions, the *force* each one has, whether it is causal, conditional, adversative, disjunctive, copulative, whether it is from minor to major, or from major to minor, etc. And the other (thing), what *mood* it requires, whether indicative or optative, whether subjunctive, or gerund etc.’]

This second definition seems to be in line with Bertonio’s choice to consider the conjunction no longer as the last or eighth part of speech. The defining criterion is no longer only syntactic because he is aware that the conjunction is not a mere linking element devoid of any semantic meaning, used to connect all the other parts of speech listed before it. It is as if the conjunction assumed greater dignity among the parts of speech, being endowed with its own semantic value. Syntax is thus excluded from the new definition, which instead focuses more on semantics and morphology. Precisely, after emphasizing the importance of the conjunction in order to speak well in any language, Bertonio dwells exclusively on two defining parameters, namely force (*fuërça*) and mood (*modo*). The former to some extent reminds us of the Priscianean concept of *vis* ‘force’, which refers to the semantic essence of coordination. However, Priscian distinguished between *vis*, i.e., the inherent connective function of conjunctions, et *ordo*, which instead relates to the function of expressing a consequential relationship between clauses (*consequentia*), as illustrated in the definition given in (3).

- (3) Coniunctio est pars orationis indeclinabilis, coniunctiva aliarum partium orationis, quibus consignificat, vim vel ordinationem demonstrans: *vim*, quando simul esse res aliquas significat, ut ‘et pius et fortis fuit Aeneas’; *ordinem*, quando consequentiam aliquarum demonstrat rerum, ut ‘si ambulat, movetur’. (Prisc. *Inst.* XVI, 93.1-6)⁵ (emphasis is mine)

['The conjunction is an indeclinable part of speech, conjunctive of other parts of speech, with which it co-signifies, showing force or order: *force*, when it signifies that certain things are together, as 'Aeneas was both pious and strong'; *order*, when it shows the consequence of certain things, as 'if he walks, he moves.']

From a syntactic perspective, Priscian's definition aims to point out the dual function of conjunctions, of either coordination or what we would today refer to as subordination (Baratin 1989: 53). Similarly, Nebrija distinguishes between conjunctions with a coordinating semantic function (Nebrija 2023 [1492]: 107) and conjunctions with a 'continuing' semantic function (*conjunciones continuativas*): the latter include examples of what we would call subordinating conjunctions introducing temporal sentences (Nebrija 2023 [1492]: 108). Such 'continuing' function is evidence of a linear rather than hierarchical (i.e., subordinating) syntax of conjunctions in Nebrija. This is further confirmed by his definition of Latin subordinating conjunctions *si* ('if'), *ut* ('for'), *cum* ('when'), *ubi* ('when'), *quoniam* ('because') as adjunctive (*adiunctiva*) conjunctions, which are linearly 'added' to the verb in the subjunctive mood.⁶ Differently, in Bertonio the force is a property equally ascribed to all types of conjunctions, from mere copulative to causal, conditional, adversative, and other functions also indicating the relationship between clauses posited at a different logical and syntactic level, i.e. major (*maius*) or minor (*minus*). In this way, he aims to assign equal status to all conjunctions. The second defining parameter is morphological, as it refers to the specific inflectional mood that each conjunction requires. This second definition seems to have also influenced other Jesuit grammarians working at the same school of Juli. In his *Arte de la lengua aymara*, Diego de Torres Rubio mentions the same two defining criteria, i.e., force and mood (4).⁷

- (4) En las conjunciones es necessario aduertir dos cosas, lo primero la naturaleza, y *fuërça* que tiene cada vna. Si es causal, si aduersatiua, si disiunctiua, &c. Lo segundo a que *modos* nos lleua, si a optatiuo subiunctibo, &c.
(Torres Rubio 1616: 49r) (emphasis is mine)

5. On the definition of conjunction in Priscian and other Latin grammarians see Gutiérrez Galindo (1989); on the legacy of Graeco-Latin grammarians in the definition of conjunction in medieval and Renaissance grammarians see Galán Sánchez (2005; 2006).

6. *Adiunctiva est quae verbi subiunctivis adiungitur, ut si, ut, cum, ubi, quoniam* (Nebrija 2022 [1523]: 542).

7. The same definition of conjunctions is found in Torres Rubio's *Arte de la lengua quichua* (1619: 40).

['In conjunctions it is necessary to notice two things, the first is the nature and *force* that each one has. Whether it is causal, adversative, disjunctive, etc. The second is to which *moods* it leads us, whether it is optative, subjunctive, etc.']

The morphological mood will indeed prove crucial in the emergence of the distinction between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, as will be seen in Section 3. In his grammars of Quechua, *Gramatica y arte nueva de la lengua general de todo el Peru, llamada lengua Quichua, o lengua del Inca* (1607), the Jesuit grammarian Diego González Holguín does not provide any general definition of conjunction, which he also classifies as the eighth and final part of speech, postponing any definition to the description of each specific type of conjunction (see § 3). What is interesting to notice is that the three missionary grammarians recognize the challenge in identifying and, consequently, classifying Aymara and Quechua conjunctions within the parts of speech according to the existing traditional models. For instance, Torres Rubio puts the very same particles (*particulas*) in two different sections of his grammar, one devoted to conjunctions, the other devoted to the so-called *particulas de ornato*, which are not even considered parts of speech but mere embellishments of the sentence, without any inherent semantic meaning (5):

- (5) Ay algunas particulas, que aunque algunas vezes son aduerbios, o conjunctio- nes, pero otras muchas vezes (y de ordinario) *no son partes de la oracion*, mas entran en ella, o para adornarla, o para variar en algo la significacion de las partes a quien se ayuntan [...]. *sca* es conjunction continuatiua, o copulatiua en oraciones, y adornala mucho, como en latin autem.

(Torres Rubio 1616: f. 12r-13v) (emphasis is mine)

['There are some particles, which are sometimes adverbs, or conjunctions, but often (and usually) *are not parts of speech*, but enter into it, either to adorn it, or to vary somewhat the meaning of the parts to which they are added [...]. *sca* is a continuative conjunction, or copulative conjunction in sentences, and adorns them greatly, as in Latin autem.']

In this separate section, called *De las particulas de ornato*, Torres Rubio places all the items that have a sort of pragmatic function, including those conjunctions that he considers merely ornamental, such as *autem* in Latin, according to his view. From (5) it can be thus inferred that pragmatics, as we refer to it today, is still considered secondary and optional within the grammatical system.⁸

8. As shown in Zwartjes (2020: 79), Torres Rubio reserves a similar description for Quechua, by including among the *particulas de ornato* conjunctions that in modern terms would be classified as epistemic and pragmatic.

3. *Conjunctions marking independent clauses*

As seen in the definition of conjunction examined in (1), Bertonio focuses on syntax (“para trazar bien las de mas partes una con otra”) and morphology (“totalmente es indeclinable”), while leaving semantics to the specific conjunction-by-conjunction description, based on the different contexts of use. In this, he seems to adopt the Priscianean view according to which conjunctions do not have an inherent meaning of their own but convey meaning depending on the words or sentences they occur with, i.e., they *consignificant* “co-signify”. Let us focus on the types of conjunctions identified by Bertonio, Torres Rubio, and González Holguín in their grammars of Aymara and Quechua, respectively. In detail, Bertonio lists eight different types of conjunctions in Aymara by comparing them to Latin, in order copulative (e.g. *sa, sca*, corresponding to Lat. *et*; e.g. *raqui*, corresponding to Lat. *quoque*), disjunctive (e.g. *michca* corresponding to Lat. *vel*), adversative (including concessive, e.g. *pañã* corresponding to Lat. *quamvis, licet*), “corresponding to adversative” (including other adversatives or concessive like Lat. *veruntamen, sed tamen*), illative (without specific conjunction, but expressed through a “substantive verb”, corresponding to Lat. *quapropter, quamobrem, igitur*), causal (e.g. *pilla*, corresponding to Lat. *quoniam, enim, namque*), conditional (without conjunction corresponding to Lat. *si*, but expressed through *ucaca* added to the main clause), and “proper to Aymara language” (e.g. *pacta*, corresponding to Lat. *cave ne*, etc.).

Torres Rubio (1616: 42-43) classifies only seven types for Aymara, without including concessive conjunctions as a type of its own but considering them as adversatives, following in this most of grammarians of his time (Galán Sánchez 2006: 392). Differently from Bertonio, he denominates the last class of conjunctions as *indiferentes* “indifferent”, i.e., neutral or indefinite, here including the Latin conjunctions *ut* and *quod*. This peculiar class will prove relevant in answering the research question as to whether missionary grammarians recognized the subordinating role of conjunctions. In his grammar of Quechua, Torres Rubio (1619: 40-41) includes six types in the same order, precisely copulative, disjunctive, adversative, illative, causal, and again “indifferent”, while González Holguín (1607: 308-312) identifies eleven types for Quechua, by comparing them almost always to Spanish, precisely copulative (7), disjunctive (e.g. *cayri*, corresponding to Sp. *o*), adversative (e.g. *ca, ri, cana*, corresponding to Sp. *pero, empero, mas*), *pana* (e.g. *haycay, pana*, corresponding to concessive Sp. *aunque*), collective (e.g. *hinaca, hinari, hinaspa*, corresponding to Sp. *y así, así que, finalmente, al fin*), illative (e.g. *hinaspaca*, corresponding to Lat. *ergo, igitur*), rational (e.g. *raycu, manta, pacmi*, corresponding to Sp. *por tanto, por eso, por lo qual*), causal (e.g. *hay, ari, cáã*, corresponding to Sp. *porque*), affirmative (e.g. *m(i), tac, puni*, corresponding to Sp. *sin duda, sin falta, en todo caso*), presumptive (e.g. *-ch(a)*, corresponding to

Sp. *quizá*), continuative (e.g. *hay, ari, cáà*, corresponding to Sp. *y así, así que, y también*, etc.). Neither Torres Rubio nor González Holguín formally include conditionals among the conjunctions of Quechua, although both discuss them, as will be seen in § 3.3. Table 1 below shows the classification of conjunctions in the order given by the three grammarians of the school of Juli.

Table 1. Types of conjunction in Bertonio, Torres Rubio, and González Holguín

Bertonio (1603)	González Holguín (1607)	Torres Rubio (1616)	Torres Rubio (1619)
<i>copulativa</i>	<i>copulativa</i>	<i>copulativa</i>	<i>copulativa</i>
<i>disiunctiva</i>	<i>disiuntiva</i>	<i>disiunctiva</i>	<i>disiunctiva</i>
<i>adversativa</i>	<i>adversativa</i>	<i>adversativa</i>	<i>adversativa</i>
<i>correspondientes a las adversativas</i>	<i>pana 'empero'</i>	<i>illativa</i>	<i>illativa</i>
<i>illativa</i>	<i>collectiva</i>	<i>causal</i>	<i>causal</i>
<i>causal</i>	<i>ilativa</i>	<i>condicional</i>	<i>indiferentes</i>
<i>condicional</i>	<i>racional</i>	<i>indiferentes</i>	
<i>propria desta lengua</i>	<i>causal</i>		
	<i>afirmativa</i>		
	<i>presumptiva</i>		
	<i>de continuacion</i>		

These differences show that, despite working within the same school, each of the three grammarians maintained an independent approach to grammar.⁹ Let us take a closer look at specific conjunctions. The first thing to notice concerns the copulative conjunction. Moving away from the Graeco-Latin model and the Priscianean influence, which was still prevalent among Renaissance grammarians (Galán Sánchez 2005:341), the three Jesuit grammarians agree on the kind of connective function of the copulative conjunction, which serves to link not only individual words or parts of speech but also clauses and entire sentences.¹⁰ In particular, they specify that some conjunctions are more commonly used to connect single words, while others are used to connect sentences and discourses, in Aymara (6) as in Quechua (7).

9. On the grammatical sources used by González Holguín and Torres Rubio to describe the conjunctions of Quechua see Segovia Gordillo (2020:245ff.).

10. The idea that the conjunction combines both words and sentences was already circulating among European grammarians of the humanistic-Renaissance era, especially with the spread of Juan de Pastrana's (1497) grammar of Latin. However, only a few Renaissance grammarians adopted this innovation within their definition of conjunction (Galán Sánchez 2005:342).

- (6) Dos maneras de copulatiuas ay, vnas que juntan *dictiones*, otras que juntan *clausulas* y *oraciones*. (Bertonio 1603: 243) (emphasis is mine)
 [There are two types of copulatives, some that join *words*, and others that join *clauses* and *sentences*]
- (7) Las copulativas, unas son para copular y unir *dicciones solas* una con otra, y no *oraciones* [...]. Tambien pueden estas conjunciones copular oraciones enteras con otra significacion muy galana, como en Latin ‘Cum’ lo uno Tum lo otro. [...] Copulativas de oraciones o de *razones enteras*, son (ca) o (ri) que significan (y) [...]. Esta copulativa (quoque, tambien) que es comun para copular lo todo, dicciones y oraciones, se dice de muchas maneras [...].
 (González Holguín 1607: 308) (emphasis is mine)
 [‘The copulatives, some of them are for coupling and joining *single words* with each other and not *sentences* [...]. These conjunctions can also couple entire sentences with another very elegant meaning, as in Latin *cum*, the one, *tum*, the other. [...] Copulatives for sentences or *entire discourses* are *ca* or *ri*, which mean *and* [...]. This copulative *quoque, also*, which is common to couple everything, words and sentences, is said in many ways.’]

As can be noted from these preliminary definitions, both grammatical terminology and examples used by the Jesuit grammarians are drawn from Latin or Spanish. Consequently, the identification of each part of speech in the native languages proves to be extremely difficult, since Aymara and Quechua, being agglutinative languages, show a morphosyntactic structure completely different from that of Indo-European languages. For instance, Bertonio is not able to consistently distinguish between bound and free morphemes (or particles), to the extent that the same particle *raqui* ‘also’ is classified now as a copulative conjunction in the second part of his grammar devoted to syntax (Bertonio 1603: 243), now as a particle (*particula*) in the third part that is not pertaining to syntax. The description of *raqui* is one of many examples showing the challenges of identifying and classifying parts of speech in South American languages, as illustrated in (8).

- (8) Aunque esta *particula* es *aduerbio* o *conjunction*, pero porque *entra en los verbos* se pone aqui con la demas, y significa ‘etiam’ o ‘quoque’, v.g. nuestros Padres murieron y nos otros tambien moriremos, diremos *auquinacassa hihuapiscana, hiussasa hihuaracquitana*.
 (Bertonio 1603: 296) (emphasis is mine)
 [‘Although this *particle* is an *adverb* or *conjunction*, nevertheless, since it *enters the verbs*, it is placed here with the other (particles), and means ‘etiam’ or ‘quoque’, e.g. our Fathers died and we will also die, we will say *auquinacassa hihuapiscana, hiussasa hihuaracquitana*.’]

In this passage (8), Bertonio clearly shows to be aware of a theoretical issue that is still a matter of debate among linguists. Indeed, here he is forced to admit that the same *raqui* can either occur on its own, functioning as a conjunction or an adverb, or as an affix that is added to verbs, as in *hihuaraquitana* ‘and we will also die’, where the infixed *raqui* maintains its syntactic coordinative function despite being a morphological affix. Regarding the other conjunctions, it is worth noting that while Bertonio and Torres Rubio, in addition to the corresponding Latin form, limit themselves to give Aymara or Quechua examples, González Holguín also attempts to define each single type of conjunction. Precisely, all the eleven conjunctions he classifies serve to unite (*unir*) (even in the case of disjunctive, adversative, rational, causal), to gather and conclude (*recojer y concluir*) (collective and illative), to diversify (*de diversidad*) (*pana*, i.e., concessive), to affirm (*afirmar*) (affirmative), to presume (*presumir*) or suspect (*sospechar*) (presumptive), to continue (*continuar*) (continuative). The trait these conjunctions have in common is that they generally connect sentences placed on the same syntactic level; that is, they connect independent sentences, not determined by other sentences. Indeed, in modern linguistics, it is well-known that in coordination, the two clauses are syntactically equal, i.e., both are finite and independent, whereas in subordination, the two clauses are not syntactically equal, i.e., one is subordinate or dependent on the main clause, being non-finite or sometimes showing special inflection like subjunctive (Croft 2001: 321). Thus, conjunctions such as those marking relative or conditional clauses are perceived by González Holguín as different in nature from the others listed above because they characterize dependent clauses. And it is probably for this reason that González Holguín decided to place this type of conjunctions separately, albeit remaining within the same chapter devoted to conjunctions.

3.1 Conjunctions marking dependent clauses (completive)

After analyzing the copulative conjunctions used for coordinating sentences placed at the same syntactic level, let us now focus on those conjunctions used to connect clauses at different syntactic levels. To this end, it is important to note that Bertonio was one of the first grammarians of his time to extend the traditional word-based notion of “determination” to the relationship between sentences, by introducing the dichotomy between governing clause (*oración determinante*) and governed clause (*oración determinada*). This dichotomy is used to express a dependency relation between the main or independent clause and its dependent clause and appears to be also adopted by the other Jesuit grammarians working at Juli (Bartolotta 2023: 58). In fact, the three missionaries move away from the traditional syntactic word-based linear order, bringing out the structural or hier-

archical order of grammatical relations. For example, in the discussion of *verba dicendi*, a clear distinction is made between main and dependent or, in modern terms, subordinate clauses (9).

- (9) Una cosa es comun a todas tres lenguas que siempre en este modo de hablar entrevienen *dos oraciones*, la una es del verbo, digo, o *satha*, el qual llamaremos verbo *determinante*, y otra que se determina de *sacha*, alla qual llamaremos oracion o verbo *determinado*.
(Bertonio 1603: 113-114) (emphasis is mine)
[‘One thing is common to the three languages, that always in this way of speaking there are *two clauses*, one is from the verb ‘say,’ or *satha*, which we will call the *determining* verb, and another that is determined from *sacha* (scil. *satha*), which we will call *determined* sentence or verb.’]

Consequently, the conjunction that marks the dependent or subordinate clause is introduced to describe the hierarchical structure of this complex construction consisting of two sentences.¹¹ Let us observe the passages in (10) and (11).

- (10) [...] en la lengua Española en *la oracion que se determina del verbo dice*, pienso quiero, &c. casi siempre se usa de aquella *particula, que, declarativa*; la lengua Aymara usa de *hua*, o *pi*, añadiendo muchas veces el gerundio *sassina*; la lengua Latina no tiene particula que le corresponda, sino usa del infinitivo poniendo il verbo determinado en el tiempo que la cosa pide, sino es que queramos decir, que la particula *quod*, es lo mismo que la particula que del romance, pero los buenos Latinos no la usan.
(Bertonio 1603: 113) (emphasis is mine)
[‘in the Spanish language in *the sentence that is determined from the verb say, think, want, etc.*, that *declarative particle ‘that’* is almost always used; the Aymara language uses *hua*, or *pi*, often adding the gerund *sassina*; the Latin language does not have a particle that corresponds to it, but uses the infinitive by putting the determined verb in the tense requested by the context, unless we want to say that the particle *quod* is the same as the particle *that* of Romance, but the good Latins do not use it’]

In (10) Bertonio tries to explain the complex construction of the verb ‘to say’ (*satha*) and other similar verbs in Aymara, by making a comparison with Spanish and Latin. Indeed, the indigenous Andean languages, like Quechua and Aymara,

11. The concept of complex sentence was first introduced by the Renaissance grammarian Petrus Ramus (1515–1572) in 1560 (Galán Sánchez 2005: 347). The same concept is found in Bertonio’s *Arte* (Bartolotta 2023: 58), who however refers to a sentence made of two clauses placed at a different syntactic level.

use nominalized or nonfinite verbal forms (e.g. gerunds, participles) instead of subordinate clauses with finite verbal forms, as is typical of Indo-European languages such as Latin or Spanish. Therefore, faced with this new syntactic peculiarity, Bertonio is forced to explain the relation of dependency by comparing the nominalized dependent clause made in Aymara with the gerund *sassina* to the clause that in Spanish is marked by what he calls the declarative particle *que* ‘that’, corresponding to Latin *quod*. And that is precisely the point, as Bertonio is aware that Sp. *que* or Lat. *quod* ‘that’ are the particles that mark the dependent clause, but he still does not know how to name or classify such particles.¹² Indeed, Humanist and Renaissance grammarians traditionally classified Latin *quod* as a causal conjunction. The first to recognize its completive function was Thomas Linacre (c.1460–1524), who in his *De emendata structura latini sermonis* (1524) labeled *quod* as a “definitive” conjunction, which is used to determine the meaning of the preceding verb (*definitivae, quae praecedentis verbi significationem determinant*) (Linacre 1524; cf. Galán Sánchez 2006: 393). However, in Linacre’s definition, the notion of dependency (*determinatio*) is still used in its traditional sense and applied to two individual words, — in this case, the verb and the conjunction. It is unlikely that the Jesuit grammarians at the school of Juli were familiar with Linacre’s work, since none of them adopted his definitions. Nevertheless, they move a step beyond Linacre: not only do they exclude *quod* from the category of causal conjunctions, but Torres Rubio also classifies it separately, placing it among those conjunctions without a specific name, i.e., *indiferentes* (11).

- (11) Otras *conjunciones* ay *indiferentes*, como es ‘*ut, quod*’, en romance ‘que’, esta se suple con el gerundio *sasin*, como el dize *que* vendrà, *hupapi hutaha sasinsi*, o con el mesmo verbo *satha*, como digote que hagas esto, *aca lurama sasma* ». (Torres Rubio 1616: f. 43r) (emphasis is mine)
[‘There are other *indifferent conjunctions*, such as ‘*ut, quod*’, in Romance ‘que’, this is replaced with the gerund *sasin*, as in ‘he says *that* he will come’, *hupapi hutaha sasinsi*, or with the same verb *satha*, as in ‘I tell you to do this’, *aca lurama sasma*.’]

More importantly, the relation of syntactic dependency (*determinatio*) no longer concerns two single words, e.g., a verb and its complement, such as the Latin verb *credo* and the conjunction *quod* in Linacre’s example, but two entire sentences, as seen in (9) and (10). This paved the way towards the modern

12. It should be noted that in the three Jesuit grammarians of the school of Juli the term *particula* turns out to be highly polysemous. It is used as a synonym for grammatical morphemes (of case, number, tense, mood, etc.) and for preposition, adverb, and conjunction, as partly seen for instance with *raqui* in (8).

definition of subordinate conjunction, since a conjunction can be defined as subordinating insofar it marks a dependent clause (*determinada*), i.e., a clause subordinated by another clause. Thus, the idea of what we currently refer to as subordinate conjunction originally emerged in relation to sentences governed by verbs of saying, thinking, and believing, which have a distinct argument structure compared to other verbs. In fact, these verb classes require a whole sentence to saturate their valence rather than a simple NP-object. It is with reference to these specific verbs that the notion of dependency is first associated with the notion of conjunction in missionary grammars. Indeed, in these cases, the conjunction introduces a subordinate or dependent object-clause. Such an association arises precisely due to the peculiar characteristic of many South American indigenous languages of expressing subordination by using nominalizations or simple NPs (also including non-finite verb forms, such as gerunds, participles, and supines) (cf. van Gijn & al. 2011). This might have facilitated the shift from the notion of dependency between two words, as still conceived in other Renaissance grammarians such as Linacre, to the notion of dependency between two clauses.

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that while Bertonio, in his effort to align with the traditional model, considers Aymara *hua* and *pi* as conjunctions corresponding to the Latin conjunction *quod* introducing the dependent clause (10), Torres Rubio argues that Latin *quod* has no equivalent in Aymara. Indeed, this language replaces the complement clause introduced by *quod*, with a nominalization using the gerund *sasin*.¹³ The problem arises because *hua* and *pi* are sentence suffixes with declarative and confirmatory functions, respectively. As such, they can mark either dependent or independent clauses without distinction. This pattern persists in modern Aymara, where both suffixes, transliterated as *-wa* (*hua*) and *-pi*, can attach to either nouns or verbs and take scope over the entire sentence (cf. Hardman 2001: 171, 179; Coler 2014: 535, 556). Therefore, as they still are not familiar with the proper definition, the two European grammarians include *hua* and *pi* among the general category of *particulas de ornato* “particles of ornament” (Bertonio 1603: 316), which can also be used as conjunctions or adverbs, as already seen in (5). Of course, such approximation and vagueness are revealing of a linguistic reflection where the so-called subordinating conjunctions are still a concept in the process of formation.

13. Interestingly, the example given by Torres Rubio shows the same particle *pi* identified by Bertonio as introducing a dependent clause (*hupapi hutaha sasinsi* ‘el dize que vendrà’) (11).

3.2 Conjunctions marking dependent clauses (relative)

The idea of a conjunction that characterizes or marks an entire dependent clause reappears in the discussion about both relative and conditional clauses. In the section devoted to conjunctions of Quechua, after listing the eleven types of conjunctions, González Holguín adds two types, which he names *para relativos* ‘for relatives’ (12), and *de las oraciones condicionales* ‘of conditional sentences’. Let us consider first the relative sentence while leaving the conditional sentence for discussion in Section § 3.3.

- (12) *A la primera oracion de las dos relativas se añade al cabo ca por señal de que son relativas, y luego se comienza la otra oracion con chayca para trabarlas, que suple por ‘el que, lo que, lo cual’, como se dijo allí.*

(González Holguín 1607: 312)

[‘To the *first clause* of the two relative clauses, *ca* is added at the end as a *sign that they are relative*, and then the *other clause* begins with *chayca* to link them, which replaces ‘él que, lo que, lo cual’, as mentioned there.’]

In this passage (12), González Holguín defines the two relative particles *ca* and *chayca*, which have been identified as *señal de relaciones* “signals of relations” (p.288). In the chapter devoted to the relative clauses (p.286ff.), *chayca* is said to be essential in the relative construction. He specifies the meaning of this particle as follows (13).

- (13) *Digo que por eso estas oraciones [scil. relativas] se hacen asperas y oscuras á los que no son muy versados en la lengua, porqué no entienden la fuerza y significacion de dos particulas que hay en ‘chayca’ una es ‘chay’ que es pronombre y significa él, o este, y ‘ca’ que significa entre otras muchas significaciones [...] de la partícula de la elegancia lo que en latin ‘quod, que’ como se vee aquí, yachaychic cunanpunchaoca, ayunaypunchaocmi, sabed que hoy es dia de ayuno,* (González Holguín 1607: 287) (emphasis is mine)

[‘I say that for this reason these [*scil. relative*] sentences become harsh and obscure to those who are not very versed in the language, because they do not understand the force and meaning of two particles found in *chayca*. One is *chay*, which is a pronoun and means ‘he’ or ‘this’, and *ca*, which means among many other meanings [...] of the *particle of elegance that in Latin is quod* ‘that’, as it is seen here, *yachaychic cunanpunchaoca, ayunaypunchaocmi* ‘know that today is a day of fasting.’]

In (13) González Holguín clarifies that *chayca* is made of two elements, i.e., the pronominal form *chay* and the particle *ca*, which he assimilates to the Latin conjunction *quod*, corresponding to the Spanish complementizer *que* ‘that’, as in the quoted example ‘sabad **que** hoy es dia de ayuno’. This compound particle *chayca* is not yet defined by a specific name, except as the periphrasis ‘conjunction

for relatives.’¹⁴ This lack of a precise definition reflects that Latin *quod* is generally classified as a causal conjunction in the Renaissance grammars (Galán Sánchez 2006: 386-387). Thus, since the complementizer *quod* cannot be equated with the causal *quod*, González Holguín, like Bertonio and Torres Rubio, encounters the difficulty of defining this type of conjunction. Unable to determine its exact classification, they place it among the so-called *partículas de elegancia* “particles of elegance” or *partículas de ornato* “particles of ornament”, which are said to form the sentence in a fluent and elegant manner. At the same time, González Holguín emphasizes the complexity of the ‘force’ of *chayca*, thus conferring to it one of the defining features typical of conjunctions, as seen in Bertonio (2) and Torres Rubio (4). Interestingly enough, he adds that this relative marker (*señal de relaciones*) conveys an ‘indeterminate’ meaning (14).

- (14) Y desta chayca añado que como es forma de cuantos relativos hay así su significacion es *infinita y no determinada*, y á veces significa como nombre relativo y otras come adverbio con oraciones de tiempo dice entonces con oraciones de lugar dice allí, o en ese lugar y a veces dice en tal caso, o siendo así o de esta manera, y así se ha de explicar estirandola á todo lo que pide la primera oracion relativa. (González Holguín 1607: 288) (emphasis is mine)
[‘And about this *chayca*, I add that as it is the form of how many relatives there are, so its meaning is *infinite* and *not determined*, and sometimes it means as a relative noun and other times as an adverb. With temporal clauses, it says ‘then’, with locative clauses it says ‘there’ or ‘in this place’, and sometimes it says ‘in such a case’, or ‘being so’ or ‘in this way’, and thus it should be explained by extending it to all that the first relative sentence asks for.]

The passage in (14) describes the conjunction for relatives *chayca* as a polyvalent lexical element, somehow like Sp. *que*, Lat. *quod*, or Engl. *that*. Indeed, González Holguín clarifies that it can also function as a relative pronoun and as an adverb, used in different types of clauses. What is relevant here is that this lexical element is infinite and undetermined. In González Holguín (1607: 261-262), these terms refer to what is unfinished or incomplete and needs to be governed by another element. In fact, these terms are reserved for dependent clauses or, as we would say, subordinate clauses (cf. Bartolotta 2023: 59). It is for this reason that the function of *chayca* can only be identified through its connection with the first relative clause on which it depends.¹⁵ In other words, González Holguín is

14. Precisely, González Holguín (1607: 312) entitles the paragraph *Para relativos* “for relatives” by omitting the word ‘conjunction’, but inserting the same paragraph within the list of conjunctions.

15. It is worth noting that, in contemporary Spanish grammars of that period, the verb *pedir* ‘to ask’ is employed as a synonym for *rejir* ‘to govern’ (cf. Bartolotta 2022: 59).

emphasizing how this conjunction ‘for relatives’ is a subordinate conjunction that depends on the main clause, introducing a clause that is governed by an independent clause. Let us observe the Quechuan example in (15).

- (15) Diospa graciaanpac camaricunchayca, usachicuntacmi, y significa para la gracia de Dios se prepara ese tal la alcanza, que diremos aquí que ni hay participio que diga él que ni ‘pi’ nombre relativo que lo dice y falta, y el verbo no lo dice mas que preparase, (González Holguín 1607:287) (emphasis is mine) [‘Diospa graciaanpac camaricunchayca, usachicuntacmi, and it means [he who] prepares himself for the grace of God, such person reaches it, what will we say here given that there is neither a participle that says ‘he who’ nor *pi* relative noun that says it and it is missing, and the verb does not say more than ‘prepares himself’[?]]

González Holguín begins to explain the example in (15) by saying that in this relative sentence the relative pronoun or a participle replacing it are both missing, while the verb *camaricun* only means ‘prepare oneself’. As he clarifies in the next passage, already quoted in (13), it is *chayca* that allows us to understand that this is a relative clause. More precisely, (15) shows a complex sentence made up of two clauses. On the one hand, the relative clause with the compound verb *camaricunchayca* ‘he who prepares himself’, on the other hand, the main independent clause with the verb *usachicuntacmi* ‘he reaches it’. It is *chayca* that, when added to the verb *camaricun*, transforms it into the verb of the relative clause ‘who/that prepares himself’. In modern linguistic terms, this could be an instance of correlative clauses, i.e., “a coordinate-like structure used for the relative clause function: [...] both clauses are balanced, and the relative clause is not embedded” (Croft 2001:326). However, the presence of a specific relative morpheme in the relative clause leads González Holguín to consider the two clauses as syntactically unequal. More in detail, as seen in (12), he defines *chayca* as the linking element that connects the two clauses. Now, since it is *no determinada* ‘not determined’ and thus dependent on the main clause, here *usachicuntacmi* ‘he reaches it’, this would imply that the whole clause marked by *chayca* is dependent on the main clause *usachicuntacmi*. In fact, the overlap between verb and its corresponding sentence is a common feature among grammarians of the time, as seen for example in (9) (cf. Bartolotta 2023: 53-54). This kind of reasoned description allows us to trace the development that led 17th-century grammarians to define the relative clause as a dependent or subordinate clause before its definition was established in the Port-Royal Grammar (Arnauld & Lancelot 1660).¹⁶

16. Similarly, the description of relative clauses provided by Bertonio points to the dependency status of the relative clause in relation to the main clause (cf. Bartolotta 2023: 62).

3.3 Conjunctions marking dependent clauses (conditional)

After analyzing the development of the concept of dependent, i.e., subordinating conjunction with reference to the relative clause, let us now examine the conditional conjunction. Firstly, the only one of the three Jesuit grammarians to formally include the conditional conjunction among the other conjunctions is Bertonio, who in this respect proves his adherence to one of the most innovative approaches within the Renaissance grammatical tradition (Galán Sánchez 2006: 402).

- (16) No ay partícula de por si, con que se explique la *conjunction condicional* que en Latin es, *si*, pero sufficientemente se entiende ex antecedentibus & consequentibus, y por una partícula, *ucaca*, que entra en la 2. *oracion absoluta* [...]: si no hicieredes penitencia ireis al infierno, *hani penitencia lurapiscahata*, *ucaca manque pacharo mapinihata* (Bertonio 1603: 247-248) (emphasis is mine)
 [‘There is no particle for ‘if’, with which the *conditional conjunction* in Latin *si* is explained, but it is sufficiently understood from the antecedents and consequents, and by a particle *ucaca* that enters the second absolute sentence [...]: if you do not do penance you will go to hell, *hani penitencia lurapiscahata*, *ucaca manque pacharo mapinihata*’]

In this passage (16), Bertonio explicitly defines Latin *si* as a conditional conjunction, noting however that it has no equivalent in Aymara. He adds, though, that in the Aymara conditional sentence, it is the second independent clause (*oracion absoluta*) that is marked by a specific particle (*ucaca*), as shown in the example he provides, where the two clauses are separated by a comma. Now, since Aymara is an SOV language, here Bertonio shows to be aware of the fact that the second clause is always the main independent clause of a complex construction or sentence, and that this clause governs, i.e., *determines* the clause placed first in the same construction, similarly to what seen in (9). Compared to Bertonio, González Holguín shows adherence to the more traditional models in the choice to exclude the conditional conjunction from his list of ‘official’ conjunctions. However, he adds a new separate paragraph called *de las oraciones condicionales* ‘of the conditional sentences’, following those dedicated to all the other conjunctions. Similarly, after describing continuative conjunctions, Torres Rubio mentions a conjunction that “entra en las oraciones condicionales” (‘enters conditional sentences’) in Aymara. These choices suggest that the inclusion of a specific conditional conjunction was not yet widely accepted among European grammarians. However, the descriptions given by the missionaries suggest that they are aware that some specific conjunctions can mark dependent conditional sentences. Let us examine González Holguín’s definitions (17)–(18).

- (17) Para las oraciones condicionales que incluyen ‘si’ o quando o aunqué, aquel ‘si’ *une estas dos oraciones*, como se dijo en el *subjuntivo*.
(González Holguín 1607:312) (emphasis is mine)
[‘For conditional sentences that include ‘if’ or ‘when’ or ‘although’, that ‘if’ connects these two sentences, as mentioned in the *subjunctive*.’]

From this brief syntactic definition, it can be inferred that the Quechua equivalent of Spanish *si* ‘if’, here assimilated to other conjunctions such as the temporal ‘when’ and the concessive ‘although’, always connects two sentences. As with relative clauses, González Holguín here refers to a single complex sentence consisting of two clauses.¹⁷ The explanation of how these two clauses work is postponed to the section dedicated to the subjunctive (18).

- (18) al subjuntivo le pertenecen todas las oraciones condicionales *por respecto de la particula ‘si’* que es del *subjuntivo*: la qual se ha de explicar con poner ‘ca’ al fin del subjuntivo en toda las oraciones condicionales.
(González Holguín 1607:98) (emphasis is mine)
[‘all conditional sentences pertain to the subjunctive *because of the particle si*, which is of the *subjunctive*: this is made explicit by adding *ca* at the end of the subjunctive in all conditional sentences.’]

González Holguín emphasizes two distinctive features of the conditional sentence: on the one hand, the particle ‘if’, which he includes in the section on conjunctions, and on the other hand, the subjunctive mood. Regarding the latter, he adds a crucial piece of information (19).

- (19) Digo pues, que el subjuntivo no se halla solo, ni puede haber una *oracion de subjuntivo* sin otra que se junte, que eso significa subjuntivo, que se *junta y subjecta á otra oracion que lo determina* (González Holguín 1607:95-96). Las oraciones de subjuntivo [...] son siempre *indeterminadas*, y aguardan á que otra oracion de otro modo las determine, y concluya su sentido y segun lo dicho han de estar primero, y las que las determinan han de estar al fin dellas. Y así estas se llaman oraciones indeterminadas, que no pueden estar por si solas, sin *otra oracion que las determine*. (González Holguín 1607:261)
(emphasis is mine)
[‘I say then that the subjunctive is not found alone, nor can there be a *subjunctive sentence* without another (sentence) that joins it, as that is what subjunctive means, that it *joins and is subjected to another sentence that determines it*’]

17. In this regard, González Holguín (1607:261) dedicates a chapter of his grammar to *Del orden de dos oraciones o mas entre si, que se ordenan á un sentido entero* [‘On the order of two or more sentences among themselves, which are ordered to form a complete meaning’].

[Subjective sentences [...] are always *indeterminate*, and they wait for another sentence with a different mood to determine them and complete their meaning. According to what has been said, they must be located first, and the sentences that determine them must be located at the end of them. Thus, they are called indeterminate sentences, which cannot stand alone without *another sentence that determines them*.']

The subjunctive is the mood of dependent or subordinate (*subjectas* 'subjected') clauses, which González Holguín calls indeterminate because they require another (independent) clause, with the indicative mood, that governs them (González Holguín 1607: 261). As seen for Bertonio (9), González Holguín is fully aware that the first clause of the complex conditional sentence is dependent on the second governing clause of the construction. Like Aymara, Quechua is indeed an SOV language (cf. Cerrón Palomino 2008: 183), which is why González Holguín often remarks that the governing clause must be placed at the end of a complex sentence or construction, after the subordinate clause. Similarly to Bertonio, González Holguín points out that a conditional sentence cannot be made without the presence of the particle 'if', which serves to join the two clauses forming the complex sentence. However, compared to Aymara, Quechua has this particle, so that González Holguín can include it in the conjunction class, in the same chapter devoted to other 'official' conjunctions.

4. *Final remarks*

Despite the difficulty of tracing discrete boundaries among parts of speech, the category of conjunction turns out to be fundamental in any theoretical approach, starting from Antiquity and throughout the history of linguistics. It allows us to capture the universal phenomenon of coordination, which tends to grammaticalize cross-linguistically, be it initially expressed through lexicon (linking particles, adverbs), phonology (intonation or pause), morphology (inflectional or derivational morphemes), syntax (juxtaposition). Returning to the research questions posed at the beginning of this article, we are now in a position to provide an answer. As for the first question, namely (i) is there continuity or discontinuity between missionary grammars and traditional models of Graeco-Latin heritage in defining 'conjunction?', the textual analysis of the Jesuit missionary grammars of Aymara and Quechua has shown that the classifications and definitions of conjunctions provided by the three European grammarians, although presenting some differences among them, are generally in line with some of the main tendencies within the syntactic reflection of that time.

However, some important original features emerge, allowing us to trace back to the first divergence between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions.

Also, the description of conjunction shows that, as was typical of that period, there is still no distinction between syntactic and pragmatic functions of conjunctions, as is evident, for instance, from González Holguín's (1607: 311) description of what he calls affirmative and presumptive conjunctions, which in contemporary linguistics would correspond to pragmatic and epistemic discourse markers. Of course, the great difference between traditional Renaissance and modern classifications is mainly due to the lack of a developed and accepted syntactic notion of dependency between clauses. This notion is said to have been introduced for the first time by the grammarians of Port-Royal (cf., among others, Graffi 1998; 2021: 35), but a close scrutiny of the description of conjunctions in the grammars of non-Indo-European indigenous languages has instead revealed that a clear distinction between main and subordinate clauses was already existing in the syntactic reflection preceding Port-Royal. As for the second question, namely (ii) how do missionary grammarians try to adapt traditional classifications of conjunctions to the syntactic system of indigenous languages?, it should be noted that both Aymara and Quechua, as most of South American native languages, exhibit a peculiar syntactic system, in that they use nominalizations and non-finite verbal forms (participles, gerunds, supines) as a subordination strategy. This forced the missionary grammarians to explain subordination in terms of 'determination' (dependency) no longer between two single words (e.g., a verb and its complement), but between the two entire clauses. As a result, it is at this point that the first differentiation begins between conjunctions marking independent clauses and conjunctions marking dependent clauses. Compared to the Priscianean *vis*, the *fuerça* of conjunctions in missionary grammars covers in itself both coordinating and subordinating functions, which in Bertonio are considered equally important. On the other hand, and in this case as a development of Priscian's notion of *ordo* or *consequentia*, what might be called 'subordinating force' does not seem to be intrinsic exclusively to the semantic meaning of the conjunction *per se* but inherited from the type of sentence in which the conjunction is found. As for the third question, namely (iii) are they somehow aware of the difference between coordinating and subordinating conjunctions at the sentence level?, the textual analysis allows us to observe that the conjunction can be said coordinating or 'subordinating' to the extent it marks a clause that is, respectively, independent or dependent (*determinada*), i.e., governed by another sentence. Of course, the difficulty posed by the new syntactic concept of inter-clause dependency arises from the absence, in the preceding grammatical tradition, of specific terminology for this type of relationships, to the point that Torres Rubio, as shown in (11), is forced to resort to the term *indiferente* 'indifferent', i.e. indefinite, to label a conjunction equivalent to the Spanish complementizer *que*, which he correctly interprets as referring to a clause placed at a different syntactic level from independent

clauses, i.e., a hierarchically subordinate clause. This suggests that the description of the syntactic notion of dependency as a process based on the relationship between two clauses rather than between two words paved the way towards the modern definition of subordinating conjunction.

In future research, the analysis should be extended to include as many grammars of indigenous languages as possible that exhibit subordination strategies different from those found in Indo-European languages, also including the contributions of missionary grammarians from other religious orders. This would allow us to determine whether, before these Jesuit grammarians at the turn of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, grammars produced by other religious orders or institutions had already identified the distinction between conjunctions connecting two independent clauses and conjunctions connecting two clauses placed at a different syntactic level.

FUNDING

This investigation is part of the project of national relevance funded by the Italian Ministry of Education, University and Research, named “European and extra-European metalanguage and grammars: syntactic theories towards the concept of language in the history of ideas” (PRIN 2022ZCE5RA, funded from October 2023).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to the two anonymous HL reviewers and to the Editor Otto Zwartjes for their useful comments and valuable suggestions.

REFERENCES

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

- Arnauld, Antoine & Claude Lancelot. 1660. *Grammaire générale et raisonnée*. Paris: Pierre Le Petit.
- Bertonio Romano, Ludovico. 1603. *Arte y grammatica myy copiosa de la lengva aymara. Con muchos, y varios modos de hablar para su mayor declaracion, con la tabla de los capitulos, y cosas que en ella se contienen, &c.* Roma: Luis Zannetti.
- Bertonio [Romano], Ludovico. 1612. *Arte de la Lengua Aymara, con una Silva de Phrases de la misma lengua y su declaración en Romance*. Juli: Francisco del Canto.

- González Holguín, Diego. 1607. *Gramatica y Arte nueva de la lengua general de todo el Peru, llamada lengua Qquichua, o lengua del Inca*. Ciudad de los Reyes [Lima]: Francisco del Canto.
- Linacre, Thomas. 1524. *De emendata structura latini sermonis libri sex*. London: Richard Pynson.
- Nebrija, Elio Antonio de. 2023 [1492]. *Gramática de la lengua castellana*. (= *Linkgua Historia* 273). Barcelona: Red ediciones.
- Nebrija, Elio Antonio de. 2022 [1523]. *Introductiones latinae. Recognitio*. Volúmenes 1 y 2 ed. by Eustaquio Sánchez Salor, Santiago López Moreda, M. Luisa Harto Trujillo & Joaquín Villalba Álvarez. Cáceres: Universidad de Extremadura.
- Pastrana, Juan de. 1497. *Gramática Pastrane*. [Lisbon: per Valentinum Fernandi de Moravia]. National Library of Portugal, Ms. INC 1425].
- Torres Rubio, Diego de. 1616. *Arte de la lengua aymara*. Lima: Francisco del Canto.
- Torres Rubio, Diego de. 1619. *Arte de la lengua quicha*. Lima: Francisco Lasso.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

-  Auroux, Sylvaine. 2000. "Port-Royal et la tradition française de la grammaire générale". *History of The Language Sciences. An international Handbook of the Evolution of the Study of Language from the Beginnings to the Present* ed. by Auroux Sylvain, E.F. Konrad Koerner, Hans-Joseph Niederehe & Kees Versteegh, 1022-1029. Berlin & New-York: Walter De Gruyter.
- Baratin, Marc. 1989. *La naissance de la syntaxe à Rome*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- Bartolotta, Annamaria. 2022. "Grammatica latina e innovazione nella linguistica missionaria: il contributo di Ludovico Bertonio (1557–1625)". *Ubi homo, ibi lingua* ed. by Laura Biondi, Francesco Dedè, Andrea Scala, 45-63. Alessandria: Edizioni Dell'Orso.
- Bartolotta, Annamaria. 2023. "On the Syntax of Dependency in Late Sixteenth-Century Europe". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft* 33:1. 45-67.
-  Berry-Rogghe, Godelieve. 1970. "The conjunction as a grammatical category". *Linguistics* 63. 5-18.
- Calvo Perez, Julio. 1997. "La gramática aimara de Bertonio (1603) y la escuela de Juli". *La descripción de las lenguas amerindias en la época colonial* ed. by Klaus Zimmermann, 321-338. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert/ Madrid: Iberoamericana.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2000. *Lingüística Aimara*. Lima: Centro de Estudios Regionales Andinos 'Bartolomé de las Casas'.
- Cerrón-Palomino, Rodolfo. 2008. *Quechumara. Estructuras paralelas del quechua y del aimara*. La Paz-Bolivia: Plural editores.
-  Coler, Matt. 2014. *A Grammar of Muylaq' Aymara. Aymara as Spoken in Southern Peru*. (= *Brill's Studies in the Indigenous Languages of the Americas*, 8). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
-  Colombat, Bernard. 2020. "The Notion of Dependency in Latin Grammar in the Renaissance and the 17th century". *Chapters on Dependency. A historical survey from Antiquity to Tesnière* ed. by András Imrényi & Nicolas Mazziotta (= *Studies in Language Companion Series*, 212), 59-84. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

-  Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar. Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Cesare, Anna Maria. 2019. *Le parti invariabili del discorso*. Roma: Carocci.
- De Cesare, Anna Maria. 2022. “La concezione delle congiunzioni e degli avverbi negli schemi di annotazione dei corpora d’italiano scritto: breve ricognizione e alcune proposte”. *Corpora e Studi Linguistici* ed. by Emanuela Cresti and Massimo Moneglia, 337-349. Milano: Officinaventuno.
-  de Jonge, Casper. 2008. *Between Grammar and Rhetoric: Dionysius of Halicarnassus on language, linguistics and literature* (= *Mnemosyne Supplements*, 301). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
-  Esparza Torres, Miguel Ángel. 2007. “Nebrija y los modelos de los misioneros lingüistas del náhuatl”. *Missionary Linguistics III. Morphology and Syntax. Selected Papers from the Third and Fourth International Conferences on Missionary Linguistics* ed. by Otto Zwartjes, Gregroy James & Emilio Ridruejo, (= *Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 111), 3-40. Amsterdam & Philadelphia, John Benjamins.
- Esparza Torres, Miguel Ángel. 2023. “De Nebrija y la gramatización de las lenguas Filipinas: ¿Viajó Nebrija en el Galeón de Manila?”. *De Estepa a Salamanca. Miradas en torno a la lengua* ed. by Carmen Quijada van den Berghe, Borja Alonso Pascua, Francisco Escudero Paniagua, Carolina Martín Gallego, & Gema Belén Garrido Vílchez, 85-100. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- Galán Sánchez, Pedro Juan. 2005. “Definición de la *conjunción* en la gramática grecolatina antigua, medieval y renacentista”. *Humanitas* 57. 309-350.
-  Galán Sánchez, Pedro Juan. 2006. “La clasificación de la conjunción en las gramáticas latinas del Renacimiento”. *Euphrosyne. Revista de Filología Clásica* 34. 379-402.
-  Gijn, Rik van, Katharina Haude & Pieter Muysken, eds. 2011. *Subordination in Native South American Languages*. (= *Typological Studies in Language*, 97). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
-  Graffi, Giorgio. 1998. “The Treatment of Syntax by Some Early 19th-Century Linguists: New insights and the continuity of general grammar”. *Historiographia linguistica* 25:3. 257-284.
- Graffi, Giorgio. 2019. *Breve storia della linguistica*. Roma: Carocci.
- Graffi, Giorgio. 2021. *Introduzione alla sintassi*. Roma: Carocci.
- Gutiérrez Galindo, Marco Antonio. 1989. “Las definiciones de conjunción en los gramáticos latinos: un capítulo importante en la historia de la sintaxis”. *Revista española de lingüística* 19:2. 389-420.
- Hardman, Marta James. 2001. *Aymara*. (= *Lincom Studies in Native American Linguistics*, 35). München: Lincom Europa.
-  Haspelmath, Martin, (ed.). 2004. *Coordinating Constructions*. (= *Typological Studies in Language*, 58). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
-  Laury, Ritva, (ed.). 2008. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining. The multifunctionality of conjunctions*. (= *Typological Studies in Language*, 80). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
-  Lenker, Ursula. 2010. *Argument and Rhetoric. Adverbial connectors in the history of English*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter Mouton.

- doi Luhtala, Anneli. 2020. "Syntactic relations in ancient and medieval grammatical theory". *Chapters on Dependency. A historical survey from Antiquity to Tesnière* ed. by András Imrényi, Nicolas Mazziotta, 23-57. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- doi Mauri, Caterina. 2008. *Coordination Relations in the Languages of Europe and Beyond*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Medina Montero, José Francisco. 2015. *El verbo, el participio y las clases de palabras invariables en las gramáticas de español para extranjeros de los siglos XVI y XVII*. Firenze: Olschki.
- doi Mithun, Marianne. 1988. "The Grammaticization of Coordination". *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse* ed. by John Haiman and Sandra A. Thomson, 331-360. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- doi Mithun, Marianne. 2003. "Functional Perspectives on Syntactic Change". *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics* ed. by Richard D. Janda & Brian. D. Joseph, 552-572. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- doi Orlandini, Anna & Paolo Poccetti. 2014. "Polyfunctionality and transcategoriality of coordinating particles in Latin and in other ancient languages". *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13:2. 267-278.
- Peetermans, Andy. 2020. *The Art of Transforming Traditions Conceptual developments in early modern American missionary grammar writing*. Ph.D. Thesis. Leuven: KU Leuven.
- doi Percival, W. Keith. 1990. "Reflections on the History of Dependency Notions in Linguistics". *Historiographia Linguistica* 17:1/2. 29-47.
- Prandi, Michele. 2007. "Avverbi di collegamento e congiunzioni". *Particulas. Particelle. Estudios de lingüística contrastiva español e italiano* ed. by Félix San Vicente, 89-103. Bologna: Clueb.
- Salvi, Giampaolo. 2014. "La classificazione delle parti del discorso". *Italogramma* 8. 55-74.
- Schad, Samantha. 2007. *A Lexicon of Latin Grammatical Terminology*. Pisa & Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore.
- Segovia Gordillo, Ana. 2016. "Repercusiones de la escuela de Juli en los trabajos lingüísticos de González Holguín y Bertonio". *Revista argentina de historiografía lingüística* 8: 2. 123-154.
- doi Segovia Gordillo, Ana. 2020. "Interjecciones y conjunciones en las artes de la lengua quechua: continuidades y rupturas". *Nuevos enfoques y desafíos metodológicos para el estudio de la lingüística misionera latinoamericana (siglos XVI-XVIII)* ed. by Otto Zwartjes. Special issue: *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 18(36):2. 235-256.
- doi Suto, Taki. 2012. *Boethius on Mind, Grammar and Logic. A study on Boethius' commentaries on Peri Hermeneias*. (= *Philosophia Antiqua*, 127). Leiden & Boston: Brill.
- Swiggers, Peter & Alfons Wouters. 2015. "Priscian on the Distinction between Adverbs and Conjunctions". *Literature, Scholarship, Philosophy, and History. Classical Studies in Memory of Ioannis Taifacos* ed. by Georgios Xenis, 265-275. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Zwartjes, Otto. 2000. "Norma y uso en las gramáticas misioneras hispánicas en la época colonial". *XIV Skandinaviska Romanistkongressen Stockholm 10-15 augusti 1999* ed. by Jane Nystedt. (= *Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis, Romanica Stockholmiensia* 19), 404-418. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.

-  Zwartjes, Otto. 2002. "The description of the indigenous languages of Portuguese America by the Jesuits during the colonial period. The impact of the Latin grammar of Manuel Álvares". *Historiographia Linguistica* 29:1/2. 19-70.
-  Zwartjes, Otto. 2020. "Algunas observaciones sobre el modelo grecolatino en las gramáticas misioneras de lenguas amerindias: ¿el mismo perro con distinto collar?". *Nuevos enfoques y desafíos metodológicos para el estudio de la lingüística misionera latinoamericana (siglos XVI–XVIII)* ed. by Otto Zwartjes. Special issue: *Revista Internacional de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 18(36):2. 53-88.

RÉSUMÉ

Bien que la coordination soit une construction syntaxique fondamentale et universelle, la conjonction est une catégorie grammaticale ou partie du discours qui a souvent été négligée dans l'histoire de la linguistique. La cause peut en être attribuée en grande partie à l'absence de correspondance entre les caractéristiques morphosyntaxiques et les fonctions sémantiques de cette catégorie, qui devrait plutôt être placée sur un continuum grammatical entre la coordination et la subordination. La difficulté d'une définition univoque est déjà évidente dans les réflexions des grammairiens anciens. Le cas des grammairiens missionnaires du début de l'époque moderne représente à cet égard un moment charnière, en raison de la difficulté à adapter les classifications de la tradition européenne aux langues indigènes, caractérisées par un système morphosyntaxique complètement différent. Cette étude se propose d'analyser les premières grammaires de l'aymara et du quechua rédigées par des grammairiens missionnaires travaillant à l'école de Juli, laquelle a été décrite comme un véritable 'laboratoire linguistique' de la Compagnie de Jésus. Étant donné que les notions de subordination et de phrase dépendante sont généralement attribuées aux grammairiens de Port-Royal (Arnould & Lancelot 1660), et qu'une distinction explicite entre les conjonctions de subordination et de coordination n'avait pas encore été formalisée à l'époque, je vais tenter de reconstruire cette distinction en analysant les types de propositions qui sont explicitement définies comme dépendantes et associées à des conjonctions spécifiques. L'analyse textuelle suggère que, dès la fin du XVI^e siècle et le début du XVII^e siècle, les grammairiens européens avaient déjà conscience de la distinction entre coordination et subordination, remettant ainsi en question les hypothèses dominantes dans l'historiographie de la pensée linguistique.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Obwohl die Koordination eine grundlegende und universelle syntaktische Konstruktion ist, wurde die Konjunktion als grammatische Kategorie oder Wortart in der Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft zunächst häufig vernachlässigt. Der Grund dafür lässt sich auf die fehlende Übereinstimmung zwischen den morphosyntaktischen Merkmalen und den funktionalen Bedeutungen dieser Kategorie zurückführen, die eher auf einem grammatischen Kontinuum zwischen Koordination und Subordination einzuordnen ist. Die Problematik einer eindeutigen Definition zeigt sich bereits in den Überlegungen der antiken Grammatiker. Der Fall der Missionsgrammatiker zu Beginn der Neuzeit stellt einen Wendepunkt dar. Die Schwierigkeit bestand

vor allem darin, die Kategorien der europäischen Tradition auf indigene Sprachen zu übertragen, deren morphosyntaktische Systeme völlig anders strukturiert sind. Im vorliegenden Beitrag werden die frühesten Grammatiken des Aymara und des Quechua analysiert. Sie wurden von Missionsgrammatikern der Schule von Juli verfasst, die als ein echtes 'sprachwissenschaftliches Laboratorium' der Gesellschaft Jesu bezeichnet worden ist. Weil die Begriffe der Subordination und des Nebensatzes traditionell mit der Grammatik von Port-Royal (Arnauld & Lancelot 1660) in Verbindung gebracht werden und eine systematische Unterscheidung zwischen subordinierenden und koordinierenden Konjunktionen zu dieser Zeit noch nicht vorhanden war, wird im Beitrag der Versuch unternommen, diese Unterscheidung zu rekonstruieren. Dies erfolgt durch die Analyse von Satztypen, die explizit als abhängig bezeichnet werden und mit bestimmten Konjunktionen verbunden sind. Die Analyse deutet darauf hin, dass sich die europäischen Grammatiker bereits im späten 16. und frühen 17. Jahrhundert der Unterscheidung zwischen Koordination und Subordination bewusst waren. Diese Beobachtung stellt verbreitete Annahmen in der Historiographie der Sprachwissenschaft in Frage und erfordert eine Neubewertung der Rolle frühneuzeitlicher Grammatiker in der Beschreibung grammatischer Kategorien.

Address for correspondence

Annamaria Bartolotta
Dipartimento di Scienze Umanistiche
Università di Palermo
Viale delle Scienze, Edificio 12
90128 PALERMO
Italy
annamaria.bartolotta@unipa.it

Publication history

Date received: 3 March 2025
Date accepted: 9 August 2025
Published online: 16 September 2025