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Abstract

The following is a transatlantic study of the initial English and Spanish reactions to the problem of language difference in the Americas, focusing on the language related literature of England, Spain, New England, and New Spain, from 1492 to 1693. As part of the arts of empire, which is the use of language technologies for domination, both English and Spanish explorers, historians, and colonists created bilingual word-lists in the primary phase of the language encounter, yet the burgeoning empires’ responses diverged significantly with the deployment of missionary linguistics, resulting in the extremely uneven production of Amerindian grammars. This disparity in descriptive linguistics signals an understudied historical problem that I explain through comparative analysis of the English and Spanish traditions of language policy and language sciences, with particular regard for the effects of the Reformation on monastic communities and the funding of missionary expeditions. Another problem resides in the manner in which linguistic imperialism de-articulates the linguistic data from the language consultant and the historical context. Moving from texts founded on the interview of language slaves to texts requiring more willing collaboration, my response is the creation of an interpretive model, called narrative re-articulation, that combines linguistic data into a virtual syntax in such a way that the moment of language exchange, called the coercive consultation event, is reinserted into the historical narrative. This expands our understanding of the language encounter and linguistic imperialism by identifying language consultants by name, when possible, and by demonstrating the survivance of Amerindian cultures and Amerindian historical figures. Pushing against the early modern de-articulation of the Amerindian consultants from the consultation event, and questioning the reasons for such divergent literary responses to the problem of language difference, I create an interpretive frame for recovering the moment of
language exchange and explain the theological and institutional differences between the English and Spanish models for linguistic imperialism in the Americas.
Preface

The following research program and all information and analysis contained within are the sole design of the author. No portion of this investigation has been published elsewhere and no co-authors or collaborators were involved in the writing of this document.
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1 Introduction

1.1 The Arts of Empire and De-Articulation

During the colonization of the Americas an approach to the problem of language difference between Europeans and Amerindians was undertaken through the arts of empire, an assemblage of language arts and practices for the purpose of expanding dominion over foreign language speakers. The deployment of the arts of empire resulted in the development of two distinct approaches to learning the languages of the Amerindians: the early word-lists (short collections of lexical items, sometimes organized alphabetically though often not) and the later grammars (Latin-based grammatical analyses of syntax and morphology). Both the English and the Spanish abducted Amerindians in order to capture linguistic data for the word-lists – an inherently hostile process that resulted in a restrictive view of the language – that were published as supplements to travel accounts and histories. When it came to the cooperative model necessary for the elaboration of complex Amerindian grammars, however, a major divergence in the two traditions emerged resulting in a meagre output in Anglo America and robust output in Spanish America. These two categories of language texts represent two distinct phases in English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Yet both forms of linguistic description resulted in the de-articulation and deracination of the necessary language consultant, a process that separated the Amerindian subject from the historical record, dismantled his or her status as an authorial collaborator, and detached him or her from the linguistic data itself. My objectives then are to elaborate an interpretative model in order to re-articulate the Amerindian consultant to the colonial linguistic text, to demonstrate through a survey of word-lists and Amerindian grammars the recuperative benefits of this interpretive model,
and to explain through an analysis of intellectual traditions and historical institutions the divergence in the productivity of missionary linguistics in Anglo and Spanish America.

1.2 Field of Inquiry: 1492-1693

This investigation is bounded by the European encounter with the Amerindians in 1492 and the closing of the Harvard Indian College in 1693 and incorporates both English and Spanish literature in a variety of genres. My research concentrates on travel accounts, colonial histories, theatrical plays, poems, novels, language policies, sermons and religious pamphlets, rhetorical studies, orthographies, vocabularies, and grammars developing in, but not limited to, England and Spain and their colonies, New England and New Spain. I begin my study with the earliest language encounter between Europeans and Amerindians described in Cristóbal Colón’s *diario de a bordo* from his first voyage to the Caribbean. The *diario* demonstrates abduction as an integral component of the early language encounter and many European explorers and colonists followed this model as a solution to the problem of mutual incomprehensibility. I look at two captivity narratives from the sixteenth century, Paquiquineo’s (Don Luis) and Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca’s stories of bondage and their relations to the problem of language difference, adding a brief glance at Mary Rowlandson’s *Sovereignty and Goodness of God*. Throughout this study I make occasional reference to a number of theatrical representations of the language encounter and language learning, including William Shakespeare’s *Henry V*, *The Tempest*, and *Two Gentleman of Verona*, and Lope de Vega’s *El nuevo mundo descubierto por Cristóbal Colón*. Other fictional works, such as Miguel de Cervante’s *Don Quijote*, Samuel Daniel’s *Musophilus*, and Thomas More’s *Utopia* further demonstrate an awareness among Europeans of the problem of language difference and the

---

1 Whenever possible, I provide the names of the Amerindian, English, and Spanish historical figures in their original language. I likewise try to present texts in their original language and, when the meaning is not readily apparent, provide translations from Castilian to English. The translations of quotations that I have made myself are not given full citation.
possibility of linguistic imperialism. Although I draw from the early histories of the conquest, particularly the Spanish tradition with Francisco López de Gómara, Bartolomé de Las Casas, “El Inca” Garcilaso de la Vega, and José de Acosta, my main sources for linguistic data are Pietro Martire d’Anghiera, Richard Hakluyt, and Samuel Purchas as well as the accounts of Antonio Pigafetta, John Smith, Pablo José de Arriaga and William Strachey. These last seven authors include word-lists as supplements for their accounts of exploration and colonization which is why they are central to the project of re-articulation.

In my further analysis of the arts of empire, I turn to the Amerindian grammars developed by missionary linguists for the purposes of civilizing and Christianizing indigenous societies. Before a direct analysis of the de-articulation that occurs in the grammars themselves, however, I must first establish the state of language sciences out of which these colonial texts emerge and survey the linguistic traditions in England and Spain prior to and following the Columbian event. Antonio de Nebrija’s Gramática castellana functions as a seminal moment in the writing of vernacular grammars, followed by his Reglas de ortografía en la lengua castellana and William Bullokar’s Bref Grammar for English, which were similarly concerned with standardizing the vernacular orthographies. The existence of a tradition of linguistic imperialism in the British Isles and Iberian Peninsula prior to the colonization of the Americas is exemplified in the Siete partidas, The Statutes of Kilkenny, and the Act for the English Order, Habit and Language. Protestant clergymen John Donne’s and Robert Gray’s exhortations for a Christian mission and a moral conquest of the Americas make an appearance as well as Diego Valadés’s recommendations for effective cross-cultural evangelism in the Rhetorica christiana. Because much of the second stage of this investigation concerns historical arguments and a broad view of the language sciences in England and Spain, I survey many past chronicles and current histories of the transatlantic as well as
publications on early modern missionary linguistics. This historiography serves to contextualize and sharpen my inquiry on a number of Amerindian grammars from the missionary linguists Maturino Gilberti and Alonso de Molina, and the two grammatical texts of my analysis, John Eliot’s *The Indian Grammar Begun* and Francisco Pareja’s *Arte de la lengva timesqvana*. Through both historical research and figural reading I demonstrate that, despite not appearing on the title pages of the grammars, these evangelists and the word-list compilers before them were assisted by the Amerindian consultants Macanoe, Kempes, Hernando de Ribas, Cockenoe, as well as many nameless others.

1.3 Theoretical Framework: The Language Encounter

The subject of this investigation is, broadly speaking, the language encounter between European explorers and colonists and Amerindians in the contact zone of the early modern Americas. Edward Gray’s collection of essays under the same title, *The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800*, affords, in seminal form, many of the ideas developed here, such as the importance of gesture in early contact, the use of abduction to create interpreters, and the robustly institutional approach of the Spanish. Parting from the historical and ideological analysis contained in Gray’s collection, my arguments drive toward a unique literary analysis of early modern linguistic texts and speculates about the precise moment of language exchange for Amerindian word-lists and grammars.

1.3.1 Captivity as Source of Linguistic Data

The word-lists represent the first textual stage in the unfolding of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the Americas and this short, informal collection of Amerindian lexical items is accomplished almost entirely through the forced captivity of Amerindians. Lisa Voigt offers a helpful model for the exchange of information vital to imperial expansion in her recent study *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulations*
of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds (2009). Voigt explores “the role of captivity in the production of knowledge […] in the early modern imperial world” (1), and claims that “the production and circulation of captivity accounts in new and exotic locales responds […] to a desire for eyewitness information about cultures and lands where Europeans hoped to extend commercial and territorial dominion” (1). She finally identifies “acknowledgment of the captive’s key role in knowledge production and imperial expansion in Spanish and English texts” (24). These captivity narratives were particularly concerned with geographic and ethnographic knowledge and therefore often included linguistic data. Voigt’s study is situated within a more recent turn toward the valorization of sixteenth-century Spanish descriptions of the natural world and the development of scientific practices, a scholarly trend for which Hispanist scholars Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra and Antonio Barrera-Osorio are largely responsible (2). My investigation makes a relatedly minor foray into the history of early modern science, albeit with a more unequivocal concern for revealing and resolving some of the pernicious historiographical effects of colonial language arts.

When writing about captivity, Voigt’s account is necessarily limited, for she focuses entirely on “European and Euro-American captives who ‘return’ – for it is as a consequence of their return that they are able to write or be written about in European languages and genres” (32). The result of this bias – which Voigt acknowledges openly – is the neglect of what Joyce Chaplin calls “captivity without the narrative” (“Enslavement of Indians in Early America: Captivity without the Narrative” 45). Chaplin makes three claims to the importance of Amerindian slavery for the history of English America and the United States, the most relevant of which is her first: “Indian slavery had tremendous cultural consequences for both British and Indian peoples” (45). This cultural consequence was not only political and
economic, as Chaplin notes, but also historiographic, for the absence of Amerindian eyewitness narratives and the failure of Europeans to produce accounts of Amerindian slavery result in the “lack [of] a critical body of written testimony” (46) that keeps Amerindians “outside of several important narratives that have structured colonial American history” (46). Captivity in the initial stage of linguistic imperialism represents the recognition of and reaction to the problem of language difference and yet the linguistic texts that develop out of Amerindian captivity often ignore or elide their origins, creating what Chaplin calls, “an enormous gap in the story” (45).

Although very much in line with Voigt and Chaplin’s approaches, and with scholars such as Cañizares-Esguerra in mind, my investigation concentrates more specifically on the exchange of linguistic information, how the exchange is articulated in the travel accounts and histories, how it is de-articulated in these very documents through the exclusion of abduction and forced interview from the narrative, how the word-lists appear as sourceless supplements to the main narrative, and how they are often dropped from later editions of the texts. Through the analysis of Pigafetta’s narrative of Fernão de Magalhães’s (Ferdinand Magellan) circumnavigation I develop a model for what I term the “coercive consultation event,” the forced interview of a language slave for the purpose of gathering linguistic data. My analysis of later word-lists is an attempt to re-articulate the coercive consultation event that is regularly de-articulated from the main narrative of travel accounts and histories, thus filling the enormous gap in the story.

1.3.2 Linguistic Imperialism

Robert Philipson provides a helpful definition of the term “linguistic imperialism” in his book of the same name. *Linguistic Imperialism* is, however, restricted to observations on
modern English, so I broaden the scope of his study to include other vernaculars and other types of linguistic power. According to Philipson, linguistic imperialism is

*dominance of [a given language] asserted and maintained by the establishment and continuous reconstitution of structural and cultural inequalities between [that language] and other languages.*

Here *structural* refers broadly to material properties (for example, institutions, financial allocations) and *cultural* to immaterial or ideological properties (for example, attitudes, pedagogic principles) (47).

Although Phillipson succinctly gathers the principle themes relating to linguistic imperialism, particularly the institutional and ideological factors that I investigate in this study, he does not account for the use of the language arts to dominate a linguistic community through their own language, a similar dialect, or a nearby prestige language. Contrary to the modern spread of English and Anglophone dominance through the desimination of English grammars and native-speaking language instructors, early modern linguistic imperialism sought to control peoples by controlling their languages – the coercion of indigenous communities through the application of the language arts. Offering a sound position from which to expand research into linguistic imperialism, I depart from Philipson by performing a comparative analysis of the English and Spanish empires in the early modern period, and expand further by describing the reduction of native languages to grammar for the purpose of colonial dominion, conversion, and assimilation.

Linguistic imperialism can be divided into three forms, of which Philipson identifies the second two – the subjective, the ideological, and the material. This division is artificial in as much as the three never occur separately in the world, for where we find the linguistic construction of the subject and language hierarchies we also find the material apparatuses for linguistic imperialism. Linguistic imperialism is a unique feature of the European
colonization of the Americas, despite the reduced scale on which it occurred in Anglo America in the seventeenth century and despite objections to its existence that, quite frankly, muddy the waters. Subjective linguistic imperialism is the erasure of Amerindian historical presence and agency, an element of colonial linguistic texts that this investigation attempts to reverse or mitigate through the re-articulation of voice and presence in the very linguistic documents that de-articulate the Amerindian speaker from his or her words. Ideological linguistic imperialism is the positing of the prestige and sacredness of European languages and the efficiency and power of European language technologies over and against the deficient “nature” of Amerindian languages and writing systems. Material linguistic imperialism enables social control through the implementation of linguistic technologies such as moveable-type printing presses, alphabetic scripts, paper and ink, grammars, dictionaries – all reliant on and facilitating early modern missionary linguistics. English and Spanish colonists deployed subjective, ideological, and material linguistic imperial strategies in the colonial contact zone to confront the problem of language difference and establish

---

2 Simon Gikandi’s rebuttal to Phillipson, “Provincializing English,” lacks coherence. It misrepresents Phillipson maintaining an “assumption that one language can have worldwide hegemony” while citing counter-examples of Scottish, Welsh, and Irish missionaries spreading “Englishes” in Africa and the production of English-language chapbooks in Nigeria only reinforce Phillipson’s position (11). The Scots, Welsh, and Irish adopted English because of military, economic, and cultural colonization; Africans use European printing technologies to print chapbooks reproducing Shakespeare (a centerpiece of English-language cultural imperialism and anglocentricity). We thus have historically non-English-speaking peoples spreading English (or Englishes) to other historically non-English-speaking peoples through ideological and material means. The statement that “English can be celebrated not as part of a global drive toward monolingualism but as part of the diversity and plurality of world languages” is so dangerously myopic that it celebrates the birth and continuance of dialects while ignoring the death of indigenous languages and subversion of their cultures (13). (UNESCO, for example, estimates that 150 of the 280 languages spoken in the region of the United States in 1492 are now extinct (“FAQ on Endangered Languages”).) To those like Gikandi who try to dismantle the concept of linguistic imperialism by emphasizing individual choice and dialectal variation Phillipson responds, “it is important to look at English as one language, because we are abstracting from a multiplicity of forms in order to situate English in the wider linguistic ecology, in processes of hierarchization of languages, in the realities of structural power nationally and supra-nationally” (Linguistic Imperialism Continued 28). The conflict here arises from two contradictory approaches to linguistic phenomena, with imperial studies butting up against post-colonial analyses. It is also likely that the scale of these studies make them incompatible.
control over native communities. The verb “to reduce” applied equally to Amerindian languages, communities, and social practices indicates for us the ideological unity of these imperial practices.

Reduction and de-articulation are two ways to describe the subjective erasure of Amerindian language consultants from the early modern linguistic texts that reproduce their speech in phonemic writing. In travel accounts, histories, and grammars, colonized peoples experience subjective linguistic imperialism through the erasure of individual traits and names, through the obliteration of linguistic difference and complexity, through the elision of indigenous literatures and writing systems, and in bilingual word-lists and grammars through the obscuring of historical agency. Colonial narratives likewise effect the erasure of colonized peoples through the description of a world brimming with zoological, geographical, meteorological, and botanical observations in which the protagonist’s actions are central. In a reading of Alexander von Humboldt’s travel accounts Mary Louise Pratt discovers a feature typical of scientific travel writing, “the erasure of the human” (Imperial Eyes 125). Building from Pratt’s study of the encounters in the contact zone of the Americas, Noel Elizabeth Currie argues that in colonial literature “the very existence of [non-Europeans] is simultaneously confirmed and denied through the paradox of absence and presence” (Colonial Discourse 5); she draws the reader’s attention to the special degree of erasure for indigenous women – the elision of details regarding their names, actions, social positions, physical features, and more. (77). Part of this study is the project of revealing the colonial process of subjective erasure in English and Spanish texts that record Amerindian linguistic data.

Phillipson, following Tove Skutnabb-Kangas, calls the ideological feature of linguistic imperialism linguicism, drawing parallels between language ideology and other forms
of hierarchization, such as prejudices toward race (racism), ethnicity (ethnicism), socio-economic class (classism), and gender (sexism) (“Realities and Myths of Linguistic Imperialism” 239). Ideological linguistic imperialism is perhaps most fully developed in Walter Mignolo’s account of the Spanish conquest of Mesoamerica, where he argues that Spanish linguistic ideology is guided by a “theory of the letter” (Darker Side of Renaissance 41). This attitude toward language is fundamentally Eurocentric, for it sets alphabetic writing at the pinnacle of a hierarchy of writing systems: phonemic writing is greater than syllabic, which is greater than ideogrammatic, which is greater than pictographic, etc. The result of this theory of the letter was to belittle and undervalue the literary achievements of pre-Columbian Amerindian societies because they were considered without letters and therefore had no writing. Ideologically, then, Mexico texts, because they were not alphabetic, were considered “paintings” rather than “writing” and consequently Mexica history was regarded by early colonists such as Pedro de Gante as non-existent (Mignolo 45).

Although Mignolo’s elaboration of Spanish linguistic ideology is powerful and insightful, it has sparked a debate about the consistency of that ideology as it came to bear on pre-Columbian writing systems and Amerindian linguistic exchange. In How to Write a

---

3 The linguicism that represents Amerindian languages and writing systems as barbaric is pervasive in the colonial period. For example, Las Casas’s categorical account in Apologética historia sumaria (ca. 1550), which hinges barbarity or civility on a culture’s writing systems, literary achievements, and linguistic pedigree (645-54); seventeenth-century Puritan minister Daniel Gookin’s belief “that native languages perpetuated a kind of savage barbarism among Indians” and his concomitant insistence on preaching to the Natick people in English (Andrews, Native Apostles 52); Pietro Martire D’Anghiera’s “Vocabula Barbara” (1516) word-list discussed in the following chapters; and the Historia natural y moral de las Indias (1590) and De promulgatione Evangelii apud barbaros (1588) where José de Acosta uses indio and bárbaro interchangeably.

4 Later authors such as Rojinsky have indicated counterexamples to Mignolo’s elaboration of the “theory of the letter.” Although Mesoamerican writing was evaluated from the perspective of a culture of books and alphabetic scripts, humanists often believed Egyptian hieroglyphics held arcane knowledge that could not be represented in letters (Companion to Empire 188). For a discussion of the Renaissance conception of writing originating in hieroglyphics, see Hudson, European Thought and Writing (12, 21). Hudson notes that José de Acosta and Antonio de Solis y Ribandeneira refer to the mixed writing system of Mesoamerica as “hieroglyphics” (39).
History of the New World Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra takes Mignolo to task for overstating Spanish linguistic ideology and presents numerous counter-examples from colonial texts. Cañizares-Esguerra rejects the absoluteness of Mignolo’s description by demonstrating the continuance of Amerindian writing practices after colonization, a strategy that was vital to cultural assimilation and evangelical efforts. David Rojinsky summarizes the conceptual contention between these two scholars: “the ‘lack’ of letters as a symbol of cultural inferiority in a wider colonial ‘discourse of lack,’ though a constant discursive trope in certain colonial genres, did not always correspond to the employment of indigenous writing in practice” (Companion to Empire 192). The discourse of lack is exemplified in the recurring description of Amerindian languages as phonetically less complex than the European vernaculars, found in their phonemic representation as lacking certain letters and sounds (Mignolo, Darker Side 47). Although the Spanish generally regarded Amerindian writing as primitive – both less efficient and less elegant – they simultaneously regarded Maya and Mexica codices and Inca quipus as reliable sources of historical information (Cañizares-Esguerra 7), contradicting Mignolo’s view that the Spanish regarded alphabetic writing as the only script “in which truth finds its warranty” (Mignolo 83). What these scholars demonstrate is the importance of an understanding of linguistic ideology in the study of early modern imperialism, and even though they disagree about the consistency of that ideology, they both assert and demonstrate its influence on material linguistic imperialism.

If linguistic imperialism can be understood generally as the imposition of a foreign language upon a language community (through military or economic force, through prestige or coercion), then material linguistic imperialism can be understood as the imposition of foreign linguistic technologies. These technologies are quite diverse and include the wordlists and grammars that are the object of this investigation, as well as dictionaries, the
alphabet, the “word” (a surprisingly complex subject), calligraphy, printing presses and their whole train of artifacts (paper, ink, type, books, etc.), language schools, and language studies such as classical rhetoric. Material linguistic imperialism advanced unevenly in the Americas. Cañizares-Esguerra notes that missionaries in Mexico and Peru used local, indigenous systems of writing for evangelical purposes. “Amerindians brought quipus to Christian churches,” he writes, “to read them aloud during confessions;” adding, “[a]s in Mexico, scholars and bureaucrats in Peru also summoned local scribes […] to ‘translate’ their testimonies into the Latin alphabet” (How to Write 74). Nevertheless, the pre-Columbian writing systems were slowly replaced through the establishment of grammar schools and colleges where Europeans instructed Amerindians in phonemic writing. Miguel León-Portilla indicates that many Nahuas

habían aprendido a escribir valiéndose del alfabeto. Y, aunque en algunos casos copiaron y preservaron las pinturas y signos glíficos de los códices que pudieron consultar, optaron por redactar sus obras en su propia lengua, con la escritura latina, adaptada para representar los fonemas del náhuatl (El destino de la palabra 6) [had learned to write by making use of the alphabet. And although in certain cases they copied and preserved the paintings and glyphic signs of the available codices, they opted to write their works in their own language, in Latin letters adapted to represent Nahuatl phonemes].

In this passage on the transmission of European writing practices to the Americas we uncover a number of important themes: the Mexica transcribe their codices into the new alphabetic writing system; they transcribe those they are able to consult, meaning some codices disappeared abroad or, more likely, were burned for containing satanic magic; the Latin alphabet is purposefully adapted to represent Nahuatl phonemes; this adaptation
replaces the earlier writing system. It also demonstrates the continuity of Amerindian culture in the face of dramatic socio-political transformation. Dependent on the hierarchy of languages and language practices formed and structured by linguistic ideology, material linguistic imperialism represents the coerced changing of language practices in the colonies to facilitate the expansion of imperial dominion.

1.3.3 The Utopian Model

Subjective, ideological, and material linguistic imperialism all find their expression in Thomas More’s fictional travel account *Utopia* (1516), where the explorer Rafael Hythloday reports his experiences on the far-flung island, describes the geography, and provides ethnographic and linguistic information on the Utopians. In contrast to Spanish bravura, Jeffrey Knapp identifies a particular tone of ambivalence in early modern English literature involving the Americas, including More’s *Utopia*, Edmund Spencer’s *Faerie Queene*, and Shakespeare’s *The Tempest (An Empire Nowhere)* 19). While Knapp encounters “avoidance” and “indifference” in much of the English treatment of New World potential in the sixteenth century, More’s fable actually represents “the first Tudor attempt to elaborate a theory of colonization” (21), purportedly inspiring More’s brother-in-law John Rastell to attempt to colonize in the Americas himself (44-7). Detailing the ways by which More shapes English imperial expansion on the model of a Utopian imperial state that moves into land “idle and waste” (24), Knapp does not recognize, or at least does not comment on, the ways in which Utopia itself is already colonized after Hythloday’s brief visit. This is despite the absence of conquistador armies and plantation settlers, for Hythloday’s celebration of the spread of humanism is in actuality a subtle yet visionary formulation of subsequent English and Spanish linguistic imperialism.
“This man, who is named Raphael – his family name is Hythloday – knows a good deal of Latin, and is particularly learned in Greek,” writes More, adding, “He studied Greek more than Latin because his main interest is philosophy […] he is a native of Portugal” (5). As an Iberian with humanist training and an implicit interest in language, Hythloday returns from his marvellous adventure with specimens of the Utopian language, as evidenced by More’s inclusion of a translation of Utopian verse which is accompanied by a one-to-one schema of the twenty-two letters of the Utopian alphabet (More 114). Invented by More’s humanist friend and correspondent Peter Giles (who appears as a character in the story), Duncan M. Derrett posits, “the idea must have occurred to our learned conspirators […] that their fairy-tale should have the usual accompaniment to a semi-fabulous adventure-story, namely a script, or alphabet, and specimens of the language” (“Utopian Alphabet” 62). Mimicking early modern travel accounts, the poem and the Utopian alphabet represent material, ideological, and subjective forms of linguistic imperialism, for the data is linguistic exotica captured in the New World and returned to the Old for the instruction and delight of readers, it is presented in Latin verse (a source for humanist education), yet there is no trace of a language consultant. What is more, this captured text fails to designate the poem’s Utopian author, and the Utopian writing itself is transformed in at least two senses, converted from the Utopian to the Latin alphabet, and translated from Utopian to Latin words.

One chapter that deals directly with the topic of linguistic imperialism is “Their Delight in Learning.” Here, Hythloday states, “[b]efore leaving on the fourth voyage, I placed on board […] a good-sized packet of books” (57) comprised solely of authors from classical antiquity. From these texts the Utopians are introduced to the studia humanitatis as well as the arts of printing and paper-making. Hythloday speculates that the indigenous
language is related to Greek (as many explorers and colonist later would), which explains for him the quickness with which the Utopians learn it. They are so taken with humanism that the Utopians print enormous quantities of the Greek texts, wholly ignoring their pre-contact writings on vellum, bark, and papyrus. A perceptive footnote from the editor Robert M. Adams observes that, despite the mention of this pre-Columbian writing and publication systems, “Apparently, the Utopians have little or no accumulated literature of their own” (57). Although More provides a description of the Utopian alphabet, this writing system is apparently not used to produce the sort of writing that would be valued by Europeans or Utopians once the Greek alphabet and modern printing have been translated to the New World context. Thus, the Utopians “contented themselves with reprinting each [humanist text] in thousands of copies.”

This episode in *Utopia* presents us with an imaginative view of linguistic imperialism in its three modes. Although there is no explicit description of either Hythloday’s language spreading among the Utopians, or the suggestions that Greek would replace the Utopian language, “Their Delight in Learning” shows the ideological and material processes by which linguistic imperialism functions. We are given to understand that the Utopians eagerly adopt the new writing system yet we are not introduced to the Utopian authors by name. Indigenous methods for producing written documents are abandoned with the introduction of European technologies; the book, the printing press, and paper replace Utopian forms of writing with ink on vellum, bark, and papyrus. These native technologies are historically situated in the European past, and the Utopians’ enthusiastic adoption of bound books and movable-type printing sets up a hierarchy that is immediately recognizable and markedly ideological. The indigenous literature of Utopia is all but forgotten with the introduction of the new learning and writing systems delivered to the island in Hythloday’s packet of books.
This demonstrates an epistemological shift characteristic of colonization, leading sources of knowledge considered legitimate by Europeans (books, paper, Greek script) to replace those used prior to contact (vellum, bark). With the arrival of Hythloday’s library on the shores of Utopia true learning and true knowledge are revealed. Ideological assimilation is evidenced in the Utopians’ sudden and profound identification with the humanist tradition. The elevation of the Greek texts and – the other side of the coin – the devaluation of their indigenous literary tradition and the lowering of their writing system in relation to the Greek alphabet represent linguistic assimilation on both the material and ideological level. Whether intentional or not, Hythloday’s intervention on the island of Utopia profoundly changes the indigenous culture to bring it leagues closer to the European notion of civility, with More’s discourse on the transmission of language arts transitioning inextricably to the spread of Christianity to the Americas in the following chapter, “Religions,” where he recounts Amerindian conversions (72).

Thus, a brief foray into imaginative literature of the early modern establishes many of the themes that I will later articulate in greater detail with regards to the English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the Americas.

1.4 Background Scholarship

The following is a partial description of the recent scholarship that has influenced my research and with which this investigation is in conversation. In my summary of the literature, I have organized the books and articles into a few broad categories: the language encounter, the history of linguistics, historical linguistics and linguistics generally, transatlantic history, the literary history of conquest, and religious history.

Principal among the influences for my investigation is Edward G. Gray, whose *New World Babel* (1999) provides enormous insight into the ideological and material conditions of
the language encounter in Anglo America. The subsequent collection of essays that he edited, *The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800* (2000), is broader in scope and provides a number of entry points into the problem of language difference in the colonization of the Americas. In it James Axtell discusses the importance of improvised gestural languages in first contact scenarios, Kathleen Bragdon outlines the efforts of English missionary linguists for the New England Company, Frances Kartunnencatalogues the frequency with which Amerindians were abducted to resolve communication problems, and Isaías Lerner provides an overview of missionary linguistics in Spanish America and the efforts of the religious Orders. Much of this research into the language encounter appears to arise out of and against Tzvetan Todorov’s *The Conquest of America* (1982), an early study into the linguistic and literary aspects of colonial domination that exaggerated the conceptual benefits of alphabetic literacy. Both David Rojinsky in *Companion to Empire* (2010) and Eric Cheyfitz in *Poetics of Imperialism* (1997) criticize Todorov’s Euro-centric approach while deepening our understanding of the importance of translation for imperial expansion. Cheyfitz also notes the invisibility of the translator. So too does Stephen Greenblatt in “Learning to Curse: Aspects of Linguistic Colonialism in the Sixteenth Century” (1990), which characterizes the linguistic ideology of lettered Europeans as a source for the dehumanization of non-literate non-Europeans, exemplified in Shakespeare’s Caliban. Here he states, “the primal crime in the New World was committed in the interest of language” (17), an important observation further developed in his essay “Kidnapping Language” (1991). Peter Hulme’s helpful *Colonial Encounters* (1992) models an approach to the language encounter and linguistic miscomprehension that incorporates insights from ethnography and historical linguistics, while David Murray’s *Forked Tongues* (1991) examines ideologies implicit in attitudes toward translation and the characterization of Amerindian languages as
“primitive.” His book Indian Giving (2000) frames the language encounter within an economy of exchange and offers a unique and insightful reading of the earliest word-list to come out of the colonization of the Americas, Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s “Vocabvla Barbara.”

Perhaps the nearest study to my own for being a sustained discussion of bilingual word-lists is Laura J. Murray’s article “Vocabularies of Native American Languages: A Literary and Historical approach to an Elusive Genre” (2001). Although Laura Murray touches lightly on several of the word-lists I analyze, our approaches and our ultimate objectives are distinct because she does not develop an interpretive model from colonial language exchanges nor does she attempt to reconstruct the coercive consultation event. Instead, she discusses the rhetorical effect of the lexicons in producing an image of the author back home. Still other investigations into the language encounter benefit this study, such as Walter Mignolo’s The Darker Side of the Renaissance (1995) and Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra’s How to Write a History of the New World (2001), both of which analyze the ideological and material consequences of the European colonization of the Americas, as discussed briefly above. Robert Phillipson has likewise been introduced, so I’ll only briefly mention the conceptual value of his sustained research in the material and ideological forces behind the spread of modern English – Linguistic Imperialism (1992), “Realities and Myths of Linguistic Imperialism” (1997), and Linguistic Imperialism Continued (2009). Nicholas Ostler’s telescopic history of the spread of vernacular languages out of Europe, Empire of the Word (2005), sets many of the pieces in place for a more microscopic comparison of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism. Mary Louise Pratt’s oft-cited Imperial Eyes (1992) aids my deployment of a post-colonial reading of travel accounts and proto-scientific descriptions. Equally helpful is her joint effort with Elizabeth Traugott, Linguistics for Students of Literature (1980) for introducing me to the discipline-specific vocabulary of linguistics.
An important component of this investigation is the historical context, especially transatlantic histories that take a comparative approach, for which I’ve turned to the masterful work of J. H. Elliott. Cited here are his *The Old World and the New 1492-1650* (1970), *Empires of the Atlantic: Britain and Spain in America 1492-1830* (2006), and *Spain, Europe and the Wider World 1500-1800* (2009). European/Amerindian relations are a noteworthy yet marginal aspect of Elliott’s work, and so a reading of Francis Jennings’s *The Invasion of America* (1975) and *The Founders of America* (1993) represents a more Amerindian-focused counterbalance. Two works that are essentially transatlantic in as much as they recount the travels of Amerindians to Europe are Alden T. Vaughan’s *Transatlantic Encounters: American Indians in Britain, 1500-1776* (2006) and the somewhat derivative study *The Red Atlantic: American Indigenes and the Making of the Modern World* (2014) by Jace Weaver. Likewise Jill Lepore’s *The Name of War: King Philip’s War and the Origins of American Identity*, although straying into tenuous patches of language theory, is an insightful account of European/Amerindian relations in Anglo America that delivers a modern perspective on the missionary linguist John Eliot. In Irving Leonard’s classic *Books of the Brave* (1949) and Jeffrey Knapp’s *An Empire Nowhere* (1994) I encounter a more strictly literary discussion of the colonization that is supplemented by the print history of Carmen Castañeda in *Casa de la primera imprenta de América* (2004).

Finally, for a view of the religious developments that influenced the English and Spanish imperial efforts in the Americas, Diarmaid MacCulloch’s *Reformation: Europe’s House Divided* (2003) offers a comprehensive analysis that makes sense of the religious differences between the Puritans and Catholics. Other histories of the Reformation, such as Madeleine Gray’s introductory *The Protestant Reformation: Belief, Practice and Tradition* (2003), Mark Noll’s *The Old Religion in a New World* (2002), and Susan Doran and Christopher Durston’s England-
focused *Princes, Pastors, and People* (1991) contextualize the spiritual practices and theological concerns that conditioned European attitudes toward mission work. One area of religious history that is underappreciated in studies of the colonization is the European monastic tradition and its relation to the cultural shifts of the Reformation. While the previous works touch on the monasteries briefly, both Peter King’s *Western Monasticism* (1999) and Derek Beales’s *Prosperity and Plunder* (2003) illuminate the intellectual tradition of the religious Orders and the consequences from the division of the European Christian community. In *El envío de misioneros a América durante la época española* (1977) by Pedro Borges Morán and *The Spiritual Conquest of Mexico* (1933) by Robert Ricard we see how the stable structure of the monasteries in Catholic Spain positioned the Spanish Crown to send droves of enthusiastic friars to the Americas. Importantly for this investigation, the religious Orders were the principle authors of the Amerindian grammars, their evangelical efforts depending on fluency in the indigenous languages of Spanish America. For the development of missionary linguistics in Anglo America, my research benefits from the recent work of Lepore and the earlier work of William Kellaway, whose *The New England Company* (1962) is essential to understanding the difficulty with which mission work was established in New England. Last of all, a very early study, William Wallace Tooker’s *John Eliot’s First Indian Teacher and Interpreter Cokenoe-De-Long Island* (1896) introduces the figure of Cokenoe, a Montauk man who taught Eliot the Wampanoag language yet received only partial credit in the publication of *The Indian Grammar Begun*.

### 1.5 Methodology

As can be seen from the catalogue of scholarly works above, my methodology depends enormously on a comprehensive understanding of the historical context of the language encounter in the Americas. By comprehensive, I intend a comparative historical
approach like that used by J. H. Elliott and the transatlantic historians who have followed in his wake, such as James Lang and Anthony Pagden, for in my experience tradition-specific histories of the colonization of the Americas are, by definition, less aware of the broader context. Therefore a comparative approach to linguistic imperialism reveals, through juxtaposition, the consequences of disparate theologies, institutional conditions, intellectual traditions, and historical trajectories. The link between an investigation that is strictly historical and one that is more literary critical is forged by Hayden White, whose *Metahistory* discloses ideology in the narrative structure of histories, what he calls the “poetics of history” (1), a form of literary criticism applied to non-fiction documents “to provide a new perspective” (2) on historical knowledge.

Two additional considerations guide my research and analysis: first, the invention of an interpretive model for reading early modern linguistic data as narratives; and second, the ethical impulse for pursuing a line of investigation that seeks to re-assert Amerindian agency in the narrative. If we accept the proposition that the linguistic data records a historical event of linguistic consultation in de-articulated or de-narrativized form, then an ethical approach to the history of the colonization of the Americas would seek to re-articulate that event. I believe that the best discipline for achieving this end is literary criticism supplemented, naturally, through comparative history. The work of new historicists such as Stephen Greenblatt demonstrates that novel insights into historical problems open up when sustained literary analysis is applied to an array of historical documents, both fiction and non-fiction. Just as White encounters a poetics of history, in the word-lists and grammars I discern a poetics of linguistics, realized in the rhetoric of lists and their incorporation of fictional devices, such as character, setting, dialogue, and plot. The interpretive model, what I am calling narrative re-articulation, identifies rhetorical tropes and narrative elements in
seemingly arbitrary collections of words. I bring together words under the rhetorical
categories proposed in Henry Peacham’s *The Garden of Eloquence* in order to create islands of
significance, and by identifying the flow between these islands a relational significance
emerges that forms a rudimentary narrative. This narrative is then supplemented by whatever
historical data is available, thus revealing the hidden coercive consultation event in its fullest
narrative form.

1.6 Chapter Summaries

1.6.1 Chapter 2: Narrative Re-articulation: How to Read for the Coercive Consultation Event

Beginning in the first stage of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the
Americas, this chapter gives a more complete description of the bilingual word-lists,
provides a number of examples from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, describes how
they developed out of the language encounter, and slowly builds an interpretive model
through a series of interconnected topics. Although the word-lists represent the first textual
transmission of Amerindian languages as linguistic data, I pause momentarily to consider an
important stage in communication that both preceded and accompanied speech, the
exchange of gestures and pointing. I then describe the abducted Amerindian interpreters as
language slaves and examine two captivity stories in order to establish the degree of violence
surrounding the word-lists as well as the theme of sexual intimacy in abduction scenarios.
Pointing and gestures return as intrinsic to early modern language learning, when vernacular
grammars were largely unavailable, as language instruction involved the bodies of the teacher
and the student and vocabularies were often constructed through ostension, or definition by
pointing.
Because this investigation attempts to reconstruct the linguistic ideology of the Europeans, I question the very concept of the “word” and demonstrate how, like Mignolo’s “theory of the letter,” the colonists arrived in the Americas with a “theory of the word” that structured their perception and representation of Amerindian languages. I then turn to the rhetoric of lists and, with the aid of several literary scholars, I identify a number of rhetorical categories that bind the sequence of words into groups, these groups then hang together through a virtual syntax that begins to form a narrative. Finally, the full coercive consultation event is presented explicitly in an early travel account, and this narrative completes the construction of my interpretive model and prepares it for deployment, with the rest of my interpretive framework, in the next chapter.

1.6.2 Chapter 3: Early Modern Word-Lists: Restoring Historical Context and the Source of Linguistic Knowledge

Here I offer a survey of five early modern bilingual word-lists that exclude a description of the coercive consultation event, and by engaging the interpretive model of narrative re-articulation, I speculate about the likely origins of and conditions for the language exchange. The relevance of ostension to the word-lists is made clearer in this chapter as it allows me to re-articulate the Amerindian language consultant through the presence of the human body, often defined in parts. Because the word-lists are generally presented as indexes isolated from the main narrative, the source of the linguistic data is often unknown, a mystery that my reading attempts to resolve. It is as supplements that the word-lists produce fuller narratives of the colonial language encounter, and so in a further reading I uncover a narrative of close physical proximity that suggests sexual intimacy. Another text expands on the idea that the word-lists are historically fixed documents that emerge from a single event. In an examination of a Powhatan word-list that “abstract[s]
language from speech” (Laura Murray 592) I trace the otherwise sourceless linguistic data to a violent scene of extreme coercion and torture. To incorporate the perspective of an Amerindian on the language exchange and European translations of Amerindian words, I digress momentarily to the critical yet humorous observations of an Amerindian author from Peru who challenges the surety of European translations and complicates the one-to-one structure of the bilingual word-lists. I end with a close reading of one of the most fully word-lists of the seventeenth century to propose the identity of the Amerindian language consultant through a combination of evidence provided by the colonial history and the re-articulated narrative of the bilingual vocabulary. The establishment of the identity of the language consultant is augmented by a speculative reading that re-articulates events that otherwise remain absent from the historical narrative.

1.6.3 Chapter 4: The Arts of Empire: Language Sciences and the Colonization of the Americas

This chapter functions as a bridge between the first and second stages of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the Americas, offering a series of interlocking historical arguments in an attempt to answer the following question: What accounts for the disparity in the production of Amerindian grammars in Anglo and Spanish America? It is here that a comparative history presents a unique entry point into an analysis of the colonization of the Americas. After establishing the enormous disproportion in the production of Amerindian grammars, I look at the English and Spanish experiences of linguistic imperialism in Europe and their traditions in the language sciences. A shared linguistic ideology, forming a hierarchy of languages, united these two nations and caused the transmission of Latin to the Americas, where the vernacular languages were not as prominently taught as one might imagine. This depended on the education of the missionaries, who were the primary agents
of linguistic imperialism and who were deployed in quite disparate numbers in Anglo and Spanish America. The Reformation, therefore, has enormous explanatory power for the differences in colonization, especially with regards to language, for the monastic system provided the vast majority of the missionary linguists. The social changes that resulted from the Reformation hugely diminished England’s ability to send missionaries abroad, mainly because the monasteries were shuttered in the first third of the sixteenth century. I therefore end this historical investigation with a look at how the first Protestant missionary endeavour, the New England Company, was organized and funded and how this compared to the funding of the Catholic friars in Spanish America.

1.6.4 Chapter 5: Survivance Grammatica: The Timucua and Cockenoe’s Grammar

The final chapter is designed around the metaphors of cultural imperialism as “killing the Indian to save the man” and narrative re-articulation as “resurrection work.” The theory of survivance is therefore essential for demonstrating the continuity and vitality of Amerindian cultures and languages in the face of a broad assemblage of colonial practices and linguistic technologies for domination and transformation.

The most emblematic social organization used to Christianize and civilize Amerindian societies in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is the reduction or missionary reservation. These settlements relocated Amerindian communities and inserted them into a network of linguistic technologies, and thus the Amerindians were reduced in two ways, culturally reduced to civility and their languages reduced to grammar. The Amerindian colleges of New England and New Spain shared similarities deriving from the European linguistic ideology, forming another link in the chain of the arts of empire. Yet there were differences in the objectives of higher education in Anglo and Spanish America and these had a significant effect on the production of a native clergy and Amerindian
authors and the incorporation of Amerindian educational practices. The printing presses played a crucial role in linguistic imperialism but again they were engaged distinctly, demonstrating theological differences between the Puritan and Catholic colonists. These theological differences revolved around literacy and the inclusion or exclusion of the Bible in the conversion process. The difference in the modes of evangelism in the Puritan and Catholic Americas can be summarized as textuality versus iconography, which we see displayed in two early Amerindian grammars that, despite their differences, both erase the necessary Amerindian consultant from their title pages.

Against this assemblage of linguistic imperialism, I perform two close readings of grammars in an attempt to restore historical agency to the Amerindian consultants and account for the continuance of Amerindian cultural difference and practices. In re-articulating the language consultant to the historical narrative, I more securely establish the survivance of particular Amerindian historical figures and certain Amerindian cultural practices. These grammars are both unsettling and pleasing in their representation of Amerindians, providing subtle hints of both extreme coercion and celebration, both weeping and laughter, and narrative re-articulation strongly demonstrates the survivance of Amerindian historical figures and cultures against and within the very arts of empire.

1.6.5 Epilogue

In this brief chapter I propose two distinct directions in research that this project recommends, which are an investigation into the effects of Amerindian grammars on the development of philosophies of language in Europe and a more sustained analysis of the relationship between missionary linguistics and the emergence of Amerindian authors in the colonies. Attempting to anticipate the problems of establishing influence, I return to J. H. Elliott to schematize the various questions that such a line of investigation must seek to
answer through historical evidence. Rather than assuming continuity and familiarity, I would like to demonstrate the tangible influence of missionary linguistics (whenever possible) on specific cultural developments in both European and Amerindian societies.
2 Narrative Re-Articulation: How to Read for the Coercive Consultation

Event

2.1 Introduction

In the winter of 1520, somewhere on the coast of Tierra del Fuego, Magalhães’s crew abducted two Tehuelche men and brought them on board the Victoria, where they were shackled, measured, and observed and where the sole surviving indigene was interviewed, producing one of the earliest European/Amerindian word-lists ever recorded – a truncated bilingual vocabulary presented in two facing columns. Antonio Pigafetta, the Italian humanist and chronicler of the expedition, recorded his interactions with the Tehuelche (christened Paul on his deathbed), providing European readers with two separate narratives of the linguistic exchange: one hastily yet explicitly in the prose narrative of the expedition and the other implicitly in the word-list. Unlike the vast majority of the word-lists produced during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries by English and Spanish explorers, colonists, and chroniclers, the Tehuelche vocabulary is followed in the narrative by a brief description of the process by which the linguistic information was captured. It is therefore a uniquely forthcoming text from the first stage of European linguistic imperialism and exceptionally valuable as an interpretive model for us to re-articulate the word-list to the historical narrative. To borrow a felicitous phrase from Umberto Eco, the bilingual word-lists are “signs, witnesses to something else, to the past they come from, to an exotic world of which they are the only documents, to the invisible world” (Infinity of Lists 170). But how do we move from the fact of the Amerindian language in the colonial text – these witnesses to an exotic world – to a fuller reconstruction of the concealed or obliquely-presented language exchange?
The re-articulation of the word-list into the historical narrative requires a focus on the hidden, overlooked, and naturalized features of language-learning and linguistic consultation in colonial texts. To that end I begin by presenting the use of impromptu gestural languages in order to contextualize the problem of language difference and establish the use of gesture and pointing in language-learning situations. The language slave then appears as an attempt to alter the way we discuss abducted Amerindian interpreters and to establish the coercive conditions under which linguistic data was often exchanged. The body in word-lists functions to both verify the physical presence of the Amerindian consultant and to reinforce the role of the body in early modern language study. The word as a non-universal grammatical unit is hard to grasp, yet I focus on it in one section in order to demonstrate the tenacious conceptual gap between European and Amerindian languages, complicating even further the problem of language difference and the simplified contents of the word-lists, and delineating what I call a “theory of the word” for European writers. I then present a rhetorical reading of lists that permits the combination of lexical items into groups; these groups hang together in a virtual syntax that will allow me to reconstruct a story out of the vocabularies. Finally, we revisit the earliest language exchanges to demonstrate the stubborn resistance that word-lists hold toward revealing the consultation event, and then analyze the Tehuelche word-list of Pigafetta’s travel account where most of the components remain in place. All of these elements combine to form a heuristic multi-tool for getting closer to the moment of language exchange, a model I call narrative re-articulation.

In distinction from the Amerindian dictionaries and grammars that the Europeans and Amerindians wrote collaboratively while dwelling together for extended periods, the Amerindian word-lists are distinct, relatively short linguistic texts largely because they were
written as a result of abduction and enslavement while sailing in unfamiliar waters. Laura Murray designates the mobility of the European explorers, their education and commercial interests as well as abduction, as the major “factors that determined choice of genre for early linguistic efforts” (“Vocabularies” 592). Kidnapping was often achieved through trickery and the Amerindians were then compelled to interview through physical violence, isolation, restraint, and restricted access to food and drink. For these reasons, the language exchanges that produced the word-lists I am referring to in this study as coercive consultation events and the consultants as language slaves. My objective is to bring the event of their capture and interview up to the level of narrative, for though the linguistic data reveals much about the historical situation it is always in de-narrativized form. Developing from violent and antagonistic relationships, the word-lists are significantly more limited in scope than later dictionaries and grammars and though I attempt to name the coerced consultant in each case it is not always possible. This is because the colonial narratives that the word-lists supplement sometimes mention abduction without connecting it explicitly with the list. The word-lists are typically not anchored to the chronology of the narrative and their free-floating character has resulted in their being discarded from later editions. This is especially

5 The following is a partial, chronological inventory of Amerindian word-lists in colonial texts: Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s De orbe novo (1516); Antonio Pigafetta’s Relazione del primo viaggio intorno al mondo (1525); Richard Eden’s The Decades of the Newe Worlde (1555) (containing translations of Martire d’Anghiera and Pigafetta); Jacques Cartier’s Discours de voyage (1556); Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga’s La araucana (1569-1589); Jean de Léry’s Histoire d’un voyage (1578); Thomas Hariot’s Briefe and True Report (1588); Richard Hakluyt’s Principal Navigations (1589) (containing lists from Christopher Hall, John Janes, Francis Drake, Cartier, Francisco López de Gómara, and others); Pedro Fernández de Castro y Andrade’s Descripción de la provincia de los Quicos en lo natural (1608); John Smith’s A Map of Virginia (1612); William Strachey’s Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania (1612); Pablo José de Arriaga’s Exterpación de la idolatria del Piru (1621); Samuel Purchas’s Hakluytus Posthumus (containing James Rosier’s list) (1625); Fray Pedro Simón’s Noticias historiales de las conquistas de Tierra Firme en las Indias Occidentales (1627); Antonio de León Pinelo’s Epitome de la biblioteca oriental i occidental (1629); William Wood’s New-England’s Prospect (1634); Roger William’s A Key into the language of America (1643); and Thomas Gage’s The English-American (1648), among others. See: Philip Barbour, “Earliest Reconnaissance;” Stephen Greenblatt, “Learning to Curse” 34; Isaías Lerner, “Spanish Colonization;” Daniel J. Slive, “A New World of Words.”
true of the bilingual word-lists written by English and Spanish explorers, historians, and colonists in consultation with Amerindians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The result is that these colonial encounters are under a form of multiple erasures or de-articulations.

Attempts to reconstruct the initial language encounter have already been published, such as Red Atlantic where Jace Weaver conjectures that the first words spoken to the Tainos were “Salaam Aleichem” because Cristóbal Colón’s translator Luis de Torres spoke Arabic (as well as Hebrew, Aramaic, and Portuguese) (41), though Colón is not forthcoming about the details of the conversation. In contrast to Weaver, my study focuses on the implicit dialogue recorded in the initial language exchange in word-list form. There are traces in these travel accounts and histories that allow for the re-articulation of the coercive consultation events and though the identification of the exact language slave (euphemistically referred to as interpreters, linguists, or lenguas) is not always possible, a reconstruction of the interview through an analysis of the virtual syntax allows us to conjecture with some accuracy about the details of the linguistic exchange. (Much like the fact of their slavery, the Amerindians’ participation in linguistic consultation is very often entirely obscured.) The virtual syntax is a kind of implicit grammar that allows us as readers to combine individual lexical items into groups and groups into meaningful structures from which we may reconstruct a fuller narrative of the coercive consultation event. By restoring the consultation event to the main narrative, these Amerindian linguists are revealed to be language slaves abducted by Europeans for the sake of resolving the problem of language difference; they are also more than language slaves, for the Amerindian consultants defy their captors in heroic ways, though not always successfully. We may restore a certain degree of historical agency to these consultants by attempting to re-articulate implicit dialogues to the actions contained in the
historical narrative in de-narrativized form. The colonial writers suggest this possibility themselves. Regarding his word-list, Roger Williams attempts to avoid the dialogue form for brevity’s sake yet he allows that there is “an implicite Dialogue” *(A key* 25, emphasis mine) in the structure.

Lamentably, historians and literary critics often ignore the word-lists because of their peculiar structure and their seemingly tenuous relationship to the narratives they supplement, one scholar calling a list “frivolous-seeming preliminary material, a brief vocabulary of Indian words” *(Knapp, Empire Nowhere* 209). Yet these textual supplements display many of the characteristics of prose narratives: they are aesthetic, producing both pleasurable and painful emotions through poignant combinations of words; they are rhetorical, making a claim on our attention and instructing us; they are also loaded with fictional devices, including plot, character, setting, and dialogue. By analyzing the choice of terms, the flow between terms, the structural organization, and islands of words in conjunction, an image of the almost entirely hidden language consultation process can be recreated. It is for these reasons that this project is recuperative, for in analyzing the oft-ignored, excluded, and unsourced word-lists I begin to re-articulate not only a textual fragment that has been elided and excreted, but to re-stage the coercive consultation event from which the bilingual word-list was produced. In so doing we recover the history of the Amerindian consultants who collaborated to produce the first textual representations of Amerindian languages in the European tradition.

I re-establish the physical presence of the Amerindian consultant through a reconstruction of the divided and denoted Amerindian body. The logic of the word-list implies that language learning is a form of memorization and the presence of the Amerindian consultant can be established through reference to the preeminent early modern
site of vocabulary memorization: the human body. Although the more expressive features of
the gestural language used between Europeans and Amerindians are ignored in the colonial
texts, the manual sign most often used to communicate is pointing, especially when
indicating an object or a part of the body. This mode of denotation is not without its
complications, as I demonstrate later, yet it is fundamental to establishing the presence of
the Amerindian body in the coercive consultation event. Assumptions often cause pointing
and denotation to misfire, yet other cultural practices similarly taken as natural cause the
word-lists to reveal the tenacious problem of language difference for Europeans and
Amerindians.

Complications in linguistic representation arise from the imprecision of the object
analyzed, for a word is not always a word, especially when the target language differs so
greatly from the source language. Lay explorers and humanist colonists derived their
grammatical understanding from Latin and imposed it onto the languages of the Americas
(Mignolo, *Darker Side* 37), something grammarians were beginning to perform on the
European vernaculars, which inevitably led to distortions in the representation of European
and Amerindian vernaculars. A conflict was therefore present not only on the level of
societies and individual bodies but also on the level of morphosyntactics, as low synthetic
languages confronted high synthetic languages, called polysynthetic. Low synthetic languages
differ from polysynthetics in the morpheme-to-word ratio, resulting in polysynthetic
languages such as Wampanoag having sentence-long “words.” Balthasar Bickel and Johanna
Nichols describe this linguistic feature, writing, “polysynthesis [...] brings together [...] into
a single grammatical word [...] not only grammatical information like person, number, and
tense, but also various lexical concepts [such as objects and natural events in a] bound
morphology,” adding, “[t]his phenomenon is widespread in North American languages”
(“Inflectional Morphology” 192). Although the repercussions of this will become more apparent in the following chapter, I establish the “word” as a non-natural object so that my reading is not complacent with the terms established by the colonial authors, as has happened in more recent analyses.

Beginning with Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s “Vocabvla Barbara” [Barbarian Vocabulary] in 1516, the bilingual word-list appears in a variety of texts throughout the entire period of the European colonization of the Americas.6 Written for the Europeans’ “delight, if they can get no profit” (Wood, New-England’s 111), these word-lists often appeared without any identifiable origin at the end of colonial narratives, as an appendix or a supplement to the main story. As indicated, William Wood’s word-list, appended to his New-England’s Prospect (1634), is prefaced with the recognition that the Amerindian words may serve no other purpose but the reader’s “delight” (111). James Axtell, however, relates the anecdote of Colonel Norwood who, after exhausting the language of gestures, resorts to his memory of John Smith’s Generall Historie of Virginia (1624) where Smith’s Powhatan word-list is reproduced. “Norwood remembered a single word,” writes Axtell, “werowance, “chief” – and that word, he thought (probably wrongly), saved their lives because they were immediately ferried by canoe and conducted to the chief of Kickotank” (“Babel of Tongues” 28). The readership for these word-lists, then, was not only charmed by the inclusion of New World lexical curiosities but also interested in Amerindian languages for imperial motives: to

---

6 In The Fall of Natural Man, Anthony Pagden claims that the category “barbarian” functioned for European imperial thought to distinguish the self from the Other (15) and notes that the term originally arose to identify those who spoke nonsense languages rather than Greek, which was the language of rationality (16). For more on barbarians and barbarian languages, see Pagden 15-26.
facilitate trade, treaty, and military parley. The fortuitous learning of key Amerindian terms could save a tenuously established settlement or help lost explorers survive until rescue.

It is often the case that these word-lists appear as an unsourced appendix to the main narrative, or later compilers reorganize and reduce the number of lexical items, or the list in its entirety is excluded (often without comment) from subsequent editions. This status as disjecta membra alone gives us reason for investigation. Analysis here is an attempt to recognize and value an unstable textual feature before it fades from modern consideration. The titles of lists are similarly unstable (word-list, vocabulary, dictionary, glossary) and the languages they describe are ambiguous in the extreme (Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s “Vocabvla Barbara,” Roger William’s “Language of America,” or the ubiquitous “Indian language”). Taken as first instance of the European arts of empire in the Americas, the word-lists actually occur chronologically after the unrecorded, impromptu gestural languages that facilitated first contact. Of these manual languages we have only residual, unsystematic descriptions, yet gesture reveals much about the coercive consultation event and therefore I linger briefly over the topic. There are many word-lists appearing in the literature of the colonization of the Americas though only a few will be analyzed here at any depth, beginning in this chapter with Paul’s Tehuelche vocabulary and following with a broader survey in the next. As noted above, the tradition appears to begin with Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s “Vocabvla Barbara,” some five pages appended to the 1516 Latin edition of De orbe nouo (137-41), edited by grammarian Antonio de Nebrija. The Italian humanist Antonio Pigafetta

---

7 Michael Lok is a good example of the kind of reader interested in exotic words and was deeply involved in the Frobisher expeditions. He writes: “In which travailes besides the knowledge of all those famous ‘common’ languages of those countries I sought also for the knowledge of the state of all their commonwealths” (East India by Northwest[ard] 88).

8 For good reason there is a scarcity of literary criticism on word-lists. Typical of these disjecta membra, Martire d’Anghiera’s list is reduced and modified in subsequent editions and translations (such as Richard Eden’s The Decades of the New World in 1555) and is totally omitted from the “complete” modern English translation of the Latin text (David Murray 83, 213).
produced a number of bilingual word-lists (Malay, for example) in his account of the Magalhães expedition, *Relazione del primo viaggio intorno al mondo* [The First Voyage around the World] (1525). I concentrate analysis, however, on the Tehuelche word-list in this text because Pigafetta is uncommonly explicit about the coercive consultation event, and from this I extrapolate a model for reading later word-lists and re-articulate the abstracted, de-narrativedized linguistic data into the historical narrative.

2.2 The Silent Rhetoric: From Gestural Language to Pointing

In comparing packs (“manadas”) of wild men in Spain with the inhabitants of the New World, José de Acosta writes in *Historia natural y moral de las Indias* (1590) of the uncivilized men, “si no es el gesto y figura, no tienen otra cosa de hombres” [if not for gesture and shape, they have nothing else of Man] (82). Following the classical definition of humans as language-using animals (Pagden, *Fall of Natural Man* 16), the wildlings are only men in as much as they use gestural language. Yet that essential indication of humanity receives scant attention in colonial texts, where the sounds and words of Amerindians are privileged over the precise details of their gestures. John Bulwer’s serendipitous metaphor of a dark continent in *Chirologia: Natural language of the hand* (1644) laments this very lapse in attentiveness: “In which continent of Humanity [the Light of Learning] hath noted (as a maine deficiencie) one Province not to have beene visited, and that is Gesture” (A3,3). English and Spanish explorers and colonizers responded quickly to the impenetrable difference of Amerindian languages by abducting language slaves, what Columbus and other Spanish-speakers called *lenguas* and English-speakers called interpreters or linguists (Ostler,

---

Empires of the Word 341). In his *diario* entry of October 12, 1492, Columbus writes, “yo plaziendo a nro señor levare de aqui al tpo de mi partida seys a v. al. p[ar]a q deprenda fablar” [Our Lord pleasing, at the time of my departure I will take six [Tainos] from here to Your Highnesses in order that they may learn to speak] (68-9). Noting that this abduction soon became standard practice for European explorers and colonizers Stephen Greenblatt declares, “the primal crime in the New World was committed in the interest of language” (“Learning to Curse” 17), adding in another essay, “the principal means chosen by the Europeans to establish linguistic contact was kidnapping” (“Kidnapping Language” 106). Quoting Kirkpatrick Sale, Weaver calls this act “the birth of American slavery” (*Red Atlantic* 43). The first communications between Europeans and the abducted Amerindians, however, were in the form of gestures and while the specific shape of these manual signs is often left to the imagination, their translation is regularly precipitous and authoritative. Frustrated with unintelligible speech, Ángel Rosenblat notes Colón “[t]uvo que recurrir a otros medios” (“La hispanización de América” 87) [had to find recourse to other means], and citing Bartolomé de Las Casas, he adds, “Las manos les servían de lengua” [their hands were their interpreters]. Although this chapter is fundamentally concerned with word-lists, the fact of gestural communication in colonial texts and the fundamental role of gesture in shaping the content of word-lists must give us pause to consider how viewing gestures as “natural signs” led to significant mistranslations.

Though Colón’s *diario* does not include a bilingual word-list, and much less a gesture-list, we discover in it themes typical of the literature of linguistic imperialism in the Americas. As the statement “that they may learn to speak” suggests, Amerindians are often represented as having neither languages – such as in John Taylor’s “Epitaph in the *Barmooda* tongue, which must be pronounced with the accent of the grunting of a hogge” (*Origins of English*
Nonsense 104) – nor writing systems – such as in Lope de Vega’s anecdote of the Amerindian astonished to learn that books “speak” and reveal hidden, deceitful actions (El nuevo mundo descubierto 3.47).10 Amerindian languages are alternatively represented as being no different from European languages and this perfect linguistic comprehension is quite obviously fictionalization. Hulme writes, “there is no evidence and no reason to suppose that what Columbus presented as a dialogue between European and native was other than a European monologue” (Colonial Encounters 20). Yet again and again, communication begins with and returns to signs or señas, even though these gestures – which largely consist of pointing at objects and the body though certainly other culture-specific gestures escape representation – quickly prove inadequate. During Magalhães’s circumnavigation, such is the case of the abducted Tehuelche man whose communication López de Gómara describes, writing, “Comenzaron a entrar en plática por señas, que no aprovechaba hablar” (Historia general 1:217) [They entered into conversation by signs, as speech was beyond use]. The specific quality of these signs is ignored by the text, however, as the chronicler Antonio Pigafetta moves directly to representations of spoken language in a word-list.

The problem of language difference in both speech and gesture naturally gives rise to misunderstandings even though the chroniclers are reluctant to acknowledge as much. Just a week after abducting the Tainos, Colón’s faith in the translations provided by his lenguas disintegrates and the language gap yawns open before him as a real problem for exploration and colonization: “yo bien crey q todo lo que dezian era burla p[ar]a se fugir” [I well believe that all they were saying was a ruse in order to flee] (Diario 79) and “no doy mucha fe a sus dezires: asi por no los entender yo bien” [I do not give much credit to what they say, from

10 Variations on this theme recur in colonial literature regarding Amerindians. See also, López de Gómara, Historia general 1:79-80; Martire d’Anghiera, Décadas 367; Daniel Defoe, Essay upon literature 5-6.
not understanding them well] (101). Although his *diario* was only rediscovered in 1791, Colón’s text contains the first examples of the misunderstandings that arose in the process of linguistic negotiation. These confusions ranged from the innocent to the catastrophic: from naively mistaking *Bohío* (“a house” or “dwelling”) for the name of an island, a blunder that Bartolomé de Las Casas criticizes in marginalia, writing, “por aquí parece que poco los entendía” [this shows how little he understood them] (166); to imposing interpretations that change the course of history, as the *diario* is the first European text in which the term “cannibal” appears (what Hulme declares “the special, perhaps even defining, feature of the discourse of colonialism as it pertained to the native Caribbean” [3]).

The word for “house” is mistaken for the name of an island because Columbus and his Taino language slaves communicate principally by gesture. Thus, when pointing toward dwellings on the island the ambiguity of the gesture allows for the captain to understand the field of reference to encompass the entire landmass. Pointing, in fact, is the most common lexical item in the improvised gestural vocabulary and while it is a great source of communication it is also the cause for many misperceptions. The size and complexity of these traditional and improvised gestural languages are lost in time and obscured by the common refrain, “indicated by signs/gestures/señas.” In his essay “Babel of Tongues,” Axtell writes, “When Indians and Europeans met for the first time […] it was obvious that they would initially have to communicate not through a common tongue but by some shared syntax of signs, motions, and gestures,” what Axtell calls a “silent rhetoric” (17). The results of this were sometimes fortunate, sometimes disastrous, and sometimes comically inept. “At the beginning,” writes Robert Ricard, “preaching was done by signs […] To suggest hell they pointed to the earth, fire, toads, and snakes; then they raised their eyes, pointed to heaven, and spoke of a single God. The Indians barely understood” (*Spiritual Conquest of Mexico* 46).
Beyond the fact that none of the cultures shared an unambiguous sign system, there was also the difficulty of translating the signs into written form.\footnote{During the seventeenth-century flowering of universal languages, both Juan Pablo Bonet’s 
*Reducción de las letras y arte para enseñar a hablar a los mudos* (1620) and John Bulwer’s *Chirologia* (1644) developed sign languages in an attempt to overcome the problem of language difference. Their works contain many illustrations of gesture.} Although Pietro Martire d’Anghiera declares, “the languages of all the nations of these Ilandes, maye well be written with our Latine letters” (*Decades* 1:67) in this instance of communication it appears that the alphabet could have determined representation and abstracted gestures by focusing observation instead on phonetic communication. Regardless, the shape and movement of these impromptu gestural languages were largely ignored in colonial accounts, except when they are breezily described as transparent vehicles of evident meaning. Commenting on nineteenth-century ethnographer Garrick Mallery, David Murray notes “[t]he widespread use of [Indian sign languages] had always attracted comment, both admiring […] and patronizing” (*Forked Tongues* 17), sign languages that Mallery regarded as “truly natural language[s]” (18) that do not require interpretation.

Such is the sentiment in Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s account of one of Colón’s exchanges where the captain asks of a group of Tainos, who have assembled near his ship in canoes for trade, whence they acquired their gold and pearls. Of the encounter d’Anghiera writes, “Preguntándoles dónde se cogían aquellas cosas, mostraron con el dedo la propia playa, y con una torsión y movimiento de manos y labios, parecían dar a entender que no estimaban en mucho las perlas y llegando a más, agarraron unas canastillas, como queriendo significar que si se quedaban allí, podrían recogerlas por cestos” (*De Orbe Novo* Vol 1. VI: 136) [When questioned as to whence came the pearls, they answered by pointing with their fingers to a neighbouring coast; by grimaces and gestures they seemed to indicate that if the Spaniards would stop with them they would give them basketfuls of pearls]. The details of
the gestures, the pointing, the twisting and movement of the hands and face, immediately give way to meaning that is both transparent and hopeful, exemplified in the phrase “as if wanting to signify.” Regardless of the distance between Martyr and the Tainos, or the ephemeral quality of the gestures, there is no lingering over the precise quality of the “silent rhetoric” here or elsewhere (the relative positions of arms and digits and directional movement), unlike the linguistic observations of sound, such as when Martyr emphasizes that the stress in “bohío” is on the “i” (115). The gesture that receives the most comment and least description is pointing, the “mostrar con el dedo,” yet Colón refers to signs over and over again (Diario 71, 77, 83, 111, etc.).

The hastiness with which the explorers pass over the language of signs is again exemplified in d’Anghiera’s description of Colón’s abduction of ten Tainos (the number changes depending on the author) to make them interpreters, “por medio de los cuales podría consignar por escrito sin dificultad la lengua de todas aquellas islas” (Décadas 109) [by the aid of whom could be recorded in writing without difficulty the language of all those islands]. Their linguistic contribution is activated not through the practiced study of gesture, but through the phonemic recording of their speech. While the word-lists represent the initial phase of the textual incorporation of Amerindian languages into European cultures, it is only because of the ephemeral quality of that prior language – the improvised and highly ambiguous language of gestures – that my research must begin at the word. The necessarily textual character of this investigation is perhaps nowhere more strongly felt than in the explorers’, colonizers’, and historians’ phonemic bias.

2.3 Interpreters are Language Slaves

Miguel de Cervantes writes, “por la libertad así como por la honra se puede y debe aventurar la vida, y, por el contrario, el cautiverio es el mayor mal que puede venir a los
hombres” (Don Quijote 985) [for freedom, as for honor, life may and should be risked. And on the other hand, captivity is the greatest evil that can fall to the lot of man] (Don Quixote 741). Although the fact of slavery plays an important function in Cervantes’s narrative – connecting the novel with the New World language encounter, the problem of language difference, and above all translation – it is often obscured or euphemized in colonial texts. Even current interpretations tend to ignore the practical implications behind rather pregnant descriptions by colonists. Thus, contemporary scholar Frances Karttunen states rather mildly that the Puritan missionary and grammarian John Eliot learned the Narragansett language from a local man’s “house servant,” a Montauk boy named Cockenoe taken during the Pequot War of the 1630s (“Interpreters Snatched” 220), while Edward Andrews calls him “an Indian who was taken captive” (Native Apostles 26). Francis Jennings rightly points out that as the source for Eliot’s language learning this “house servant” was a war-prize, writing: “New Englanders understood more precisely that an Indian servant captured in war was a slave” (Invasion of America 233). Although responses to abduction varied greatly, there is no doubting that, at least initially, such Amerindian figures as Squanto, Enrique de Malaca, Felipillo, Francisco de Chicora, Julián and Melchor, Gaspar Antonio Chi, Doña Marina (La Malinche), Diego Colón, and hundreds of nameless others, and even Europeans such as the

---

12 Don Quijote is perhaps the period’s best source for multi-faceted, fictional representations of the language encounter. The novel is brimming with playful recognition of the problem of language difference, different writing systems, and translation, for example: mutual linguistic incomprehension, primarily between speakers of Arabic and Castilian, leaves some characters lost in silence (140, 389); literacy drives the plot in as much as it inspires Don Quijote’s madness and also informs his “textual attitude” toward the world (28-33, 309); the whole text is presumably a recovered translation from Arabic to Castilian by the Moorish historian Cide Hamete Benengeli (86-7, 273); non-literate characters congregate around the reading of books by literate characters (321); Cervantes claims in the second part of the novel that the emperor of China wrote a letter begging him to teach Castilian in a language school there (547); and finally, the author mounts an impressive defense of writing in the vernacular languages (667). This is a very partial list.

13 A similar obfuscation occurs regarding the “companion” or “servant” or “pet” given to Bartolomé de Las Casas by his father. Weaver writes, “Regardless of how [the Taino boy] has been characterized, he was by any definition a captive and a slave” (Red Atlantic 48).
boys Thomas Savage and Henry Spelman (whom John Smith delivered to Wahunsenacawh [Bach, *Colonial Transformations* 22]), were bonded as slaves for the purpose of bridging the language gap.\(^{14}\)

The unwilling interpreter Paquiquineo, a prominent Algonquian *werowance* later baptized Don Luis de Velasco, suffered ten years in captivity from 1561 to 1571, having been abducted by the Spanish from Virginia and taken to the West Indies, Mexico, and Spain (Jennings, *Founders* 166; Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters* 44). (The inclusion of Paquiquineo’s captivity story here represents an attempt to mitigate the “captivity without narrative” effect so common to cases of enslaved, non-literate Amerindians.) Setting out from Havana after many years of forced linguistic assimilation and with his testimony to the richness of his country encouraging a Jesuit mission and Spanish settlement, Paquiquineo was finally returned home with a contingent of Jesuit missionaries who soon after their arrival began “complaining of his un-Christian behavior and pointing out their great need of his interpreting services” (Karttunen 223). Unlike the language slaves who fled from colonists never to be seen again or others who happily integrated into European colonial society, Paquiquineo spent five months with his people and returned to the mission (located near the future Jamestown settlement) with a group of warriors who killed all of the colonists except for the altar boy (and later grammarian) Alonso de Olmos.

This episode represents the common practice of abducting and indoctrinating interpreters to facilitate colonization; language slaves thus perform an essential function within imperial expansion by providing information and facilitating communication.

---

\(^{14}\) Weaver identifies the first of the Amerindian language slaves as two unnamed Beothuk boys abducted by Vikings in 1009, writing, “The fact that they took the boys and taught them their language is strong evidence they intended to continue trading with the region’s indigenous people” (*Red Atlantic* 36-7). Voigt likewise notes, “Prince Henry and his navigators frequently relied on captured natives to serve as interpreters and informants as they explored the West African coastline in the 1440s” (*Writing Captivity* 6).
Although Paquiquineo’s act of retribution is perhaps not typical, it does give an indication of the sense of injustice and rage felt by those who were abducted for their native-speech capacities. Frank Siebert claims that Paquiquineo was actually the father of Wahunsenacawh, citing the Virginia Company secretary Ralph Hamor: “Powhatans father was driven by [the Spanish] from the west-Indies into those parts” (“Resurrecting Virginia Algonquian” 287). However, Robert Beverley conjectures in *The history and present state of Virginia* (1705) that Paquiquineo was Wahunsenacawh’s brother Oppechancanough, writing, “we suppose him to have come from the Spanish Indians, some-where near Mexico” (47). Regardless of familial relation, it is likely that Paquiquineo’s experiences were communicated sufficiently to inform Chief Wahunsenacawh’s attitude of scepticism and defiance toward the English of Jamestown. As I discuss in detail in the following chapter, this resistance to the English meant that John Smith and William Strachey likely extracted the words that comprised their lists from Powhatans under duress.

Karttunen refers to the *lenguas* simply as interpreters or “coerced language-learners” (222) and the travel accounts and histories make no reference to their station as slaves. It is perhaps unsurprising that the status of the interpreter as a language slave was often masked, sometimes behind the very polyvalence of the Spanish word *lengua*: tongue, language, interpreter. In *Naufragios*, Álvar Núñez Cabeza de Vaca’s account of his near-decade lost in La Florida, the author only very reluctantly refers to his position as a slave, despite occupying this social position during the majority of his stay. He understates his captivity, referring to “los indios que a mí me tenían” (*Naufragios* 128) [the Indians who were holding me (*Castaways* 48)], though he later explicitly identifies his enslavement once, writing, “me

---

15 Voigt helpfully summarizes Paquiquineo’s history in *Writing Captivity* and cites Helen C. Rountree’s rebuttal to the claim of descent from Paquiquineo to Wahunsenacawh in *Pocahontas, Powhatan, Opechancanough* (101-2).
dieron por esclavo a un indio” (Naufragios 138) [they gave me as a slave to an Indian (Castaways 56)]. This situation is quickly resolved because it is preceded in the narrative with the rather optimistic statement “no era obligado a cosa ninguna, y no era esclavo” (Naufragios 133) [[I was not obliged to do anything and was not a slave (Castaways 52)] and followed by Cabeza de Vaca’s peregrination toward Mexico. His apprenticeship in the Mareame language takes him roughly six years and it appears common in the period for language learning across linguistic families, from Indo-European to Algic or Uto-Aztecan for example, to take nearly a decade, such as in the case of the Spanish slave to the Calusa, Hernando de Escalante Fontaneda (Greenblatt, “Kidnapping” 96-8). We gather from Cabeza de Vaca’s experience that to learn a language is to debase oneself, “to place oneself in a situation of dependency, to submit” (104), yet linguistic fluency is a kind of power and is likely responsible in part for Cabeza de Vaca’s liberation and messianic return from the wilderness.

Eventually recorded by a scribe in Spain, Cabeza de Vaca’s account of his time as a shipwrecked colonist begins by lamenting the problem of language difference and the lack of a common tongue or interpreter. The Spanish word lengua is used ambiguously as he writes, “aunque nos hablaron, como nosotros no teníamos lengua, no los entendíamos” (Naufragios 84) [although they spoke to us we did not understand them, for we had no interpreter (Castaways 11)] and “íbamos mudos y sin lengua” (Naufragios 88) [we were powerless to speak without an interpreter (Castaways 14)]. Characteristically, he describes the impotent and frustrating recourse to a language of signs and pointing (Naufragios 84, 87, 123, etc.). Finally, after a period of apprenticeship in Mareame and a parallel rise from slave to shaman, Cabeza de Vaca demonstrates a level of linguistic mastery that allows him to identify a staggering

---

16 M. López-Morillas’s translation ignores the ambiguity of the term, opting for “interpreter” in place of “language.”
number of language groups (“naciones y lenguas”) during his journey from La Florida to Mexico, naming nearly twenty languages or dialects (171).

The significance of Cabeza de Vaca’s history is in the fact that his linguistic mastery coupled with his miraculous shamanic healings raise his social station, for it is only when he speaks Mareame fluently and is able to frame his actions in religious rhetoric that he is liberated from his status as slave. Although this account does not provide us with a word-list, it presents us with the narrative paradox of a slave’s tragic desperation and his reluctance to overstate his slavery, a narrative tick much like the avoidance of referring to abducted interpreters as language slaves. Discussed more fully in the following chapter with reference to Hakluyt’s presentation of the voyage of John Davis, Cabeza de Vaca’s narrative offers a glimpse of an additional feature that is common in the literature of the language encounter, the recurrence of a discourse of colonial decency that obscures and omits sexual relations.

“Acontecía muchas veces” Cabeza de Vaca writes, “que las mujeres que con nosotros iban parían algunas, y luego en naciendo nos traían la criatura a que la santiguásemos y tocásemos” (195) [It often happened that some of the women who were traveling with us gave birth, and then they would bring us the baby as soon as it was born to have us touch it and sign it with the cross (Castaways 104)]. The modern editor of Naufragios, Juan Francisco Maura, of these children writes, “Probablemente aquí aparecerían los primeros mestizos de los Estados Unidos. Es de dudar que los tres cristianos y el moro mantuvieran una estricta abstinencia sexual durante nueve años” (Naufragios 195) [Probably the first mestizos of the United States appear here. It is doubtful that the three Christians and the Moor maintained strict sexual abstinence for nine years]. Much like the violence of enslavement tamped down through euphemism, or the lacuna of the coercive consultation event, sexual congress
between Europeans and Amerindians is treated in the colonial literature as a narrative taboo that can only be reconstructed through speculative reading.

We have in the cases of Paquiquineo and Cabeza de Vaca examples from both sides of the colonial encounter where language and the capacity to translate serve to construct the role of the individual. Paquiquineo, through his forced learning of Spanish, becomes integral to the Jesuit settlement in Virginia, which he justifiably unsettles violently through war. With Cabeza de Vaca, we encounter a significant, perhaps pregnant instability in the term lengua (tongue, language, interpreter). However, the slavery experienced by Paquiquineo and Cabeza de Vaca are fundamentally different on at least two points: first, because Paquiquineo was abducted and removed from his native culture against his will and second, because Cabeza de Vaca did not serve his masters for the purpose of imperial expansion. Nowhere in Naufragios does Cabeza de Vaca’s Spanish language prove beneficial or strategic for his Amerindian masters. The language slave is in essence an unwilling auxiliary of the imperial state and in this sense, Cabeza de Vaca, Fontaneda, and Rowlandson all fall short of the mark. However, Cabeza de Vaca’s narrative is important precisely because he describes slavery yet rarely calls it by name, and he omits sexual relations, suggesting for our later analyses of word-lists that colonists were reluctant to fully represent physically intimate and violent events in their narratives of linguistic imperialism.

17 Regarding two other “white slave” narratives: while Hernando de Escalante Fontaneda’s Memoria de las cosas y costa y indios de la Florida (ca. 1575) (in Pacheco, Francisco de Cárdenas, et al. Colección de documentos inéditos relativos al descubrimiento) is highly aware of the problem of language difference – as demonstrated by Greenblatt in “Kidnapping Language” – Mary Rowlandson’s The Sovereignty and Goodness of God (1682) ignores language difference almost entirely.

18 See Anna Brickhouse’s “Mistranslation, Unsettlement, and La Navidad,” a reconstitution of political agency in language slaves and the development of the concept of “unsettlement.”
2.4 Language Learning, Pointing, the Body

There was a strong connection between travel and language learning in the early modern period, and in a sense the so-called Age of Exploration – called by Sylvain Auroux the Age of Grammar – awoke Europeans to profound cultural and linguistic difference. By the early sixteenth century it was common for English gentlemen to seek education in the vernacular languages of Europe, especially Italian, by travelling abroad and studying for months or years with a private tutor (Howard, *English Travelers of the Renaissance* 23). Although universities taught the prestige languages, Vivian Salman notes that in seventeenth-century England “schools neglected the study of modern languages” (“Foreign Languages in 17th-Century England” 179). Travel was a practical approach to language learning that responded to the scarcity of vernacular grammars, a genre that began its slow development and diffusion with Antonio de Nebrija’s *Gramática de la lengua castellana* (1492). Language learning in the early modern period fundamentally depended on close physical proximity to the language instructor, or, in the case of the bilingual word-list, the anonymous and anonymized language consultant. This is borne out by the content of the word-lists and the behaviour of Europeans and even Amerindians who similarly experienced an absence of grammars to guide language study. In a report from the Earl of Cumberland we see the natives of Dominica “will point to most parts of the body, and having told the name of it in the language of Dominica, he would not rest till he were told the name of it in English” (qtd. in Greenblatt, “Kidnapping Language” 105).19

19 In New France, Gabriel Sagard describes the difficulty of language instruction without writing, stating that because his Huron teachers “could not always make me understand their conceptions, they would explain them by figures, similarities, and external demonstrations, sometimes by speech, and sometimes by tracing the thing on the ground with a stick as best they could, or by body movements, without being ashamed of making very indelicate ones” (qtd. in Laura Murray, “Vocabularies” 598).
This same pattern in non-textual language study is likewise present in early modern theatrical representations of language learning. Travel and education are united in William Shakespeare’s *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* (ca. 1594), where we encounter the practice of traveling abroad for the sake of becoming “a perfect man” – gentlemen leave home, “Some, to discover Islands far away; / Some, to the studious universities” (1.3.9-10). It appears that Shakespeare thought deeply about language encounters, for the problem of language difference is a source of dramatic tension complicating the plot of *The Tempest* (ca. 1610) and, importantly for our discussion here, we have many of the elements of language learning in a comedic scene from *Henry V* (ca. 1599).

In Act 3, Scene 4 the French princess Katherine is given a brief, amusing lesson in English by her lady-in-waiting Alice. What is significant about this scene is that instruction in the foreign language is based entirely upon reference to the body – fluency defined by the acquisition of substantives – and that the humour of the scene arises out of mispronunciation, misunderstanding, and allusion to what Strachey in his word-list calls “a womans secrett” (*Historie of Travell* 180). At the conclusion of her lesson, Katherine summarizes what she has learned, stating, “De foot et de coun! […] Néan-moins, je réciterai une autre fois ma leçon ensemble: d’hand, de fingres, de nails, d’arm, d’elbow, de nick, de sin, de foot, de coun” (3.4.47-54) […] Nonetheless, I recite my lesson again entire…]. One can see Katherine pointing to the parts of the body as she bilingually performs a beginner’s lesson before an English-speaking audience. This scene can be given a post-colonial reading, however, as it is re-staged again and again in linguistic consultations in which Europeans

---

20 For a discussion of linguistic colonialism in *The Tempest*, see: Greenblatt “Learning to Curse;” Hulme, *Colonial Encounters* 91-161; Retamar “Caliban: Notes Toward a Discussion of Culture in Our America;” Vaughan and Vaughan, *Shakespeare’s Caliban: A Cultural History.*

learn the most immediate and intimate substantives from their Amerindian consultants. Although used for comedic effect, the fact that Katherine names the parts of the body and arrives ultimately at a term that is “mauvais, corruptible, gros” (3.4.48) establishes for us a pattern that is to be found almost strictly within the word-lists rather than the main narrative to which they are appended. The means by which language is apprehended is for Katherine the grammatical unit of the word – the word as substantive learned in denotation of body parts.

Early modern philosophy of language was dominated by what J. H. Elliott calls the Judeo-Christian and classical “dual inheritance” (Old World and the New 41). Exemplary of this combined tradition are the biblical accounts of language origins (Eden) and language difference (Tower of Babel), Plato’s Cratylus (where Socrates presses both Hermogenes and Cratylus on the relation between names and things), and Augustine’s Confessions.22 These early texts are almost exclusively concerned with the relation between words and things, with naming and denotation. Such was the general focus on words rather than larger units of meaning that Hannah Dawson writes, “early-modern philosophy of language is fundamentally a philosophy of words […] More particularly, [it] might often be characterized as a philosophy of names, whereby sounds are considered to be applied to, or to name, something extra-linguistic” (Locke, Language 7). For example, the Spanish grammarian Antonio de Nebrija identifies and elevates the word as the exceptional grammatical unit in Introductiones Latinae (1495), writing, “Dictio est pars minima orationis constructæ, idest, in ordine compositæ. Pars inquit Priscianus quantum ad totum intelligendum, idest totius sensus intellectum: quia si dictio diuidatur: non ad totum intelligendum hæc fit diuisio” (III: kii[b])  

22 For an introduction to the philosophy of language in the classical tradition, see Harris and Taylor, Landmarks in Linguistic Thought.
Priscian says that the word is the part that envelops the whole, that is to say that it must give the understanding of the whole meaning because if a word is divided it is not possible to understand its totality] (trans. Rosa Lucas, qtd. in Monzón, “16th Century Artes of Tarascan” 75).23 In the late-seventeenth century John Locke, too, would go on to raise the word to an ontological level in his more recognizably modern inquiry into the relation between language and knowledge, writing, “Thus we may conceive how *Words*, which were by Nature so well adapted to that purpose, come to be made use of by Men, as *the Signs of their Ideas*” (Essay concerning human understanding III: 2.1-2; see Harris and Taylor 108-19, and Aarsleff 26-7, 42-5). The word is the minimal meaningful unit in the consideration of scholars in the early modern and beyond, language in the European imagination functioning to denote objects in the world and ideas in our minds. Concentrating briefly on Augustine’s contribution here provides a way to discuss the role of pointing and the body in language learning and the inadequacy of what Ludwig Wittgenstein calls “ostensive definition” or “definition by pointing.”

In *Confessions* Augustine describes language learning as a process of simply hooking up words to things, writing, “[I observed that] my elders would make some particular sound, and as they made it would point at or move towards some particular thing; and from this I came to realize that the thing was called by the sound they made when they wished to draw my attention to it. That they intended this was clear from the *motions of their body*” (11, emphasis mine).24 Although Augustine indicates that he first learned to name the objects of the world rather than the parts of the body, the presence of the body is fundamental to the process of language learning, for it is through “pointing it out” and “bodily movements” that

---

23 The Latin orthography I have only slightly modified for the ease of reading.
24 Wittgenstein provides the following translation: “I grasped that the thing was called by the sound they uttered when they meant to *point it out*. Their intention was shewn by their *bodily movements*, as it were the natural language of all peoples” (8, emphasis mine).
the child learns to associate sounds with things. Offering a narrow understanding of language, Augustine as a child learns through the accrual of substantives like Princess Katherine. One is reminded here of Colón’s language slaves whose pointing often misfires and whose gestures pile up signs of the body: “todos estos hombres q yo traygo [...] hazen señas q ay muy mucho oro y q lo traen en los braços en manillas y a las piernas y a las orejas y al nariz y al pescueço” [all these men [...] make signs that there is very much gold and that they wear rings of it on their arms and on their legs and in their ears and on their noses and on their chests] (Diario 83). Not only is the body used to specify the object of language through pointing, enabling the learning of the meanings of sounds, but it is also the source of language in that it is often the object first named through denotation, as will be seen in the word-lists later.

The story of language learning that Augustine relates is a reduction of language to representation and for Wittgenstein this view of language is standard to traditional philosophy and overlooks what is new to his *Philosophical Investigations*, which is, “the meaning of the word is its use in language” (§43). In his earlier work, the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Wittgenstein developed the picture theory of meaning which isolated word-meaning to representational value and reduced sentence-meaning to either assertion, question, or command (Biletzki and Matar, “Ludwig Wittgenstein”). However, in his later understanding of language as a game, words take on a multiplicity of meanings that go beyond their representational aspect (see the partial list at §23). Ostensive definition functions in the *Philosophical Investigations* to separate Wittgenstein’s later understanding of language from the earlier somewhat traditional view.

---

25 One is reminded of the opening passage of Gabriel García Márquez’s *One Hundred Years of Solitude* where he writes, “The world was so recent that many things lacked names, and in order to indicate them it was necessary to point” (1). Here gestural language precedes the verbal.
For our purposes it functions to characterize the process of language learning that was not only seen as natural in the early modern period (when language learning was popularly represented as the amassing of substantives) but also essential to the coercive consultation event. Wittgenstein writes, “Someone coming into a strange country will sometimes learn the language of the inhabitants from ostensive definitions that they give him; and he will often have to guess the meaning of these definitions; and will guess sometimes right, and sometimes wrong” (§32). I have shown how Colón’s understanding is mistaken despite the enthusiastic pointing and gesturing of his Amerindian language slaves, a form of communication that Augustine calls “a kind of natural language to all races which consists in facial expressions, glances of the eye, gestures” (*Confessions* 11). It is unclear if Augustine assumed that gesture was a universal language, in as much as it was natural, but regardless Colón disproved this shortly after first contact. I will now show how ostension functions inadequately to do even that which Augustine proposes is its main purpose and the origin of language learning: the naming of things.

Wittgenstein demonstrates that ostension is not always sufficient in making the “queer connexion between word and object” (§38), of performing a “baptism of the object,” and writes, “an ostensive definition explains the use – the meaning – of a word when the overall role of the word in language is clear” (§30, emphasis mine). In the colonial language encounter, the “role of a word” was established through ostension during the coercive consultation event “sometimes right, and sometimes wrong.” The confusion that creeps in with ostension can be illustrated through a common language game played with children. In this game you ask, “Where is your face?” The child then points to her cheek and she is told, “No, that is your cheek. Where is your face?” She then points to her nose. “No, that is your nose,” you say, “Where is your face?” And so on and so on. What this silly game shows is
that pointing is often an inadequate means by which to divide up the objects of the world—“an ostensive definition can be variously interpreted in every case” (§28). Likewise, clarification can only be arrived at through further linguistic interrogation or questioning through a shared system of signs. “Kidnapping Language,” while it does not investigate the consultation event that produces the word-list, is an excellent early study of the problem of both Europeans (Greenblatt 93) and Amerindians (97) assuming their spoken and gestured sign systems are universal.

Although the word-lists examined here are an early phase of European linguistic imperialism towards Amerindians and their languages, for Wittgenstein, the naming of objects, the piling up of signs for substantives, “is so far not a move in the language-game—any more than putting a piece in its place on the board is a move in chess” (§49). Which is to say it is linguistic data of a kind but it is not yet language. The question is: What kind of linguistic data is the word?

2.5 Words ≠ Words

When translating from Amerindian to European languages and vice versa the English and Spanish writers of the bilingual word-lists are making at least two major assumptions: 1) that “words” are natural objects to language and 2) that substantives are always distinct from other linguistic information (i.e. that object-names can be separated from other linguistic entailings).26 A knotty problem arises when speakers of low synthetic languages (such as Spanish, English, or French) project their morphosyntactic structure onto polysynthetic languages.27 For example, in a description of a Delaware jargon word-list titled *The Indian Interpreter* (ca. 1680) – the earliest book on an Amerindian language printed in the

---

26 These same assumptions are present in contemporary scholarship as well. See for example: Vaughan, *Transatlantic Encounters* 62; Rivett, “Learning to Write Algonquian Letters” 562-3.

27 For a popular introduction to the problem of the word, see R.L.G.’s “Word Processing,” *The Economist* (September 4, 2014).
Middle Colonies – Axtell quotes Ives Goddard, noting that the Amerindian phrases tend to be “almost grammarless and based chiefly on an English construction” (“Babel of Tongues” 37) – which is to say, a heaping up of words with no attention to syntax. Not all languages of the Americas were polysynthetics (such as the Mayan languages), but most of the languages encountered by the authors of the word-lists (such as the Algonquian languages, Nahuatl, Quechua, Inuktitut, and Taino) were. Edward Gray describes polysynthesis as “combining many words to create a single word” (Language Encounter 3), yet this curious definition continues to view language in precisely the manner by which the explorers and colonists did, that is, through one’s native morphosyntactic structure. Regardless, the example that Gray provides is illustrative: “a Mohawk speaker would use a single word – roughly transcribed as “sahuwanhotukwhase” – to say “She opened the door for him again” (3). While the word-lists make what appears to be a simple proposition – to convert one European word into its Amerindian equivalent – a finer understanding of the structure of languages reveals this to be a decidedly complicated task. The privileging of the word likewise demonstrates the relative power of the interviewer and interviewee in linguistic consultation, a situation that Greenblatt encapsulates as “the radically unequal distribution of power that lies at the heart of almost all language learning in the New World” (“Kidnapping Language” 106). It is from a “theory of the word” that the English and Spanish approached Amerindian languages and it was from a position of power that they imposed this foreign grammatical unit on polysynthetic languages.

In Dixon and Aikhenvald’s Word: A Cross-Linguistic Typology, the authors note that for the vast majority of languages spoken by smaller communities there is a lexeme for “proper names” yet there is none for “word,” and that the idea of “word” is tied up with the cultural heritage of European speakers, writers, and grammarians (3). Drawing from the textual
tradition of classical antiquity, early modern Europeans inherited the concept of “word” or “logos” from Greek and Latin culture, e.g. “In the beginning was the Word, and the word was with God, and the Word was God” (John 1:1). Dixon and Aikhenvald write, citing Lyons, “The word is the unit par excellence of traditional grammatical theory. It is the basis of the distinction which is frequently drawn between morphology and syntax and it is the principal unit of lexicography” (2). Linguists often situate the word between the morpheme (“a sound or sound sequence that is conventionally united with particular meaning or meanings and that cannot be analyzed into simpler elements”) and larger units of meaning like the phrase, idiom, or sentence (Traugott and Pratt, Linguistics 405). However, Dixon and Aikhenvald point out, “Some polysynthetic languages of North America lack any unit that looks like the sort of word we are used to from European languages” (3).

There is a conceptual dilemma here in that European explorers, historians, and colonists – because of their linguistic and cultural heritage – assume that the elicitation process is straightforward under a theory of the word. Yet there is a tenacious conceptual gap, something akin to the problem of translating things (horses, rifles) and ideas (monotheism, the trinity) that simply do not exist in the target language.28 We see evidence of the confusion caused by dissimilarity in morphosyntactics when William Strachey attempts to translate from the Powhatan language. The lexical items of the word-lists usually

28 For a more complete list arising from the difficulty that Jesuits had in translating, see Codignola’s “The Holy See and the Conversion of the Indians” (215). Language divides the world in curious ways and seemingly “natural” objects sometimes lack signifiers, such as when Alonso de Molina was unable to find an adequate translation for hombre [man] in Nahuatl, having to settle on terms designating social groups, like tlacatl for “chieftain” or “lord” (Pagden, Fall of Natural 17). In the Golden Age-description of the Tainos Pietro Martire d’Anghiera imprudently claims that their language lacked the possessive forms, writing, “Es cosa averiguada que aquellos indígenas poseen en común la tierra, como la luz del Sol y como el agua, y que desconocen las palabras “tuyo” y “mío”, semillero de todos los males” (Décadas 141). [It is established that those indigenous peoples hold the earth in common, just as the sunlight and the waters, and that they know not the words “yours” and “mine,” the seeds of all inequities]. Perhaps the “lack” of the words for “yours” and “mine” was a function of Taino’s polysynthetic structure that combines such morphemes with many others?
seem arbitrary, but Strachey’s mistranslation of the English word “dust” (Historie of Travell 182) makes sense when the Powhatan word “Nepensun” is corrected later by historical linguists James Crawford as the sentence “I have something [dust, a foreign body, a mote] in my eye” (Southeastern Indian Languages 292). Crawford’s emendation of Strachey’s translation suddenly and quite humorously animates the body of the Amerindian in the linguistic exchange, replacing an absence with a presence, while also demonstrating the conceptual gap that causes the European colonist to mistake a sentence for a substantive.

For the most part, the compilers of the word-lists operated under a theory of linguistic transparency and cultural universality. The in-line translations of authors like Pietro Martire d’Anghiera give the sense that, despite the difference and novelty of New World languages, an approximation can be made through cultural equivalence. When Martyr introduces a new word from an Amerindian language that designates a new thing found in the Americas, he places it in a recognizable context: “A estas tempestades de aire, que los griegos llaman tifones, dan los indígenas el nombre de ‘huracanes’” (Décadas 149) [To these tempests of the air, which the Greeks call typhoons, the indigenes give the name “hurricanes”]. In contrast to the in-line translations that serve to clarify the meaning for narrative comprehension, word-lists such as Martyr’s “Vocabvla Barbara” give a different impression through the structure, the absence of context, and the language-centric character.

There is a logic of replacement here and this is precisely the reason why I write word-list in hyphenated form; the orthography is an attempt to create a visual impression of the theory of linguistic transparency where there is an absolute, one-to-one relation between languages at the level of the word.

Although “word” is an ambiguous expression whose meaning is determined variously by linguists as a morphological object, a syntactic atom, or a phonological word, in
On the Definition of Word Anna-Maria Sciullo and Edwin Williams analyze still another
definition: the word as *listeme*. They write, “We have dubbed such memorized objects [as
words and phrases] *listemes*, and this property of being memorized, *listedness*” (3). Listedness is
what happens when a word is lexicalized or indexed, when it becomes a memorized
vocabulary item. Yet they also demonstrate that even this novel definition of “word” is
insufficient, as is shown in the following hierarchy:

- All the morphemes are listed.
- “Most” of the words are listed.
- Many of the compounds are listed.
- Some of the phrases are listed.
- Four or five of the sentences are listed (14).

There is extreme and likely intractable difficulty in treating the word as a natural object. They
write,

> Perhaps the division of labor between words and phrases peculiar to English and the
other Indo-European languages has misled linguists to regard listedness as a criterial
property of word. In highly agglutinative languages it is inconceivable that every
lexical item could be listed. Passamaquody, for example, has more than 10,000 forms
for every verb (15).

To extend this observation, Sciullo and Williams may suggest here that the specific features
of English and the Indo-European language family caused European explorers to experience
the language encounter in a particular way that naturalized the word. The term “word” is
variously defined according to the data one seeks to analyze; there are definitions for “word”
that are phonological, grammatical, and even sociological, and yet not all of these definitions
are used simultaneously in any given investigation. “[Although] many types of definition
have been suggested for ‘word,’” write Dixon and Aikhenvald, “there has often been a lack of a clear distinction between lexeme and word form, and/or between phonological and grammatical criteria” (Word 34). It is ultimately a question of what data is to be isolated for analysis, what data can be elicited from the linguistic consultant, how that data is represented by the writer, and in what writing system.

By exposing the highly unstable meaning of “word” and by revealing it to be a product of localized linguistic structures and cultural histories, it is my hope that the problem of language difference that the explorers and colonists faced in the Americas becomes even more apparent in the narratives of coerced language learning. The socio-historical trajectory of the word in Europe is one of the conditions necessary for the possibility of the Amerindian word-lists and, as such, the exalted presence of the word demonstrates the power of Europeans to dictate linguistic exchange. Nonetheless, the example from Strachey must be recognized as a form of resistance by Amerindians to assimilate to the idea of language held by Europeans and Crawford’s more recent translation can be considered a different path toward the same goal of reanimating the voice of the Amerindian consultant. It appears, however, that the various morphosyntactic problems are effaced by the devilishly simple one-to-one structure of the word-lists, where a kind of conceptual violence doubles and obscures the violence of the language encounter.

2.6 The Rhetoric of Lists: Virtual Syntax

The word-lists found in the New World travel accounts and histories of the early modern period do not display the taxonomic rigor of, say, the bilingual dictionaries and grammars published by friars in New Spain in the sixteenth century. They rarely appear, as one might expect, in alphabetic order. The disjunctive flow between two seemingly unrelated items can produce poetic estrangement or the humorous effects of literary lists like Jorge
Luis Borges’s “Celestial Emporium of the Benevolent Knowledge” in “The Analytical Language of John Wilkins.” This list is that which “shattered […] all the familiar landscapes” (xv) of Foucault’s thought and gave rise to his The Order of Things by signalling the historical contingency of taxonomies and conceptual structures. However, there is something about the structure of lists in how the items contained in them hang together beyond grammar that invites the reader to search for organizing principles, the backstory, the “logic,” the conditions for the possibility of the list. (It is, perhaps, not surprising that the “lunatic eclecticism” of these lists has caused them to be compared to the Wunderkammer – those colonial repositories of exotica – by at least two authors [Eco, Infinity of Lists 205; David Murray, Indian Giving 70].) The rhetoric of lists is present in the virtual syntax that binds groups of words together into meaningful structures and it is from the combination of these structures that I re-articulate our narrative from the word-lists. Although David Murray describes the progression of terms in Roger Williams’s A Key into the Language of America (1643) as “a process akin to word association” (96), the concept of a virtual syntax that I argue for here is stricter and more systematic than mere imaginative combination.

There are a number of aesthetic and rhetorical qualities in the structure of lists. In the case of Borges’s “Celestial Emporium,” the aesthetic qualities arise out of the surprising and even disquieting juxtaposition of absurd encyclopaedic categorization and the simultaneous assertion and denial of taxonomic rigor. In The Art of Fiction, David Lodge provides a reading of a list in F. Scott Fitzgerald and discovers in its organization that the “miscellaneousness of the list [conveys] the completely non-utilitarian nature of [the character’s action]” (64). This is to say, that the arbitrary order of the list can reveal to us more about the ideology of the list’s real or fictional composer than it does about the world represented by the list. Or differently, the arbitrariness is not just conceptual chaos but a purposeful
relation with a disorganized world. What Lodge calls the “expressive potential” of lists is
different from prose because lists contain an unwritten virtual syntax in the space between
words, a grammar that must be provided by the reader through informed speculation that
combines words into meaningful structures. Put differently, word-lists represent a de-
articulation of words from syntax and yet this de-articulation is never complete. What is
more, a further dimension exists when two lists separated by blank spaces or mere commas are
set in conversation, for there again resides a virtual syntax. The bilingual word-list, therefore,
contains an unwritten syntax both vertically (between two terms of the same language) and
horizontally (between two terms of different languages). The promiscuous mixing of terms
in a list can be fertile and give rise to aesthetic pleasure, the multiplication of meanings, and
for us most importantly, insight into obscured historical events.

Robert Belknap similarly discovers in the list a source of pleasure but makes a
perhaps unnecessary distinction between “literary lists” and “pragmatic lists” (The List xiii).
For my investigation, this division is unproductive because the techniques to read a “literary
list” are just as relevant for these “pragmatic” word-lists. Belknap does, however, provide a
taxonomy of lists that helps distinguish the object of our analysis from other sequential
structures: the list, the catalogue, the inventory, the itinerary, and the lexicon. In a sense, the
list is the barest structure among these, for the catalogue usually provides “descriptive
enhancement” and is more comprehensive, the inventory stands in the place of material
things and is generally guided by a “conceptual principle,” the itinerary describes actions
organized in time, while in the lexicon “words are inventoried with their definitions, ordered
and arranged for ease of accessibility” (3). This signals that the list is the least comprehensive
structure of sequential ordering because it excludes information provided by other, more
elaborate forms (hence the proposition that the word-list is the first stage of the textual
incorporation of Amerindian languages). The nakedness of the list, its lack of context, its 
denial of syntactic relation, encourages the reader to fill in the blank spaces and provide the 
information that other structures make explicit. It likewise signals that the more complex and 
informative list structures are unattainable in a situation of abduction and coerced 
consultation or, more intriguingly, that the word-list may be informed by such sequences as 
the itinerary and thus represent a chronological sequence of events. As Belknap, quoting 
from Emerson’s “The Poet,” writes, “Bare lists of words are found suggestive to an 
imaginative and excited mind” (5).

Lists persuade the reader of their authority and sufficiency through a number of 
strategies. Henry Peacham’s The Garden of Eloquence (1577) designates the patterns of listing 
with several categories, including: congeries, conglobatio, dinumeratio, distributio, enumeratio, 
expolitio, incrementum, ordinatio, partitio, merismus, and synonymia, among others (Belknap 7-8). For 
my purposes, the definition of only a few terms will serve. A congeries is a “multiplication or 
heaping together of many words signifying diverse things of like nature,” which is distinct 
from incrementum, where, “the stronger may follow the weaker, and the worthier the less 
worthy,” thus giving a sense of rising and culmination (3). Because of the nearly universal 
one-to-one organization of the bilingual word-lists the authors generally suppose that one 
name for one thing is sufficient for description. Nevertheless, this is not always the case, as 
the pell-mell organization of Strachey’s word-list leads him to provide several translations for 
the same word, giving a sense of improvisational chaos: “Amonsoquath – a Beare,” “a Beare 
– Momonsacqweo,” and “an otter or rather a Bever – Pohkevwh,” “An Otter – Cuttack” 
(Historie of Travell 175, 196). Whether orderly or disorderly, congeries form islands of 
significance in the word-lists where “diverse things of like nature” cause several items in 
sequence to cohere into meaningful structures. We can often witness incrementum as the flow
between terms indicates a sense of culmination or rising tension, such as in John Janes’s word-lists which places certain phrases in sequence, beginning with the weaker “Yliaoute, I meane no harme” and ending with the stronger “Quoysah, Giue it to me” (Hakluyt, Principal Navigations XII: 238). Partitio is when “the whole is divided into parts,” which is the most common relation to the body in these lists. Christopher Hall’s word-list, for example, is almost entirely comprised of body parts: hand, nose, eye, tooth, head, ear, leg, foot, etc. (81). As the child’s game suggested earlier, it is far easier to define the body ostensively in sections rather than in conglomerations, such as the face.

Francis Spufford writes, “Lists refuse the connecting powers of language, in favour of a sequence of disconnected elements” (Chatto Book 1). Yet, as Peacham demonstrates, the elements of a list, no matter how disparate, are often connected in patterns that go beyond “brute sequence” (7), or as Roger Williams terms it, a “rude lumpe” (Key into Language 3). Although not nearly comprehensive, Spufford’s book attempts to provide a survey of the many, many lists that inhabit the European literary tradition, from Homer’s catalogue of ships in The Iliad to Shakespeare’s Macbeth in which the Weird Sisters fill their caldron with a grotesque yet charming list of ingredients. Spufford is reluctant to call the list a genre or mode or lend it a “theoretical design” because, he writes, “A device that can contain anything comes perilously close to being a device that is nothing in itself” (7). Umberto Eco’s impractical distinction between lists that are “infinite” and “finite” demonstrates a similar exasperation with the problem of defining lists (The Infinity of Lists 17). They can occur as paragraphs just as they can occur as columns and the contents of a list are, at least theoretically, potentially infinite. The bilingual word-lists of the colonization of the Americas, however, tend never to rise above several hundred items. Throwing his hands up in resignation, Spufford provides the following definition: “for my purposes, a list [is] any
sequence in which there [is] more than three items; and in which, as far as syntax [is]
concerned, nothing other than sequence link[s] the items” (25). For my purposes, this
definition serves well enough to characterize the bilingual word-list and distinguishes it
sufficiently from the Amerindian grammars that are the subject of a later chapter.

Word-lists, then, are certainly devoid of Peacham’s “elegance” but are rhetorical
nonetheless. Close inspection reveals that there are organizing principles that fuse together
quantities of items into islands of significance, just as the ears, nose, eyes, and mouth
comprise a face. These lists are generally not organized alphabetically, except for William
Strachey’s – strangely enough and meaningful in a way that will become clear later – where
sections are divided alphabetically yet several Powhatan words begin each section,
approaching yet refusing the “ease of accessibility” characteristic of lexicons. Somewhere
intermediate to the word-list and the bilingual dictionary, Strachey’s collection of Powhatan
words approaches the comprehensiveness and orderliness of later works without achieving
it. An awareness of the expressive potential of words in “brute sequence” and the rhetorical
effects of certain patterns in sequence, such as those described by Peacham, affords us a
view of the bilingual word-lists that is not merely dismissive of their “frivolous-seeming”
character or solely concerned for the unique linguistic data they present.

Arbitrariness in order is itself deeply expressive of the character of the author and his
relation to the consultant, something that becomes apparent by questioning the choice of
terms and reading into the virtual syntax that inhabits the empty spaces between items, both
vertically and horizontally. In a sense, the empty spaces that define the bareness of the lists
can be extended further to a narrative nakedness that results from their lack of context and,
figuratively, to the absence of the language slave who for the most part remains unnamed
and undescribed. This is especially bizarre and perhaps representative of the power relation
between the colonial author and the language slave, for despite the absence of the Amerindian these lists are replete with Amerindian body parts. In the brute sequence of these listed body parts we can witness the coercive consultation event and restage it as one involving abduction, physical proximity, ostensive definition, and misunderstandings.

2.7 Earliest Examples of the Arts of Empire

To return to the beginning, David Murray and Isaías Lerner agree that the “Vocabvla Barbara” appended to the 1516 edition of Pietro Martire d’Anghiera’s *De orbe novo* is very likely the first Amerindian word-list to come out of the language encounter in the New World (Indian Giving 80; “Spanish Colonization” 284). Murray’s analysis of the contents of this list is a unique example of literary criticism applied to the bilingual word-list where he discovers that the word-list is wholly disorganized and contains entries for cannibalism in both Latin and “barbarian,” “Anthropophagi,” translated as “comestores hominum” (d’Anghiera 137), “Caribes” as “sunt anthropophagi”(138), and again “Cannibales” as “ideum qui caribes.” Also, the word-list is almost entirely comprised of Amerindian substantives (the rare adverb “Técheta” is translated as “much” [141]). Murray notes that the list “refers as much to the text as to any world beyond it” (Indian Giving 80) by providing proper names (“Bartholome colon adelantat hispaniolæ” [d’Anghiera 137]) and place names (commonly regions, islands, lakes, rivers, and villages).29 He also shows that the word “machabuca” is translated as “dicitur quid ad me” (“as it was said to me”) (140), which is an entirely opaque translation that chimes more with Borges’s “Celestial Emporium” than anything else. Finally Murray indicates that d’Anghiera justifies the inclusion of the list with, “farewell [reader] and learn new voices/words [voces] and new names at the same time as

29 Perhaps the higher frequency of proper names results from how they can be isolated in polysynthetic languages in a way that other object names cannot (Dixon and Aikhenvald 3).
new things to be marvelled at” (trans. in *Indian Giving* 81) hinting that the purpose of the word-list is the edification of the reader’s curiosity and delight rather than linguistic mastery.

Richard Eden translated the “Vocabvla Barbara” as “The Indian language” and reduced the five-page list to just fourteen words, accompanied by a glossary that could be called the first “colonial vocabulary” because it is the first appearance of “colonie” (“an habitacion” [*The Decades* 45]) in the English language and because it is mostly concerned with nautical exploration and settlement (*Oxford English Dictionary*). Although short, David Murray finds Eden’s bilingual word-list “a fascinating set, presenting basic words but reflecting concerns of power and religion (king, devil, priest, sword) and the new and exotic (canoe, song) (*Indian Giving* 82). Not entirely faithful to the content of d’Anghiera’s list, Eden attempts similitude by including a truncated, prefatory word-list in a mirror image of his source-text, where the list is appended at the most frequent position at the tail end.

Neither of these word-lists provides any indication that the author spoke with an Amerindian consultant or that the words might be from diverse languages (Taino being the most probable source). They therefore do not function well to inform an interpretive model to re-articulate the coercive consultation event with the historical narrative. David Murray is skeptical that Martyr learned the words from an Amerindian (because he never left Europe) and assumes that, like much of his information, he gleaned it from reading letters and *diarios* (81). This is consistent with the adverb *tēcheta* appearing as in-line translation of a cacique’s declarations on Hispaniola (d’Anghiera Vol. 1 VIII: 371). However, d’Anghiera was also a great interviewer of explorers and colonists. Isaías Lerner therefore entertains the possibility that the “barbarous” word-list is the result of an omitted consultation with language slaves brought to Spain by Colón (“Spanish Colonization” 284). This would explain the inclusion of “as it was said to me” without explaining its meaning. Whatever the case, d’Anghiera’s
“Vocabvla Barbara” is not the only vocabulary included in Richard Eden’s *Decades of the Newe Worlde*, for the coercive consultation event is made visible in the bilingual word-list accompanying Antonio Pigafetta’s account of the Magalhães expedition. Such was the influence of this particular list that Theodore Cachey Jr. speculates that it is the origin of Shakespeare’s Caliban and most certainly the source from which this pre-eminently colonial figure learns to cry out “Setebos!” in despair (*First Voyage*, “Introduction” x).

2.8 “I, with pen in hand, asked him for other words”

Now that I have contextualized the production of the word-lists, problematized the linguistic items they present as natural objects, characterized some of the aesthetic and rhetorical qualities of the lists, and viewed a short reading of early word-lists, let us turn to Pigafetta’s writing to apply these observations and complete the interpretive model of narrative re-articulation.

The first phonemic representation of the Tehuelche language appears in Pigafetta’s *Relazione del primo viaggio intorno al mondo* (1525). Differing slightly from López de Gómara’s description, Pigafetta recounts reaching the coast of South America where Magalhães’s crew captures two male “Patagonia giants” through subterfuge, places them in shackles, and forces them to accompany the expedition. In a loose interpretation, Eden writes, “when they sawe how they were deceaued they rored lyke bulles and cryed vppon theyr greate deuyll Setebos to helpe them,” and integrates some of the lexical items into his condensed narrative of the encounter in order to elaborate a fanciful ethnography that the Tehuelche somehow

---

30 Eden preserves in its entirety the Tehuelche word-list from Patagonia while excluding the Behasa Melayu words from Malay and the Reo Maohi from Tahiti.

31 The long-term vitality of the word-list assures the inclusion of Amerindian linguistic data in contemporary travel accounts, such as the modern classic *In Patagonia* by Bruce Chatwin. Many of Chatwin’s vignettes hark back to the early exploration literature and in a number of chapters he discusses the indigenous languages of the Americas, representing fragments of word-lists (167, 177). The language of the Yámana or Yaghan is treated through linguistic relativity (175-7).
“declared by signes” (252). One of the Patagonians quickly succumbs to illness and disappears from the narrative. The other survives long enough to provide Pigafetta with a word-list of ninety items and to reach the Pacific Ocean where he too succumbs to illness. Because the Patagonian’s gums swell up, it is likely he dies of the same malnutrition and starvation that the crew suffers (24). Gómara declares that the Patagonian refuses to eat “de puro coraje” (Historia general 1: 218) [out of anger], however there is no telling whether the Patagonian is purposefully denied food. On his deathbed the Patagonian is converted to Catholicism and like so many language slaves after him, he is baptized with a Christian name. Similar to his biblical namesake, “Paul” begins his spiritual journey with a hateful reaction to the crucifix and ends by asking for it, to “[embrace] it and [kiss] it many times” (Pigafetta 22). This troubling story of a man abducted from his home, forced into chains, carried on the high seas, interviewed by incomprehensible foreigners, and shown strange religious symbols is summarily dropped from the narrative like a body into the ocean. Pigafetta finishes his relation of Paul callously writing, “When those people wish to make a fire, they rub a sharpened piece of wood against another piece” (22).

The Tehuelche word-list is fairly ample given the adverse conditions under which it was recorded and its appearance is just as abrupt as Paul’s disappearance. There is no apparent connection between the word-list and the main narrative, as the vocabulary items disrupt the account after an extended description of flying fish. In a chronological reversal, we are given a description of the coercive consultation event only after the word-list interrupts the prose narrative with two facing columns of vocabulary items. Pigafetta writes, “That giant whom we had in our ship told me those words; for when he, upon asking me for *capar*, that is to say, bread, as they call that root which they use as bread, and *oli*, that is to say, water, saw me write those words, and afterward when I, with pen in hand, asked him for
other words, he understood me" (22). This is as close as we come to an explicit description of the coercive consultation event in my survey of the sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English and Spanish travel accounts and histories. Any additional details must be conjectured through a sustained reading of the list’s virtual syntax and our knowledge of context. Note that this contextualization of the word-list includes in-line translation of lexical items that do not appear in the vocabulary. We should also note that the power relation between the Italian scribe and the abducted Tehuelche man is defined by Pigafetta’s ability to give or deny sustenance. Furthermore, their understanding is facilitated by ostension and translation denotes the presence of specific objects such as bread and water. Crucially, Pigafetta records the whole episode as it occurs. This is imminently important, for though the consultation event is usually omitted from the main narrative, we gather from this scene and from the relative accuracy of the word-lists that the writer would listen to the word, transcribe it phonemically, and repeat it to the captive to confirm accuracy (22; Cachey notes that a nineteenth-century Tehuelche word-list corresponds “almost exactly” with Pigafetta’s).

In a historical and literary investigation into linguistic imperialism there is an ethical demand to accurately reconstruct the moment of language capture, especially when the actual scene of exchange, what I call the coercive consultation event, is excluded from the narrative that frames the word-list. From what we know of the gestural language in early colonial encounters and the common recourse to ostension, I re-articulate the coercive consultation event here and speculate with some accuracy about the form of the conversation. A scene develops around the exchange if we read it as a dramatic dialogue with the empty space between terms indicating a change in speaker.
The European and Amerindian are below deck sitting opposite each other with Paul in fetters (“grillos”). Pigafetta arranges paper and pen and ink and begins pointing at parts of his body to elicit his first word. “Teeth,” he indicates with a gesture pointing to his mouth, waits, listens to the response, writes it and recites it for accuracy: “phor” (21). The Tehuelche responds with confusion or bemused consent, with frustration or boredom, with eagerness or reluctance, and Pigafetta is convinced that his prisoner quickly understands the rules of the game. Beginning with the mouth is telling because of the role of food in the language exchange and because of the language-producing faculty of the mouth. Perhaps the Tehuelche is rewarded with food for complying? In a demonstration of Peacham’s merismus, the word-list divides the body into parts working downward, from the head to the parts of the face, down to the chest and shoulders, down again to the genitals, the buttocks, and the feet. Significantly, there is no word for face. From the fingernails, we also learn the verb “gechare,” as the Patagonian likely had “to scratch” the fleabites received on board the Victoria. From certain lexical items we can assume that the Tehuelche was held momentarily above deck, as he translates the sun, stars, sea, and wind. For other words it is not clear how the translation was elicited, such as the difference between dog and wolf, or penis and vagina, or the verbs that comment on the interview itself, such as “to look” and “to ask” (22). As there were no women nor dogs – nor wolves (especially in the southern hemisphere) – mentioned in the main narrative, we must ask if some of these beings were onboard the Victoria and simply omitted from the account? The presence of female genitalia in the word-list and the absence of women in the narrative may present us with an early example of colonial decency where indigenous women abducted as sex slaves are omitted from the main narrative. Because our understanding of such events is necessarily sketchy, there exists the further possibility that all these features of the natural world were presented as illustrations.
from a book while the Patagonian struggled against his chains below deck. This final potentiality however would have to overcome the problem of connecting names to the ornately symbolic representations common in the early modern period.

The further the list continues, the more abstract the terms become. Before Setebos is invoked, the Patagonian produces first substantives, then verbs, and finally the names for the colors black, red, and yellow. To properly isolate the color of an object takes an incredible amount of understanding that is generally dependent on shared linguistic and cultural comprehension. This presents a similar conceptual gap like that of defining the face. (While we are generally given words for parts of the face, we are rarely given the face itself).

Wittgenstein indicates the complexity of this problem by asking, “what does […] ‘pointing to the color’ consist in? […] Point to a piece of paper […] And now point […] to its color” (Philosophical Investigations §33). Pigafetta does not specify the amount of time involved in the coercive consultation event yet I conjecture with some confidence that the moment in which he attempted to elicit color-names caused a breakdown of communication and a complication of the exchange. (One imagines same-coloured objects being trotted out for reference.) The plot of this language exchange is perturbed by the turn toward abstract words that resist ostensive definition. It is therefore understandable that Paul, exhausted by the interview and indignant about his captivity, would terminate the exchange by invoking both “Setebos” and “Cheleule,” the Patagonians’ “big devil” and “small devil” and the words that conclude this list (22). Like Dr. Faustus fleeing the stage after crying out “ah, Mephastophilis!,” Paul’s final words reveal a man condemned to suffer. Or perhaps a final curse against his interviewer, an act of resistance before the curtain falls?

There is no logical organizing principle behind the terms from Tehuelche besides what appears to be the “ready-at-hand” character of the things translated. In fact, ready-at-
hand could be an organizational touchstone for many of these word-lists, with things like arms and legs, bowls and cups, or eating and sitting, being the most common terms. For example, many of the words from Arriaga’s later Castilian-Quechua word-list are food items, indicating that interviews often took place around meals (Extirpación 189-90). The aesthetic quality of the list can be found in the plot-like structure that moves from common substantives, to verbs, to abstractions like color, and finally to the invocation of religious figures – incrementum, from simple to complex. Rhetorically, the list itself also functions to lend authority to Pigafetta as eye-witness (or ear-witness) testimony (see Voigt 25-6), and to provide a level of realist authenticity, for the discourse of the word-list is undeniably distinct from the discourse of the “marvellous,” the wholly new to be scrutinized, that characterized many of the initial travel accounts. It likewise resists the elevated discourse produced by noble warriors, such as in Gaspar Pérez de Villagrá’s New World epic Historia de la nueva México (1610) where the Amerindians harangue their troops in speeches similar to Thucydides’s Greeks regardless of Pérez de Villagrá’s ignorance of their language. The word-lists produce a fine-textured reality in the systematic difference of lexical terms. Although Paul the “Patagonian giant” is identified as a kind of monster – much like the cynocephali, cyclops, blemmyae, and Amazons “found” in the New World – he is confirmed as rational and human through his use of language. Stephen Asma notes that, while ancient Greeks and Romans admitted “whole classes of unclassifiable creatures” into “the category of human,” speaking monsters were a problem for medieval and early modern Christians.

---

32 The modern English translation of this text is unique among the literature I have surveyed in providing an expanded rather than a reduced version of the word-list (Extirpation 175-85.)

33 For some. In his famous debate with Bartolomé de Las Casas in Valladolid in 1550-51, Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda compared the linguistic and architectural accomplishments of the Amerindians to those of ingenious animals like parrots, spiders, and bees (Elliott, The Old World 43-45).
because it raised the question of their possible redemption through the Gospels, exemplified in Eastern Orthodox depictions of the dog-headed Saint Christopher (*On Monsters* 37).

The bilingual word-list, then, asserts the humanity of the language consultant while simultaneously the main narrative, the estrangement of the vocabulary from its context, and the interviewer’s actions all deny that very humanity. The Amerindian speaker at the same time articulates words while he is de-articulated from his very own speech. My speculative reading establishes the Tehuelche as an active participant in a narrative of colonial language exchange, one who learns to respond to the interviewer’s queries and resists mightily his abduction and enslavement. The act of re-articulation, which reveals the complexity of the language exchange and integrates the lexical items into the coercive consultation event, is for this reason an ethical response to the historical account, for it creates a fuller image of the colonial language encounter than the one that the writers give us.

### 2.9 Conclusion

My approach to the initial stage in linguistic imperialism represents the English and Spanish sharing an unsophisticated and often impromptu linguistic tradition in the word-list, one that explorers, historians, and colonists wrote to give testimony of the New World, a fragment of linguistic expression “to profit or to delight, to say what shall be pleasing and at the same time helpful” (Horace, *Ars Poetica* 58). In *Marvelous Possessions*, Greenblatt writes, “Narratives that represent Indians and Spaniards in sophisticated dialogue are, [Las Casas] suggests, most often intentional falsifications, designed to make the arbitrary and violent actions of the conquistadors appear more just than they actually were” (95). Reading from the coercive consultation event in Pigafetta’s journal shows us how the analysis of the bilingual word-list gives a more problematic, historically grounded, yet speculative description of the “sophisticated dialogues” reported in the literature of conquest. In this
exchange we witness power relations typical of the colonial language encounter in which Amerindians are abducted through subterfuge, restrained by shackles, forced into dependence on the captors for food and water, and interviewed under duress. The terms of the word-list rise incrementally in abstraction, from concrete, ready-at-hand object-names that can be denoted easily enough, to verbs relevant to the consultation, to substantives that stubbornly resist ostension. By treating the word-list as a drama that occurs in real-time – as Pigafetta admits – the narrative of a colonial encounter that is otherwise de-narrativized in the travel account emerges from the empty spaces. Recognizable patterns will begin to cohere as I apply the same hermeneutics to several other bilingual word-lists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, turning now to a survey of both the English and Spanish’s initial response to the problem of language difference in the Americas.
3 Early Modern Word-Lists: Restoring Historical Context and the Source of Linguistic Knowledge

3.1 Introduction

Tzvetan Todorov’s *The Conquest of America: The Question of the Other* (1982) introduced to literary scholars and historians alike an exciting and illuminating approach to the study of empire by focusing on the semiotic exchange between Europeans and Amerindians, or more specifically, Spaniards and the Tainos, Mexica, and Maya they contacted and colonized. Despite the major flaws of his study, which unfortunately categorized Amerindian writing systems as “primitive,” his focus on the linguistic component of imperialism was novel and occasioned a large number of later studies concerned with the language encounter. Not exclusively interested in the construction of the self and Other in linguistic imperialism, the following texts nonetheless build from Todorov’s early study: Greenblatt’s *Learning to Curse* (1990) and *Marvelous Possessions* (1991), Eric Cheyfitz’s *The Poetics of Imperialism* (1991), Peter Hulme’s *Colonial Encounters* (1992), Walter Mignolo’s *The Darker Side of the Renaissance* (1995), Edward Gray’s *New World Babel* (1999), Edward Gray and Norman Fiering’s *The Language Encounter in the Americas, 1492-1800* (2000), David Murray’s *Forked Tongues* (1991) and *Indian Giving* (2000), Rebecca Ann Bach’s *Colonial Transformations* (2000), Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra’s *How to Write a History of the New World* (2001), and David Rojinsky’s *Companion to Empire* (2010), among others. Apparent from this list is the deepening and broadening investigation into the language encounter between Europeans and Amerindians in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Many of these investigations make brief mention of the bilingual

---

34 There are numerous criticisms of the evolutionary model that defines Todorov’s understanding of societies, which crudely falls into a discourse of “advanced” versus “primitive” cultures. See Cheyfitz, *Poetics of Empire* (xxiv), Rojinsky, *Companion to Empire* (225), Greenblatt, *Marvelous Possessions* (11-12, 99), Pastor, “Utopía y conquista” (108), Brotherston, “Grammatology” (63), and Lepore, *Name of War* (26), among others.
word-lists of early modern travel accounts and histories, though only Murray’s *Indian Giving* offers a sustained reading of that early textual representation of the language exchange, making his analysis of the “Vocabvla Barbara,” John Smith’s *Map of Virginia*, and Roger William’s *A key into the language of America* both unique and insightful. Murray focuses on the linguistic, religious, and material economies of exchange in these word-lists, yet this nearest approximation to the Amerindian word-lists does not attempt to reconstruct the moment of exchange, in part because one primary text, Williams’s *A key into the language of America*, was written alone by the English trader and missionary on his voyage home from the colonies. Despite a rich tradition of scholarly interventions into the field of linguistic imperialism and the early modern language encounter, there are no thorough attempts to re-articulate the precise moment of the coercive consultation event back into the historical narrative.

Because of the strange quality of the word-lists, certain colonial narratives have not yet been brought to light and certain narrative contradictions, or aporias, have not been questioned adequately. The previous chapter developed some of the tools necessary for analyzing the word-lists, these strange narratives that arrive to us in de-narrativized form. Here I will deploy narrative re-articulation to a survey of English and Spanish word-lists in order to bring up to the level of narrative the coercive consultation events that precipitate the writing of the Amerindian word-lists, as well as consider an Amerindian perspective on the translations made by Europeans. In the first section I read Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations* (1589) where we encounter a violent scene from Martin Frobisher’s expedition (1576) that appears to deny the possibility of language exchange. Through a contextual reading and an awareness of *merismus*, I discover the body of the most likely Amerindian to contribute to the word-list. The second example is likewise from Hakluyt’s collection of English and Spanish travel accounts, this time from the voyage of John Davis (1585). Here I develop further the
implications of sexual intimacy and reproduction hinted at in the travel account of Cabeza de Vaca and I elaborate the concept of colonial decency, whereby certain unsavoury events are repressed in the narration of colonial encounters. The third text, John Smith’s *Map of Virginia* (1612), is similar to the first in being an example of the extreme violence that was often a condition necessary for the possibility of the word-list; the rhetorical strategy of congeries allows me to bring together certain lexical items into groups that then form into a coherent narrative of the coercive consultation event. The fourth text will function differently from the previous ones because it will provide us with a view of the language exchange from a *mestizo* author whose identity as an Amerindian is founded on his mastery of an Amerindian language. Inca Garcilaso de la Vega complicates the “fiction of translation” in his *Comentarios reales* (1609) by subverting and refuting Spanish translations of Quechua words and thus presents us with what I call “counter-translation,” the purposeful retranslation and denial of translatability by a native speaker. De la Vega’s views on translation are relevant to the word-list later published in Pablo José de Arriaga’s *La extirpación de la idolatría en el Piru* (1621). Finally, the fifth text presents us with the most felicitous outcome of our interrogation of the word-lists by establishing the collaboration of an Amerindian language consultant, the Powhatan Kempes. William Strachey’s *Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* (1612) is therefore the final text in my survey of the word-list because it gives us a glimpse of the often-erased Amerindian translator whom I discover only by pushing against the colonial impulse to negate Amerindian presence and by re-articulating the word-list to the main narrative.

3.2 Merismus: “he bit his tong in twayne within his mouth”

Peacham’s rhetorical category of *merismus* is important for understanding both the effect of the word-list on the reader and the ideological underpinning of its construction.
The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines *merismus* as “A form of synecdoche in which two [or more] contrasting or complementary parts are made to represent the whole” (“Merismus”). The effect is a kind of atomistic view of the world in parts, the existence of a person or thing denoted by the de-articulated presence of its individual components. As a feature of de-articulation, this atomization likewise results in the Amerindian languages being represented in individual parts, predominantly isolated noun-words. The ideological underpinning is one in which full presence, perhaps given by the name of the person or thing, is merely suggested by the parts themselves, thus leaving the representation of the whole to mere rhetorical effect. That is, the atomization of a language consultant, for example, is consistent with an ideology of domination that interpolates him or her as a functional part of imperial expansion, one who translates to the benefit of colonists. In this first analysis, *merismus* plays an important role in the representation of the language slave and also in his reaction to the coercive consultation event.

This word-list occurs in Martin Frobisher’s voyage to North America in search of the Northwest Passage to Cathay (China). This English-Inuktitut word-list is included in Christopher Hall’s narrative of the expedition which is edited and compiled in Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations* (1589) where at least five other bilingual word-lists are presented in the volumes relating to the Americas (although the list included in Francis Drake’s account of the circumnavigation is from Java). Unlike Pigafetta’s description of the language encounter, this narrative leaves the consultation event entirely de-articulated and omitted from the travel account. There is no explicit indication of the source of the Amerindian words, yet the narrative indicates a likely consultant when Frobisher and his crew, like Colón and Magalhães before him, abduct an Inuit man through subterfuge. While searching for five English sailors taken by the Amerindians, Hall describes Frobisher’s crew drawing their ship
near a number of fishing Inuit to gain information, and momentarily frustrated in their attempts, they “intised one boate to our ships side, with a Bell, and in giuing him the Bell, we tooke him, and his boate, and so kept him” (Hakluyt 80). This is all the information that Hall provides regarding the Inuit man whose speech is de-articulated from the narrative, appearing as a language supplement without a source, “The language of the people of Meta incognita” (81):

Argoteyt, a hand.
Cangnawe, a nose.
Arered, an eye.
Keiotot, a tooth.
Mutchatet, the head.
Chewat, an eare.
Comagaye, a legge.
Atoniagay, a foote.
Callagay, a paire of breeches.
Attegay, a coate.
Polleuetagay, a knife.
Accaskay, a shippe.
Coblone, a thumbe.
Teckkere, the foremost finger.
Ketteckle, the middle finger.
Mekellacane, the fourth finger.
Yacketrone, the little finger.
Like the Patagonians, the Inuit man is abducted through subterfuge and yet unlike “Paul” he remains unnamed and physically undescribed. In George Best’s version of events, he refers to the Inuit as Frobisher’s “newe pray (which was sufficient witnesse of the captaines farre and tedious travell towards the unknown partes of the worlde [...] whose language was neyther knowne nor understood of anye” (A True Discourse 74). The abduction of the Amerindian will prove the expedition’s passage to the Americas and Best clearly suggests that his language was heard and yet not understood. This final point creates a problem for the narrative, an aporia.

The word-list appears as a kind of disjecta membra after the travel account. The Inuit hostage is taken aboard in Hall’s account and then disappears from his narrative, the only indication of his continued presence on the return trip home is the appearance of the word-list that appends – without comment on its origin or the process of language exchange – his narrative of Frobisher’s voyage. It is as if the abducted Amerindian were swallowed by the ship that carries him as an unwilling captive back to England with the crew, and that his only means of expression is the anaemic “dialogue” that is offered as a supplement to the text. Yet Hall, Best, and Michael Lok all record the abduction event differently, leaving the word-list in an even more precarious relation to the main narrative of the colonial encounter. Best reports of the kidnapping that when the Inuit “founde himself in captivitie, for very choler and disdain, he bit his tong in twayne within his mouth,” a wound that leads to his death a short time after his arrival in London (74; see also Vaughan 2). Hall and Lok fail to mention the Inuit’s brave and tragic severing of his own tongue and Lok appears to contradict the

---

35 Best does not include the Inuktitut word-list in his version of the first voyage.  
36 Although the Inuit’s forced sojourn to London was brief, he was exhibited for profit both in life and death and his portrait was drawn by a number of artists, two of which were hired by the Cathay Company (Vaughan 3). “Had the captive of 1571 lived,” writes Vaughan, “he would surely have been trained as an interpreter for Frobisher’s second voyage to Meta Incognita” (4).
chronology of Best’s account, stating that after abduction Frobisher “made signes to him presently that yf he would bring his [5] men he should go againe at liberty, but he would not seem to vnderstand his meaning,” adding later, “the capitayn […] could here no newes of his men nor bote nor could perceive by the prysoner [w]hat wold come agayn” (86). In Lok’s narrative, then, the Inuit man does not immediately sever his own tongue but is put under “sure garde” and Frobisher confers with him first through gesture and again through some unknown medium, possibly speech. It is unusual that Lok would fail to mention that one of the reasons for the breakdown in communication was the fact that the Inuit no longer had a tongue.

It is possible that the Inuit’s violent reaction was made with the full knowledge that humans were abducted for the information they possessed (whether linguistic data or geographical knowledge) and biting off his tongue assured the safety of his community by protecting them from abduction or reprisal.\(^\text{37}\) In both Best’s and Lok’s account, the compatriots of the Inuit man call to him frantically from the shore, described as “hallowing or howling showts” (86). The actual unfolding of the consultation event is elided from all of the narratives and this fact creates an almost irresolvable aporia of a potentially tongue-less language consultant.\(^\text{38}\) By biting his tongue off the Inuit prevents himself from becoming a _lengua_ and creates for our investigation an almost insurmountable problem: How do we identify the source of the Inuktitut language data if the only acknowledged captive is

\(^{37}\) Another possible motivation is the captive’s belief in the mystical power of language, an avenue of investigation that I have not pursued here. The vitality of cabalism in the early modern period and Queen Elizabeth’s arcane philosopher John Dee’s search for a universal language suggest that belief in the magical properties of language was not uncommon. See Eco, _The Search for the Perfect Language_; Hudson, _Writing and European Thought_; and Olender, _Las lenguas del paraíso_.

\(^{38}\) It is also possible that, like Paul before him, this Amerindian language slave appears in Shakespeare’s _The Tempest_ when Trinculo quips that Englishmen “will not give a doit to relieve a lame beggar,” but “will lay out ten so see a dead Indian” (2.2.31-2). Weaver connects this line to the more temporally proximate arrival of the Amerindians abducted by George Waymouth in 1605 (Red _Atlantic_ 57-8).
physically incapable of speech? It seems that given this problem of identification my reconstruction of the coercive consultation event is even more necessary because it restores to the historical narrative an event that is impossible within the account provided by the chroniclers and explorers. We also must not ignore the distinct possibility that the sequence of events is reversed in the travel account and that the Inuit man bit off his tongue because of the consultation event. With this in mind, I examine the word-list as the only entry point to the details of this particularly violent language exchange.

The overwhelming presence of the body in this list serves as a narrative substitute for the body of the abducted Inuit who is negated by the historical record. While it is certain that there is a level of intimacy that occurs in the naming of body parts, one also has the sense that the interaction is spatially limited because the range of substantives is so narrow. That is, the setting for the consultation event is given in the translation (“Accaskay, a shippe”), but does not move further beyond the body than garments (“Callagay, a paire of breeches;” “Attegay, a coate”) and personal belongings (“Polleuetagay, a knife”) (Hakluyt 81), the last item suggestive of either trade or physical threats or both. Knives were indispensable tools and therefore popular trade items. John Janes, for example, notes in a later travel account that the Inuit are especially interested in trading for iron (238). Yet just as the knife may represent the promise of reward for the Inuit man’s compliance in the language exchange, it may also present a threat directed at him for a refusal to articulate the words that his captors try to elicit. With the presence of the word, it is clear that the English imposed their morphosyntactics on Inuktitut, dividing the polysynthetic language into parts that were not natural to the structure of the language. The consultation also involved a complex process of ostension because of the limited exposure that the English and Inuit had to each other’s language. To speculate: we can imagine the two interlocutors sitting across
from each other, the Inuit restrained in shackles, the European setting his paper, pen, and ink before him, just as Pigafetta did fifty years earlier. There may be a number of crewmembers watching in the wings. The Englishman dictates the terms of the language exchange by pointing to a body part (“Arered, an eye”), he records the answer, repeats it to his captive while pointing to his eye, corrects the transcription and moves on to the next item.

Thus begins merismus as the Inuit is represented through parts. Thus, also, do we have a conversation that suggests physical intimacy, the touching of one’s own body and the body of the other. The vocabulary is short, suggesting that the consultation event was unproductive and devolved into confused misunderstanding, or the abducted Inuit was uncooperative, or that he forced the interview to end by silencing himself permanently, biting out his own tongue. There is no explicit indication of the amount of time spent coaxing linguistic data from the slave, but seventeen total lexemes is a rather poor inventory for even a short interview. The field of reference for this list is so limited, so microscopic, that one has the sense of close-quarters, restraint, and resistance. Beginning with “Argoteyt, a hand” and digressing through other substantives, the list ends with the parts of the hand: “Coblone, a thumbe;” “Teckkere, the foremost finger;” “Ketteckle, the middle finger;” “Mekellacane, the fourth finger;” “Yacketrone, the little finger” (81). The fact that the hand is so central to this narrative is peculiar and implies that the consultation involved a level of physical intimacy; the touching of the hand and the fingers would, however, constitute an event of dangerous proximity with a furious and frightened hostage. If we consider that merismus is a rhetorical device for dividing up the world, one must wonder what purpose the dividing the Inuit’s body to such a degree would serve colonists and explorers? Is it solely the manufacture of authority in the writer? In a text that ostensibly serves to inform readers
and potential colonists about the New World the division of the body into parts and the parts into sub-parts would under no conditions be considered *utile* however *dulce* it might otherwise seem. The body is therefore asserted in the de-articulated narrative as the source of language learning through denotation.

Christopher Hall’s Inuktitut word-list from Frobisher’s first voyage to Meta Incognita presents a narrative lacuna in the place of the language consultant. From the accounts of George Best and Michael Lok, the Inuit man who approaches the *Gabriel* to catch a bell that Frobisher purposefully throws short is the same Inuit who bites his tongue off out of “coller.” Hall, however, makes no note of his tongue being bitten off nor does he indicate the source of the linguistic data. Yet the word-list appears in Hakluyt’s anthology directly after Hall’s narrative of the first Frobisher expedition. What are we to make of this? A few possibilities present themselves: there is either a different Inuit consultant who is the source of the Inuktitut words and who is never mentioned by the travel account; or, the enraged Inuit who literally de-articulates himself did so after the coercive consultation event had already begun. Both prospects are troubling. Hall’s word-list of “The language of the people of Meta incognita” is a disconcerting example of Peacham’s *merismus*, as the presence of the Inuit man is disappeared from the main narrative, his body de-articulated into smaller and smaller parts, until all that is left of him is “the little finger” and a disembodied voice in a linguistic appendix.

### 3.3 Colonial Decency: “Icune, Come hither”

John Janes presents “The language of the Esquimaux” in a bilingual word-list of thirty-seven items that is likewise published in Hakluyt’s *Principal Navigations*.³⁹ A merchant in

---

³⁹ Volume XIV contains a word-list from Jacques Cartier’s second voyage, but, as is typical, it is much reduced from the original five-page list in *The Voyage of Jacques Cartier* (English translation 1580). Hakluyt provides no explanation for this editorial decision.
the crew of the 1585 voyage of John Davis also in search of the Northwest Passage, Janes writes a word-list that is an early example of the inclusion of phrases and the suggestion of omitted scenes of sexual intimacy. In the previous chapter I noted that early modern narratives of encounters with Amerindians often purposefully omitted the representation of sexual intimacy and reproduction, such as in Cabeza de Vaca’s *Naufragios*. Perhaps because of his role as a merchant, Janes’s narrative is laden with lists, especially of commodities and especially when recounting the moments in which the “theeuish Islanders” steal from the ship while on board for trading purposes (238). These commodity lists provide an implicit narrative of the material exchange between the English and the Inuit, a process documented thoroughly by David Murray in *Indian Giving*. Despite being a merchant, Janes has difficulty recognizing that the “Seale skinnes, and sammon peale” brought on board are not tribute to the English but rather part of the material economy of exchange founded on the gift as described by Murray (*Indian Giving* 20, 39). Janes’s narrative is antagonistic to the presence of the Inuit despite the evidence of mutually beneficial trade and the curiously intimate tone in the de-articulated encounter of the word-list. It appears that the consultation event occurred on the main deck and likely during one of these lively trading sessions, though the only explicit information Janes provides is, “they pronounce their language very hollow, and deepe in the throat: these words following we learned from them” (Hakluyt 238-9).

Noel Elizabeth Currie finds that many travel accounts describing colonial encounters “render [women] invisible in the account of the voyage” and that their presence can only be restored through analysis of textual supplements, such as illustrations or engravings or, in our case, word-lists (*Constructing Colonial Discourse* 77). In John Janes’s account there are no women. But then there is also no distinction between genders whatever, the Inuit being referred to as simply “these people” and “Islanders.” Nor is it absolutely necessary that
women be involved in what emerges from the word-list as a scene of close physical proximity, celebration, and possible seduction. Currie’s intelligent reading of the illustrations in James Cook’s *Voyages* (1784) represent a parallel investigation into the de-articulated colonial encounters residing in supplementary textual features and her analysis reveals how a colonial discourse of impartiality, commercial trade, and scientific rigor can obscure the more salacious and perhaps rapacious aspects of the text. Although Currie refers to the obfuscating character of the travel account as “colonial discourse” generally, her analysis of the Nootka Sound encounter coupled with my own reading of Janes’s encounter with the Inuit as represented by the word-list more precisely contribute to what I call colonial decency, the purposeful elision of sexual relations between Europeans and indigenous peoples.

---

40 Murray notes that a similar concern for sexual reserve and decorum led to a phrase in William Wood’s *New-England’s Prospect* (1634) being concealed behind a Latin translation. Only in a 1639 edition does the phrase appear in English as “kiss my arsehole” (*Indian Giving* 215). Although Douglas, who was canon of St. Paul’s, redacted sexual encounters between the English and the islanders from Cook’s journal, the contents of the word-list cohere into vignettes of intense physical proximity. In a list of over 1200 lexical items, Cook provides translations for body parts, painting little scenes of familiarity: “Punctuated Arches on the hips,” “The Hips,” “Hips, the back punctuated arches of the hips;” “A black Mark on the skin;” “A Mole upon the skin;” “A Pimple” followed by “To pinch with the fingers;” “The Veins that run under the skin;” “The Nipple of the breast;” “Tickle, to tickle a person;” “The Part below the tongue;” and the most suggestive sequence, “To grasp with the hand, “Grasping the antagonist’s thigh when dancing,” “To groan,” “The groin,” “To grow as a plant,” “To grunt, or strain” (*Three Voyages*, 275-301). There is in the virtual syntax here the implication of scenes involving physical touch and vocal response despite the list following a proscribed alphabetic order. Bear in mind that the choice of lexemes is not absolutely determined by alphabetical order, for any particular item might be replaced by a number of synonyms. This suggestive vignette is not exceptional in the narrative that emerges from Cook’s word-list, yet it does contradict Douglas’s excised edition of Cook’s the travel account.

41 The suggestion that explorers and their crews had sexual relations with indigenous people, often through abduction and rape, is supported by the development of rules precisely prohibiting those actions, such as in the *Orders to bee observed by the Commanders of the Fleet, and land Companies, under the charge and conduct of Sr. Walter Randeigh* (1617). This text, published in Peter Force’s *Tracts and other papers relating principally to the origin, settlement, and progress of the colonies in North America*, contains two rules that specifically address the issue: “no Man shall force any woman, bee shee Christian or Heathen upon paine of death” (145) and “you shall not take any thing from any Indian by force, for from thence forth we shall never be releieved; but you must use them with all courtesie” (146).
Just as the previous word-lists reveal violent details from the language encounter, Janes’s bilingual word-list suggests events of physical intimacy, yet is somewhat more speculative because of the limited number of translated words. Furthermore, unlike the earlier coercive consultation events, Janes does not indicate that there was an abduction precipitating the linguistic exchange and so the identity of the Inuit consultant is an absolute mystery. Contrary to the kidnappings, with the presence of the Inuit on board the ship for the purpose of trade, we can restage a scene that is far more celebratory than punitive. Janes opens the scene by translating the words, “Kesinyo, Eate some” and “Madlycoyte, Musicke,” followed shortly by “Yliaoute, I meane no harme” (Hakluyt 238). The word-list then goes on to offer substantives relevant to a scene of economic exchange as they “go fetch” such items as a dart (spear or harpoon), a knife, iron, a stag, a needle, fish, a skin, a coat, a bracelet, a seal, and thread (238).

Interspersed among these substantives are several body parts and verbs of a suggestive nature and it is these terms that form for us a congeries of physical proximity and sexual intimacy. Typical of the body as represented by the word-list is the inclusion of such items as “Vderah, A nose” and “Blete, An eye,” but less typical is the inclusion of “Vgnake, A tongue.” One must ask what interest men such John Janes have in parts of the body that are generally concealed? Is the tongue, as suggested in the previous section, a synecdoche not just for the whole consultant but also for a consultant who functions as an interpreter? The word-list’s narrative of intimacy develops from this uncommon body part and from the inclusion of the revelatory phrase “Canyglow, Kiss me.” If we set these two terms in relation to others, a scene emerges: “Kesinyo, Eate some,” “Madlycoyte, Musicke,” “Yliaoute, I meane no harme,” “Mysacoah, Wash it,” “Canyglow, Kiss me,” “Sambah, Below,” “Cooah, Go to him,” “Icune, Come hither,” “Goucah, Come downe,” “Vgnake, A tongue,”
“Macuah, A beard,” “Quoysah, Giue it to me” (238). The virtual syntax between these items draws them together into a scene of feasting and music beginning above deck where the English and Inuit mingle. The English musicians in John Davis’s crew play instruments to delight and pacify the Inuit. There is flirtation and coaxing as the two societies engage with each other, the sailors perhaps saying “come hither” in the direction of the companionways leading below deck, suggested twice with “below” and “come down.” The significance of “wash it” is perhaps explained by the experience of Cook’s crew in Nootka Sound. Although Cook’s editor John Douglas purged many scenes of sexual indecency from his account, Currie explains that the illustrations of women from Nootka Sound represent them after a “ceremony of purification” that removed a dark, protective grease from their skin in a prelude to sexual intercourse (Constructing Colonial Discourse 75-7). A discourse of colonial decency in travel accounts make such degrees of intimacy between Europeans and Amerindians, much as other forms of violence, un-narratable, and so we must search for them in recondite textual features.

Janes’s word-list is unusual for this collection in that the coercive consultation event appears to have been occasioned by trade and a scene of music and feasting. The celebratory and intimate tone of the word-list suggests that the language exchange was not prefaced by abduction, confinement, and restraint. Perhaps it is for this reason that Janes includes a translation for a delicate and hidden body part and why the narrative of the word-list is more of merriment, negotiation, and persuasion. Although the language consultant is unnamed here, we are not given the impression either by the travel account’s main narrative or the word-list that the elicitation process anticipated his or her death. By connecting phrases and substantives into islands of significance, creating a congeries of unusual body parts or dialogue uncharacteristic of trade, the virtual syntax begins to tell a story utterly ignored and
omitted by the main narrative. A deep reading of these word-lists, however, is always on the point of breaking rather than bending the text – pushing it beyond historical verifiability. Nonetheless, it is because of the paucity of narrative material, the way that scant narrative material contradicts the main narrative, and the conscious efforts to suppress certain details – such as Douglas’s concern for decency – that a speculative reading is appropriate.

3.4 Congeries: “Ka ka torawincs yowo. What call you this [?]”

John Smith’s accounts of the settlement of Jamestown in 1606 and his tense negotiations with the Powhatan are the site of much recent literary criticism. Murray’s Indian Giving provides a brief but exceptional reading of Smith’s Powhatan (also called Virginia Algonquian) word-list published in the preface to his Map of Virginia (1612), though Murray does not speculate on the necessary and hidden consultation event. Philip Barbour’s introduction to the Complete Works of Captain John Smith notes that, while humbly apologizing for “his own rough pen,” Smith “left to posterity one of the basic ethnological studies of the tidewater Algonkians of the early seventeenth century” (“Introduction” lx). “[Smith’s] writings,” declares Barbour, “reflect weakness and uncertainty in style, conservative use of dialect words in English in company with occasional borrowings from foreign languages, and the particularity of putting down his thoughts at random, in his own way, with little regard to organization” (lxix). This lack of regard for organization is what characterizes the “forty-six random words” of Smith’s Powhatan word-list, which additionally includes “the numerals from one to ten, twenty to a hundred by tens, and a thousand, and ten phrases or sentences” (Barbour, “Earliest Reconnaissance” 21).

Of all the word-lists I’ve encountered, Smith’s has attracted the most scholarly attention. Barbour demonstrates that both Smith and William Strachey drew knowledge from Hakluyt’s Principal Navigation, especially the few Carolina Algonquian words found in
Thomas Hariot’s account of the Roanoke colony, *A Brief and True Report of the New Found Land of Virginia* (1588) (22). Barbour shows that Smith’s flawed understanding of Powhatan propagates errors in translation, such as “crenepo” for “woman,” derived from Hakluyt rather than an Algonquian consultant (35). In *Studies in Southeastern Indian Languages* James Crawford notes that, because missionary activity was absent in Virginia and North Carolina, our knowledge of the Algonquian languages there are “restricted to a few poorly recorded vocabularies” (7). Frank Siebert attempts to question, verify, and correct Smith’s Powhatan translations through historical linguistics and reveals Smith’s rather tenuous grasp on the Algonquian as well as the morphosyntactic gap between the languages. Despite his failings as a linguist, Smith produced a bilingual word-list to inform and delight readers back home. Like many amateur linguists before him, he justifies the inclusion of the list, “Because many doe desire to knowe the maner of their Language, I haue inserted these few words” (*Map of Virginia* 136).

The problem of language difference was something that Smith was acutely aware of and even if his linguistic efforts were clumsy, it seems he genuinely desired to instruct the English in Powhatan culture and language. Smith’s attempts to foster an alliance with the Powhatan Algonquians are credited with saving the faltering colony and because of these complex and dangerous negotiations his writing is invaluable for historical linguists as well as historians and literary scholars of early America. To improve communication between the societies he delivered two young boys to Wahunsenacawh to serve as language slaves, Thomas Savage and Henry Spelman. The second of these was later killed, like many interpreters, for suspicions of his allegiance in the retaliation of the Patowemek for a

---

42 Hariot’s work contains the first example of the term for chief among the Powhatan, *werowance* (*OED*). Hariot writes, “In some places of the countrey one onely towne belongeth to the gouernment of a *Wiroans* or chiefe Lorde” (*Brief and True Report* 48).
massacre committed by the English (in which poor Spelman was not involved) (Bach, *Colonial Transformations* 22). Not only were interpreters created through violence, they were also subject to constant suspicion that could lead to their death through violence. For a poignant example, Jill Lepore quotes a 1675 letter from John Allyn to Fitz-John Winthrop: “beware of having any linguist in your company, least he so hide himself as that you leave him behind you!” (*Name of War* 43). While Smith provides no explicit indication of the word-list’s audience, his promotion of colonization through the Virginia Company and his awareness of the problem of language difference indicate that this list was conceived as a primer for future colonists and a glossary to facilitate comprehension of his *Map*. Yet the contents of the word-list are not obviously beneficial for colonization nor are they contextually specific in the way of Richard Eden’s colonial vocabulary.

Printed after his return to England, the *Map of Virginia* represents one of the many promotional tracts published by the Virginia Company in the hope of attracting investors and colonists to the struggling settlement. The Powhatan-English word-list appends the document without indication of its source and precedes a map of tidewater Virginia (with many Algonquian place-names) and the narrative of the first year of colonization from Smith’s point-of-view. This lack of any context again presents the word-list as *disjecta membra*. It begins with a phrase that begs the translation of an object’s name: “Ka ka torawincs yowo. What call you this” (136). Oddly, the phrase is not punctuated with a question mark, giving it a rather petulant tone from the beginning. In this phrase we also have an example of language learning that is incomprehensible without ostension. The meaning of the phrase can only be completed through gesturing to an object present at the language encounter and using the demonstrative. Wittgenstein perceptibly notes that “the word ‘this’ has been called the only *genuine* name; so that anything else we call a name was one only in an inexact,
approximate sense” (PI §38). The “this” of the interrogatory phrase thrusts us into the language encounter as it gestures toward the object of inquiry, the thing or person denoted. From Smith’s initial translation, we have the expression of a desire to learn and also a recognition of the problem of language difference. The English reader is taught first and foremost to ask for the names of things and to gesture at them, and they are also taught, through the absence of a question mark, a rather haughty tone consistent with Smith’s style and political reputation.

The representation of the Powhatan language in individual words exemplifies the theory of the word and signifies an important orthographical decision by Smith, who divides the initial phrase into four distinct words and in so doing establishes writing conventions for English audiences. Dixon and Aikhenvald, citing Van Wyk, describe two different conventions for writing word divisions: disjunctive, “according to which relatively simple, and, therefore, relatively short, linguistic units are written and regarded as words,” and conjunctive, “according to which simple units are joined to form long words with complex morphological structures” (Word 8). From my discussion of the word in the previous chapter it should be apparent that neither of these approaches to representing language in phonemic writing is founded on a unit naturally occurring in polysynthetic languages such as Powhatan. Smith’s decision to represent “What call you this” disjunctively gives a false impression to the English reader that the content of this phrase could be parsed into individual words. His desire to make Powhatan more like English creates spaces and potential pauses, as he also does with “woyawgh tawgh” for “I am hungry,” which Barbour notes, “should probably be one word” (“Earliest Reconnaissance” 47).

Turning to the contents of Smith’s Powhatan translations, we find a logic of trade and economy in the terms of word-list, a natural colonial vocabulary that is perturbed by
later lexical items. There is also a miscellaneousness to the non-alphabetical list and certain words shock the reader with their abrupt change in register and context. Because the list is short, I will narrate it briefly in a modern English translation: man, woman, boy, houses, skins or garments, shoes, beds, fire, bow, arrows, swords, target (shield), guns, axes, pickaxes, knives, shears, pipes, copper, metal, woods, leaves, land, stone, cuckold, water, fish, sturgeon, flesh, blood, friends, enemies, the worst enemies, the best friends, followed by some phrases and basic numbers, then days, suns, nights, moons, years, stars, heavens, gods, petty gods, deaths, lives, and additional phrases (Smith 136). One can see the settlers’ benefit in learning the names of objects highly prized by the Powhatans, especially the metal commodities for which new words were invented, such as “Accowprets” for “shears,” which Barbour calls “a made-up name for a novel artefact” (“Earliest Reconnaissance” 31). But the word-list surprises in its obtuseness. There are no translations for the common foods that proved essential to the survival of Jamestown, such as corn, deer, eels, and shellfish, or the kinship relations that were essential in building cultural dialogue, such as father and brother.

Defying colonial decency, the inclusion of the lexical item “cuckold” as “wepenter” is almost comical in its inutility: it is pure miscellaneousness, almost a puckish ploy for outrage. Although these substantives (there are no verbs outside the sentences) reflect trade, the inclusion of “cuckold” represents for Karen Robertson “one fissure of curiosity about patriarchal sexual arrangements intersecting the material” (qtd. in Murray, Indian Giving 84). I say that there are no verbs, but this is misleading, for a closer look at Smith’s “cuckold” reveals the “word” to be a far more ambiguous action. “Wepenter,” for which Barbour proposes the correction “wepenten,” is more accurately “to lie with” or “to lie with each other” or “he sleeps with him or her” (“Earliest Reconnaissance” 46). Barbour reconstructs the meaning by comparing the Powhatan with Natick, Delaware, and Cree, and in no
instance does he discover a connotation of infidelity or wounded masculine pride. Robertson’s encountering “patriarchal sexual arrangements” in the word reflects more about Smith’s miscomprehension of the Powhatan language and his own sexual desire than it does about any real Powhatan cultural category, a situation tantamount to Lodge’s reading of Fitzgerald’s list in the previous chapter. Jeffrey Knapp categorizes this strange lexeme as a joke, writing, “What looks frivolous about the vocabulary […] is that Smith lists too ‘few’ [Powhatan words] to make the vocabulary useful, [and] makes jokes about the list (for instance, by inserting among the words for land, stone, water, and fish the Indian term for cuckold)” (Empire Nowhere 209). Nevertheless, I find this stylistic explanation contrary to Smith’s petulant, self-important discourse that so much ostracized him from the Jamestown founders. Smith’s (and later Strachey’s) representation of the wives of Wahunsenacawh as an oriental harem, as well as Smith’s captivity and professed sexual liaison with his Turkish master’s Greek mistress while he was a slave, may inform this lexeme more than anything else. Then again, it could merely be a huckster’s wink, for Smith was an accomplished propagandist who tenaciously built support for the colonial project by any means.

But where does this word-list come from? We know that Smith composed the Map of Virginia when he was already back in England. As with many of the colonizers, Smith kept a journal, though it is unclear if it is from this journal, his memory, or some other texts that the word-list was developed. His drawing the term “crenepo” from an English source-text seems to indicate that Smith referred and possibly deferred to other colonial narratives. Bach speculates that Smith had access to Strachey’s Powhatan word-list, though this is somewhat obviated by their distinct translations for the word “cuckold:” “wepenter” vs. “winpenton” (Colonial Transformations 212). There are no scenes of explicit language consultation to which we can point with absolute certainty in Smith’s narrative of the settlement of Jamestown and,
as indicated, the word-list appears wholly beyond context. However, in his earlier publication *A True Relation of Such Occurrences and Accidents of Noate as Hath Happned in Virginia* (1608) there is a scene of colonial encounter suggestive of linguistic consultation which is often overlooked in the discussion of Smith’s managing of the Jamestown settlement.

Because of the tense and often violent relations with the Virginia natives there was suspicion that additional ambushes were being plotted, so the counsel at Jamestown desired credible information on the Amerindians’ war plans. Taking action, Smith relates a scene in which we recognize many of the elements common to the coercive consultation event:

The Counsell concluded that I should terrifie them with some torture, to know if I could know their intent. The next day I bound one in hold to the maine Mast, and presenting sixe Muskets with match in the cockes, forced him to desire life, to answere my demaunds he could not, but one of his Comouodos was of the counsel of Paspahegh, that could satisfie me: I, releasing him out of sight, I affriegted the other, first with the rack, then with Muskets, which seeing, he desired me to stay, and hee would confess to this execution: Maister Scrivener come, his discourse was to this effect (*True Relation* 89).

At first blush, this event does not appear to be an appropriate source for Powhatan linguistic data, given Smith’s physical and mental occupation with the interrogation. Yet our knowledge of the consultation event as well as further evidence makes this scene of forced consolation a plausible source for at least some of Smith’s word-list. It is, first and foremost, a scene of extreme coercion. It includes the abduction of two Amerindians, threats to one of their lives, his restraint by ropes or fetters, isolation from other community members, and a forced “dialogue” in the Powhatan language that is witnessed by the suggestively-named Matthew Scrivener, an English colonist who was briefly acting governor and later
Jamestown’s secretary. As Smith was occupied with the torture and interrogation of a man called “Macanoe” (93), it is likely that Scrivener recorded this event because the details of the confession are complicated and include mention of several local Amerindian nations, their plans for ambush, their relations to the Powhatan, and the eventual plot to abduct Captain Newport after a feast set out in his honour. The amount of information attained regarding the intended abduction of Newport strongly suggests that it was deliberately documented; the importance of accurately translating the Powhatan confession likewise recommends a written record. This bit of speculation is supported by Scrivener’s role as colony secretary as well as the following phrases that conclude Smith’s word-list.

Perceiving the consultation process behind the linguistic data, Murray writes, “One of the inherent possibilities of the word-list, especially as it begins to incorporate sentences or phrases as grammatical examples and variations, is dialogue” (86). Unique among critical analyses of these word-lists, however, David Read recognizes “a hidden narrative underlying the otherwise colorless organization,” and provides a brief, two-page reading of the Smith’s Powhatan lexicon (New World, Known World 23). This narrative is drawn out of the brute sequence by the discovery of unifying themes, the identification of rhetorical patterns, and the cementing of a virtual syntax. Read places “two strange sequences” (23) of substantives and phrases in relation because they cohere into congeries, “diverse things of like nature.” These sequences are first, the congeries of substantives related to human bodies (flesh and blood) and human relations (friends, enemies, the worst enemies, the best of friends) and second, the dialogue that ends the word-list. The work of re-articulating the coercive consultation event to the sample of Powhatan words, is entreated by violent confrontation, colonial inutility, and terms of political negotiation suggested in the contents of the list. Although Read never speculates on its origin, he does comment, “The nature of that
exchange is extremely ambiguous,” and adds, “[t]he interest of the sequence lies in its very impression of historicity, in the way in which it appears to represent a distinct exchange between Smith and the speakers of [Virginia] Algonquian” (24, emphasis mine). This final statement is close to the mark, for the dialogue is far too situational for it to be of any general value, as Read notes, “the utility of the passage for lay students of Algonquian is hard to detect” (24).

The connection between “flesh” and “blood” and the threat of torture is apparent enough and the importance of phrases such as “the worst enemies” and “the best of friends” are also highly relevant to an exchange in which political relations are the subject of interrogation. Likewise, the question “Tawnor nebiegh Powhatan, where dwels Powwhatan” (Map of Virginia 139) is germane to the discussion because the Paspahegh man reveals that the Paspahegh, Chickahamanian, Youghtanum, Pamunka, Mattapanient, and Kiskiack are colluding with Wahunsenacawh to lay a trap for Captain Newport. The later sequence of phrases builds a dramatic tension that is out of the ordinary to a casual encounter between equals. The response to the question above, “Now he dwels a great way hence at Orapaks,” is answered with strong rejection from Smith that smacks of a hard-nosed interrogation, “You lie, he staid ever at Werowocomoco” (139). This accusation and the response from the consultant (“Truely he is there I doe not lie” [139]) establish an asymmetrical power relation between the two interlocutors that might not be feasible were the Amerindian consultant not restrained, isolated, or physically threatened. The last three phrases in this situationally fixed and impossible to generalize conversation are commands given to an unseen Amerindian: “Run you then to the king Mawmarynough and bid him come hither,” “Get you gone, & come againe quickly,” and “Bid Pokahontas bring hither two little Baskets,

---

43 For a discussion of the accusation of lying in Amerindian vocabularies, such as Williams’s A Key to the language of America, see Laura Murray, “Vocabularies of Native American Languages: A Literary and Historical Approach to an Elusive Genre” (596-7).
and I will give her white beads to make her a chaine” (139). These phrases might be directed to the Paspahgeh man who was “releas[ed] […] out of sight” (89) because he held no vital information. The Paspahgeh whom Smith threatens and interrogates appears to be Macanoe, though it is difficult to tell from the text because Smith is not overly concerned with naming his Amerindian adversaries individually. He writes of “[t]he confession of Macanoe, which was the counseller of Paspahgeh” several pages after the description of the interrogation (93). The fact that the Paspahgeh nation paid tribute to the Powhatans means Macanoe would be familiar with Wahunsenacawh’s daughter, Pocahontas, who provided the Jamestown colony with food for survival on a number of occasions, thus the “two little Baskets” that Smith demands. Not only is the word-list not discordant to a scene of violent interrogation, it veritably harmonizes with this specific, historical moment.

This re-articulation of the Powhatan word-list attempts to re-establish the “historicity” of a dialogue that is de-historicized by the structure of the list, its isolation from the main narrative, and the absence of an explicit language exchange in Smith’s account of the settlement of Jamestown. The presence of the known scribe Matthew Scrivener at the scene of torture and interrogation, the complexity of the information conveyed to Smith by the Paspahgeh men, and our knowledge of the armature of the coercive consultation event (the fetters and weapons and writing instruments) give the word-list a coherence that is otherwise absent. The arbitrariness that characterizes Smith’s style, his “putting down his thoughts at random, in his own way, with little regard to organization,” conceal what is, by all indications, a historical encounter between the author and a language consultant, and not just a consultant, but one under extreme duress. My re-articulation of a historical scene to the word-list, each occurring in texts published four years apart, is a response to that initial question posed by Smith, “What call you this[?]” For the ostensible utility of the list is denied
by its very contents, and the actual scene of language exchange suggested by the
demonstrative “this” is refused by the de-articulation of the list from the narrative – we have
ostensive definition and the disappearance of the object simultaneously.

The militarization of the political relations with the Powhatan developed from
Smith’s predominance in the beginning years of colonization and his successful courting of
Wahunsenacawh’s mercy and allegiance. Linguistic exchange between the English and the
Powhatans was primarily for the sake of trade, as indicated obliquely by the contents of
Smith’s word-list, but it was highly restricted to the military hierarchy that dominated
intercultural relations, as testified by the instructions to colonists written by Thomas Gates et
al, *For the Colony in Virginea Britannia. Lawes Divine, Moral and Martiall* (1612), edited by William
Strachey. These instructions are deeply concerned with language use and include strictures
against cursing, blasphemy, and sedition, as well as prohibitions against unauthorized trade
with the Virginia natives (Gates 36-47). Wahunsenacawh is mentioned by name in the law:
“No man or woman, (upon paine of death) shall runne away from the Colonie, to
Powhatan, or any savage Weroance else whatsoever” (50). Likewise, martial law states, “No
Souldier may speake or have any private conference with any of the salvages, without leave
of his Captaine, nor his Captaine without leave of his chiefe Officer, upon paine of death”
(60). What these instructions appear to indicate is that linguistic exchange with the Powhatan
was highly formalized within a military structure. Barbour writes, “it is obvious that [Smith’s]
instincts were militaristic; discipline and training for self-defence were among his mottos”
(lxvi), and adds, “when Smith’s career led him to lay down the musket and the compass, he
had to improvise with the pen” (lxix). This scene of torture and interrogation uncannily fits
the dialogue that concludes Smith’s word-list and conforms to his character as a soldier-of-
fortune turned ethnographer. Reading the word-list as a narrative, regardless of the actual
source of the linguistic data, draws our attention to the torture of Macanoe in Smith’s *A True Relation*, a colonial encounter that might otherwise escape a critical reading and remain wholly de-articulated from the consultation event. What is more, the reported speech in the word-list when combined with the scene of torture creates a profounder sense of the word-list belonging to the historical context, which is so important for a more elaborate and forthright narration of historical events.

3.5 Counter-Translations: “what they wanted to understand”

An Amerindian author’s commentaries on the translations contained in a Quechua word-list offer for us a unique perspective on European linguistic imperialism, what I call here counter-translation in reference to the idea of the “counter-conquest.”

Prior to this reading, my analysis has revealed hidden narratives of abduction, confinement, restraint, physical intimacy, and torture. Although colonial in nature and worthy of being reinserted into the historical narrative, the consultation events from which the following word-list was constructed are here bracketed momentarily to allow the intervention of an Amerindian author in the process of translation, a voice that invariably complicates the process of interpretation and reveals the gross simplification of the language exchange as represented by colonists. In order for us to access an Amerindian perspective on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century European imperial literature we must turn to the Spanish tradition, for in the English literature arising out of the colonization of the Americas there are no published Amerindians until the eighteenth century, a problem to which we will return in the

---

44 In “The Discursive Encounter of Spain and America” Rolena Adorno classifies Cabeza de Vaca’s *Naufragios* as a “counter-conquest” narrative because, in her interpretation, it advocates a non-military or anti-reconquista approach to the colonization of the Americas (220). She links this to the *Apologetica historia sumaria* and the life-work of Bartolomé de Las Casas, to which we might add other indigenistas like Alonso de la Vera Cruz and Vasco de Quiroga (see also Weaver 216-7). The counter-conquest was not an absolute rejection of Spanish imperial logic so much as an attenuation of expansion through military means.
following chapter. In this section I examine certain specific translations produced by the Spanish Jesuit Pablo José de Arriaga during a *visita* to the Andes that sought to discipline Quechua religious practices, by way of a critique of the shortcomings of European representations of the language exchange made by Inca Garcilaso de la Vega.

Published in Lima, Arriaga’s *La extirpación de la idolatría en el Piru* (1621) documents the continuing Amerindian heresies practiced in the Andes and contains as a supplement a word-list of sixty-four Quechua substantives. Although the English translator and editor L. Clark Keating notes that the contemporary Father Dávila claimed Arriaga “did not know the Indian language,” he finds this difficult to believe given his “extensive use of individual words” and “some long phrases” (*Extirpation* 175). We have seen in examples of figures such as Smith that this understanding of language fluency is somewhat naïve – substantives and phrases do not a language make. Paraphrasing Wittgenstein, it is no more a move than placing the chessmen on the board. Arriaga’s text contains some two hundred Quechua words, largely defined with in-line translation, and a brief word-list that is mostly concerned with culinary items.  

Scattered among the alphabetical items are religious terms such as the word “huaca,” which Arriaga translates as “Ídolo, o adoratorio, tómase también por tesoro” (*Extirpación* 189) [“idol or place of worship; a sacred object; also taken in the sense of treasure”] (*Extirpation* 179). Steve J. Sterne notes that, igniting in Huamanga, Peru, the religious and political movement of Taki Onqoy or “the dancing sickness” sought to overthrow Christian dominion through the returning strength of the Andean *huacas* and the

---

45 An absolute rarity of the tradition, English translator and editor L. Clark Keating not only preserves the word-list but also expands it to include the Quechua words given in-line translation.

46 Arriaga’s in-line presentation of the word as “ídolos y huacas” (“idols and *huacas*”) creates an equivalence of distance that the word-list closes (*Extirpación* 8, 14, etc.). Spanish editor Enrique Urbano provides a footnote indicating the same or similar Spanish translations of *huaca* from as early as 1560 in Domingo de Santo Tomás’s *Lexicon o vocabulario de la lengua general de Perú*, continuing through three other linguistic texts to the early seventeenth century.
necessary dissolution of Amerindian-Spanish collaboration in the 1560s (“Paradigms of Conquest” 21). Father Arriaga’s visita to the Andean highlands was motivated by this connection between linguistic, religious, and political practice and similar to the work of Bernardino de Sahagún in New Spain his objective was to secure orthodoxy in the indigenous community by studying their language and religion.

The term huaca is therefore translated as a threat to the Christian mission in Spanish America and as with earlier cases in our investigation, the one-to-one structure of the word-list oversimplifies the cross-cultural translation, a process that Eric Cheyfitz describes as “a congeries of contradictions that attempt to parade as linguistic coherence by constructing a fiction of translation” (Poetics of Imperialism 205). The fiction of translation within a set of contradictions is for Cheyfitz one definition of ideology (205) and we will see here how the mestizo author de la Vega subverts that imperial ideology by redefining or counter-translating Quechua religious terms with a kind of philological jujitsu.

In Language, Authority, and Indigenous History in the Comentarios reales de los Incas, Margarita Zamora argues that de la Vega’s Comentarios reales (1609) deploys early modern philological practices to show how “pagan Incas played a privileged role in Christian history” (4). De la Vega employs linguistic analysis as “a rhetorical strategy for the revision of what [he] considers the false versions of Inca[n] history written by Spaniards, and then, as an essential component in the process of integration and synthesis of two widely divergent worlds – the Incan and the European” (3-4). Rhetorically, he brings pre-Columbian Peru in line with Christian history, and vice versa, by minimizing the claims of heresy made by earlier Spanish clergymen, and characterizing Andean monotheism as proto-Christian (Elliot, Spain, Europe 187). In doing so, de la Vega subverts Spanish authority by demonstrating again and again their linguistic incompetence. His philological project forms part of a tradition of
Amerindian authors in Spanish America pushing back against Spanish imperial representations beginning in the sixteenth century, a tradition that is absent in Anglo America until the late eighteenth century at the earliest. De la Vega’s humanist-style resistance shows that the polyvalence of certain Quechua words confuses the Spaniards – though they do not admit as much – and his Comentarios aggressively and sometimes sarcastically amends the Spanish misrepresentation of Andean religious practices.

In the Comentarios, in a chapter titled “De otras muchas cosas que el nombre Huaca significa” [Of many other meanings of the word Huaca], de la Vega strengthens his counter-translational project rhetorically while still not directly responding to the question of whether huaca may be translated as “idol” or “place of worship” or “treasure.” He writes,

> dos historiadores españoles, que no supieron esta diferencia, dijeron: los indios entran llorando y guayando en sus templos a sus sacrificios, que huaca eso quiere decir. Habiendo tanta diferencia de este significado llorar a los otros, y siendo uno verbo y el otro nombre, verdad es que la diferente significación consiste solamente en la diferente pronunciación, sin mudar letra ni acento (95) [two Spanish historians, who did not know the difference, [stated] that the Indians enter their temples for their sacrifices weeping and wailing, for such is the meaning of huaca. Although the difference between this meaning of “mourn” and the others is so great and it is a verb and the other a noun, the difference is really shown by the different pronunciation, without changing any letter or accent] (Livermore 79)

By emphasizing the phonetic proximity of two words here de la Vega simultaneously increases his own authority while diminishing that of the Spanish historians who are unable to distinguish the pronunciations that mark the difference between verb and noun. His chapter on huaca is an example of rhetorical and philological jujitsu whereby the authoritative
claims of Spanish eyewitnesses are turned against them and shown to be nothing but
misperception, simplification, hubris, and the worst crime a humanist might commit: bad
translation.

De la Vega deflects the discussion of idolatry by turning away from *huaca* to tell a
humorous anecdote about a Spanish friar who laboured for four years as a lecturer in San
Pablo de Córdoba on the *lengua general* (Quechua) and could not distinguish between the two
proper pronunciations of *pacha* for either “heaven” or “clothing” (96). The previous chapter
in the *Comentarios*, “De muchos dioses que los historiadores españoles impropiamente
aplican a los indios” [Of the many gods wrongly attributed to the Indians by the Spanish
historians], however, provides an in-line translation for *huaca* as “cordillera” [mountain
range], stating that the Andeans paid tribute, “no por tenerlas por dioses ni adorarlas, sino
por la particular ventaja que hacían a las comunes” (96) [not because they were considered
gods and therefore worthy of adoration, but because of their special superiority over the
common run of things] (Royal Commentaries 77). One is given the impression that the
translation of *huaca* will be resolved in the following chapter because of its title, but the
secular definition remains and thus mitigates the pagan representation of the Incas.
Repeating the declaration that *huaca* has many meanings (“diversas significaciones”), de la
Vega continues his criticism by stating, “Sospecho que el nombre [Tangatanga] está corrupto
porque los españoles corrompen todos los más que toman en boca” (Comentarios reales 97) [I
suspect that the word [Tangatanga] is corrupt, because the Spanish corrupt all other
languages they try to speak] (Royal Commentaries 80). Despite the title of this chapter de la
Vega provides no definite translation for *huaca*, which is precisely the point of his criticism:
none exists. There is no one-to-one Quechua-to-Spanish equivalent that will resolve the
polyvalence of the term and thus make Andean paganism and heresy explicit and punishable.
What is unusual and valuable about this commentary is that a Amerindian with alphabetic literacy responds to claims about his language and characterizations of his culture with his own pen and ink and, importantly, through the rhetorical and philological practices of early modern humanism. De la Vega’s project systematically undermines the authority of Spanish chroniclers and their claims regarding indigenous languages, such as when he demonstrates the misunderstanding that gives origin of the name “Peru,” stating, “los cristianos entendieron conforme a su deseo” (Comentarios reales 22) [the Christians understood what they wanted to understand] (Royal Commentaries 16).47 Zamora categorizes these philological criticisms as part of his project to construct a proto-Christian Andean identity and demolish the pagan, barbarian Spanish representations. The recurring scenes of miscommunication support “one of Garcilaso’s basic premises – that the Europeans are incompetent interpreters of the language of the Indians” (68).

De la Vega’s Comentarios subvert Spanish authority by mystifying interpretation and positing multiple meanings for words, meanings that are only available to native speakers of Amerindian languages and only revealed through the writing of Amerindians. In the “Advertencia” that opens his Comentarios reales, de la Vega writes,

Para atajar esta corrupción me sea lícito, pues soy indio, que en esta historia yo escriba como indio con las mismas letras que aquellas tales dicciones se deben escribir. Y no se les haga de mal a los que las leyeren ver la novedad presente en contra del mal uso introducido, que antes debe dar gusto leer aquellos nombres en su propiedad y pureza (10). [To avoid further corruption, I may be permitted, since I

47 Pietro Martire d’Anghiera makes a similar observation on the linguistic incompetence of the conquistadors when he traces the origins of the name of the peninsula “Yucatán” to an Amerindian phrase meaning “no os entiendo” (Décadas 398) [I don’t understand you]. As with the name of Peru, we can see here the colonists understanding “according to their desire” and the place names of the Americas themselves exhibiting the problem of language difference and the fiction of translation.
am an Indian, to write like an Indian in this history, using the letters that should be
used in these words. Let none who read take exception to this novelty in opposition
to the incorrect usage that is usually adopted: they should rather be glad to be able to
read the words written correctly and with purity] (Livermore 6).

Zamora claims that the use of Quechua in the Comentarios gives de la Vega the final word on
interpretation and permits him to build on the resemblance system of meaning elaborated in
Foucault’s Order of Things wherein meaning is constructed through the relation between
signifier, signified, and the similarities they share. Through this understanding of language, it
is therefore logical that the exotic customs and artefacts of the New World be represented in
their original linguistic context in order to preserve that similarity – for de la Vega huaca
cannot be reduced to idol. Zamora writes, “This complementary relationship between
language and referent […] is at the heart of Garcilaso’s philological practice, allowing him to
rely on the Quechua word as the ultimate interpretative authority, as well as the most
appropriate vehicle of representation” (81). According to Zamora then, de la Vega’s
philological intervention appears as an early example of linguistic relativism in that the
possibility of translation for huaca across languages is extremely limited because there is no
culturally based resemblance in Spanish for the term. By figuratively placing himself between
the Quechua-speaking language consultants and the Castilian-speaking interviewers, de la
Vega at once performs a denial of the possibility of translation and an adroit counter-
translation while asserting that both of these positions depend on his absolute mastery of the
Spanish and Andean languages, histories, and religious practices.

In commenting on Incan history, de la Vega complicates and subverts Spanish
representations of Andean religious practices and the lengua general by demonstrating through
recurring scenes of the colonists’ linguistic incompetence the deep-rootedness of
misunderstanding. This writing is exemplary of re-articulation in a number of senses, for de la Vega resituates the Quechua word back into Andean culture while simultaneously positioning earlier translations of *huaca* in a linguistic context of multiple misunderstandings, one so riven by cultural incomprehension that foreign specialists in the language are incapable of making the most basic syntactic distinctions. Perhaps his greatest re-articulation of all is the representation of pre-Columbian Andean culture as proto-Christian, a counter-translation that is entirely antagonistic to Spanish depictions of their pagan and heretical past.

De la Vega’s linguistic authority is constructed on his identity not only as a native speaker but also as an aristocrat, a *mestizo*, a humanist, and a skilful and entertaining writer; his rhetoric amplifies the number of meanings for any given Quechua word, refusing the European practice of one-to-one translation, and pulling the veil back on Spanish linguistic proficiency. Despite being a serious and significant entry into the literary counter-conquest, the humorous anecdotes of Spanish linguistic ineptitude give de la Vega’s resistance and subversiveness a congenial tone which very likely contributed to the popular success of his writing. His counter-translation of *huaca* as “mountain range” neutralizes the pagan connotations of the word while his later refusal to provide a simple, one-word translation of this term with “diversas significaciones” places in question the entire word-list project. De la Vega intervenes into the project of Spanish linguistic imperialism to demonstrate just how wilful the process of translation is and what the stakes can be, for in questioning the linguistic work of authors like Pablo José de Arriaga the project of uprooting native spiritual practices becomes more tenuous, an extirpation that cannot depend on the simple translation of *huaca* as pagan idolatry.
3.6 The Face of Kempes: “Sakahocan, to write”

William Strachey’s bilingual word-list, which is appended to *The Historie of Travell into Virginia Britania* (1612), builds on Smith’s and Hariot’s works, though his contribution is far more elaborate and complete, consisting of around 800 words and phrases. It is clear from the extent of Strachey’s list that he had long interviews with a Powhatan speaker, although like many of his contemporaries he never describes the consultation event explicitly. Unlike Smith’s brief word-list of forty-seven items, which may have been elicited in a single sitting (or “enhanced interrogation”), the one Strachey presents is obviously the work of a continued exchange and personal relationship with an unnamed Powhatan. The extent of this word-list means that it generically verges on being a dictionary – though it doesn’t satisfy all the criteria laid out in the previous chapter – and that it also gives us more evidence toward the identification of the Amerindian language consultant.

As with the previous section in which we identified the participation of an Amerindian in the war of words, Strachey’s word-list presents a unique opportunity for us to directly name the Amerindian involved in the translation process and to identify the influence of the consultant in the language exchange. The suggestion that the Powhatan speaker had as great an influence in shaping the list as Strachey is found initially in the organization of the lexical items, for throughout the alphabetical list most lettered sections begin with Powhatan-words-first organization (e.g. “*Ahone – God,*” “*Boketawh – Fier,*” etc.) and then transition abruptly to the transcription of English-words-first, usually after five or six terms. This peculiar organization resists the accessibility of the dictionary because the reader is uncertain under which language a specific term might fall. Furthermore, it suggests that the word-list was written in two distinct stages, where the Powhatan-first words represent an initial consultation event and the English-first words subsequent interviews and
exchanges. Because the *Historie of Travell* refuses to narrate the consultation event, our task here will be the literary detective work of re-articulating it from clues provided implicitly in the main story and the word-list.

Strachey is an eccentric writer whose lack of narrative structure is augmented by fanciful and unfounded speculation on the character of the Powhatan language, the “Language of the Indians” (12). There is a performative aspect to the word-list that positions Strachey as a learned gentleman, as, unlike Smith, he references Latin texts and the Bible with ease and even presumes to identify Amerindian languages and their origins. 48 Siebert notes,

> In comparison with most of his contemporaries, [Strachey’s] ‘ear’ for an exotic language appears to have been of a superior order, but in common with other English writers of his period he had little conception of consistency in sound representation or of uniform orthography (“Resurrecting Virginian Algonquian” 292).

The *Historie of Travell* uses in-line translation extensively, sometimes twice in a sentence, and the word-list that supplements the text is more obviously beneficial to colonists than Smith’s, and not just because of the sheer number of items.

Strachey’s justification of the list can be found in one version of the manuscript’s title, “A Short Dictionary […] By which, such who shall be Imployed the the may know the readyer how to confer, and how to truck and Trade with the People.” Unlike Smith, Strachey provides a translation for the main staples that kept the Jamestown colony from collapse, e.g. “Poketawes, which the West-Indians (our neighbours) call Maiz, their kynd of wheat”

48 Contrary to Strachey, John Smith is far more likely to borrow vocabulary from living languages, such as the word “Camouodos,” a unique variation of the Spanish *camaradas* (Smith 89; also Barbour “Introduction” lxix). This would appear to contradict Fitzmaurice’s assertion that Smith modeled his writing rhetorically after his reading of Cicero, Aurelius, and Tacitus (*Humanism in America* 182-3).
Yet his list also presents a number of mysteries, such as the translation of “Cheese or any curded matter made of milke, ootun” when the Powhatan did not practice herding and the early colony had no livestock. Another sign of eccentricity, Strachey also translates a Powhatan song of victory celebration over the English that is full of mocking phrases, which he declares,

may signifie how that they killed vs for all our Pocasacks, that is our Guns, and for all Capt Newport brought them Copper and could hurt Thomas Newport (a boy whose name indeed is Thomas Sauadge, whome Capt Newport leaving with Powhatan to learne the Language… (86).

In the hands of Smith, this war dance and victory song is transformed into the “shouts and cryes” of a “Virginia Maske,” what Bach calls, “a fiction of incomprehensibility […] a display of devil worship and ‘infernal passions’” (Colonial Transformations 212). Compared to the militaristic mind of Smith, Strachey offers a less petulant perspective, one that is as humanistic as de la Vega’s, one that is even willing to embrace irony, a character rare among European chroniclers of the language encounter.

The eclecticism and potential eroticism located in such translated terms as “cuckold” and “Curled haire” adjacent to “a woman’s Secrett” reveal an interest, shared by Smith, in the sexual relations of the Powhatan people (180). This theme is also developed in the main narrative when Strachey describes an interview with a Powhatan man named Kempes who provides him with the names of all of Wahunsenacawh’s wives, or rather, “his women” (61).

It is here in the narrative that we first encounter the form of the list, for the names of the

---

49 James Rosier claims in A True Relation (1605) of the Weymouth expedition that the Abenakis “make butter and cheese of the milke they have of the Rain-Deere” (qtd. in Transatlantic Encounter 63), yet Vaughan corrects the account by adding, “the Abenakis had neither tame deer nor butter and cheese” (63). Strachey could be confused with the walnut milk produced by the Powhatan, though Barbour’s translation of walnut milk as “Pawcohicorra” does not resolve the mystery (“Earliest Reconnaissance” 40).
women are presented in three columns that interrupt the preceding and succeeding paragraphs. Strachey justifies the inclusion of the list, writing, “the names of the women I haue not thought altogether amisse to set downe as he [Kempes] gaue them vnto me,” describing how they are “very young women,” “about a dozen at present,” and “in whose Company [Chief Wahunsenacawh] takes more delight then in the rest” (61). The Oriental-like sexual immodesty would certainly have tongues wagging back in London and would add to the image of Wahunsenacawh as a lascivious and brutal sensualist. However, for our investigation here, the description of Kempes that contextualizes the information on Wahunsenacawh’s sex life is more to the point.

“Kempes [is] an Indian,” Strachey writes, “who died the last yeare of the Scurvye at Iames towne, after he had dwelt with vs almost one whole yeare, much made of by our Lord Generall, and who could speake a pretty deale of English” (61). This description reveals several clues that strongly indicate that Kempes was consulted in the language exchange. Kempes’s first appearance in the text is set within a consultation event in which Strachey interviews him regarding the names of Wahunsenacawh’s wives. It is from this interview that Strachey provides his first list in the main narrative of the Historie of Travell, which is a formal break from the prose narrative that comes before and after. Given the phonetic complexity of the names for a student of the Powhatan language (Winganuske, Ashetoiske, Amopotoiske, Ottopomtacke), it can be assumed that Strachey wrote them down while he was interviewing Kempes, much in the way Pigafetta interviewed the Patagonian “Paul.”

Still further clues indicate Kempes’s collaboration: the Powhatan man is described as “speaking a pretty deale of English” (61). Because English-Powhatan bilingualism was unusual among the communities of the English colonists and Virginian natives, Kempes is situated among a narrow cast of possible consultants. Although Strachey mentions other
Powhatan men who might serve as language consultants, Machumps and Amarice, the first of these visited England and would not have been available for interview and the second “had his braynes knock’t out for selling but a basket of Corne, and lying in the English fort 2. or 3. daies” (62). The list of informants is short, then, and we know that Kempes spent sufficient time among the English in order to develop the bilingual word-list of about 800 lexical items. Although the translation is ultimately “puzzling” (“Earliest Reconnaissance” 43) to Barbour because it is only tangentially related to the Powhatan term for “stone,” the appearance of “Sakahocan, to write” (Strachey 200) recommends that the consultant was involved in the process to such a degree that he translated the physical armature of the language exchange and could perhaps be considered more than just a collaborator. To become familiar with the English writing technology to such a degree and to have possibly invented a Powhatan word to bridge the cultural gap would have required the kind of extended contact that only Kempes was capable of experiencing.

We also know that he died of “scurvy,” and this here is precisely what provides the final clue in our case for Kempes as the Powhatan translator. Beyond his knowledge of Wahunsenacawh’s wives, and the relevance of such terms as “cuckold,” “a woman’s Secret,” or “the privities or Secret of a man” to that specific conversation, we have one lexical item that in its gross inutility demands interpretation. Although much of Strachey’s list is pragmatic, at turns economic, religious, familial, corporeal, and agricultural, this phrase appears in the Powhatan-first section of the letter N, preceded by the words for “your companion,” “my self,” “a reed,” “a cane,” and “the sun” and succeeded by “sit down” and “sleep” (194). That phrase is, “Nepunche Neir – I am dead” and it seems incredible to translate, an impossible expression that would be extremely difficult to elicit were the situation not one of immanent death. Because it falls among words and phrases in the
Powhatan-first section, we are given the impression that this statement was offered not as a response to Strachey’s questions, not a verbal answer to ostension like so many other substantives in the list, but as a declaration from a man suffering his final hours. Even if such a translation is ultimately false – especially if such a translation is ultimately false – we are suddenly transported by the phrase to a precise historical event in which the transcriber witnesses the consultant’s final breaths.

In Strachey’s text there is little to indicate the power differential found in other word-lists and the oscillation between Powhatan and English in the primary position at least suggests a more equitable relationship between the colonist and the native consultant. However, because of Kempes fatal sickness, we would still have to define the consultation event as coercive because it is likely that the language exchange occurred while he was languishing in bed. The presence of a European at the deathbed of an Amerindian was almost a colonial genre in and of itself. The New England Company published John Eliot’s *The Dying Speeches of Several Indians* (1685) to promote his evangelical efforts and in the preface to Roger Williams’s *A key into the language of America* we witness the demise Wequash who is purported to state, “me much pray to Jesus Christ […] me so big naughty Heart, me heart all one stone!” (23). Although Strachey claims that Kempes died of scurvy, it is very likely that he contracted a virulent disease like smallpox during his year-long stay among the English of Jamestown. Strachey, as the first secretary of the floundering colony, might have felt obliged to record Kempes’s final words for the benefit of those “who shall be Imployed thither,” even if those words appeared in de-articulated, de-narrativized form.

Perhaps tellingly, interest in sexual relations is displayed exclusively in the English-first sections, which would indicate that Strachey elicited these terms through questions and ostension. On the contrary, the Powhatan-first sections signify that Kempes is directing the
dialogue. From the discovery of the phrase “I am dead” signs of disease and the deterioration of health and morale rise to the surface of the list, forming islands of meaning: the Powhatan-first translations, “God,” “farewell,” “I am sick,” “I am cold,” “warne your self,” “Now I vnderstand you,” “I am hungry,” “I burne,” “come look [at] my head,” “Sleepe,” “I vnderstand you not,” “I haue forgotten,” “a word of wonder,” “my beloved friend,” multiple references to tending a dying fire, such as “blow the fier with your mouth,” and the final, ominous term, “Sanckone – to sneese” (174-207) – all create a lexical congeries around the question of bodily health, close physical proximity, and intense intimacy. There are other congeries that are situationally appropriate from the English-first translations, such as, “the devil,” “To be melancholy or sad,” “the poxe,” “to be sick,” “the Soule or vitall breath of man,” “to speake softly,” “to warne one,” “weake” and “weary,” and “to weepe” (194-205).

A re-articulation of the word-list creates the following scene: the Englishman sits at the bedside of the sick and dying Powhatan, he tends the fire to warm their dwelling, he sets out his paper, pen, and ink and the consultation event begins, not with the threat of violence, but with an urgency borne of Kempes’s failing health. The fact that “Sanckone – to sneese” occurs under the letter Z and is the only entry for this final section suggests that it is the last translation that Kempes is strong enough to provide. Kempes’s long deterioration ends with the closing of the word-list.

Taken together, these pregnant expressions and Strachey’s earlier description of Kempes dying from scurvy re-articulate the otherwise de-articulated word-list. Regardless of Kempes’s untimely expiration from the colonial narrative prior to the supplementary word-list – or perhaps because of it – the restitution of his agency in the narrative of the language encounter is vital and, in my understanding, an ethical response to de-articulation and the
imbalance of power so prevalent in the coercive consultation event. The virtual syntax of Strachey’s word-list can be built up from the brief description of his interview with Kempes whose naming of Wahunsenacawh’s wives precipitates the first list form in the narrative of the Historie of Travell. This proximity is the primary clue of Kempes’s collaboration in the Powhatan-English word-list and establishes him as a source for the kind of linguistic data that is presented in sequence. The description of his death by scurvy at Jamestown connects to the bizarrely specific phrase “I am dead,” a phrase that resists not only ostension but also the utilitarian claims made by Strachey’s title on “how to truck and Trade with the People.” Drawing the scene of Kempes’s death from “Scurvye” out of the word-list allows us to recuperate the actions and words of a historical figure that would otherwise remain de-narrativized and absent from the historical record.

To return briefly to the denotation game played with a child as demonstration of how conglomerations resist ostension in the previous chapter, let us pause momentarily to appreciate the perhaps intimate or, at the very least, extended interpersonal relationship between Kempes and Strachey, e.g. “my beloved friend” (205). Unique among the word-lists I analyze here, Strachey’s translation of the term “the Face” (183) indicates that he spent enough time with his consultant to bridge the communication gap that so frustrates the ostensive definition of the human visage. Jane Tompkins indicates the rarity of such a lexical item, writing, “Indian faces are virtually never described in the earliest accounts” (“‘Indians:’ Textualism, Morality” 72), and though Strachey does not delineate Kempes’s features precisely, at least he gives a place for the ear, nose, mouth, and eyes to settle upon. The year that Kempes spent in Jamestown permitted the kind of linguistic accommodation and personal familiarity necessary for a productive language exchange and so among the usual parts of the human body and parts of the face, we encounter a rare translation of an
Amerindian term for the human visage. Just as with the face, we are able to discover the role of Kempes by conglomerating individual details and clues dispersed over the plane of the text. It is with this final image of Kempes that I end my analysis of a survey of Amerindian word-lists from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

3.7 Conclusion

A fuller examination of the word-lists in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century English and Spanish travel accounts and histories would build from this initial attempt to re-articulate the language encounter implicit in the linguistic data while also incorporating Amerindian perspectives on interpretations and European translation practices. Nonetheless, our reading of mere a handful of texts demonstrates some of the more tenacious obstacles to narrating the coercive consultation event from words in brute sequence as well as, with all humility, the reward of a more coherent and comprehensive historical narrative. Occurring after the abundant yet under-represented exchange of gestural communication – the first lacuna in the narrative of the New World language encounter – the first phase of European linguistic imperialism often resulted from the abduction and forced interview of Amerindian subjects. The details of the language exchange are almost always left out of the narrative of events despite the presence of the lexicon obviously requiring a moment of purposeful exchange. In my analysis of these lists, searching for implied narratives, I discover in the inutility of the translations possible accounts of coercion by physical violence, courageous Amerindian resistance, sexual intimacy, and the identification of the indigenous consultants Macanoe and Kempes as the sources of early Powhatan linguistic data.

Although the word-lists themselves are somewhat arbitrarily drawn from the broader tradition, they each function to model the kind of reading that pushes back against the logic of the colonial literature in which certain scenes of language encounter are elided from the
narrative. My discovery of sexual intimacy in Janes’s word-list, or in the earlier account of Cabeza de Vaca, support the contention that the European authors preferred, for decency, for decorum, or for the sake of their own hides, to keep certain details hidden just below the surface from readers back home. A perceptive reader, however, can access these historical events with the right tools in hand. The proposal that scenes of sexual intimacy are implicit in the textual supplement is therefore an attempt to destabilize a colonial discourse that would leave such stories below the level of narrative, de-articulated both in the sense of silenced and disconnected.

The explicit counter-translations of de la Vega syncopate with that initial, tragic scene of the Inuit man severing his own tongue, for the writing of “El Inca” consistently resists the easy translation of Quechua words, suggesting alternative, religiously neutralized interpretations or even refusing a Spanish definitions outright. Despite the underdeveloped form of the word-list generally indicating a language exchange that was based on underdeveloped or even antagonistic relationships between Europeans and Amerindians, I ascertain in Strachey’s list a narrative that binds a name to a face and thus establish, perhaps for the first time, the literary and linguistic contributions of the Powhatan Kempes.

In this survey of the first incorporation of Amerindian languages into the European textual tradition there is no marked difference between the English and the Spanish tradition: both present bilingual translations organized into opposing columns of individual lexical items, both present the linguistic data in a separate appendix or supplement, and both regularly de-articulate the language consultant from story. This uniformity appears to arrive from the fact that the notable English compilers of New World histories, such as Eden, Hakluyt, and Purchas, derived their model directly from the Spanish explorers, such as Pigafetta, and chroniclers, such as Pietro Martire d’Anghiera. It follows from this that the
earliest Amerindian word-lists in English come directly from the Spanish tradition and that English explorers, such as Francis Drake, and colonists, such as John Smith, would imitate this model.

Regardless of influence, at this stage of linguistic imperialism the arts of empire are at their most rudimentary, consisting only of words in list form produced largely by sailors and settlers. In the following stage, the arts of empire are more fully developed and the two traditions diverge enormously when arriving at the production and publication of Amerindian grammars. Before I deploy a narrative re-articulation of the Amerindian grammars, however, it is important to understand the reasons behind this significant divergence because the results were far reaching and characterized to a large degree the relations between settler communities and indigenous inhabitants. Therefore, to better understand the differences in English and Spanish linguistic imperialism, the following chapter serves as a bridge to my later close reading, a step back from the texts to engage with a number of intertwined historical arguments.
4 The Arts of Empire: Language Sciences and the Colonization of the Americas

4.1 Introduction

Missionary linguists began reducing Amerindian languages to grammar in New Spain in the 1530s and in New England in the 1660s as part of the evangelical missions to convert indigenous communities to Christianity and civilize them through cultural assimilation. The grammatical description of indigenous languages advanced religious assimilation of the Amerindians by facilitating European fluency in Amerindian languages, the creation of alphabetically literate Amerindian converts, and the translation and printing of Christian texts in local and regional languages. Because of the complexity of the endeavour, the grammars did not rely on Amerindian language slaves in the way of word-lists but rather on the full and partial cooperation of fully and partially converted Amerindians. “En tal empresa participaron conjuntamente los hablantes de ellos y buen número de frailes misioneros” (Las primeras gramáticas del Nuevo Mundo 12) [Participating jointly in said project were the (Amerindian) speakers and a good number of missionary friars], write Ascención and Miguel León-Portilla, indicating that the tradition was one built communally – albeit with unresolved tensions and simmering resentments– between European evangelists and Amerindian consultants. The Amerindian-authored literature developing out of the European colonization of the Americas is tremendously lopsided in the colonies and this imbalance appears to depend precisely on the relation between missionaries and Amerindians and their ability to jointly reduce languages to grammar. The presence or absence of mission funds, the abundance or scarcity of religious humanists, and the theological impetus to convert unbelievers all coalesce behind that crucial relationship between the missionary linguist and the native speaker. Despite both English and Spanish
missionary linguistics producing a similar degree of de-articulation of the Amerindian consultant and his or her culture and history, here I attempt to come to grips with the enormous divergence in the productivity of the two linguistic traditions, a fact of the colonization of the Americas that is not explained by the roughly one hundred year difference from the Spanish conquest of New Spain to the English settlement of New England. That is, the Spanish head start does not resolve the problem of both more Amerindian grammars and more Amerindian writers in Spanish America.

It is important to understand in broad terms the imperial legacy and linguistic ideology that de-articulated Amerindian presence in the moment of capturing language. Although the observations here contextualize the efforts of the missionary linguists John Eliot and Francisco Pareja, whose grammars are the focus of the following chapter, here I propose several interlocking historical arguments to explain the divergence in missionary linguistics in the English and Spanish colonies. For despite arriving at a comparable state in the language science of descriptive linguistics, Eliot and Pareja emerged from intellectual and religious backgrounds that contrarily hindered and fostered linguistic projects for cultural assimilation. In Reformation: Europe’s House Divided, Diarmaid MacCulloch gestures to the Puritan neglect of evangelizing the Amerindians, and even notices that Puritan linguist Roger Williams let his ministry and study of Narragansett lapse (540). MacCulloch then contrasts this with the missionary activity in Spanish America and questions the origins of the difference, writing, “[i]t cannot simply be accounted for by the early difficulties of the colonies in surviving at all, or the tensions and cultural incomprehensions between the two societies that sometimes boiled over into open warfare” (540). If not the difficulty of settlement and the problems of political negotiation, what then accounts for the differences?
The structure of this chapter moves from the establishment of a problem (different numbers of colonial Amerindian grammars), to the similarities in the English and Spanish responses, to the dissimilarities in the unfolding of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism. In the first section, I argue that the English tradition of descriptive linguistics in the American colonies is deficient in comparison with the Spanish, that early modern linguistic imperialism has not been adequately studied by English-speaking researchers, and correspondingly that a proper understanding of these propositions can only be arrived at through cross-linguistic comparative research. In the second, both England and Spain shared a Christian heritage that, combined with the intellectual tradition of humanism, formed a linguistic ideology valuing Latin above other languages. This section functions to reveal similarities between the English and the Spanish as a shared linguistic hierarchy structured both Amerindian grammars and Amerindian education. In the third section, the dissimilarities begin to accrue, for although the English and Spanish implemented linguistic imperialism internally in Europe prior to contact with the Americas and although they both had lively traditions in the language sciences, the Spanish were more active in reducing to grammar the non-hegemonic vernaculars in their domain. In the fourth section, I argue that the friars were the primary agents of linguistic imperialism because of their education and religious training, yet the Reformation in England caused the dissolution of the monastic system and the disbanding of the religious Orders there, perhaps the most significant factor in the divergence of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism. I also compare English and Spanish evangelism in New England and New Spain and argue that the Puritan mission was underfunded and poorly positioned institutionally relative to the Catholic mission, which had close ties to the Spanish Crown. In the final section, I demonstrate that the artefacts of
linguistic imperialism are currently being used to revive certain Amerindian languages and thus the tools of colonialism are turned against imperial history.

The images that these interlocking arguments create is one of a robust Spanish linguistic imperial project that antedates the Columbian event and continues unmolested through the social upheavals of the Reformation, next to an image of a more meagre English tradition of linguistic imperialism in the British Isles with their capacity to reduce Amerindian languages to grammar hobbled by the dissolution of the monasteries and the social restructuring that developed from the split with the Catholic Church. These various and interrelated factors go a long way to explain the divergence in the English and Spanish linguistic responses to the problem of language difference in the Americas and prepare us for a close reading of the grammars that represent the second phase of linguistic imperialism.

4.2 The Uneven Advance of Linguistic Imperialism

The English and Spanish colonization of the Americas emerged from opposing sides of the Reformation and subsequently held divergent attitudes toward evangelical missions among the Amerindians and the reduction of their languages to grammar. Although missionary linguistics flourished in Spanish America under a continuous Catholic monarchy, producing hundreds of Amerindian grammars for hundreds of languages before the nineteenth century, it was financially neglected and politically derelict in Anglo America under an English Crown that seesawed between Protestant to Catholic monarchs, resulting in a linguistic tradition that was distinctly anaemic in the seventeenth century. 

50 Nevertheless,

50 Compare the disproportionate number of entries for English and Spanish early modern languages sciences in Europe and the Americas in: Ludewig, Literature of American Aboriginal Languages; García Icazbalceta, Apuntes para un catálogo de escritores de lenguas indígenas de América; Salmon, Language and Society in Early Modern England and The Study of Language in 17th-Century England; Koerner and Niederehe, History of Linguistics in Spain II; Niederehe, Hans-Josef, Bibliografía cronológica de la lingüística, la gramática y la lexicografía del español; Esparza Torres, et al, Bibliografía temática de historiografía lingüística española.
the work of missionary linguists in both Anglo and Spanish America produced what Nicholas Ostler calls “the world’s first tradition of descriptive linguistics” (Empires of the Word 345). The marginality of this historical enterprise in Anglo America is reflected by the marginality its study is accorded by contemporary English literary criticism, while its productivity in Spanish America has sparked long-standing interest among Hispanists. To firmly establish the actuality of the differences it is necessary to first perform a comparative historical analysis of the English and Spanish empires and to add up the numbers of Amerindian grammars from each tradition, a simple measure of interest. In Linguistic Imperialism, Robert Phillipson recommends a similar approach, writing, “It would doubtless be fascinating to undertake a comparative study of the distinctive characteristics of empires, and the role played by language in their establishment and maintenance” (Linguistic Imperialism 31). Before a comparative investigation into the development of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism projects, it is therefore essential to quantify those differences by surveying a collection of studies on missionary linguistics in the early modern Americas.

Indeed, comparing the numbers of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Amerindian grammars indicates unambiguously a relative deficiency in English missionary linguistics. In his limited yet helpful investigation “Sixteenth and Seventeenth Century Grammars,” John Rowe notes that, of the 62 languages for which grammars were first published in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, 25 are in Latin, 21 are in Castilian and just 3 are in English (362).51 The Latin grammars are predominantly for the languages of Eurasia and Africa, the Castilian for the languages of the Americas and the Pacific, and the three English grammars are for French (1521), English (1586), and Massachusett (Wampanoag) (1666)

---
51 Rowe’s study leaves out several grammars that I have located in my own research (named later) and so it should not be regarded as comprehensive, merely as a place to start comparative research. See also, Smith-Stark, “Phonological Description in New Spain” 6; Ordahl Kupperman, “Introduction.” America in European Consciousness 18.
Narrowing in further on the texts that will be the subject the following chapter, Rowe writes, “Only 2 of the American languages are from North America north of Mexico (Timucua and Massachusett)” (362-3), by Pareja and Eliot respectively. Rowe’s research occurred before the development of digital archives and the publication of more extensive studies, such as Niederehe’s *Bibliografía cronológica de la lingüística, la gramática y la lexicografía del español* (1994), and he appears to only have visited archives in England, France, and the United States (364), so it is almost certain that his accounting of Castilian grammars of Amerindian languages is low. For estimates on the printing and availability of Castilian books into England, Thomas Henry provides several figures in “The Output of Spanish Books in the Sixteenth Century” and although he doesn’t categorize by genre his results are nonetheless quite revealing. Citing Konrad Haebler’s early twentieth-century study of the transmission of Spanish works abroad, Thomas writes, “[with] a total output of 800 books for thirty Spanish places in the fifteenth century […] the English Museum has 155 (perhaps 157) for sixteen places, that is, nearly 20 per cent” (75). Later in his essay, he estimates that around thirty percent of printed Castilian books entered the English book market (82) and later still, for a wider view, he writes, “we may roughly estimate […] the full total of sixteenth-century Spanish books printed outside the Peninsula – ignoring the New World – at 900, or about 9 per cent, of those estimated to have been produced in the home district” (88). It is therefore likely that while Rowe’s estimate of English grammars is somewhat precise his estimate of Spanish grammars is inaccurate in the direction of under-representation – a problem that only a broad comparative analysis can resolve.

Other surveys of Spanish grammatical work consistently present higher numbers than Rowe’s and it follows that many Castilian-language studies would not regularly appear in foreign archives. In fact, if we turn to the Hermann Ludewig’s earlier and much larger
study of Amerindian grammars, *Literature of American Aboriginal Languages* (1858), Rowe’s essay appears to grossly underestimate the disparity between the English and Spanish work in descriptive linguistics. Listing the Amerindian languages represented by travel accounts, vocabularies, and grammars, Ludewig lends a view of stark difference, one that is almost night and day: from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the English produced six and the Spanish seventy-one Amerindian grammars.\(^{52}\) Speaking volumes about the contrast between English and Spanish linguistic imperialism, the number of English-language Amerindian grammars is even somewhat inflated when we look closer at their contents. The grammarians include John Eliot, Jonathan Edwards, Thomas Gage, Roger Williams, Thomas Falkner, and one anonymous translator. Naturally, this translation is from Castilian to English. Thomas Gage’s brief twelve-page grammar was written while doing mission work as a Dominican in Spanish America. Falkner’s grammar is similarly only twelve-pages and like Gage’s it merely supplements a more central travel account, *A Description of Patagonia and the Adjoining Parts of South America* (1774). Roger William’s *A key into the language of America* (1643), while invaluable, is not properly a grammar modeled on Latin, but rather a sociological introduction to the language through helpful phrases and cultural touchstones. Of the six English-language Amerindian grammars published from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, then, there are approximately two – Eliot’s *The Indian Grammar Begun* (1666) and Edward’s *Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew Indians* (1788) – that approximate the grammatical descriptions or *artes* of the Spanish missionary linguists.

Surveying the many Spanish *artes*, one is given two impressions: that the Amerindian grammars constituted a generative tradition, because subsequent descriptions could build on

---

\(^{52}\) I have excluded all the unpublished Amerindian grammars that reside in manuscript form in libraries and monasteries in Spanish America. Including these would place the Spanish well above a hundred separate grammars, many describing the same major languages, e.g. Nahuatl, Quechua, Guaraní, Aymara, etc.
earlier ones, and that the friars often considered their grammar a lifework, a monument that
capped their evangelical mission and secured their legacy. Still other scholars affirm this view
and the numbers presented by Ludewig. Jerald T. Milanich identifies at least ninety-five
Amerindian language books printed in Spanish America by 1600 for the sake of evangelism
(*The Timucua* 65). Ostler stresses the incongruity between English and Spanish descriptive
linguistics by adding the following numbers from a later date: “In 1892 the Count of Viñaza
listed 493 distinct languages identified by Spanish linguists in the Americas over three and a
half centuries of research, and the titles of significant documents describing some aspect of
369 of them. In that period 6667 separate authors had produced 1,118 works” (“Social
Roots of Missionary Linguistics” 44). The question is: What historical circumstances and
linguistic ideologies drove such an enormous output of missionary linguistics in Spanish
America while in Anglo America the publication of Amerindian grammars was relatively
minute?53

From the divergence in linguistic activity it follows that the study of linguistic
imperialism in the early modern Americas has become an important topic for Hispanic
studies while in English studies it remains quite overlooked. The foundational series edited
primarily by Otto Zwartjes, *Missionary Linguistics/Lingüística misionera*, is dominated by Spanish
linguistic projects, less so by Portuguese and French, and marginally supported by English –
the focus is on sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Catholic fieldwork out of necessity. In
their outline of the project, Zwartjes and Even Hovdhaugen identify a lacuna in
contemporary research that my investigation responds to, writing, “there exists hardly any
comparative studies attempting to interrelate the grammars written in different languages

53 In part, this question is answered by Pagden’s comparison of the divergent purposes and
justifications of empire held by the English and Spanish in *Lords of All the World*. Pagden does not,
however, relate the developing theories of empire to the question of linguistic imperialism.
(Latin, Spanish, Portuguese, English, French, Dutch, etc.), by missionaries of different orders (Dominicans, Franciscans, Jesuits, etc.), and in different continents” (Introduction 2). While some Puritans successfully missionized in North America during the seventeenth century, such as the Mayhews on Martha’s Vineyard and John Eliot in New England, their projects were isolated, largely independent, constrained by Puritan textual practices, and often financially insolvent. (Both worked within the ambit of Wampanoag speakers.) J. H. Elliott stresses this difference, writing, “the commitment of the Spanish Crown to the missionary enterprise over the course of three centuries underlines one of the sharpest points of difference between Spanish and [English] approaches to colonisation” (Spain, Europe 166). To give some perspective on the scale of the Catholic mission, Pedro Borges Morán in El envío de misioneros a América durante la época española estimates that the Spanish Crown trained and financed 5,000 missionaries in the sixteenth century and 6,000 more by the second half of the seventeenth century, transporting the friars and their religious artefacts to the Americas and the Philippines (40).

After reviewing the literature that canonizes John “Apostle to the Indians” Eliot, such as Cotton Mather’s Magnalia Christi Americana: or, the ecclesiastical history of New-England (1702), I contend that we can only properly understand this area of colonial literature through a comparative approach, for the abundance of descriptive linguistics in Spanish America and its relative scarcity in English America has significant explanatory power. It helps us identify reasons for the development of alphabetic literacy among colonized

---

54 The grammatical descriptions of languages by the religious Orders were not, as one might object, determined by the cultural practices and social organizations of the Amerindian societies themselves. Both Spanish and French friars in consultation with Amerindian speakers produced grammars at the centres and peripheries of colonial power, including near the relatively grammatically unproductive areas of English America. To avoid the charge that I have chosen to compare missionary linguistics from incomparably populated regions, in the subsequent chapter I will analyze two grammars written on the east coast of North America.
Amerindians and the subsequent literary contributions of Amerindian authors in their respective colonial spheres, a position supported by Mignolo’s statement, “the missionaries contributed to the spread of Western literacy by writing hundreds of grammars of Amerindian languages” (*Darker Side* 53). For example, in New Spain, the *Anales de Tlatelolco* were written by anonymous Mexica authors in Nahuatl using the Latin alphabet as early as 1528 (Klor de Alva, “Introduction” xiv). Likewise, the Inca Guaman Poma de Ayala finished his Castilian-language cultural history of Peru *El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno* in 1615. These are but two examples among many – Amerindians have a long history of writing in alphabetic scripts in Spanish America. In contrast, the first text published by an Amerindian in Anglo America (often believed to be Samsom Occom’s *Sermon, Preached at the Execution of Moses Paul* (1772)) is a letter written by Occom’s son-in-law Joseph Johnson published in the Connecticut *Journal* earlier that same year (Brooks, “This Indian World” 23). Although the Spanish began colonizing around a hundred years prior to the English, the first Amerindian-authored texts were written and published in Spanish over two hundred years prior to Occom. The deficient tradition of descriptive linguistics in Anglo America is coextensive with the gap in Amerindian alphabetic writing and publishing and therefore a textual “counter-conquest” was likely more difficult to achieve for Eastern Woodland cultures where cultural assimilation and linguistic imperialism were relatively anemic.

In *The Darker Side of the Renaissance*, Walter Mignolo contrasts the languages of modernity (English, French, and German) with the languages of the early modern (Castilian, Portuguese, and Italian), claiming the northern shift in power lends scientific legitimacy to

---

55 See also Bracken’s “‘In this separation:’ The Non-Correspondence of Joseph Johnson,” in *Theorizing Native Studies.*

56 For a discussion of literacy and counter-conquest in Spanish America, see Mazzotti’s “Continuity vs. Acculturation: Aztec and Inca Cases of Alphabetic Literacy” in *The Language Encounter in the Americas.*
English, for example, and saw Castilian lose power as a knowledge-generating language (ix). The discourse that represents Catholic Europe as unevolved effectively covers over cultural practices that today we would identify as modern or even progressive, such as financing educated specialists to facilitate assimilation through the production of grammars and the translation of cultural histories. Elliott is quick to color this intellectual Black Legend as misrepresentation by reminding us that the Spanish adopted the Gregorian calendar earlier than the English, writing, “in spite of assumptions of later historians […] Protestantism and modernity were not invariably synonymous” (*Empires of the Atlantic* 3). Cañizares-Esguerra likewise notes, “In northern European and Anglo-American consciousness, Spain and Spanish America have been cast as ‘backward’ ever since the seventeenth century,” and adds that English historiography written in the New World is “negligible and derivative” compared to the work of Spanish American creoles (*How to Write the History* 5). This final point is likewise the case of the Amerindian grammars written in English America where missionary linguistics is comparatively feeble. Yet because of the departmental character of academic research, and because his efforts are hardly ever placed in a transatlantic context, a strictly English-language approach to linguistic imperialism in the colonial period makes John Eliot’s admirable yet isolated achievement appear more significant than it actually is. Its solitariness in an otherwise empty field makes it appear monumental.

E. F. K. Koerner calls early modern descriptive linguistics a subfield of Christian evangelism (“Notes on Missionary linguistics” 22). It goes without saying that England’s

---

57 For a summary of the increasing recognition of the contributions to scientific knowledge of Castilian writers in Spain and Spanish America during the sixteenth and seventeenth century, largely attributable to scholars Cañizares-Esguerra and Antonio Barrera-Osorio, see Voigt, *Writing Captivity* 2-4.
complicated divorce from Catholicism had enormous effects in Europe. Yet this sixteenth-century schism in the European spiritual community had, in my understanding, wholly underappreciated effects on the development of linguistic imperialism in the Americas. The changes in the relationship between Crown and Church shaped English colonialism in the New World by displacing a vital institution that functioned to assimilate communities religiously through powerful language technologies: the religious Orders and the monasteries. The disparity in the production of grammars delineated above has roots in the Reformation because the practice of reducing Amerindian languages to grammar was essentially a missionary enterprise. David Armitage characterizes the English as a “post-Reformation empire” that was “above all and beyond all other such polities, Protestant, commercial, maritime and free” (Ideological Origins of the English Empire 65). Although the production of word-lists by explorers, colonists, and historians was a popular tradition in both English and Castilian, the incongruence in the activity of missionary linguists in the respective colonial spheres falls largely within what J. H. Elliott calls the “great divide of the Protestant Reformation” (“Empire and State in English and Spanish America” 373).

We therefore see in this section that the Spanish unequivocally produced more Amerindian grammars than the English during the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries and that at least one English study, while recognizing a disparity in linguistic activity, has grossly underestimated the number of grammars written by friars in the New World. A close look at the English-language descriptive linguistics reveals that the only Amerindian grammars published were those written by deeply religious men, the missionaries Eliot and Edwards. It is for this reason that the field is called “missionary

---

58 An expanded version of this investigation would confront the broad effects of the Reformation on missionary linguistics by comparing the output of non-European grammars by Catholic (Portugal, Spain, France, Italy) and Protestant nations (the Netherlands, England, and Germany [the Holy Roman Empire]).
linguistics” and that the Reformation is central to understanding the historical differences in
English and Spanish linguistic imperialism. However, before looking at the dissimilarities, in
the following section I attempt to describe certain cultural similarities that, in my view,
impeded the spread of the vernacular languages to the Americas.

4.3 Linguistic Ideology: The Shared Background

“Humanist attitudes toward language are in fact essentially pragmatic,” writes
Zamora, continuing, “the study of language was an integral part of the building of an
time” (17). Yet this statement obscures a deeply held linguistic ideology behind a surface
of pragmatism. A historical analysis of the cultural logic behind the English and Spanish
projects to assimilate the Amerindians reveals shared features of linguistic imperialism in the
ey carried on in the early modern Transatlantic that in large part derive from this humanism. The development
of descriptive linguistics in the New World is inseparable from a humanist linguistic ideology
and the cultural attitudes emerging from the Reformation. Despite the religious rupture to
the Latin Church, the English and Spanish shared an intellectual and religious background
that guided their initial responses to the problem of language difference in the Americas.
That shared background was the Latinized view of language that anchored humanism to the
works of classical antiquity combined with a Christian valorization of the languages of the
sacred texts, Latin, ancient Greek, and Hebrew. These traditions influenced the minds of
missionary linguists such that they treated the languages of the Americas in a very particular,
Latinized way. And while there would be no tradition of missionary linguistics without
humanism, I show here how the linguistic ideology that united the English and Spanish
hindered somewhat the spread of the vernaculars, forged certain New World educational
institutions in the Latinate tradition, structured Amerindian grammars through Latin, and
determined what it meant for a language to be simultaneously reduced to grammar and raised to prestige.

Michael Silverstein defines linguistic ideology as “any sets of beliefs about language articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use” (“Language Structure and Linguistic Ideology” 194). To this I would add certain tacit beliefs that (often unknowingly) guide linguistic practices, such as Mignolo’s theory of the letter and, in the preceding chapters, the theory of the word. Through linguistic ideology languages and forms of language transmission are judged hierarchically to have better or worse “natural” qualities (Phillipson, *Linguistic Imperialism Continued* 3). Because missionaries controlled linguistic assimilation efforts, the language instruction that developed in the colonial sphere was initially bound fast to Christian theology and the Latin-focused education of *studia humanitatis*. Andrew Fitzmaurice defines humanism as “the revival of the Greek and Roman disciplines of grammar, rhetoric, history, moral philosophy and poetry,” adding, “[w]orks within the disciplines of the *studia humanitatis* were produced following the classical models” (*Humanism in America* 4-5). This final point shows that not only did humanism shape the “what” of early modern education but also the “how,” as curricula incorporated classical texts and newer works, such as vernacular grammars, followed the classical model.

In New Spain for example, the Franciscans who founded the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco in 1536 had been educated in the universities of Alcalá and Salamanca, institutions “at the forefront of Spanish humanist culture until the mid-sixteenth century” (Cañizares-Esguerra 73). For this reason Latin books prevailed in the library at Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco (Castañeda 58). Humanism as an educational practice held in high esteem grammatical analysis and its functional deployment, and this form of study was rooted in the
imperial prestige language of Latin. Religious scholars on both sides of the Reformation embraced humanism as a restorative educational practice and a linguistic ideology, although not always the consequences of radical philological work. MacCulloch states that both Protestants and Catholics “brought a new concentration on and a new respect for sections of traditional scholarship which medieval universities considered of secondary importance: the non-theological parts of their arts curriculum, especially poetry, oratory, and rhetoric,” adding, “Humanists were lovers and connoisseurs of words” (77; also 83, 85-7). The actions of colonists in regards to language can be understood, therefore, as ideologically motivated solutions for the problem of language difference. The education of missionary linguists fundamentally determined English and Spanish imperial linguistic projects and their unfolding relations to the prestige languages and the vernaculars.

“Gods actions, are our instructions,” writes the anonymous author of *A True Declaration of the Estate of the Colonie in Virginia* (1610), continuing, “[turning] the greatest cursing, into the greatest blessing, and by confusion of tongues, [keeping] them from confusion of states; scattering those clouen people, into as many colonies ouer the face of the earth, as there are diversities of languages” (Force, *Tracts*, 3:4). Christian thought held sway over colonists and the long-held belief that the confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel resulted in 72 languages (Eco, *Search for the Perfect Language* 96) only slowly passed into twilight, in part because of exposure to the multiplicity of languages in the Americas. Attempting to dispel naïve biblical interpretations propagated by the likes of Thomas Thorowgood and John Eliot, Hamon L'Estrange declared, “they say at the Constitution of tongues there were 72 languages, but the Americans have 700 or more” (*Americans no Iewes*
Despite this assertion, biblical interpretations persisted and as late as 1788 Jonathan Edwards demonstrated “some instances between [Mohican] and the Hebrew” (Observations on the Language of the Muhhekaneew). Mere coincidence between substantives in Hebrew and indigenous American tongues were used from the outset to establish the provenance of Amerindian languages and peoples, the dialects of the Americas often cast as the result of linguistic degradation and divine punishment (Gray, New World Babel 24; Bragdon, “Native Languages as Spoken” 175; Elliott, Empires of Atlantic 189). The biblical tale moralizing the problem of language difference however proved a conceptual impediment for Europeans and limited their perception of real language difference.

J. H. Elliott writes of the “uncertain impact” of the Americas in Europe, pondering, “the apparent slowness of Europe in making the mental adjustments required to incorporate America within its field of vision” (Old World and New 8). This slowness is evident in the projects of missionary linguists who, at least initially, insisted on instructing Amerindians in the classical and biblical languages. (Recall that More, a humanist scholar, foreshadowed this process by having Hythloday teach the Utopians ancient Greek.) Grammatical studies in ancient languages were a necessary condition for treating language as an object of analysis and social control and the agents of European linguistic imperialism were by and large religiously devout humanists. Coupled with Christian theology, humanism ideologically guided both English and Spanish assimilation efforts in the Americas, often resulting in
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59 John Eliot wrote the preface to Thomas Thorowgood’s Iews in America (1650) where the author identifies the Amerindians as the lost tribes of Israel, in part based on linguistic similarities. Including the estimate noted above, L’Estrange responded systematically to each of Thorowgood’s claims in Americans no Iews, or Improbabilities that the Americans are of that race (1652). Thorowgood’s final retort was Iews in America, or Probabilities, that those Indians are Judaical, made more probable by some Additionals to the former Conjectures (1660). See Kellaway, New England Company 24; Gray, New World Babel 21.

60 Elliott only slightly mitigates this statement in a later review of the line of investigation developing from his comparative history The Old World and the New in the essay “Final Reflections: The Old World and the New Revisited,” in America in European Consciousness, 1492-1750.
curious linguistic developments in the colonial contact zone, such as Amerindian students rigorously trained in Latin rather than in the vernacular languages. The shared Christian and humanist traditions facilitated the project for linguistic imperialism by providing a model for grammatical study and adult language learning while simultaneously impeding the spread of the vernacular languages by privileging the teaching of Latin to Amerindian students.

English and Castilian began accruing their own prestige in the early modern with the development of literary monuments and legal codes and the expansion of the state over different language communities. Both the English and the Spanish ideally wanted to linguistically assimilate the people of the Americas, though how these new vassals, trading partners, or even hostile neighbors would come to speak the European vernaculars was unclear. In the *Discourse Concerning Western Planting* (1584), Hakluyt makes an early recommendation that English settlers “firste learne the language of the people nere adjoyninge (the gifte of tongues beinge nowe taken awaye)” (*Principal Navigations* XIII: 200; see Cheyfitz 110), although the procedure for this to be accomplished is left entirely to the imagination. Near the same time, the English language spread like manufactured commodities on high-seas trade routes in the poetic imaginary of Samuel Daniel. In *Musophilus* (1599) the title character inquires,

> And who, in time, knowes whither we may vent

---

61 Hans-Martin Gauger locates Castilian’s rise to prestige at the end of the fifteenth century and the beginning of the Siglo de Oro. In the mid-fifteenth century Juan de Mena compares Greek and Latin to the “rudo y desierto” [brutish and desolate] Castilian. In 1651, Jéronima de San Joseph proclaims, “[castellano], viene hoy a exceder a toda la más florida cultura de los griegos y latinos” [[Castilian], now comes to surpass in all the full-flower of Greek and Latin culture] (“La conciencia lingüística del Siglo de Oro” 50). Additionally, Don Quijote praises the vernacular in 1615, stating, “todos los poetas antiguos escribieron en la lengua que mamaron en la leche, y no fueron a buscar las extranjeras para declarar la alteza de sus conceptos; y siendo esto así, razón sería se extendiese esta costumbre por todas las naciones” (*Quixote* 667) [all the poets wrote in the language they imbibed with their mother’s milk and never went in quest of foreign ones to express their sublime conceptions. That being so, the usage should in justice extend to all nations] (*Quixote* 509).
The treasure of our tongue, to what strange shores
This gaine of our best glory shall be sent,
T’inrich vnknowing Nations with our stores? (C vi(a))

The treatment of language as a curious object or commodity resides here in the image of the
English language “venting” onto strange shores from the holds of ships. The polyvalence of
the term “vent” is evocative: to express, to utter, to spend, to explode or fire (like a canon),
and the homologous “to vend,” to give utterance to, and to sell (OED). Both Hakluyt and
Daniels decline to detail a map for linguistic imperialism through either the spread of
English or the learning of Amerindian languages. While Musophilus praises humanist learning
and the supreme power of rhetoric, it offers no clue as to how the “vnknowing Nations”
might be linguistically enriched, except by the appeal of the prestige and “glory” of English.
Greenblatt discovers in Daniel’s poem a “reversal” of the Spanish project, writing, “It is as if
in place of the evang[e]lical spirit[…]Daniel would substitute a linguistic mission, the
propagation of the English speech” (“Learning to Curse” 16). Although Greenblatt correctly
recognizes the humanist tenor of Musophilus – learning and eloquence rooted in a Latinized
literary education – it is inaccurate to suggest that there was any linguistic project in the
European colonies that was separate from the evangelical mission. 62 The future passive tense
of the phrase “shall be sent” begs the fundamental question of the spread of the English
language to the Americas: By whom?

Held to be of exquisite expressiveness by some and practical value by others, the
vernaculars made glacially slow progress among Amerindian communities while the
churchmen and friars coordinated linguistic and cultural assimilation. The Spanish Crown

62 Daniel was nearly prophetic, for the spread of English in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century
Anglo America was never much more systematic than his metaphor suggests, propagated in large
part by farmers through disproportional demographic growth rather than by missionaries (Ostler,
Empire of the Word 537).
enthusiastically anticipated the spread of the Castilian language and, unlike the English, transmitted royal instructions for the education of Amerindian vassals in the vernacular. Time and again, however, these proposals met with, on the one hand, the stubborn practicality of missionary friars and, on the other, the full weight of the linguistic ideology of humanism. In 1550, the Spanish royal court issued a decree, stating,

[...]

Given the progress of the missionary project through local languages and the *lenguas generales* (Amerindian languages with regional coverage and often an imperial legacy), this proposal was virtually ignored by the religious Orders. It was far easier, more effective, and cheaper for the friars to learn the languages of prospective converts than it was to establish educational structures on the scale of industrialized public school systems. In the sixteenth century, then, both the English and the Spanish envisioned a future in which Amerindians spoke their vernaculars, yet the English lacked a clear plan to spread English and the Spanish Crown, despite having its religious representatives in the field, was unable to convince friars of the wisdom of a Castilian-speaking Amerindian population.

Tensions within the empire manifested around problems of language difference. The Church was not entirely disinterested in the promotion of indigenous languages because the clergy grasped power all the tighter by commanding assimilation through Amerindian tongues. Ostler notes, “Maintenance of contact through [...] less accessible languages meant that the priests remained sole effective channel between the pure-blood Indians [...] and the
rest of the world” (366). (For this very reason Lope de Aguirre, in his treasonous letter to Felipe II, condemns the mendicant Orders who “pretende[n] mandar y gobernar todas estas tierras” [Jornada de Omagua y Dorado 138] [expect to control and govern all these lands].)

Regarding the spread of Castilian, Mignolo writes, “hispanizing the Amerindians remained at the level of edicts, royal orders and laws” (“Nebrija in the New World” 195). Linguistic imperialism in Spanish America, therefore, had a distinct character from Phillipson’s recent description of the spread of English in the modern world, when the colonies were systematically educated in the vernaculars spoken in the metropolis (Linguistic Imperialism). To be a language specialist in early modern Europe meant to be educated in Latin grammar and this education created a cultural logic in England and Spain that naturally led to the spread of this ancient prestige language to the Americas, mitigating somewhat the spread of the English and Castilian languages. Adult language learning was at this time inseparable from the study of Latin grammar.

A modern perspective based on a secular education may lead us to question the effectiveness and desirability of teaching Latin, ancient Greek, and Hebrew to Amerindian students when these languages were almost entirely restricted to textual representation and when only small portions of the European population were conversant in them. We must keep in mind, however, that the purpose of education in the early modern period was the cultivation of virtue in the student, a principle derived from Plato’s Republic. Hence the educated clergy taught prestige languages at both the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco in New Spain (founded 1536) and the Harvard Indian College in New England (founded 1656), where Mesoamerican and Eastern Woodland students studied such works as Antonio de Nebrija’s or William Lily’s Latin grammars and learned to form sentences like Cicero. In the production of the sixteenth-century Nahuatl grammar and dictionary, friar Alonso de Molina
relied heavily on the multilingual Texcocan student Hernando de Ribas (Bernasocchi and Galeote 30). As one of the first students at Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco he was, according to Juan Baptista, “very knowledgeable in Latin, and with much ease translated anything from Latin and from Romance into the Mexican language” (qtd. in Smith-Stark 52).

Education at the Harvard Indian College had a similar focus on the biblical and classical languages as a description of curricula prior to its founding attests. In New Englands first fruits (1643), the author(s) describes the “Rules, and Precepts that are Observed in [Harvard]” stating, “When any schollar is able to understand Tully [Cicero] […] and make and speake true Latine in Verse and Prose […] And decline perfectly the paradigms of Nounes and Verbes in the Greek tongue: Let him then and not before be capable of admission into the College” (13). A recent article in the Harvard Gazette reports the recovery of a Latin poem written by a Wampanoag student named Benjamin Larnell, stating, “this young student from a native village near Taunton, Mass., spent time writing verse not only in Latin, but in Greek and Hebrew as well” (Ireland, “Harvard’s Indian College Poet”). Citing a contemporary scholar of Latin pedagogy, the article declares that the Latin poem by Larnell, the last Amerindian student at Harvard in the colonial era, demonstrates that “American Indians were trained in exactly the same way as colonial Puritans.”

Higher education was consequently slow to accommodate the realities of the colonial situation, continuing the formal structure of pedagogy from prior to contact for both Europeans and Amerindians. Mostly educated in Patristics and the trivium of grammar, logic,

---

63 Published anonymously, this text is variously attributed to John Eliot (Lepore 28) and Hugh Peter and Thomas Weld (Freeman 84).
64 This article confusingly calls Larnell “the last student of the colonial era associated with Harvard’s Indian College,” stating that “he died from fever before graduating with the Class of 1716.” The Harvard Indian College is known to have been demolished in 1693, a year before Larnell was born (Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic 75). Nonetheless, his education seems typical.
and rhetoric, the mendicant Orders and their Puritan counterparts initially replicated their
own education for assimilation efforts. Language learning, linguistics practices, and the
nature of language itself were all inexorably linked to a linguistic ideology that was Latinized
and inseparable from Christian doctrine. Perhaps this is what Elliott means by the
“apparent slowness of Europeans to make mental adjustments”? The very newness and
difference of the New World forced colonists to rely heavily on their cultural background.
Consequently we encounter in both Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco and Harvard a *translatio studii*,
the transference of a particularly humanist kind of learning to the colonial sphere that
promoted instruction in grammar, rhetoric, history, moral philosophy and poetry through a
classical corpus that necessitated the learning of Latin.

“The substitution of the printed word and the need for interpretation to supplement
the immediacy of the voice, is one way Christians were able to distinguish their own religion
from that of the heathens” (*Indian Giving* 113), writes Murray. To illustrate the method by
which Amerindian languages were processed by missionaries, we need look no further than
*The Indian Grammar Begun* where Eliot describes “The Art of making words,” which is
achieved, “1. By various articulate sounds. 2. By regularly composing of them” (1). This
passage is rich in the linguistic ideology I am attempting to elucidate. Eliot’s statement
demonstrates a confidence in the word as natural object (despite Wampanoag’s polysynthetic
structure) and the term “composing” intimately binds language to such humanist textual

---

*Arabic was accorded high status because of its written tradition, exemplified by Juan Luis Vives’s desire to construct language learning centers for missionaries to the Moors, writing in a letter, “mi gran deseo sería que se establecieran en la mayoría de nuestras ciudades colegios de lenguas, no solamente de las tres consabidas: latina, griega y hebrea, sino también de la arábiga” [my great desire would be the establishment of language schools in the majority of our cities, not only for the three illustrious ones: Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, but also for Arabic] (qtd. in Zimmerman, “Traducción, Préstamos y Teoría del Lenguaje” 117).*
practices as translation, grammatical analysis, and philology. Conversion proceeded from a combination of preaching and educational efforts and the Amerindian reductions – the “missionary reservations” discussed in the following chapters – likewise relied on the creation of religious curricula in the language of the prospective converts. Thus, missionaries like Eliot and Pareja produced grammars and dictionaries and in doing so transformed and immobilized Amerindian languages in order to redeploy them in evangelical and civilizing efforts. Missionary linguists produced textbooks that were naturally doctrinal, the majority of the earliest Amerindian texts printed in the colonies being prayer books, sermons, and catechisms (Cowan, “Native Languages of North America” 4; Ricard 48; Castañeda 40).

Language arts, religion, print technology, and textuality were all conjoined to form a powerful assemblage for linguistic imperialism in the Americas, what I have been referring to here as the arts of empire.

Missionary linguistics moved Amerindian languages into alphabetic literacy through the production of grammars and lexicons and the translation of sacred texts, a colonial process that distanced Amerindian cultures from their pre-Columbian textual traditions. According to Mignolo, Bernardo José de Aldrete, author of Del origen y principio de la lengua castellana (1606), “recognized religion as the most important ally for maintaining or changing a language” (Darker Side 30; also Elliott, Old World 36). Religion therefore dovetailed with the grammatical studies of humanism to form a powerful ideology for the reduction of Amerindian languages to grammar. In Plain dealing, or Nevves from New-England (1642),

67 We might also argue that in the order of these linguistics expressions, from articulating sounds to composition, there is the assumption of speech preceding writing, much historicized by Jacques Derrida in Of Grammatology. For a discussion of how Derrida’s deconstruction of writing maps onto the nature/culture opposition and its specific deployment in representing Amerindian languages, see Murray, Forked Tongues 16-7.

68 See Mignolo’s discussion of the Incan quipu writing system in Darker Side, 84-7; also Peacock’s discussion of Algonquin wampum belts in “Writing and Speech After Derrida” 84.
Thomas Lechford likewise fuses religion to language, or more precisely, conversion to educational efforts, writing, “He will make it good, that the way to instruct the Indians, must be in their owne language, not English; and that their language may be perfected” (53). Note that the vernacular language was often the third option after Latin and the indigenous languages. What is more, Lechford frames the reduction of an Amerindian language and its use in printed Christian materials as a kind of improvement. The “perfecting” process of creating an orthography, reducing to grammar, and printing religious texts finally results in the language becoming more regular, stationary, and logical. For both Aldrete and Lechford, perfection not only signified a language’s reduction to grammar but also the raising of that language to sacred writing. We therefore find that in the unfolding of English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the Americas, the classical European languages of Latin, ancient Greek, and Hebrew as well as the more prestigious and useful Amerindian languages inhibited the spread of the European vernaculars through educational institutions.

In “Colonial Linguistics” Joseph Errington highlights the ideological underpinnings of missionary linguistics and certain secondary social effects generated by “bring[ing] the Indian Language into Rules” (Eliot, Indian Grammar, Title). Noting that missionary linguistics was “grounded in institutions” that “legitimized simple views of enormously complex situations,” Errington argues that sources of linguistic certainty were “bound up with enabling ideologies about hierarchies of languages” (20). The erasure of complexity is present in the Latinized model deployed for reducing a language to grammar. Mignolo critiques the use of Latin as the language structuring Amerindian grammars, which he argues is the result of the “ontological dimension” of the Latin alphabet for missionary linguists (Darker Side 46). Many of the Amerindian grammars begin by acknowledging that the language consists of eight parts of speech like Latin, for example, Pareja’s description of
Timucua, “[l]as partes de la oracion son ocho” [there are eight parts of the sentence] (Arte de la lengua Timucvana 8). Using Latin grammar to structure languages of wildly different morphosyntactics naturally resulted in the erasure of difference and the forced approximation of Amerindian to European languages.

Smith-Stark attenuates this representation by insisting that missionary linguistics rapidly evolved and noting the innovation of scripts and typefaces for tonal languages and phonemes unknown to Indo-European languages (“Phonological Description” 8, 12-3). Pareja provides us with an example again when he notes the difference between the use of the infinitive in Latin and Timucua (86). Nonetheless, Errington calls the ideological character of Latin part of a “theolinguistic hierarchy,” writing, “[a]s a Truth-language, metonymically bound up with the transcendent message it conveyed, Latin legitimized these descriptive projects both as means and ends for propagating faith” (22). The role of Latin in structuring languages extended even to the European vernaculars for centuries, especially in the case of English, as I explain in a later survey of the European language sciences. What is more, particular dialects of English were treated as less prestigious, leading the colonial historian Robert Beverly to excuse his rustic English prose with a revealing analogy: “I am an Indian, and don’t pretend to be exact in my Language” (History of Virginia 8). The conflation of “Indianness” with linguistic imprecision exemplifies the desire to bring languages up to the prestige of Latin or the imperial dialect. It would be remiss in all this, however, to charge the missionary linguists with an ideology divorced of practice, for Latin was not only sacred but also the primary language for the study of grammar itself. Grammatical study was Latin study.

Like the Great Chain of Being descending from God down to the angels, humans, birds, fish, land animals, and plants (Valadés, Rhetorica christiana 222), the hierarchical chain of
languages descended from the trinity of Latin, ancient Greek, and Hebrew down to the European vernaculars, the written Amerindian *linguas generales*, and down further still to the unwritten languages of smaller Amerindian societies. The linguistic ideology of the religious humanists ordered languages within a hierarchy that positioned the “unimproved” languages of the Americas as the last link in the chain. For example, in *Apologética historia sumaria* (ca. 1550) Las Casas creates a taxonomy of barbarism that is a clear statement of linguistic ideology that sets Latin at the top of a hierarchy of languages. His four types of barbarians are summarized as: 1) those displaying animal-like social behavior, such as ferociousness or a lack of reason; 2) those lacking a writing system and a linguistic descent from Latin; 3) those lacking basic forms of governance; 4) those lacking true religion (645-54, emphasis mine).

Such an engrained sense of the natural quality and historical legacy of the prestige languages could not but interfere in the spread of the vernacular languages in the Americas, yet Las Casas also signals that certain Amerindians, such as the Mexica, are more civilized and consequently their languages more prestigious.

Reducing a language to grammar had the effect of moving it up the language chain. Molina’s work, for example, is leveraged on the prestige of the Mexican empire, for the dialect he reduces (with the help of Hernando de Ribas) is that which “se vsan aqui en Tetzcuco y en Mexico, que es donde mejor y mas curiosamente se habla la lengua” [is used here in Texcoco and Mexico, which is where it is best and most carefully spoken] (*Vocabulario en lengua castellana y mexicana* 6). The printing of a Nahuatl grammar and dictionary combined with the Mexica imperial legacy to raise Nahuatl in the hierarchy of languages, leading friar Rodrigo de la Cruz to call it in 1550 “an extremely elegant language, as elegant as any in the world” in a letter to Charles V (qtd. in Ricard 50). The fixing of a local dialect as the proper, most eloquent, “best,” or “most careful” manifestation of a
language has significant effects for language spread and language “improvement” or “perfection.” The collateral effects of the missionary linguistics therefore extended to language itself, for the reduction to grammar of specific Amerindian dialects had ideological repercussions, as suggested by Molina and de la Cruz’s valorization of Texcocan and Tenochtitlan Nahuatl.

Edward Gray notes that, given the “seeming linguistic confusion of the region,” doubts about the usefulness of an “Indian Library” in Wampanoag were raised (New World Babel 66). Echoing Phillipson’s observation that missionary linguistics plays a structural role in the colonies (Linguistic Imperialism 128), Eliot responded to these doubts in a letter to Richard Baxter in 1669, claiming “these books will be a meanes to fix, and to extend this language” (Some unpublished correspondence 454), suggesting that different Amerindian nations were anticipated to assimilate to the written version of Wampanoag. Eliot provides three reasons for privileging this dialect: 1) “the Massachusett and Narragansett Sachems have held a very vast imperiu[m] over all parts, far and neere;” 2) regarding wampum, he states, “Narragansett Bay is the principal, if not the only place in all this country, where [tha]t shellfish is found, of w[hi]ch shells they make their jewels and mony of great value;” and finally, the geographical attractiveness of the bay means, “these p[ar]ts we[re] places of great resort fro[m] all p[ar]ts and their language desirable” (454-5). Reminiscent of both Nahuatl and Quechua, Eliot reduced to grammar an imperial dialect that is central to the production of specie and is a geographical omphalos, all centrifugal factors drawing other dialects within its orbit. Eliot ends his argument, writing, “Thus, by the overruling p[ro]vidence of God, the Bible is in the finest language to be spread over all the country.”

The practice of isolating lingua francas begins in the sixteenth century, as noted by Ostler above (Empires of the Word 345), when Catholic friars described Amerindian languages
grammatically and promoted them as *lenguas generales* (Errington 29). The variety of Quechua standardized under Spanish rule was, according to Errington, “legitimized by chronotopic associations with Cuzco, that empire’s former sacred political center” (28). The valorization of an imperial heritage extended appreciation to the pre-Columbian empires. Missionary linguists identified the privilege of imperial space in the Cuzco dialect and thrust it into a higher orbit through alphabetic written publication (grammars, catechisms, confessionaries) and oral dissemination (proselytization, court proceedings). It is in this sense that certain Amerindian languages were caught up in imperial linguistics, because their reduction to grammar was very often not for the sole purpose of converting a specific culture so much as for a broader evangelical mission to nearby linguistic communities, who would find the adoption of a *lengua general* easier than the learning of an entirely unrelated Indo-European language. The diffusion of a geographically limited dialect or even a more regionally dominant *lengua general* is a feature of imperial linguistics that is distinct from more modern expressions of imperial linguistics in which the parent country exports its vernacular. The *lenguas generales* spreading under Spanish rule complicates the rudimentary structure of power divided between the imperial centre and the colonial periphery by making more intricate hierarchical relations of imperial space, with linguistic peripheries in the centre (such as the Basque Country in Spain) and linguistic centres in the periphery (such as Cuzco and Tenochtitlán in the Americas) (Phillipson, *Linguistic Imperialism* 52).

I have shown that the English and Spanish published missionary linguistics at a massively disparate level and that their shared linguistic ideology produced an automatic
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69 However, when imperial forces are divided and missionary linguists simultaneously target a number of dialects in close proximity, the opposite process may develop. Errington discovers this exact problem in twentieth century Africa where, “By 1930, Protestant and Catholic missions had produced three mutually distinct languages within their territorially delimited spheres of spiritual influence” (Errington 24).
response to the language problem in the Americas, driving them to teach Amerindians Latin despite the impracticality of it. Latin, the prestigious Amerindian languages, and the *lenguas generales* all combined to mitigate the spread of both English and Castilian in the New World by diverting resources. It is in these considerations that the English and Spanish experience was similar. The rest of this chapter is dedicated to exploring their dissimilarities.

4.4 Pre-Contact Language Sciences and Policies

Prior to the colonization of the Americas and the work of the missionary linguists, there existed in England and Spain traditions of language policy and language sciences, and while both nations demonstrated a concern for linguistic unity between monarch and vassals, the Spanish state was historically more active in promoting the reduction of non-hegemonic languages within its domain. Traditions in language policy and languages sciences had a direct impact on the development of linguistic imperialism in the New World and here I argue for a distinctly uneven development in England and Spain before the colonization of the Americas. Because I am inevitably interested in the relations between *translatio imperii* and *translatio studii* in regards to the Americas, it is important to understand the intellectual and political context from which England and Spain launched their linguistic imperial projects. J. H. Elliott defines *translatio imperii* as “the process by which supremacy pass[es] from one people to another” (Spain, Europe 136), to which Cheyfitz adds the definition of *translatio studii* as “transferral of learning” (Poetics of Imperialism 111). The unity of these concepts resides in the phrase “the arts of empire,” for if we understand the language arts – be they word-lists or grammars – as extending the domain of the imperial centre then the *translatio studii* that saw the transmission of the humanist learning and missionary linguistics to the Americas is part and parcel with the *translatio imperii* that saw the westward shift of imperial power away from Rome to the Atlantic littoral nations of England, Spain, and France.
Before Colón ever kidnapped a Taino in the interest of linguistic imperialism, however, Spain already had a history of endorsing the use of Castilian to unite the diverse linguistic communities of the Iberian Peninsula. On the cusp of the Columbian event Nebrija’s vernacular and Latin grammars fortified a vigorous tradition of descriptive linguistics that was transported intact to the Americas and the Pacific. Rowe writes, “[t]he first printed grammar of a natural language other than Latin and ancient Greek was the Spanish one by Elio Antonio de [N]ebrija” (361), which Even Hovdhaugen attributes to motives that “were a combination of pedagogical and nationalistic ones” (“Missionary Grammars” 11). With the publishing of Nebrija’s *Gramática castellana* (1492), the opening shot in the age of vernacular grammar was made, initiated with the infamous epithet, “siempre la lengua fue compañera del imperio” (3) [language was always the companion of empire].

Translation studies in the Iberian Peninsula stretch back to the twelfth century when Christians conquered the Moorish city of Toledo where a “tradition of translation from Arabic into Latin began […] and continued more or less down to the times of Alfonso el Sabio” (Dunlop, “Work of Translation at Toledo” 55). Here resided the loose and shifting cohort of scholars known as the Toledo School of Translators who helped reintroduce Aristotle to the west. At the time of contact with the Americas, Spain therefore already had several centuries of a tradition of translation integrated into the Christian expansion of the *Reconquista* (Zimmerman, “Traducción, Préstamos y Teoría del Lenguaje” 117). Translation
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70 Many scholars use this introductory expression from Nebrija’s *Gramática castellana*, as well as the statement given upon its presentation to Queen Isabel by the Bishop of Ávila that “language is the perfect instrument of empire” (qtd. in Greenblatt, “Learning to Curse” 17), in order to emphasize the European empires’ consciousness of the importance of the language sciences in colonization. Phillipson, for example, draws a direct line of influence all the way from fifteenth-century Spain in the Americas to nineteenth-century Britain in India (*Linguistic Imperialism* 31). It is my strong conviction that these characterizations blur the differences between the English and Spanish conquests, making early English linguistic imperialism seem as coherent and robust as the Spanish, which is plainly and demonstrably false. See also, Jehlen, “Literature of Colonization” 56; Hulme, *Colonial Encounters* 1; Lepore, *Name of War* xiv; Mignolo, “Nebrija in the New World” 194.
from Arabic to Latín or Castilian on the advancing edge of Christian dominion unified the *translatio imperii et studii*.

The history of the promotion of the Castilian language throughout the Iberian Peninsula is dated to the reign of Alfonso X (1252-1284) and the publication of the *Siete partidas* (ca. 1265), which David Rojinsky describes as “a law code that not only illustrated the official acceptance of Castilian as a language of government, but also demonstrated the emergence of vernacular writing as a regulatory *practice* designed to exert socio-juridical control over repopulated spaces and peoples” (*Companion to Empire* 65). Compiled by a group of jurists, the *Siete partidas* was instrumental in establishing a literary and legal pedigree for the Castilian language, referred to by Alfonso as “our Latin” (60). This was an important step toward the making of the Spanish language, for prior to the rise of Castilian the Iberian Peninsula was home to the languages of Basque, Catalan, Arabic, Aragonese, Leonese, and Galician, as well as blends like Ladino and Mozarabic.

Although it strove to avoid the linguistic and cultural degradation of its colonists in Ireland, the English Crown was not nearly as active in stimulating the reduction of the non-hegemonic languages of the English Isles. The language ecology was similarly diverse in the British Isles where Welsh, Cornish, and Irish and Scottish Gaelic were spoken.71 While the Spanish were in the long process of the Reconquista, the English were “planting” or colonizing in Ireland, and in 1366 we have an early example of imperial linguistic policy in *The Statutes of Kilkenny* (see Ostler, *Empires of the Word* 464-5; Elliott, *Spain, Europe* 156). Two things stand out about this policy under Edward III: first, the statutes are directed at the colonizing planters with the aim of keeping them from “going native” and adopting the
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71 This is not to mention the plethora of English dialects spoken on the island, a problem noted by Chaucer in *Troilus and Criseyde* when he writes to his “littel booke,” “And for ther is so gret diuersite / In English and in wrytyng of our tonge / So prey I god that non miswrite the, Ne the mysymetre for defaute of tonge” (1793-6).
Gaelic language and customs (as happened with the Hiberno-Normans); second, while it attempts to establish English as the hegemonic language, the statute is written in Norman-French (see Crowley, “Colonialism and Language” 174). Article III of the Statutes, for example, holds that any Englishman who uses the Irish language may have his estate seized by his immediate lord until he sufficiently learns to speak the English language, at which point his estate would be returned (A Statute). This legislation yokes the English language to civilization, implicitly recognizes the limited hegemony of the Norman-French as largely restricted to legal code, and structures society according to language by threatening the seizure of land and domicile. It does not, however, establish an institutional process by which the Irish would be instructed in English.

The publication of the Act for the English Order, Habit and Language (1537) under Henry VIII likewise addresses the problem of language difference in the Irish plantations, England’s testing ground for empire. Once more, the law endeavoured to cement the linguistic unity of the metropolitan centre within the colonial periphery and to protect the planters from linguistic and cultural degeneration: “there is again nothing which doth more contain and keep many of [the king’s] subjects of [Ireland], in a certain savage and wild kind and manner of living, than the diversity that is betwixt them in tongue, language, order and habit” (qtd. in Crowley 174). Imperial logic holds that a diversity of tongues fosters disorder and linguistic ideology structures the hierarchy of languages, which is evident here.

72 In The Ideological Origins of the English Empire, Armitage argues that the study of the second English Empire unfortunately “has encouraged the separation of the history of Britain and Ireland from the history of the Empire itself” (3). Elliott similarly sees Ireland as an English testing ground for empire in “The Seizure of Overseas Territories by the European Powers” (146-7). See also Canny, “The Ideology of English Colonization: From Ireland to America.”

73 In the reign of Henry VIII, parson John Moreman, following the Acts of the English Order, refused his parishioners the Lord’s Prayer in Cornish, much to their chagrin. A later petition to Edward VI makes this clear. The solicitors state, “we the Cornish, whereof certain of us understand no English, do utterly refuse the new service” (Jenner, A Handbook of the Cornish Language).
in the association of the Irish language with savagery and an animal way of life. (These attitudes place the English in line with the Bishop of Avila’s representation of foreign vassals as “barbarians who speak outlandish tongues” [qtd. in Mignolo, “Nebrija in the New World” 194]). Ireland formed the initial site for the westward expansion of the English and therefore presents many of the salient features of linguistic imperialism that the Americas would centuries later. Vivian Salmon notes that some of the earliest work of Protestant missionaries from England was in Ireland where “attempts were made to convert the Catholic Irish, either by teaching them to understand the English catechism and liturgy or, in a later development, by studying Irish and translating the sacred books into the vernacular,” while adding the caveat, “[t]he most important linguistic texts produced by English missionaries came from the New World” (“Study of Foreign Languages” 179). As the Spanish confronted the native Moorish culture and the Arabic language on the Iberian Peninsula, the English similarly clashed with the Irish, and through language policies both attempted to maintain linguistic cohesion between the centre and the periphery of their domains.

We also find in the Act for the English Order and the Siete partidas a similar concern for the establishment of an imperial language to unite various peoples under one law, one language, and one religion.74 A transitional period for the vernacular languages of Europe, one perceives here a language hierarchy that is somewhat malleable, allowing for the promotion of Castilian to the level of Latin, in the case of Spain, and English to the level of Norman-French, in the case of England – a shifting in linguistic hegemony that generally resulted in the ascension of the vernaculars up the chain. Although these documents suggest that both England and Spain moved inexorably toward the promotion of the vernaculars and direct policy engagement with other linguistic communities, the path toward efficient

74 Perhaps tellingly, many of the early grammars were designated as lex gramatica [grammatical law] (Hovdhaugen 11).
and effective linguistic imperialism was not without obstacles. Linguistic projects in the Americas had still to contend with the legacy of the European prestige languages (Latin, ancient Greek, and Hebrew), the classification of Amerindian languages as pagan and savage, and above all the dependence of descriptive linguistics on funding through Church, Crown, and charity.

Besides language policies, did England and Spain both actively pursue the reduction of non-hegemonic languages to grammar within their borders? A brief survey of descriptive linguistics in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century England and Spain will expand the image I have been drawing here. Spain presents a special case in regards to vernacular grammars and descriptive linguistics in the early modern period. Nebrija’s Castilian and Latin grammars are widely recognized as influencing the missionary linguists in New Spain and elsewhere. While there is some dispute as to which _arte_ was more important to the missionaries (the Castilian or the Latin), there is no disputing the fact that these works were shipped to the New World in large numbers. Bernasocchi and Galeote note that twenty copies of the _Gramática castellana_ were shipped to Hispaniola in 1513 and another 347 copies were shipped to Mexico during the sixteenth century (Introduction 23). In just two inventories from ships carrying missionaries to the New World, Borges Morán records the presence of 36 _artes_ and two _vocabularios_, though it is unclear whether the _artes_ are the Castilian or the Latin (427-8). The development of the Castilian adjective _nebrijense_ should give us some indication of the influence of Nebrija on grammarians of the early modern and beyond, regardless of whether the Castilian or Latin grammar proved more significant.
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75 Quoting Irving A. Leonard, Bernasocchi and Galeote claim, “Un estudio de todos los documentos de embarque […] probaría seguramente que llegaron a las Indias Españolas más ejemplares de [la _Gramática castellana_] que de ninguna otra” [A study of all embarkation documents…would certainly prove that more copies of the _Gramática castellana_ arrived in the Spanish Indies than any other] (Tesoro Castellano del Primer Diccionario 22). This demonstrates the seriousness with which the language problem was addressed there.
From the beginning of the sixteenth century, both inside and outside the Iberian Peninsula, the Spanish monarchy made efforts to reduce to grammar the languages spoken by non-hegemonic communities. As Castilian ascended to prestige and state sponsorship, Nebrija’s grammars informed Pedro de Alcalá’s *Arte para ligeramente saber la lengua arábiga* [Grammar for the easy learning of Arabic] (1507) and Gabriel Busa’s Latin-Catalan dictionary (150) (Rowe 372; also Bernasocchi and Galeote 25). Given the history of Sephardic Jews in Iberia, Nebrija also published a treatise on the correct pronunciation of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, titled *De vi ac potestate litterarum* [On the Pronunciation of Letters] (1503) in Salamanca (Percival, “Reception of Hebrew in Sixteenth-Century Europe” 25). Although studied unsystematically at the beginning of the eighteenth century by friar Martín Sarmiento, Enlightenment thought and metropolitan prejudices led to Galician being ignored grammatically as a rustic, pseudo-language, neither fully Portuguese nor fully Castilian (Fernández, “La ‘selección de norma’ para el gallego” 325). Basque received fairly late attention, with Jesuit Manuel Larramendi’s *El imposible vencido* (1729). What this indicates is an effort to use language technologies to create fluent speakers of and translators for foreign languages spoken by hostile or subject nations, from the Toledo School of Translators to the *Siete partidas* to Alcalá’s Arabic grammar published shortly after the fall of Moorish Grenada. But languages that were closely related to Castilian and spoken by Christian communities, such as Galician, were not so urgently reduced to grammar. Even though Catalán was reduced to grammar fairly early, it was done in service of the study of Latin, such that Lorenzo Cendrós’s *Gramatica cathalana breu i clara* (1675) served to support the more comprehensive *Gramática y apologia de la llengua cathalana* (1813) by Josep Pau Ballot i Torres. Nevertheless, Nebrija’s production of a vernacular grammar precipitated a significant amount of descriptive language science during the reconquest of the Iberian Peninsula and
the conquest of the Americas, a fact that has formed a cornerstone of Hispanist Walter Mignolo’s critique of Spanish linguistic imperialism.76

The English were less consistent in the grammatical description of the non-hegemonic languages of the British Isles. Just as many of the Spanish grammars deferred to Latin and the Nebrijense tradition, John Wallis’s *Grammatica Linguae Anglicanae* (1653) is a grammar of English written entirely in Latin, although it does defer almost entirely to the structure of vernacular itself (Rowe 365; also Gray, *New World Babel* 44). For an English equivalent to Nebrija’s *Gramática castellana*, we find William Bullokar’s vernacular *Bref Grammar for English* (1586) to be a work that seems typical of the variance in English and Spanish language sciences, for Bullokar’s efforts to reduce English to grammar and to standardize English orthography were purely private affairs. Vivian Salmon describes his grammar, writing, “[it is] noteworthy as being the first grammar of English ever to be published, but his description of English is heavily dependent on Latin grammar” (“William Bullokar”). Despite the powerful influence of Latin, Salmon also notes that Bullokar made several observations unique to English grammar. We therefore find that England lagged behind Spain in the production of vernacular grammars and that – unlike the court-appointed Nebrija – language studies came from outside the royal court.

The reduction to grammar of the non-hegemonic languages of the English Isles is a slow and uneven business. The Welsh Protestant William Salesbury published *A Dictionary in Englyshe and Welshe* (1547) and later a phonetic guide to Welsh titled *A Briefe and a Playne*
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76 Mignolo critiques the imposition of Latin grammar on Amerindian languages, which he traces to the linguistic ideology of Nebrija, but Rowe’s much earlier investigation is more lenient, noting that Latin structured all grammatical investigations in the early modern for practical reasons, writing, “[t]he Latinizing tendency was very strong, but it should not be exaggerated” (365). Although “the methods of grammar writing then in effect obscured the structural diversity of the languages described” (364), the earliest grammars, beginning with Nebrija’s, “made an attempt to describe at least some features of the language in their own terms” (365).
Introduction (1550). Salesbury was active in translating the Bible into Welsh, but the Welsh-English formula of his dictionary suggests that it functioned to instruct the Welsh in English and not the other way around (Jones, “William Salesbury”). He did not reduce Welsh to grammar and only seventy years later did Protestant minister John Davies publish a Welsh grammar in Latin in 1621 (Salmon, “Foreign Languages in 17th-Century England” 183). (Although Rowe does not recognize this last grammar in his study, this oversight in the English tradition and his lack of access to the Spanish archive regardless exhibit a far more robust Spanish tradition of descriptive linguistics.) As Elena Díaz Rubio and Jesús Bustamante García write, “antes de las primeras gramáticas de holandés e inglés, se imprimieron gramáticas de cuatro lenguas americanas – […] tarasco, quechua, náhuatl, y zapoteco” (“La alfabetización de le lengua náhuatl” 189) [before the first grammars of Dutch and English, grammars for four American languages were printed – […] Tarascan (Purépecha), Quechua, Nahuatl, and Zapotec].

J. Smith’s Grammatica Quadrilingus, or, Brief Instruction for the French, Italian, Spanish, and English Tongues (1674) marks a definite departure from the English tradition’s entrenchment in Latin. Certain features of the Latinizing tradition persist in the grammar, however, for each language’s section begins at the pronunciation of the letters in the “Quintilian method” by which “he who would reduce to art some language should first know if some of the letters in use are superfluous and, on the contrary, if some are lacking” (Smith-Stark 11; see also Mignolo, Darker Side 46). (The Quintilian method is de rigueur in the Spanish Amerindian grammars and even Eliot’s The Indian Grammar Begun.) A late entry, this example from the English language sciences indicates a focus on languages of power relevant to international politics and trade. The scholarly series English Linguistics, 1500-1800 has many valuable works demonstrating an active community of English writers engaging with the problem of
language difference. Here we encounter grammars of Anglo-Saxon in Latin (1689), a keen interest in English orthography, some concern for hegemonic languages like French and Spanish, yet scant evidence that language specialists were eager to describe the vernacular languages of the British Isles before the eighteenth century. There are John Minsheau’s *A Dictionarie in Spanish and English, A Spanish Grammar, and Pleasant and Delightful Dialogues* in Castilian and English from the 1590s when Spanish was fashionable in the Elizabethan court (Elliott, *Spain, Europe* 28). In regards to the conquered communities at home, Salesbury appears to be the exception – although “above all he was Welsh” (Jones “Salisbury”). An English grammar for Scottish Gaelic was not to come out until William Shaw’s *An Analysis of Gallic Language* (1778).

Regarding English orthography in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, Nicholas Hudson divides the movements into two camps: the Institutionalists, who desired to fix language from above and the Organicists, who favoured a *laissez faire*, evolutionary development from below (*Writing and European Thought* 92-118). In an outcome that is telling of English imperial linguistics, the later camp prevailed. The English Crown’s *laissez faire* attitude toward orthography appears to extend in a general way to language technologies as a whole, given their lack of institutional support for a fixed orthography and vernacular grammars in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. While both Bollukar in *Booke at Large* (1580) and Nebrija in *Reglas de ortografía* (1517) attempted to standardize their respective orthographies, Nebrija’s relationship with the Spanish Crown was generously supported – the Bishop of Ávila handed his grammar to Queen Isabel – and in contrast Bollukar’s “work received no endorsement from his contemporaries” (Salmon, “William Bollukar”). It is for this reason that Salmon despairs for the project, writing, “[i]t is a pity that such a dedicated
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77 Rowe also fails to count this English grammar from the sixteenth century. Nevertheless, his sketch conforms roughly to the picture of early modern European grammars.
scholar should have spent so much time and effort on the reform of English orthography, which has remained to this day a lost cause.”

So as not to ignore entirely a history of interventions by Amerindian sovereigns into language technologies, I want to briefly draw attention to one instance of pre-Columbian Amerindian language policies. Ido-pictograms were regarded in Mexico as a force capable of safeguarding or threatening social stability through their capacity to represent the past, and therefore the *amoxtli* or codices were of supreme political importance. Francis Jennings notes that, according to Bernardino de Sahagún’s *Florentine Codex*, the Mexica ruler Itzcoatl had many ancient books burned in 1430 because they contained knowledge that was considered dangerous to his rule and political legitimacy (*Founders of America* 96, 108). What this act demonstrates is an attitude not entirely unlike the Spanish who, upon arrival, burned many Amerindian texts because of their presumed demonic associations, such as in the infamous case of Diego de Landa burning the Mayan codices (Rojinsky 212; Todorov 201-2). The actions of Itzcoatl also suggest that the Mexica believed that their *amoxtli* served an ideological function, because the ruler, upon having the ancient records destroyed, then ordered new codices to be written in exaltation of his reign. Although not containers of the word, or what León-Portilla calls “escritura completa” [full writing], these texts nonetheless are language technologies because they were augmented through an oral tradition, as León-Portilla describes, “la oralidad […] se vinculaba estrechamente con el contenido de los codices, inscripciones y pinturas” [the oral tradition […] was intimately bound to the content of the codices, inscriptions and paintings] (*El destino de la palabra* 13). Thus, Itzcoatl’s policy of book burning is an example of an internal language policy through which the sovereign of the Mexica nation sought to fortify his position ideologically and politically.
Despite Itzcoatl’s censorship, and despite the Spaniards’ multiple aggressions against pre-Columbian Amerindian literature for political and religious motives, León-Portilla thoroughly demonstrates the perseverance of Nahua writing under such indigenous authors as Alvarado Tezozómoc, who accomplished the transfer “de la oralidad y el contenido de los codices, a la escritura alfabética” [of the oral tradition and the content of the codices, to alphabetic writing] (6) in the late-sixteenth and early-seventeenth centuries. This short discussion of language policy in the pre-Columbian Americas indicates that concerns about language and linguistic technologies were not isolated to the European colonizers and that these concerns may be typical of expansive regimes whose domains comprise a multitude of linguistic communities.

The history of grammatical studies in the British Isles and Iberian Peninsula indicates that despite both kingdoms residing in territories with rich linguistic ecologies and despite both England and Spain addressing language difference within their domains through policy, the Spanish ultimately took a more active approach than the English in reducing non-hegemonic languages to grammar for the purposes of rule. Although the language sciences were productive in England during the same period, a brief survey of the publication history suggests that they were deployed less purposefully for the learning of living, non-hegemonic languages. The Spanish approach was quite distinctly characterized by a long tradition of translation studies developing out of the Reconquista, strong institutional support from the Crown and Church, and a robust grammatical tradition in both Latin and Castilian directed toward the study of non-hegemonic languages for the purposes of evangelism and dominion.

4.5 The Monastic Tradition and Imperial Expansion

In Reformation: Europe’s House Divided, MacCulloch notes that the violent schism of Europe’s religious community had profound significance for newly colonized lands, writing,
“[a]t the same time as Latin Christian Europe’s common culture was falling apart, Europeans were establishing their power in the Americas” (xxii). Although a shared linguistic ideology helps explain certain similarities in the treatment of Amerindian languages, the altered relations between Church and Crown precipitating from the Reformation are fundamental to understanding the differences in English and Spanish linguistic imperialism in the Americas. Even though they had a long intellectual and religious tradition that concentrated language studies in the monasteries, the Reformation in England caused cultural and institutional differences to erupt that damaged the English Crowns’ ability to deploy language specialists to the Americas. Where evangelism is divorced from crown policy and finance, humanist exhortation would appeal to the public for the funding of missions. We therefore find in the English colonization of North America the dissociation of evangelism from Crown policy and the concomitant missionary dependence on charitable donation and corporate entities. During the same period in which Henry VIII distanced England from the papacy, the Catholic Monarchs Fernando and Isabel drew Spain so close to Rome under the *patronato real* system as to resemble the Church itself.\(^{78}\) The institutional estrangements of the Reformation explain the feebleness of the linguistic component of English expansion while the concessions of the Catholic Church to the Spanish Crown likewise illuminate the robustness of their project for linguistic imperialism in the Americas. Above all other institutions, it is the presence or absence of the monasteries and the mendicant Orders that explicates the discrepancy in the productivity of missionary linguistics in early modern Anglo and Spanish Americas.

\(^{78}\) Anthony Pagden writes, “The Spanish empire in America not only began in this way with the explicit authority of the Papacy. It was also conducted […] very largely as a Church-State venture. So close was this relationship during the early phase of colonization that between 1516 and 1518 the Island of Hispaniola was governed directly by the Hieronymite order which had itself been a creation of King Alfonso XI of Castile” (*Lords of All the World* 32).
Very early in the history of European monasticism literacy became obligatory, exemplified in Rule 139 for the monasteries established in Egypt in the late fourth-century by Pachomius, which reads, “The fundamentals of a syllable, the verbs and nouns shall be written for him and even if he does not want to, he shall be compelled to read” (qtd. in Greenblatt, *Swerve* 24). Literacy and language study were henceforth centered on the monasteries and convents and prior to Gutenberg’s movable type printing press the monastic scribes were the engine of the European book industry. Regarding European educational practices in the late medieval and early modern periods, David Knowles writes, “the only permanent depositaries of the resources of culture were the monasteries,” adding, “[the friars] desired to use educational resources at their command so as to influence the greatest possible number” (*Monastic Order in England* 487-8). The focus of education in the monasteries would shift over the course of the medieval period in England, for example, to strictly literary and historical pursuits, eventually leaving theology, philosophy, and law to the universities. Knowles writes: “In the first two periods [600 - 1154 c.e.] […] the monasteries had to all intents and purposes a monopoly of learning in England; in the last [1154 - 1216 c.e.], the initiative had passed from them to the schools and the universities” (493; also MacCulloch 90). With the expansion of the *studia humanitatis* the rigorous study of Latin and Greek became more common and by the 1300s most monasteries were required to send “a certain number of monks to university, the cleverest to Paris, others to local *studia* like Oxford or Salamanca” (*King, Western Monasticism* 237). The spread of humanism to the universities of Europe therefore had the effect of raising the quality of literary and historical research in the monasteries, to which the friars increasingly turned after Gutenberg’s press made their work as scribes obsolete (*King* 290). Despite the apparent tension between scribes and printing presses MacCulloch indicates that by the 1480s monasteries housed the
only English printing presses outside of London (90), thus demonstrating the ability of the religious Orders to respond to a new paradigm and maintain their relevance for education, grammatical studies, and the language arts generally.

Monastic literacy coupled with university studies created a class of society familiar with learning languages from books, with Latin grammatical structures, translation, and the practice of reading and writing in foreign languages. As well as being educated and literate – and unlike their secular university counterparts – Order-specific vows such as the “Mission Oath” obliged friars to evangelize, a doctrine based in the Great Commission: “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost” (Matthew 28:19). The mendicant Orders (the Franciscans, Dominicans, Augustinians) were, similar to the monks, dedicated to the contemplative life (prayer, study, administration of the sacraments, confession), yet in difference to the monks the friars conducted evangelical missions outside the walls of the monasteries and collected alms (Borges Morán, *Religiosos en hispanoamérica* 239). The monasteries, therefore, served as institutions to educate missionaries in religious doctrine and language study and to lodge them for placement – they were spiritual fortifications housing language specialists ready for deployment by abbots and bishops. Historically, Pedro Palacios identifies the monasteries’ capacity to structure society as one of their major contributions to the consolidation of the *Reconquista* in Spain, writing, “[the monasteries] brought under cultivation barren or abandoned lands […] built bridges, roads and hospitals, offered security and maintenance in return for work,” all resulting in “a veritable internal colonization” (qtd. in Beales, *Prosperity and Plunder* 114).

Susan Doran and Christopher Durston estimate around 12,000 men and women with monastic vows residing in nearly 900 religious communities in early sixteenth century in
England (*Princes, Pastors, and Peoples* 162). These communities, however, were driven out during the English Reformation with the passing of several acts under the reign of Henry VIII (MacCulloch 48). The Acts of Dissolution in 1536 and 1539 had two primary objectives: the securing of revenue for the English Crown and the extirpation of religious communities with ties of allegiance to rival nations (Doran and Durston 163-4). Henry’s financial needs, Doran and Durston write, “provided the primary impetus for the confiscations, since the threatened invasion of England by the Emperor Charles V […] on behalf of the pope, had necessitated heavy governmental expenditure on fortifications and defence” (165). By dissolving the monasteries, appropriating their land, and selling the properties in a strategic manner to consolidate support, Henry VIII effectively raised funds for the military defense of England while simultaneously exporting a social class that was politically, ideologically, spiritually, and even selfishly antagonistic to the Reformation. With the passing of two laws, the English Crown effectively transformed society, turning the capital of an institution of religious power into political and military power.

A fiery opponent of monastic isolation and the presumed decadence of the monasteries, Martin Luther proposed that their buildings and endowments be transferred to schools and orphanages and other charitable institutions. However, “his plea was little regarded. Monastic property was bought up cheaply or seized by princes and nobles” (King 273). Madeleine Gray reports, “The great fear which Luther expressed […] was that monastic property would be seized for private profit,” adding, “In England and Wales […] this was exactly what happened. In both cases, some monastic estates were used for founding schools and hospitals, but the overwhelming bulk of the property ended up in private hands” (*Protestant Reformation* 121). Gray is quick to note that the dissolution of
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79 Phillipson posits linguistic penetration in the colonial sphere as necessary for moving away from strictly “crude” military means of imperial control (*Linguistic Imperialism* 53).
monasteries stranded the indigent, especially the urban poor, on the irregular charity of civic authorities (122, also 120), yet in her regard of the social upheaval she neglects to appreciate the effects this had on grammatical studies, educational efforts, and mission work in Reformation Europe. With the Acts of Dissolution, what was to become of the over 12,000 monks, friars, and nuns from nearly 900 religious communities?

The disbanding of the religious Orders in England and the subsequent penury experienced by the friars and nuns functioned to liquidate an institution with a long heritage in the English Isles. Hounded by antagonistic policies and financially destitute, many English Catholics fled to the continent and appealed to the leading Catholic nation for help. Thus, Felipe II consented to the establishment of the Colegio de los Ingleses [College of Englishmen] in Valladolid, a Jesuit school designed by Robert Persons in 1589 for the training of catholic priests for missionizing in England and Wales (Hillgarth, Mirror of Spain 404-14). From the end of the sixteenth century to the middle of the seventeenth century, MacCulloch notes, “no fewer than six colleges were set up in Iberia, with the prime but not exclusive role of training clergy” (397). Reporting directly to the Pope after the 1550s (MacCulloch 323), the Jesuits began their mission to the Americas in 1549, performing a counterbalance to the establishment of the patronato real (royal patronage) system that conceded to the Spanish monarchy the privileges of selecting Church officials and the managing Church revenues and assets (Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic 68-9). Yet the Jesuits from Valladolid were not alone in missionizing the English Isles, for in 1619 the pope approved the sending of English Benedictines from their five monasteries on the continent on mission work in England (King 280). The brief reign of Catholic Queen Mary, what MacCulloch calls “no more than a five-year restoration of Roman obedience to England” (258), saw the arrival of Spanish Dominicans who preached at court in Latin (283), and other
Benedictines who took up residence at Westminster Abbey. Protestant Queen Elizabeth summarily expelled the Dominicans in 1559 (King 279). Despite Henry VIII’s attempt to secure a break with the papacy by dissolving monasticism in England, the monasteries in Catholic Europe continued to function in their educating and missionizing role, sending literate and devoutly religious friars to evangelize on the shores of Protestant England, whether they were welcome or not. Ironically, the disintegration of the monastic system in England proved a boon to Spain in as much as they suddenly had hundreds of willing Catholics ready to evangelize back home in the British Isles.

Henry VIII’s Act of Supremacy in 1534 wrested sovereignty over the Church within his domains away from the papacy – his royal coat of arms was subsequently painted over images of Catholic icons on the walls of parish churches (Gray 136) – yet the Spanish Monarchy took a different tack to impose its ecclesiastical authority. In the late-fifteenth and early-sixteenth centuries, the Spanish Crown maintained through the patronato real system the perquisite of collecting funds from Spanish churches, of distributing those funds to the religious Orders, determining the number and type of religious per mission, and selecting mission sites. This development in the relationship between Church and State MacCulloch calls a “major step in the gradual papal abdication of real authority within Spanish dominions” (67). Luca Codignola adds, “[b]y 1508, the Spanish crown assumed responsibility to promote the conversion of the Indians and to support the colonial church [controlling] all financial matters relating to the church and ecclesiastical appointments and payments” (“The Holy See and the Conversion of the Indians” 199). By 1600 a third or more of the annual revenue of the Castilian Church clattered into the royal treasury box (MacCulloch 61), although large sums were then reintegrated into the Church as the Crown financed and outfitted missions.
These events placed Spain in an advantageous position to fund and deploy an army of religious humanists in the Americas, beginning as early as 1493 with the papal bull *Piis fidelium* and Colón’s second voyage, on which four friars set sail (Borges Morán 60-4), resulting in the Hieronymites governing for the Spanish Crown on the Island of Hispaniola from 1516 to 1518 (Pagden, *Lords of All* 32). Disembarking from Admiral Colón’s second fleet, the first mission to the Amerindians comprised the friars Bernardo Buil, Juan de la Deule, Juan de Tisin, and Ramón Pané. This first mission to Hispaniola led to the earliest ethnographic study of indigenous religion in the New World, Pané’s *Relación acerca de las antiguiedades de los indios* (1498), an important source for Martyr’s account of Spanish colonization (Rojinsky 148). Under the *patronato real* system, the Catholic Monarchs eagerly sent friars as their own representatives to Christianize the Amerindians. The fusion of Church and Crown in Spain can be exemplified by the long residence that the Catholic monarchs often held in monasteries, a rarity among the European royalty and an experience culminating in the construction of El Escorial, a “hybrid of palace and monastery” (Beales 114). In contrast, because her father had liquidated the monastic system, this religious mode of imperial expansion was barred to Protestant Queen Elizabeth when she started authorizing settlement in the Americas, beginning with the Virginia Company in 1606.

In the early sixteenth century the initial enthusiasm for converting the Amerindians caused the Erasmist and first Bishop of Mexico Juan de Zumárraga to request that Carlos V send as many missionaries as was possible (Borges Morán 37) as well as a printing press, which “ayudaría a la empresa de evangelizar a los indios” [would benefit the task of evangelizing to the Indians] (qtd. in Bernasocchi and Galeote 16). However, such was the influx of the mendicant Orders in the Americas that a saturation point was reached by the seventeenth century, when Juan de Mendoza y Luna, Viceroy first of New Spain and then of
Peru, requested the closing of 71 monasteries. He noted in 1633 that the monasteries were brimming over, with 311 Franciscans, 250 Augustinians, 220 Mercedarians, and 189 Jesuits in 102 monasteries and colleges (Borges Morán 41-2). While the English liquidated the monasteries, disbanded the religious Orders, and distanced the English Crown from the papacy, the Spanish Crown founded an abundance of monasteries and colleges on the Iberian Peninsula and in the Americas, took control of Church finances, appointed missionary ventures, and held religious sovereignty at home and abroad.

4.6 Catholic and Puritan Evangelism

As I have noted, descriptive linguistics in the early modern was not a separate project from evangelizing missions to the Amerindians. We can therefore understand the divergence of linguistic imperialism in the English and Spanish colonies by analyzing the development of missionary projects.

For a study of mission work in Anglo America in the seventeenth century, Virginia is of no consideration because it lacked missionaries, so we must turn to an analysis of New England for the only concerted Protestant evangelism in the New World – a project conducted by the theologically precise Puritans. Initially reluctant to evangelize the cultures of the Eastern Woodland, the Puritans were criticized openly for rejecting their Christian duty. This public outcry eventually led to the founding of a corporation to organize and fund missionaries in New England. In contrast, Spain sent to the Americas a massive contingent of well-funded friars whose principle goal was the assimilation of the new Amerindian vassals to the rule and religion of the Spanish Crown. Here I demonstrate that the tardiness of the Puritan mission to the Amerindians can be traced to the fraught development of the New England Company, a corporation dedicated to missionary work in the Americas, which experienced difficulty in transferring funds across the Atlantic and wild fluctuations in
revenues from properties they had secured to finance missionaries. Needless to say, the Catholic friars had none of these same difficulties because the Reformation, and the entitlements bequeathed under the *patronato real*, left the institutional structures in prosperous and robust conditions in Spain (albeit with some modifications under the Counter-Reformation).

Some regard seventeenth-century Puritan evangelizing as missionary zeal and a genuine expression of religious engagement with the Amerindians, yet other scholars are far more skeptical. These divided sentiments match the public discourse surrounding the Anglo American missions in the time of the two most concerted projects, those of the Mayhews on Martha’s Vineyard and of John Eliot in New England. Cotton Mather, for example, glorified the work of John Eliot in his hagiography for the Puritan missions, the *Magnalia Christi Americana*. Less congenial was Thomas Lechford’s heresiography, *Plain dealing, or News from New-England*, published on his return to London from Boston, where he had unhappily passed a few contentious years. After his conflict with the Congregationalists of New England, Lechford left the Americas convinced that bishoprics were necessary in the New World and that an episcopal establishment “supported a coherent domestic and imperial rule” (Daily, “Thomas Lechford”). The Puritans of New England were, in the opinion of Lechford, unconcerned with the conversion of the Amerindians and the structure of their congregations meant missions never got off the ground. “[T]here hath not been any sent forth by any Church to learne the Natives language, or to instruct them in Religion,” writes

---

80 In a similar vein, English and Scottish ministers submitted *A Petition of W C Exhibited to the High Court of Parliament [sic] now assembled, for the propagating of the Gospel in America...* (1641), which criticized the land-grabbing ambitions of most Christian missions and the apathy of the English evangelical project in the New World (Kellaway 4). A later tract continues the criticism for the scarcity of English missions, Solomon Stoddard’s *Question Whether God is not Angry with the Country for doing so little towards the Conversion of the Indians?* (1723). Be aware that the New England Company largely based its operation on revenues accumulated through rents from properties it had purchased.
Lechford, adding, “because all Churches among them are equall, and all Officers equall […] betweene many, nothing is done that way. They must all therefore equally beare the blame” *(Plain dealing* 21). To this, Mather’s later response was, “Let all Mankind know, that we came into the *Wilderness*, because we would worship God without that *Episcopacy*, that *Common Prayer*, and those unwarrantable *Ceremonies*” *(Magnalia Christi* III: 6).

“Almost all European colonies sponsored missionary work among Native Americans” *(Old Religion in a New World* 36), writes Mark A. Noll, though this assertion conceals a number of historical inactions, including the reluctant attitude of the New England Puritans and the inadequate structure of Congregationalism for mission work. Noll’s statement is contradicted rather bluntly by Fitzmaurice’s declaration that in Virginia “missionary zeal was absent” *(Humanism and America* 139) and by Shaskan Bumas’s summation of the English Crown’s involvement in evangelical projects: “Treatment of the Indians was not a significant political issue” (“The Cannibal Butcher Shop” 109). For these reasons Presbyterian minister Robert Baylie also publicly criticized the New England Puritans’ neglect of the Great Commission in 1645 *(Jennings, Invasion of America* 238). The title of Edward Taylor’s “*The Frowardness of the Elect in the Work of Conversion*” (ca. 1690) reveals a Puritan perspective on the matter, the poem explaining their hesitance as a sensible response to the murderous violence of Amerindians who “Lull’d in the lap of sinfull Nature snugg, / Like Pearls in Puddles cover’d ore with mudd” (76). Taylor’s poem ends with a description of Puritan military conquest, likely the recent and disastrous King Philip’s War. J. H. Elliott, however, highlights the institutional inaptness of congregationalism in noting that Puritan efforts were hampered by “organizational weakness” and that the Anglican Church “possessed no monopoly on religious life” *(Empires of the Atlantic* 73).

Armitage states bluntly, “The Church of England never became a unified imperial Church”
The continuity of church hierarchy in Spanish America was not reflected in the English experience where “the godly” Puritans in New England regarded episcopacy as part of the problem (MacCulloch 383) and in Virginia the Anglicans’ “love of bishops was not ardent enough to lend much support to proposals to establish a bishop on their side of the Atlantic” (534).

In *Native Apostles*, Edward Andrews approaches English colonization by focusing his research on the training and deployment of Amerindian missionaries. Linking the successful spread of Christianity to the indoctrination of native converts and their proselytizing, this work is largely enthusiastic about the progress of Puritanism in North America, though it places most of the success squarely on the shoulders of Algonquian converts. Andrews documents the deployment of Amerindian missionaries (5), their successful evangelism (42), and the preference that Eastern Woodland cultures had for native speakers of local languages (52-3). The dependence on Amerindian missionaries for conversion efforts in Anglo America was not just theologically motivated, but a pragmatic solution to cultural and linguistic issues. For example, Andrews identifies a problem not shared by the celibate Catholic friars of Spanish America, writing, “[i]t seemed pointless to expect an army of English missionaries to volunteer their efforts when the challenges of eking out a living and providing for their own families demanded nearly all their energies” (10). J. H. Elliott astutely recognizes the dependence on Amerindian proselytizing in New England as compensation for the English failure to learn indigenous languages (*Spain, Europe* 166) and

---

81 This last claim is contradicted by Kellaway’s observation that sixteen Natick wrote Eliot in 1683 on behalf of Daniel Gookin. He writes, “[t]hey preferred [Gookin’s] preaching in English rather than Indian on the grounds that English people came to hear him and this raised the tone of the services” (120).

82 Puritans employed native preachers at a third of the cost of ordained Anglicans (about £100 per annum for a English preacher plus £50 for an interpreter versus £50 for an Amerindian preacher) (Andrews, *Native Apostles* 9).
likewise notes that “the first obligation of Puritan ministers was to their own communities
[...] unlike the friars in Spanish America, they could not devote themselves full time to
evangelization among the Indians” (Empires 74).

Ostler contextualizes the Amerindian grammars of Spanish missionaries as a kind of
historical necessity arising out of vows of celibacy because “the tradition had to be carried
on without the natural transmission of languages through raising children” (Empires of the
Word 346). Although the Catholic friars technically (though not practically) had no sons to
carry the mantle of Amerindian conversion forward, the barring of native speakers from the
religious Orders meant that adult language learning was common place – one reason for the
productivity of Amerindian grammars. The push for “native apostles” in Anglo America is
therefore one of the profoundest dissimilarities with the evangelizing projects in Spanish
America, where Amerindian priests were denied ordination for doctrinal control. In both
colonial spheres, grammatical texts facilitated the transmission of Christian thought to
Amerindian cultures. Textualizing the problem of language learning in the seventeenth
century (and ignoring the possibility of immersion or intermarriage) New Englands first fruits
touches on the scarcity of both English and Amerindian grammars in the colonies. The
writer(s) lament “the difficulty of their Language to us, and ours to them; there being no
Rules to learne either by” (3). The creation of a native class of evangelists was one advantage
that the Puritans held in the Americas, where Christian belief could be passed down from
father and mother to son and daughter without the necessity of clerical intervention. In New
Spain the First Council of Mexico of 1555 barred Amerindians from ordination (Ricard 230),
effectively safeguarding doctrine from the misinterpretation of Amerindian priests and also
securing the religious careers of thousands of Spaniards.
Barely surviving the “starving time” in the winter of 1609-10, perhaps this “eking out a living” mentioned by Andrews inspired the diversion of charitable capital in Virginia in 1615 and 1617. Despite the English Crown uncharacteristically ordering all parishes of the Church of England to donate funds to establish an Amerindian college in the colony, the contributions were reappointed by the treasurer of the Virginia Company for provisions from the annual supply ships (Jennings, *Invasion of America* 54; Freeman, *Distant Relations* 82). Elliott puts the matter bluntly: “The Virginia Company sent out no missionaries to America, and in New England Protestant missions started late and were always short of ministers” (*Spain, Europe* 166). This pattern of evangelical misfiring in Protestant England and Anglo America is markedly consistent. MacCulloch characterizes the Protestant mission to the Irish as “late and half-hearted” (398). Even though Queen Elizabeth took personal interest in the matter and funded a special typeface, the translation of the Bible into Irish Gaelic was not completed until 1685, twenty years after the Wampanoag. James Crawford adds that, because missionary activity was absent in Virginia and North Carolina, our knowledge of the Algonquian languages there are “restricted to a few poorly recorded vocabularies” (*Studies in Southeastern Indian Languages* 7). The interdependence of descriptive linguistics on evangelical missions and evangelical missions on descriptive linguistics meant that neither could thrive where missionary projects were not fully and adequately funded.

According to Francis Jennings, no missionary effort – besides the occasional sermon in a European tongue – was expended in the middle colonies of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania in the seventeenth century (*Founders of America* 193). Jennings is unabashed in his criticism of the Puritans, characterizing their handling of missionary funds as suspicious and hypocritical, cataloguing the numerous occasions when money collected in English parishes vanished into the pockets of New England and Virginia advocates, and claiming
that the Massachusetts mission only began because of “fear of Parliament’s reactions” to colonial political scandal (Jennings, Invasion 238). Indeed, Jennings sharply condemns the Puritans for the discrepancy between the royal patent of Massachusetts – declaring the principal end of settlement the conversion of the natives – and the tardiness of the missions and their questionable accounting practices. “When one reads [about the Pequot War]” Tomkins writes of Jennings’s history, “and then turns over the page to see a reproduction of the Bay Colony seal, which depicts an Indian from whose mouth issue the words ‘Come over and help us,’ the effect is shattering” (65). Identifying the basis of mission funds, Jennings notes that while “Massachusetts appealed to England for financial support for its mission […] the contributions from England seem to have been the only source of support for the mission and missionary” (Founders 191). There was an absolute dependence in the colonies on the external financing of missions, yet the funds often went to other ends (Invasion 247), such as the purchasing of arms and ammunition for the defense of Massachusetts (Kellaway, New England Company 62, 69; Bragdon 176) and the funding of Harvard College for the education of English missionaries “to studie the Indians’ language, converse with them, and carry light amongst them” (New England’s first fruits 24). These £355 disappeared entirely. Even the £20 annuity that finally supported John Eliot’s mission was unaccounted for from 1644 to 1647 (Jennings, Invasion 233).

83 Thomas Weld and Hugh Peter were both suspected of misappropriating English funds donated toward the missions. In defense of himself and Peter, Weld published “Innocency Cleared” (1649), in which he claimed that most of the money had gone to the transportation of poor children as indentured servants to New England (Freeman, Distant Relations 82; see also Kellaway 30-1). Despite this vigorous defense, Jennings notes, “Peter once let himself remark that the mission work ‘was but a plain cheat, and that there was no such thing as a gospel conversion amongst the Indians’” (Invasion 250).

84 In New England’s first fruits, the author(s) reveal their priorities in enumerating the provisions they pray to receive. Number two is “Additions of Ammunition and Powder” while number five is the funding of missionaries to study local languages (23).
If we are uncharitable, we may, like Jennings, understand these episodes of questionable money transfers as evidence of the Puritans’ hypocrisy, mendacity, and avarice. In the context of the Reformation, however, I consider the bewildering of finances to be the inevitable result of the English dissolution of the monasteries and expulsion of the mendicant Orders along with their pre-established system of funding, training, and deploying missionaries. The Reformation in England stranded missionary efforts on infrequent charitable donations collected by charismatic entrepreneurs funding married farmers to preach to communities whose languages they understood not. Nevertheless, the Protestants did take action with the formation in 1649 of the New England Company, what Kellaway calls “the oldest English Protestant missionary society” (1), whose primary aim was the conversion of the Amerindians in English America. In the dedicatory of his Indian Grammar Begun Eliot acknowledges his benefactors, company governor Robert Boyle and the “Christian Corporation for the Propagation of the Gospel unto the Indians in New England” (Eliot, “Preface”). From the seventeenth into the eighteenth century, this institution fielded missionaries to the Amerindians in Anglo America much in the way of the monastic apparatus that existed in Spanish holdings. Kellaway summarizes the New England Company neatly: “it collected and invested funds, the interest from which was sent annually to commissioners in New England, who paid the missionaries’ salaries” (1).

Evangelism and missionary linguistics in Anglo America resulted from two legal manoeuvres, themselves a response to public criticism: The Act for the Propagation of the
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85 The role of Robert Boyle in promoting descriptive linguistics in the Americas forms a substantial connection with Britain’s corporate imperial apparatus, for he was not only a distinguished member of the Royal Society but also the director of the East India Company, where the New England Company often held its meetings (Kellaway 51). He is also responsible for funding “whole or part of the expense of printing the Bible in Irish and Welsh, the New Testament in Turkish and the Gospels and Acts in Malayan” (Kellaway 47), and encouraged the “praying Indians” to continue using their native languages in order to better evangelize to neighboring nations (Chaplin, “Enslavement of Indians” 65).
Gospel Amongst the Indians, passed by the General Court of Massachusetts in 1646, and
The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, later simply the New
England Company, formed by the Long Parliament in 1649 (Freeman, *Distant Relations* 82;
Jennings, *Invasion* 56; Kellaway 15).\(^86\) This entity was a corporation that invested heavily in
property to finance its religious operatives (Kellaway 32, 36), funded the construction of the
Harvard Indian College, and maintained some of its Amerindian students through
scholarships. The pattern for the funding of missionaries in Anglo America and its stark
difference from the Spanish model should be apparent in this. By all accounts it is amazing
that John Eliot received as much financial support as he did, given how erratic the payments
of interest on the Company’s investments were. Kellaway, for example, reports a series of
property investments followed by court proceedings that led to a boom-and-bust cycle on
the Company’s income. The English Civil War disrupted the payments of rents generally in
England and affected the Company to such an extent that revenues fell from a high of £800
to a low of less than £150 in the mid-1600s (39).

Further interruption of payment occurred when the intermediaries, the
Commissioners of the United Colonies, as representatives of both the New England
Company and the colonists, found their allegiances split. In one particularly egregious
instance, the commissioners diverted mission funds toward the military defence of the
colonies in the form of muskets, powder, shot, and swords (65). For this important
shipment of goods aimed at funding mission work among the Eastern Woodland cultures
“the colonies would not pay,” writes Kellaway, adding, “the failure to recover this debt [of
£358] became one of the recurrent complaints made to the Commissioners” by the

---

\(^86\) It seems no coincidence that the appearance of an apparatus for missionary enterprise occurs in
the precise moment when England begins to transform into the British Empire, particularly with
Oliver Cromwell’s “Western Design” to colonize the Caribbean in 1654 (Pagden, *Lords* 74) and his
Company (70). The Commissioners were caught up in transatlantic trade because payment from the Company was often made in the form of commodities needed in the colonies, such as construction hardware (65), and representatives on both sides of the Atlantic profited surreptitiously (68). It was thought that further profit could be made in the exchange by sending much-needed items to colonists, but the lack of specie in Anglo America often resulted in the items being exchanged through barter and accounts left open interminably (66). The result was that missionaries often worked without pay (63-4).

Against this improvised system dependent on charitable donations and irregular disbursements from property investments, the Spanish mission to the Amerindians was consistently funded by a tithing system and reliable payments from the Spanish Crown and the Counsel of the Indies. Although some smaller monastic houses were closed and certain monasteries were shuffled into the hands of the Jesuits (King 273), the Reformation by and large left the institutional structures relatively unscathed in Spain and the Counter-Reformation made the system more robust and active. The right and obligation to Christianize Amerindian vassals created an avenue for political control in the New World and the Catholic Kings Fernando and Isabel were quick to take advantage, offering spontaneously to Alexander VI to send missionaries to the newly discovered lands (Borges Morán 60). The monasteries and religious colleges were a vital component of the conversion project and Spain’s spiritual obligations were formalized beginning with Alexander VI’s Bull Inter Caetera of 1493, which hung the right of imperial expansion on the extension of the Catholic domain. Missionizing established the justice of conquest and requests for more missionaries in the colonies were sent directly from bishops in the Americas to the Spanish
Crown, not to Rome (though later in the sixteenth century the monarchy delegated this function to the Counsel of the Indies).  

While the number of enthusiastic friars from the many Catholic kingdoms meant Spain had a large pool of candidates to draw from, the evangelizing effort had a decidedly nationalist character. In “descargar de la real conciencia” (Borges Morán 296) [the discharging of the royal conscience], a phrase typical of Catholic missionaries, the Spanish Crown discriminated against the presence of foreign religious in American expeditions and limited the variety of Orders so as not to theologically disorient the Amerindians or foster inter-Order disputes (76). “[L]a cristianización” of America, writes Borges Morán, “llevaba consigo la hispanización” (38) [The Christianization (of America) carried with it Hispanization]. Two examples of English Catholics in the New World reveal the structure of Catholic mission work and the animosity that burned between Catholics and Protestants there.

In A New Survey of the West Indies: or, the English-American his travail by sea and land (1648), Thomas Gage – an English Catholic who studied at the Colegio de los Ingleses in Valladolid – recounts his ordination as a Dominican and his clandestine travel to New Spain hidden “in a Barrel that was emptied of Bisket to that purpose” (32). Absconding to Guatemala from Tenochtitlan to avoid missionizing in the Philippines, Gage evangelized around Mixco and Pinula for five years, the likely origin of the brief grammar of Poqoman that appears as an appendix to his travel account. The difficulty Gage experienced in traveling to the Americas was a result of Spanish nationalist policies that favoured Iberian

87 J. H. Elliott interprets the absence of American affairs in the debates of the Council of Trent (1545-63) as Rome’s incapacity to effectively influence mission work in the Americas in the sixteenth century (Old World 81). The papal bull Exponi nobis nuper (1571), by placing greater control under the bishops, maintained privileges and autonomy for the religious Orders in the Americas that the rulings of the Council of Trent would have revoked (Ricard 109-10).
evangelists over all others and that concentrated English-speaking friars in the mission to win back England for the papacy. Between 1553 and 1596, for example, these majority-Spanish missions included 253 expeditions to separate destinations, totalling 4,343 missionaries from five Orders (Borges Morán 123-4). They were majority-Spanish because, as Borges Morán points out, the Counsel of the Indies regularly denied authorization to foreign friars. Nearly one hundred years prior to Gage stowing away in a ship bound for Mexico, Borges Morán registers the year 1530 as the definitive beginning of an official attitude against the presence of foreign religious in expeditions to the colonies, while adding the caveat that this position often gave way to pragmatics in demanding circumstances (296). Or, in the case of Gage, it gave way to the machinations of confreres such as friar Calvo. So while the Spanish Crown and the Counsel of the Indies permitted a trickle of foreign friars to seep across the Atlantic, these were but droplets within a flood of Spanish nationals.

In the English colonies the attitude was similarly averse to non-English and non-Protestant evangelism. Maryland functioned as an outlet for English Catholics seeking refuge from intimidation at home and was the site of the only English Catholic mission in North America during the seventeenth century (Codignola 213). During his mission from 1634 to 1645 the Jesuit Andrew White – who, like Gage, studied at the Colegio de los Ingleses in Valladolid – attempted to convert the Piscataway, developing through collaboration with Amerindian consultants a grammar, dictionary, and catechism in the Piscataway (or Conoy) language (Mackie, *Fragments of Piscataway* 11). The grammar and dictionary are presumed to have existed because they are described in historical texts, though the documents last accessed in 1832 have subsequently disappeared. Mackie, citing White’s public letter *Relatio*

88 Fitzmaurice notes that the Spanish ambassador to England, Bernardino de Mendoza, sent word through the priests in the 1580s suggesting that English Catholics settling in the New World would have their throats cut. Mendoza later reported to Felipe II that the threat succeeded in limiting English Catholic ambitions in the Americas (*Humanism and America* 42).
itineris in Marylandiam, indicates that the Jesuits purposefully isolated themselves from their native communities in order to learn the Piscataway language. White reports that all the priests “are in places far distant – thus, doubtless, that so they expect to obtain an earlier acquaintance with the barbarian language, and propagate more widely the sacred faith” (qtd. in Mackie 10). The reluctance that the Puritans exhibited toward evangelizing among the Eastern Woodland cultures was not the result of unfamiliarity with the practice, for the English Catholic mission began before either the Mayhews or John Eliot. What is more, the Jesuit Andrew White like the Dominican Thomas Gage set to work immediately learning the language of the native inhabitants and reducing it to grammar. White’s Piscataway grammar, what Noll calls “a rare success in European dealings with Native Americans” (*Old Religion* 30), was anticipated by Pareja’s Timucua grammar by roughly twenty years and followed by Eliot’s Wampanoag nearly thirty years later. The Jesuit mission was cut short in 1645, however, as Protestants assaulted the Catholic settlement at St. Mary’s City, burned much of it to the ground, and sent White in chains to London for trial (Mackie 10). The religious missions in the Americas had a distinctly nationalist character following the Reformation yet the Catholics, whether English or Spanish, consistently and earnestly sought to reduce Amerindian languages to grammar upon arriving in the New World. The Colegio de los Ingleses in Valladolid prepared both Thomas Gage and Andrew White as active linguistic imperialists.

The recording of Amerindian languages was an integral part of the Catholic mission, even for English Catholics, and both the Spanish and the English sought to limit the influence of foreign religious in their colonies. As a Jesuit, White reported directly to and received funds from the Vatican, demonstrating an institutional cohesion similar to that of the Spanish Dominicans, Franciscans, and Augustines. Paid for by the mandatory *diezmo* or
tithe, the allocation of funds from the Spanish Crown was at times generosity verging on largesse, as friar Jerónimo Ruiz del Portillo describes in a letter in 1567. After buying clothing, lodging, passage, and food en route to the port for deployment to the Americas, the friar practically sings, “de las sobras tenemos comprados doscientos ducados de libros” (qtd. in Borges Morán, *El envío de misioneros* 446) [on what remains we purchased two hundred ducats-worth of books]. In the early years, England’s policy, if it could be said to have one, was in contrast solely of obstructing the efforts of papists in the New World, though with the increasing financial commitment of chartered companies English evangelism slowly became active.

The separation of the English Crown from the Catholic Church had the perhaps unforeseen effect of stranding missionary endeavours on the shores of the trading companies. In *Humanism and America*, Fitzmaurice establishes the role that humanist rhetoric rather than Christian duty played in securing capital for colonists and missionaries in English America. Nonetheless, his representation of the funding process for English missionaries supports the argument developed here. Fitzmaurice writes, “[England] was too stretched to follow the kind of state-sponsored colonial effort seen in Spain. That did not preclude, however, the private projects [such as the New England Company],” and adds, “[i]t was consistently argued that expedience, and profit, should be subordinated to honour and the common good” (26, 57). Thus, public appeals for donation were proffered by advocates such as Richard Hakluyt, Samuel Purchas, and John Donne (63), who gave a number of sermons promoting the funding of the Virginia Company and preached, “O, if you would bee as ready to hearken at the returne of a ship, how many Indians were converted to Christ

---

89 Fitzmaurice draws perhaps too fine a distinction between Spanish and English rhetoric. Claims such as “the English produced more literature promoting colonization in the period than any other European country” are unqualified and wholly unsupported by comparative research (9).
Jesus, as what trees, drugs, or Dyes that Ship had brought, then you were in your right way”

(To the Honourable Companie of the Virginia Plantation 13).

Fitzmaurice reveals that the Virginia Company was dreadfully underfunded, writing, “In its entire history, the Virginia Company raised approximately 36,000 pounds through its joint stock […] In a similar period, the East India Company raised 2 million pounds” (61). From this discrepancy he argues that the Company was “not essentially a commercial enterprise” and that the “success or failure” of the colonizing project “rested entirely on the ability of private interest to raise capital and personnel” (7). Chartered corporations like the Virginia Company, then, were forced to rely on the generosity of the public because the English Crown was uninterested in financing economic speculation or religious conversion. But there is more to this picture, for though the joint stock companies couched their appeals in terms of a civilizing and Christianizing mission, the funds collected for such purposes had a habit of transforming into capital securing the economic and practical viability of the colonies. Fitzmaurice’s claim that the discourse of the Virginia Company, which he teases out of promotional tracts, “warned against profit” (42), that “expedience, and profit, should be subordinated to honour and the common good” (57), and that “the design was the foundation of a new commonwealth through virtuous action undertaken for the ends of honour and glory” (68), indicate for us the real gap between “the Preaching” and “the Practise” (Donne 1).

The contradiction lies in the fact that these appeals were never separate from justifications that founded the colonization project on the Christian obligation to redeem the pagan and barbaric Amerindians. Entreaties such as Hakluyt’s “Wee shall by plantinge there inlarge the glory of the gospell, and from England plant sincere religion” (Discourse on Western Planting 158) and Purchas’s statement that “God is the beginning and the end, the Alpha and
the Omega, that first and last, of whom and for whom are all things. The first and last therefore in this Virginian argument considerable, is God” (Hakluytus Posthumus 218) call into question the lack of company missionaries and the shifting of funds away from missionary enterprise. Humanist exhortation attempted to occupy an absence that Fitzmaurice fails to identify. Without a dedicated class of agents trained in cultural dissemination and linguistic assimilation and without Crown sponsorship of missionary endeavours, joint stock companies like the Virginia Company were forced to take on a role that they were poorly positioned to occupy. Whether or not profit came after honour and glory, it certainly came before piety and evangelical zeal. Despite the professed intentions of English colonists, the preoccupation for native souls demonstrated by propagandists, and the good will propounded by chartered companies, evangelism among the Eastern Woodland cultures of Virginia and New England did not begin in earnest until the mid-seventeenth century and only then with the establishment of a number of legal institutions and the private corporation charged with conversion, the New England Company. The system for financial support was fundamentally different in Spanish America and benefited from the continuation of the monastic tradition through the social restructuring of the Reformation.

4.7 Conclusion

Modern instantiations of linguistic imperialism have their roots in the colonization of the Americas (Phillipson, Linguistic Imperialism 32). The work of such current organizations as the Summer Institute of Linguistics Errington describes as the “postcolonial American successor to colonial-era missionizing linguists” (21), and their mandate of translating the Bible into indigenous languages continues this process of fixing, “perfecting,” and disseminating Amerindian languages through writing. Yet the work of sixteenth and seventeenth century missionary linguistics has more recently played a fundamental role in the
revival of Amerindian languages once thought dead. Despite the disruption of the New England mission by King Philip’s War, many of the “praying Indians” being shipped to a concentration camp on Deer Island to starve over the winter of 1675, and still more sold into slavery in the West Indies (Andrews 47), Eliot’s work of bringing Wampanoag “into Rules” is having repercussions in the present that might even be described as anti-colonial. For this reason, I conclude this chapter on the uneven advance of the arts of empire by briefly discussing the use of missionary linguistics for the restoration of linguistic community by ancestral Amerindian populations.

Beginning in 1993, the Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project strives for the revival of a language that had no fluent speakers for over 150 years. The homepage of the website displays an image of Eliot’s Indian Bible with a caption reading, “Page from the bible translated into Wôpanâak [Wampanoag] by John Eliot in 1663. The existence of this bible and other legal documents written in Wôpanâak has made the reclamation of this once lost language possible” (“Wôpanâak”). In the movement from orality to alphabetic literacy and back again to orality, the language undergoes a transformation that is phonological, syntactical, and ideological. Populations that once felt pressure to abandon their native language are now returning to it and in this sense the paucity of Amerindian grammars in Anglo America has lasting effects. In a post-colonial turn, the tools of linguistic imperialism are currently being used to reconstruct Amerindian languages as a form of resistance. The languages that missionary linguists grammatically described in the colonial period now exhibit what Gerald Vizenor calls “survivance,” defined by Karl Kroeber as succession rather than survival, “orienting its connotations not toward loss but renewal and continuity

90 This contradicts MacCulloch stating bluntly that Eliot’s Indian Bible is printed “in a dialect of Algonquin now extinct” (540), even though his study of the Reformation appeared ten years after the founding of the Wôpanâak Language Reclamation Project.
into the future rather than memorializing the past” (“Why It’s a Good Thing Gerald Vizenor is not an Indian” 25). Languages such as Wampanoag which were initially reduced to grammar for the purpose of Christianizing and civilizing Amerindian populations, languages that have experienced attrition and eventual death, are now in a state of survivance that promises the return of a sense of community and history to the ancestral Wampanoag nation.

The possibility for such things as the revival of Wampanoag language can be traced to a series of historical events that set a trajectory for missionary linguistics in England and Spain prior to and during the colonization of the Americas. Although these two European nations shared a Christian and humanist cultural tradition, there were significant dissimilarities that conditioned their abilities to respond to the problem of language difference by means of the arts of empire. Paramount among these differences was the reduced deployment of descriptive linguistics by the English Crown and the strategic shuttering of the monasteries. Henry VIII’s Acts of Dissolution proved impossible to repair for the later English Catholic monarchs, Mary and James II. As centres of scholarship the monasteries of early modern Europe functioned to educate friars in Latin grammar, an experience they carried with them to the Spanish America. When the English Crown dissolved the monasteries for political and financial security in the 1530s, the result was an institutional void that would not begin to close until the late 1640s with the founding of the New England Company. Upon the liquidation of the missionary institutions of England, chartered companies like the Massachusetts Bay Colony and the Virginia Company were forced to pick up the mantle, which they did by appealing to public charity. Unsurprisingly, private enterprise did not execute the Great Commission effectively nor take it as seriously as suggested by public seals, sermons, and promotional tracts. With the passage of two acts
in the 1640s, one in New England and the other in London, a new institution for assimilation through religious conversion was founded upon a corporate structure, ending a period of over one hundred years in which English mission work was lost at sea.

In the following chapter, I more closely examine the colonial institutions that sought to control Amerindians by controlling their languages and redeploy narrative re-articulation to bring out the voices and cultures of language consultants in two Amerindian grammars.
5 Survivance Grammatica: The Timucua and Cockenoe’s Grammar

5.1 Introduction

“A great general has said that the only good Indian is a dead one, and that high sanction of his destruction has been an enormous factor in promoting Indian massacres,” declares Richard H. Pratt in 1892. He continues, “[i]n a sense, I agree with the sentiment, but only in this: that all the Indian there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him, and save the man” (“The Advantages of Mingling Indians with Whites” 260). Nearly three hundred years before, Reverend Robert Gray expressed a similar conviction in the necessary conversion of Amerindians, stating, “for it is not the nature of men, but the education of men, which makes them barbarous and uncivill, and therefore change the education of men and you shall see that their nature will be greatly rectified and corrected” (A Good Speed to Virginia C2; see also Axtell, “Invasion Within” 44). Gray’s solution proposed to the Virginia Company is fundamentally similar to Pratt’s design, as he recommends to bring the barbarous and sauage people to a ciuill and Christian kinde of gouernment, under which they may learne how to liue holily, justly, and soberly in this world, and to apprehend the meanes to sav[e] their soules in the world to come, rather then to destroy them, or utterly to roote them out (Good Speed C2).

From 1609 to 1892 and beyond the “problem” of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas had two recurring solutions: to exterminate them or to make them, as much as culturally possible, like Europeans. In order to accomplish the latter, the English and Spanish deployed the arts of empire, an assemblage of linguistic technologies that facilitated the transformation of Amerindians into civilized Christians. This complex of interconnected social organizations, institutions, texts, and mechanical technologies resulted in the production of Amerindian grammars in the colonies, a literature that has not received due
analysis from literary critics of the colonization of the Americas. For this reason, I examine here the missionary reservations, Amerindian colleges, Amerindian-language literature, and printing presses that the Europeans founded and employed in the New World to subdue the Amerindians, culminating in the analysis of John Eliot’s Wampanoag grammar (1666) and Francisco Pareja’s Timucua grammar (1614).

To read the Amerindian grammars as evidence of the success of the European colonization of the Americas, however, is to regard the conquest as over and the Amerindian already “killed.” Conversely, Gerald Vizenor’s concept of “survivance” provides an approach that allows me to read for the still-beating vital element of Amerindian presence within the texts and structures of linguistic imperialism. Vizenor defines the concept of survivance, writing, “[it] is an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion; survivance is the continuance of stories, not a mere reaction, however pertinent” (“Aesthetics of Survivance” 1). In presenting instances of survivance, Vizenor recounts the continuance of oral traditions (2-3), the physical persistence of Amerindian communities (3-5), Amerindian political campaigns for a native literature in the face of government censure (5-10), the discursive resistance to “themes of tragedy, nihilism, and victimry” (11), and the manifestation of a “natural reason” that values the presence of wild animals and natural spaces in art (12-6). This last category Vizenor sees as a continuance of Amerindian systems of metaphor. Vizenor’s forays into an indigenous mode of literary analysis provide an ethics by which to read the Amerindian grammars for signs of continuance. Therefore, I juxtapose here the assemblage of imperial linguistics, where themes of tragedy are eminent, as well as the title pages of two grammars, where Amerindians are de-articulated from their language, against the narrative re-articulation of Eliot’s and Pareja’s grammars to establish survivance, whether it is an individual language consultant or a kind of natural reason.
I argue that missionary reservations, integrated with Amerindian colleges, language education, printing presses, and religious literature formed a powerful assemblage that both empires implemented abroad to different degrees. Yet despite the power of the arts of empire to erase indigenous cultures through conversion and translation, the presence of individual Amerindians and Amerindian traditions continue within the Wampanoag and Timucua grammars. To reveal this survivance, I will engage much the same kind of close reading that I illustrated in the analysis of the word-lists. Missionary linguist John Eliot called his evangelism “Resurrection-work” (Indian Grammar Begun A2), and building from this metaphor my analysis will push against the layered historical readings that establish the Amerindian as absent or killed. The result is the discovery of the still vital body, voice, and culture of the Wampanoag and Timucua within the very systems that were designed for their deracination.

5.2 Reduction(s): The Missionary Reservations

In order to “reduce” the savagery of the Amerindians to civilization, to reduce their languages to grammar, and to eliminate their pagan idolatry and convert them to Christianity, European colonists in both Anglo and Spanish America isolated, displaced, and resettled Amerindian communities in missionary reservations. A powerful manifestation of both the ideological and the material aspects of linguistic imperialism, the artificial communities – called reducciones, pueblo-hospitales, and praying towns – were designed by the colonists to incorporate the arts of empire as an assembled educational programs, printing presses, Christian literature in indigenous languages, and other linguistic technologies. The use of the English verb “to reduce” and the Spanish reducir in relation to both language and social organization is no coincidence here. To reduce a language to grammar was to set it within a “logical,” comprehensible framework initially derived from Latin. To “reduce” a person was
to eliminate the “savage” cultural practices that arose out of unschooled passion and an ignorance of the Christian religion, to move them ideologically closer to Europeans in two discreet stages: first, from barbarism to civility and second, from paganism to Christianity (Axtell, “Invasion Within” 45). This is essentially what Richard H. Pratt meant by “killing the Indian.” In the early modern transatlantic, therefore, the missionary reservations functioned to “reduce” Amerindian people by reduction of their language, assimilating them into European civilization and Christian religion through the language sciences.91

The influence of the Utopian model discussed in the introduction was more explicit in Spanish America than in Anglo America where a more biblically oriented model emerged, although missionary reservations in both colonial spheres deployed similar networks of linguistic technologies for assimilation. Many scholars have noted the similarities between Eliot’s praying towns and Vasco de Quiroga’s pueblo-hospitales (Andrews 27; Weaver 227; Elliot, Empires of the Atlantic 189; Spain, Europe 166), yet there are important differences between these English and Spanish reducciones. It is certain that both Eliot and Quiroga helped settle comparable Christian Amerindian societies. Developing nearly one hundred years after Quiroga, however, Eliot derived much of his model more directly and explicitly from his reading of Exodus 18:21-25 and Deuteronomy 1:25, organizing the praying towns on a system of hundreds from his understanding of the millennial order, illustrated in his publication The Christian Commonwealth: The Civil Polity of the Rising Kingdom of Jesus Christ (1659) (22, 36-8; see also Gogley 86, Kellaway 87). The first praying town of Natick was founded in

91 The placement of Amerindian bodies in reductions and the reduction of Amerindian languages to grammar both operate under imperial ideologies of power: controlling people and/by controlling sign systems. This conforms to Michel Foucault’s concept of power and its relation to the formation of knowledge. Summarizing Foucault’s argument in The Order of Things, Gary Gutting writes, “for the study of human beings, the goals of power and the goals of knowledge cannot be separated: in knowing we control and in controlling we know” (“Michel Foucault”). Thus, Eliot’s mission to “Bring the Indian Language into Rules” is simultaneously a mission to bring the Eastern Woodland under rule.
1651 on a biblical system that Eliot describes in a letter published in *Strength out of Weaknesse* (1652), writing, “with the Prayer to God I read and Expounded to them the 18th of Exodus [...] and finally they did solemnly choose two Rulers among themselves, they first chose a ruler of an Hundred, then they chose two Rulers of Fifties, then they chose Ten or Tithing men” (14). The *Christian Commonwealth* served to structured the praying towns and, following the English Civil War, was anticipated to ring in the millennial order, though the preface’s theocratic bent and celebration of regicide resulted in it being banned for sedition in the colonies (Royster, “Introduction,” *The Christian Commonwealth*). Given the religious climate in New England, it is perhaps not surprising that the only Puritan missionary reservation system to develop in the seventeenth century was so heavily indebted to biblical formulas.

The *pueblo-hospitales*, in contrast, were structured on the model society delineated in More’s mirror for princes, Quiroga having received a copy of *Utopia* from Juan de Zumárraga (Weaver 227, Todorov 193). Quiroga called the political official elected to represent thirty households the *jurado* (Verástique, *Michoacán and Eden* 132), which in More’s text is called the “syphogrant” or “phylarch” (*Utopia* 35). Property was held in common and the daily schedule was structured rigorously around work and worship with little time for the corruptions of leisure (More 37; Verástique 132). This social structure was also blended “with Spanish Catholic folk elements such as the *cofradía* and *mayordomía* system” (Verástique 131). Like the praying towns and the Harvard Indian College, the *pueblo-hospitales* and the schools mutual reinforced one another. Verástique writes, “[t]he *pueblo-hospitales* would provide the seminary [Colegio de San Nicolás] with financial support and students, while the seminary would provide the towns with clerics” (96). Thus the Utopian impulse resulted in

---

92 Quiroga and Zumárraga – avid readers of More and Erasmus, whose works were eventually banned – were both brought before the Inquisition for their “métodos inspirados por Lutero” [methods inspired by Luther] (Fernández del Castillo, “Consecuencias de la invención de la imprenta” 28; also Castañeda 55).
the forced migration of Amerindian communities and the founding of new settlements
designed around humanist and religious ideology, supported by language experts and
religious authorities.

Noting the difference in organization between Eliot’s praying towns founded on
biblical guidance and Quiroga’s *pueblo-hospitales* founded on humanist guidance and a blend of
Iberian folkways does not mean that the ventures were entirely unique. They both developed
as projects for the Christianization of Amerindian populations. They also both collaborated
with projects for reducing to grammar the languages of the evangelized populations. Yet
Bumas argues that Eliot and the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England
founded the praying towns around the Puritan settlements as a buffer to protect English
settlements from the military incursions of Eastern Woodlanders (129). Vasco de Quiroga in
contrast organized the *pueblo-hospitales* as a means to protect Mesoamericans from slavers and
rapacious conquistadors (Weaver 227). Regardless of Bumas’s antagonistic and highly
skeptical reading of the Puritan praying towns, Eliot’s effort was a late and rather isolated
push for evangelism in Anglo America, while Quiroga’s *pueblo-hospitales* project was part of
massive, joint effort between the Spanish Crown and the Catholic Church. Variances in
institutional support to the side, the reductions were apiece with imperial expansion and the
cultural assimilation of the indigenous inhabitants of the Americas.

By the time Eliot founded his fourteen praying towns – burgeoning into 91 in New
England prior to the Revolution (Axtell, “Invasion Within” 81) – the fervour for More’s
*Utopia* had subsided. However, the relevance of this book in Spanish America was not
limited to the efforts of Quiroga in New Spain, where the model of his two *pueblo-hospitales*
later inspired some *encomenderos* to follow the practice, bringing the number of such
settlements to 200 in 1580 (Weaver 228). In fact, other artificial communities in Spanish
America had complex ties to More’s popular work. Victor N. Baptiste argues that Bartolomé de Las Casas’s *Memorial de remedios para las Indias*, written in 1515, influenced the creation of More’s allegory (*Bartolomé de las Casas and Thomas More’s Utopia*). The documents comprising the *Memorial* may have reached More through his friend Erasmus, who was offered the position of councillor to Charles I of Spain in the year preceding *Utopia*’s publication (9). These *remedios* Las Casas desired to have announced “to the Indians of all islands in their own language, so they would have no doubt that the old conditions of servitude had been abolished” (Castro, *Another Face of Empire* 73); they attempt to establish a new pattern of imperial expansion through cultural assimilation. Las Casas’s later attempts in the 1520s and 1530s to found peaceful, agricultural settlements in the Americas may be understood here as the result of a whirl of humanist documents solidifying into an imperial ideology of expansion augmented through religious and linguistic means.

Regardless of the limited success Las Casas’s artificial communities and the influence of Old Testament social organization on Eliot, the publication of *Utopia* in the Spanish Low Countries anticipates the assemblages of control – reductions using schools, printing presses, books, language and rhetorical study – that the English and Spanish implemented in the Americas to expand imperial influence and religious dominion. The *pueblo-hospitales* were only one component of the cultural restructuring of Amerindian society in the Spanish colonization, for the mission system was similarly enmeshed in the linguistic assemblage and likewise reduced the Amerindians to Christianity and civility under the imperial apparatus. David Sweet describes this process, writing, “[o]nce baptized and resettled in missions, or “reduced” to the “yoke” of the gospel, in the language of the day, Indians were viewed in both law and practice as vassals” (“The Ibero-American Frontier Mission” 18).
Grammars signified access and control. The religious Orders implicitly recognized Rojinsky’s assertion of “a symbolic fusion between writing and colonial power” (Companion to Empire 215) in determining who could publish tracts on the languages of particular Amerindian communities. In Spanish America the system for linguistic assimilation was robustly institutional despite the Orders vying among themselves for power and control. Or rather, the Catholic assemblage was so exuberant that it allowed for sects to jockey among themselves for privilege. Emerging in Michoacán at the site of one of Vasco de Quiroga’s early pueblo-hospitales, the dispute between Bishop Quiroga and Maturino Gilberti over the publication of the latter’s Diálogo de doctrina christiana en la lengua de Mechuacan (1559), for example, hinged on the question of who would have greater sway among the inhabitants of Santa Fe de la Laguna: the bishop, the Augustines, or the Franciscans?

Gilberti had dedicated his earlier grammar of Tarascan, the Arte de la lengua de Mechuacan (1558), to “Vasco de Quiroga, primer obispo meretísimo de Mechuacan,” and credited for inspiring his work Erasmus of Rotterdam, whom Bernardino Verástique links to the Orders’ impetus to reduce Amerindian languages to grammar (Michoacán and Eden 103-7).93 Gilberti signals the bi-directional educational potential of this grammar by noting that with it “se podrán aprovechar della todos los que pretendieren aprender la lengua de Mechuacan: y tambien podrá feruir para los Indios de Mechuacan para aprender la lengua Castellana” (Arte 339) [those seeking to learn the language of Michoacán may find advantage in it: and also it may serve the Indians of Michoacán in learning the Castilian language]. In an attempt to control his evangelical project, however, Quiroga had 500 copies of the Diálogo withheld and Gilberti submitted to the Inquisition. Nevertheless, his works on the Tarascan

---

93 Cristina Monzón finds in Gilberti’s Arte evidence that the friar broke from the Latin-based Nebrijense tradition by identifying the meaning and use of 63 suffixes and 14 clitics, what Gilberti called “particles” (“Morphology in the 16th Century Artes of Tarascan” 76).
language, of which he was the greatest contemporary expert, were eventually released and used in the instruction of Catholic missionaries. (One suspects that Amerindian instruction in the Castilian language may have been a sticking point for Bishop Quiroga.) These works later became important for the Colegio de San Nicolás de Obispo, founded by Quiroga in Pátzcuaro in 1540, where natives and colonists studied Tarascan, Otomí, Nahuatl, and Castilian. The grammars that friars like Gilberti published, however momentarily antagonistic, formed part of an assimilating complex exemplified in Quiroga’s last will and testament. Verástique notes that, in Quiroga’s Testamento, “the cathedral, the Colegio de San Nicolás de Obispo, and the hospital-villages are woven together in a network of financial supports” (142). To such a degree did the Spanish project of linguistic imperialism thrive that internal antagonisms developed based around the defense of orthodoxy and the securing of influence.

The praying towns and pueblo-hospitales of the Anglo and Spanish Americas were artificial communities invented for the cultural assimilation of colonized Amerindian populations who were resettled and fixed in location, often against earlier customs of seasonal migration (Adas, *Dominance by Designs* 61). Although products of different centuries, denominations, and literary influences, these missionary reservations functioned similarly to pacify, civilize, and Christianize Amerindian communities through educational efforts dependent on the reduction to grammar of their native languages. Operating under the assumption that it is better to re-educate the Amerindians “rather then to destroy them, or utterly to roote them out,” the reductions represent the first cultural institutions for the purposeful assimilation of indigenous communities into European culture, designed specifically to alienate Amerindians from their cultural heritage – to kill the Indian and save the man.
5.3 Amerindian Colleges

In conjunction with the reductions, evangelical efforts imported printing presses and founded colleges for the advanced education of Amerindian students, initially targeted at the creation of an indigenous cohort of missionaries. The first two Amerindian educational centers established in the Spanish and Anglo America are the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco and the Harvard Indian College, founded in 1536 and 1656 respectively. These universities were constructed to further the missionary work among the indigenous inhabitants by instructing them in European religious and linguistic practices, consisting of Christian writings and ritual and the *trivium* of grammar, logic, and rhetoric. Both institutions translated European educational practices to Amerindian audiences and both were originally designed to convert Amerindians and create native evangelists (Jennings, *Founders* 112).

Nonetheless, the Colegio de Santa Cruz in New Spain and the Harvard Indian College in New England represent still further differences in the assimilation projects, particularly in regards to the composition of classes and their sizes, the character of literacy programs, the incorporation of Amerindian knowledge, the successful creation of Amerindian scholars, and the students’ success at resisting European diseases. Here I argue that English and Spanish projects differed on theological grounds and that, paradoxically, the friars were both more rigid and more flexible because of the diversity of religious Orders present in Spanish America.

Education with the aim of assimilation involved different demographics among the indigenous populations of Anglo and Spanish America. Eliot’s grammar schools in New England, for example, instructed men and women, young and old in religious literacy (Bragdon, “Native Languages as Spoken and Written” 181). Higher education in both Tlatelolco and Harvard, however, was exclusive to men, and in Spanish America the
universities were further restricted to powerful indigenous elites (although after the *cocoliztli* epidemic in 1545, non-aristocratic students were brought into the college) (Andrews 17; Cañizares-Esguerra, *How to Write a History* 73; Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic* 75, 205). Encountering large, urban populations with stratified social classes, Spanish colonization used compulsory education of Amerindian aristocracy to forge targeted alliances and to Christianize and Hispanicize from above. English colonists encountered cultures with far less social stratification, and literacy projects included a broad representation of genders and ages, as John Eliot indicates, “The Men, Women, and up-grown Youth do thus rationally learn to Reade: but the Children learn by rote and custome, as other Children do” (*Indian Grammar Began* 5). This grammar school model did exist for the native inhabitants in Vasco de Quiroga’s missionary reservation at Michoacán, although it is important to note that literacy was not taught in the Catholic Americas for the purpose of Biblical exegesis or the keeping of spiritual journals as in New England, but rather for the memorization of doctrine from primers and catechisms.

In Anglo and Spanish America, the number of Amerindian grammars published parallels the quantity of colleges and their class sizes, providing us with indication of the scale of their imperial linguistic projects. Sixty to seventy pupils studied annually at Tlatelolco, forming what Cañizares-Esguerra calls a “formidable cadre of indigenous humanists” (*How to Write a History* 73; also Andrews 17, 23; Mignolo, *Darker Side* 56). Ricard describes the Colegio de Santa Cruz as a collaborative endeavour, “a kind of center for Mexican studies, whose pupils, in exchange for their instruction, contributed their knowledge to the special training of missionaries” (*Spiritual Conquest of Mexico* 224). In contrast, although the Algonquian translator John Sassamon graduated from Harvard before the Indian College was built, only two indigenous students were ever in attendance at one
time, the rest of the expansive building occupied by the printing press (Jennings, Invasion 247). Of these students, writes J.H. Elliott, “scarcely one of them survived the ordeal of exposure to life at Harvard” (Empires of the Atlantic 75). Discussed in the previous chapter, Benjamin Larnell’s death before graduation was unfortunately typical of the New England experiment. Mortality rates among students were always a problem for assimilation projects because more experience with European culture meant more exposure to virulent diseases, not to mention the psychological stress of acculturation. Even though the educational institutions developed as alternatives to military conquest, the forced relocation of students and their perennial contact with European illnesses often had much the same result of diminishing the population. Nevertheless, the class sizes in Spanish America were ample enough and the Amerindian students both intelligent and dedicated enough for a number to graduate from the Universidad de México (Ricard 218) where many wrote graduate theses in Latin (Castañeda, “Libros en la Nueva España” 47).

Education for both Europeans and Amerindians had a “structural role” (Phillipson, Linguistic Imperialism 128) in the colonies in that it organized society both vertically and horizontally, sorting social classes into hierarchies and individuals into specific vocations and religious affiliations. Although Phillipson identifies a number of commonalities between the second British and the French empires, there are some important differences in the function of education in the early modern Americas. For example, despite the ideological weight of humanism in both Spanish and Anglo America, there was a certain degree of negotiation and accommodation in the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco that was not present in the Harvard Indian College. Levels of accommodation depended on the relative power of colonists, on religious doctrine and the purpose of education, as well as the degree of participation of indigenous societies. Undoubtedly both Catholic friars and Protestant
preachers practiced the extirpation of idolatry (Cañizares-Esguerra’s *Puritan Conquistadors* 110-18), yet Catholic missionaries often proved more ecumenical in recognizing the value of certain restricted cultural practices. Despite the imposition of religious dogma by the Holy Office of the Inquisition, the variety of religious Orders in Spanish America allowed for differing approaches to syncretism, with the Dominicans (who occupied the majority of positions within the Inquisition) proving much stricter and more intolerant than the Augustinians and especially the Franciscans, who produced the majority of the Amerindian grammars (Ricard 45, 218). Because of the plethora of religious representatives, the “spiritual conquest” in Spanish America could paradoxically proceed both more doctrinally dogmatic and more ecumenical, with the simultaneous persecution of idolatry and the incorporation of Amerindian cultural practices in higher education. Even though the Jesuits formalized education with a *ratio studiorum* that promoted “an officially approved theological framework” (Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic* 205) the Colegio de Santa Cruz and the Universidad de México not only integrated Amerindian instructors but also Amerindian languages and medicine.

Though somewhat skewed by his focus on the modern period, Phillipson is helpful for understanding how the structural role of language instruction produces (or reproduces) “a limited elite with Europeanized values and skills” in the colonial sphere (*Linguistic Imperialism* 128). Certain commonalities between the British and French Empires enumerated by Phillipson, however, are absent or mitigated in early modern colonial negotiations with and domination of Amerindian societies. While it is true that, comparatively, Amerindian languages held lower status than the biblical, classical, and European vernacular languages, fluent speakers like Rodrigo de la Cruz considered Nahuatl a “lengua elegantísima” (qtd. in Bernasocchi and Galeote 20). Only a fraction of the Amerindian population received
tutelage, and linguistic imperialism generally divided social classes, as Phillipson indicates, yet the Protestant desire in New England was for universal literacy among the native inhabitants. Despite the occasional inclusiveness of such practices, colonial educational projects still coincided with several of Phillipson’s points: education was generally “unsuitable” to pre-contact or colonial life; there was an “explicit policy of ‘civilizing the natives’”; the “master language [was] attributed civilizing properties;” and, finally, “local traditions and educational practices [were] ignored” (128). For these reasons, the educational institutions in the colonies had the effect of transforming Amerindian society in a totalizing way that attempted to break the transmission of traditional Amerindian knowledge.

The ignoring of local traditions was more common in New England where inhabitants of the praying towns were “supposed to build English style homes, cut their hair European-style, practice monogamous marriage, establish permanent farms, and generally subscribe to English ideas of civilization and Puritan ideas of religion” (Native Apostles 27; also Gogley, “John Eliot” 81). In Spanish America, however, there was limited negotiation with Amerindian cultural practices. This can be found specifically in the relation between Spanish colonists and Amerindian medicinal practices. Indeed, Catholics were willing to incorporate Amerindian educational practices into the curriculum of Santa Cruz.⁹⁴ Jennings illustrates the difference between Catholic and Puritan attitudes toward Amerindian culture with their regard for indigenous remedies, writing, “after three decades at their task [Puritan missionaries] knew nothing of Indian medicine” (Invasion 57). Victoria Freeman notes, “John Eliot attacked healers as ‘great witches having fellowship with the old Serpent’ […] and he and other missionaries forbade converts to take part in traditional healing ceremonies”

---

⁹⁴ Bernardino Verástique attributes the success of Vasco de Quiroga’s pueblo-hospitales to “his personal devotion, his persuasive power, and his willingness to experiment with traditional indigenous forms of social organization” (Michoacán and Eden 135, emphasis mine).
(Distant Relations 84). At Santa Cruz, in contrast, pupils studied the content of European higher education in the humanist tradition as well as indigenous healing practices (Andrews 17). The Franciscans instructed elite Nahuas in Latin and ancient Greek grammar, universal history, philosophy, theology, and plainsong while the titicih (Nahua healers) taught traditional Mexico medical practices (Bernasocchi and Galeote 21; Ricard 220). Written by Martín de la Cruz and the Nahua philologist Juan Badiano, Cañizares-Esguerra notes that the Libellus de medicinalibus Indorum herbis (1552), or Codex Badiano, was characteristic of the Colegio de Santa Cruz (How to Write a History 73-4). This collaborative work was “a typical Renaissance herbal” that “included a text of ‘pictograms’ of indigenous plants and a Latin translation of the testimony offered by local shamans for the therapeutic value associated with each plant” (74). Other such collaborative works arising out of Santa Cruz are Sahagún’s Historia general de las cosas de nueva España and the anonymous Anales de Tlatelolco. Although Santa Cruz would eventually fall out of favor with colonial authorities, the Spanish approach to indigenous languages and regard for Amerindian educational practices continued in the University of Mexico, established in 1553, where three chairs were added to the European liberal arts, one each for the Nahuatl and Otomí languages, and another for native script, “to train court interpreters to read indigenous documents” (Cañizares-Esguerra 75).

Part of the assemblage with the missionary reservations from which students were drawn, the Amerindian colleges functioned to transmit European educational practices to the indigenous students for the purpose of civilizing and Christianizing. Colonists in both Anglo and Spanish America implemented – albeit with some internal resistance – higher educational programs in which students learned Latin grammar, universal history, philosophy, and theology. Nonetheless, these imperial projects had important differences,
for the diversity of religious Orders in Spanish America allowed for an evangelical project that was simultaneously dogmatic, in a punitive way, and ecumenical, in an intellectual way. We therefore discover significant class sizes and graduation rates among the indigenous populations of Mesoamerica, although unlike Anglo America, higher education was initially restricted to an indigenous elite. Virulent disease crippled the already small class sizes in the Harvard Indian College, resulting in only two Amerindian students graduating before it was ultimately demolished. Yet in Spanish America, the native population provided class sizes large enough that the epidemics were incapable of subverting the educational project entirely. What is more, the incorporation of indigenous educational practices, particularly languages and medicine, perhaps made life at the Spanish colleges easier, providing a kind of psychological comfort that eased the process of assimilation. Regardless, the willingness of certain religious Orders to integrate Amerindian education into the curriculum resulted in a higher degree of collaboration in Spanish America, where exceptionally valuable works were produced in cooperation between Europeans and Amerindians.

5.4 Printing Presses

In addition to the Amerindian colleges, the printing press was a formidable piece of the imperial linguistic arsenal that transmitted religious and linguistic knowledge to both missionaries and their pupils. Superficial historical similarities, such as the early establishment of printing presses in New Spain (1535) and New England (1638), conceal however some important differences in attitudes toward indigenous learning and target reading communities. Although the Amerindian grammars were often created through language immersion, in both Anglo and Spanish America the apparatus for Amerindian-language instruction nearly always included two powerful technologies: the printing press
and the book. Nonetheless, variations in the deployment of linguistic technologies arise from English and Spanish cultural differences, especially the religious doctrines that favored either textuality or orality. Put simply the English and Spanish differed enormously around a central question: for whom were the books produced on the colonial printing presses? To answer this, we must consider that attitudes toward literacy in regards to religion had a significant effect on the catalogue of books printed in New Spain and New England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The relations that the presses had with educational institutions tell us as much about the projects for linguistic assimilation as the catalogue of books that came off those presses. These publication catalogues remind us that early modern projects of descriptive linguistics cannot be teased apart from evangelism. The first press in the English colonies was established at Harvard in 1638 and was immediately conscripted for John Eliot’s evangelism and missionary activity, beginning with his translation of the Bay Psalm Book in 1640 (Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic 215). This press was later housed at the mostly vacant Indian College after its construction. Andrews writes, “Perhaps not coincidentally, the printing press stored at the Indian College was the same press that began printing thousands of pages of biblical texts in Algonquian in the 1660 and 1670s” (Native Apostles 39). John Eliot’s linguistic work was essential to the Amerindian educational projects in New England, and

---

95 There was always a necessary oral phase that preceded the reduction to grammar, as none of the Amerindian languages used phonemic scripts recognizable to Europeans. Eliot appears to have learned Wampanoag primarily from the slave Cockenoe rather than in an immersion setting (Karttunen, “Interpreters Snatched from the Shores” 220; Jennings, Invasion 233). This single consultant structure differs greatly from Andrew White’s description of long-term, embedded language learning (Mackie 55). Rivett, however, indicates that Eliot spent part of two winters in wigwams among the Wampanoag in an attempt to learn their language in the mid-1640s. This period was apparently insufficient to develop fluency, for in 1646, when Eliot claims to have begun his mission work to the Wampanoag in their own language, he brought “his native interpreter Cockenoe to facilitate the question-and-answer period following the sermon” (“Learning to Write Algonquian Letters” 550).
the press at the Indian College provided most of the material for the praying towns, where authentic conversion hinged on individual reading of the Word. Through the printing of the indigenous-language Bible, Puritan missionaries like Eliot organized not just Christian communities for Amerindians, but interpretive communities structured after the strict, literate Puritan culture.

Mary Rowlandson represents the “praying Indians” as literate intermediaries (as well as opportunists) in her narrative of captivity (Sovereignty and Goodness of God 98), yet despite the elevated levels of literacy in the praying towns and despite the participation of one Amerindian called John Printer (Lepore 27) in the publication of the “Indian Library,” by the end of the seventeenth century the press housed at the Harvard Indian College stopped printing books in Wampanoag. Kellaway provides a number of explanations for this, stating, “[t]his was partly because the Indians were learning English, partly because it was a difficult and costly business and partly because no one came forward to champion the printed Indian word as Eliot […] had done” (164). This explanation, however, glosses over a tremendous event that derailed Puritan mission work in New England: the cataclysmic King Philip’s War of 1675. I have noted the forced relocation of “praying Indians” to Deer Island in the previous chapter, but have not fully signaled the effects of King Philip’s War on the project of linguistic imperialism. The outbreak of war, the massive loss of life for both the Amerindian and European communities, and the consequent feelings of resentment between the colonists and the indigenous societies resulted in the press being deployed for other purposes. In 1677, two years after the war ended, the Indian College no longer housed Amerindian students, and the press that remained there was put to a different use: “to print the colonists’ war narratives, damning Indian devils” (Lepore 44). The catastrophe of King Philip’s War convinced many of the English colonists that the evangelical mission was a
waste of time and resources, and that Amerindian converts should speak English, and so the press discontinued the printing of Amerindian books.

Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and beyond, the mendicant Orders in Spanish America coordinated enormous efforts of linguistic fieldwork, publishing, translation, and ethnography, yet the development of the Wampanoag orthography and the printing of *The Indian Grammar Begun* (1666) in New England were comparatively isolated affairs in Anglo America. As we have seen, the printing of Eliot’s “Indian Library” was interrupted because of King Philip’s War and subsequent efforts to evangelize were made in the English language in the late-seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. And while Spanish America experienced similar rebellions by both Amerindians and Europeans in the colonies, especially in the Viceroyalty of Peru, the printing of Amerindian language texts did not come to a complete halt. In fact, evangelism in indigenous languages continued uninterrupted throughout the colonial period. Education, which became increasingly systematic, was similarly performed in indigenous languages up until the colonies achieved independence, when the creole class sought national cohesion through the implementation of a Castilian curriculum (Ostler, *Empire of the Word* 17). The printing of Amerindian texts in colonial Spanish America was, in contrast to Anglo America, robust and continuous.

Gilberti’s library of six Tarascan texts were printed out of the Cromberger House in Mexico City from 1558 to 1575 by Juan Pablos, the same printer who published the first European-style book in the Americas, a Nahuatl text, Juan de Zumárraga’s *Breve y mas compendiosa doctrina christiana en lengua mexicana y castellana* (1539). Cromberger’s printing press was installed in Mexico after acquiring a royal patent and was at the heart of the project of linguistic imperialism and missionary activity. The catalogue for the presses installed in Lima (1583), La Paz (1610), and Puebla (1640) are overwhelmingly dedicated to the project of the
friars’ language learning and proselytizing (Ostler, *Empire of the Word* 346; Castañeda 40). J. H. Elliott notes, they “were primarily devoted to the printing of religious manuals, catechisms, grammars, dictionaries and other works needed for the evangelization of the Indians [...] the reading public remained overwhelmingly dependent, both for its religious and secular literature, on books imported from Spain” (*Empires of the Atlantic* 205). The Spanish American presses functioned to disseminate knowledge developed in the colonies for colonial expansion, through the publishing of works addressing the problem of linguistic and cultural difference, largely targeted at the literate clergy. This is the distinction between the Puritan tradition and that of Catholics, for the majority of Eliot’s “Indian Library” was intended for an indigenous readership, tailored for their transformation and full conversion, while the Amerindian texts printed in Spanish America were largely, but not exclusively, directed at the instruction of the religious Orders in local and regional languages.

The colonial presses assisted the English and Spanish projects for assimilation through the production of indigenous texts, uniting the missionary reservations, grammar schools, and Amerindian colleges in an assemblage of linguistic technologies. The English colonists, funding their efforts largely through the New England Company, emphasized literacy for the Amerindian converts and therefore produced an impressive number of Wampanoag books for such a brief print run. In Spanish America, presses printed a large, multi-lingual library that for the most part was targeted at a clerical class with a specific cultural mission of conversion through preaching in native languages. These books were supervised by the Office of the Inquisition, which functioned to maintain religious orthodoxy by censuring heretical literature, no matter the language. Approved books received a seal that allowed for their public sale while those considered heterodox were banned or burned, several important manuscripts disappearing deep into the archives and
many Amerindian codices being thrown into the bonfires (Jennings, *Founders of America* 96; also Elliott, *Spain, Europe* 245). Meanwhile, in the English colonies, royal governors and colonial assemblies exercised supervision over presses, but religious orthodoxy was less of a concern than seditious and blasphemous libel (Elliott, *Empires of the Atlantic* 330). Even with tighter control of the printing presses in Spanish America, as demonstrated in the quarrel between Gilberti and Quiroga, the printing of Amerindian-language books in the Spanish colonies was far more substantial and not as fragile to temporary military and demographic setbacks.

### 5.5 Literacy and the Bible

Jill Lepore begins her investigation of early American print culture with two highly relevant questions: “If literacy is employed as an agent of assimilation, can one of its uses be the devastation of a society’s political autonomy and the loss of its native language and culture? Can literacy destroy?” (*Name of War* 27) In my discussion of the various parts assembled in linguistic imperialism we have seen how missionary reservations, Amerindian colleges, and printing presses formed a totalizing apparatus that functioned to eliminate Amerindian cultural practices or “kill the Indian.” The objective remained the same in Anglo and Spanish America, even with some dissimilarities in the unfolding of these imperial projects, because the desire was the civilization and Christianization of indigenous populations. It is when we question what is meant by Christianization, however, that we encounter still further differences, for the theological doctrines had significant effects on literacy rates. These rates reflect the importance of biblical literacy in the two colonial spheres and a discussion of the theological importance of literacy positions us nicely to discuss the Bible itself as a material site for Amerindian resistance.
Christian education occurred on two levels in New England: grammar school literacy programs for the “praying Indians,” such as the Roxbury Grammar School in Eliot’s hometown, and university education for the select few who demonstrated promise and passed the Latin entrance requirement (Freeman, *Distant Relations* 83). As we have seen, evangelism in Anglo America was deeply embedded in the literary culture of Puritanism and depended on the development of grammars and Amerindian-language Bibles, catechisms, testimonials, and logic primers, all part of Eliot’s “Indian Library” of twenty-three separate publications (Lepore 35). This collection of works in Wampanoag was indispensable for missionizing education, for Eliot “always stress[ed] literacy as an absolutely necessary step towards conversion, since true (Protestant) Christians could only encounter God by reading the Scriptures” (30). Eliot’s *Mamusse Wunneetpanatamwe Up-Biblum God* (1663), or *Massachusetts Bible*, produced with the uncredited assistance of John Sassamon and Job Nesutan, is not only the first Bible published in New England but also the first Bible published in the Americas (41). This is despite the nearly one hundred year head-start that the religious Orders had in reducing Amerindian languages to grammar. Or rather, this is because of the antagonistic theological positions revolving around biblical translation and individual interpretation of scripture sparked by the Reformation.

The fashioning of Amerindian education on a Puritan model did result in elevated literacy rates among indigenous converts, despite Eastern Woodland cultures being non-literate or textual in non-alphabetic modes (Gray, *New World Babel* 52; Brotherston, “Towards a Grammatology of America”). Citing Lockridge’s *Literacy in Colonial New England*, Lepore provides the following figures: in the Plymouth Colony in 1674, of 497 converted Massachusetts, 142 (29%) could read Wampanoag, 72 (14%) could write, and 9 (2%) could
read English (36). Similar figures are difficult to extract from Spanish documents, especially
because literacy was not a measure of authentic faith. “[N]o literacy figures are available for
the creole population of the Spanish American viceroyalties,” writes J. H. Elliot, continuing,
“it seems doubtful, whether, even in the cities […] literacy rates among creoles approached
those attained in the British Colonies by the late seventeenth century” (Empires of the Atlantic
216). Both Lepore and Elliott place literacy rates in New England at around 60% for men
and 30% for women in the 1660s. The two percent English literacy rate among Amerindians
of the Plymouth Colony may explain the lag in Amerindian authors publishing in Anglo
America, beginning in the late eighteenth century. Given the paucity of hard figures – and
without recklessly hazarding a guess – we can only speculate that Amerindian literacy rates in
Spanish America were likewise quite low, yet high enough among the social elite to foster
native writing and publication, the counter-conquest discussed earlier. Overall, Amerindian
alphabetic literacy rates would be lower than European populations in Anglo and Spanish
America, with the additional caveat that Tzvetan Todorov, in The Conquest of America, greatly
overestimated literacy rates, the role of written communication, and the symbolic function of
literacy among the Spanish conquistadores themselves.

Edward Gray notes that, as a threshold to Congregationalist church membership,
compulsory literacy and scarce Amerindian grammars hindered the spread of Protestantism.
He writes, “it was perhaps this burden [of literacy] more than any other that ultimately
distinguished the spread of Christianity in Puritan New England from that in Catholic
[America]” (New World Babel 54). Expanding in part because of the Reformation and
Protestant religious doctrines, literacy comprised a language technology that distinguished

---

96 Note that English was taught, although on a much smaller scale. These figures do not account for
Latin instruction even though it was a part of the curriculum at the grammar schools, permitting
Amerindian students, such as Benjamin Larnell, access to the university.
Puritan converts to a much stricter degree than Catholics (Rivett 559). In contrast, the idealization of religious orthodoxy in Spanish America created antagonistic attitudes toward Amerindian literacy among some of the friars, further restricting access to the Latin Bible. Anticipating heterodox reception of Catholicism, in 1541 Jerónimo López presented his case against Amerindian literacy in a letter to Carlos V in which he feared that recent converts, among other blasphemies, would believe the Bible condoned polygamy (González Rodríguez, *Carlos V y la cultura de Nueva España* 31; Ricard 225, 226). Because of such objections the First Council of Mexico denied Amerindian converts access to the Vulgate and barred them from full ordination in 1555 (Andrews, *Native Apostles* 17). By prohibiting vernacular translations of the Bible, demanding the eminently high literacy needed to understand the Vulgate, and censoring the printing of unorthodox spiritual literature, religious literacy was purposefully curtailed in Catholic America.

Nevertheless, Jaime González Rodríguez notes that the first act corresponding to the education of Amerindians was the quite early Laws of Burgos (1512), which required *encomenderos* to teach two Amerindian children from their plantations to read and write the catechism in Castilian (*Carlos V* 3). It should be noted that the Laws of Burgos, however, predate the theological disputes of the Reformation precipitating from Martin Luther’s *Ninety Five Theses* in 1517. Regardless, the application of these laws was low enough to lead Hernán Cortés to request that Franciscans be placed in charge of teaching literacy in 1521. These friars, and the many who followed, established schools and colleges for the instruction of indigenous aristocrats and subsequently grammar schools for the reductions, where the catechism was learned by rote rather than the Bible being studied and interpreted. This educational system benefited from the work of missionary linguists yet the texts that resulted from collaborations were often not targeted at an indigenous readership.
This is not to say that indigenous-language texts and literacy were not produced in Spanish America. On the contrary, what León-Portilla calls the “counter-conquest” depended on the production of Amerindian-language texts written in Latin script and European-language texts written by literate Amerindians, such as the *Anales de Tlatelolco*, an early sixteenth-century Nahuatl text describing Spanish colonization from the perspective of the Mexica (Ostler, *Empires of the Word* 344; Gray, *Language Encounter* 167) as well as the ethnographic studies written in collaboration by Sahagún. However, religious conversion did not depend on the creation of broad literacy and a large, religiously focused “Indian library” for Amerindian readers. Iconography and ritual were as essential to Catholics as literacy was to Puritans. Elliott notes that Puritanism, “as a religion without images […] offered little in the way of the visual and ceremonial that […] appealed to the indigenous populations of Mexico and Peru” (*Empires of the Atlantic* 75). Amerindian-language texts like Francisco Pareja’s *Arte de la lengua timucvana* drove linguistic fluency for oral evangelism as part of an assemblage with dictionaries, catechisms, and confessionaries. Mission work benefited from oral proselytizing in local languages and the appeal of visual opulence and ornate rituals. Religious conversion mostly resulted from participation in community events and confessional practices rather than depending on alphabetic literacy and textual exegesis (Rojinsky 157). Wampanoag preachers spreading Protestantism through the Eastern Woodland societies orally (Andrews 7) and Purépecha children learning to read and write (Verástique 96, 134) attenuate rather than refute this broad image of conversion practices.

An institutional approach to the cultural assimilation of the Eastern Woodland cultures began with Eliot and the Mayhew’s preaching and culminated with the printing of Eliot’s *Massachusetts Bible* at the press in Cambridge, New England. This book and the Wampanoag *Logick Primer* – a scholastic exercise in attaining the truth of the gospel through
logic – were central texts in the religious indoctrination of Algonquians (Murray, *Indian Giving* 150). As the first complete Bible printed in the Americas, Eliot’s *Massachusett Bible* was essential to the inhabitants of the praying villages for understanding Christianity and demonstrating full, authentic conversion (Gray 56). “The creation of Eliot’s library in the Indian language,” adds Andrews, “was […] not only intended to create converts, but also to train native preachers” (*Native Apostles* 39). Translation therefore meant that Amerindian missionaries could spread the Word where colonist preachers were unable or unwilling to “go native” by learning the languages and adopting the lifestyles of their audiences (Andrews 10). Hence, in Anglo America, what the English regarded as the farce of Spanish mass baptisms was juxtaposed to the spread of Puritanism through the use of literate, Bible-reading Amerindian missionaries, what J. H. Elliott describes as, “a clear point of contrast with the Spanish Church in America” (*Spain, Europe* 166). By giving direct access to the Word, Puritan missionaries in New England presumed to eliminate the corruptions that intruded when minister intermediaries interpreted God’s voice.

Contrasting the work of Puritans and Jesuits, Cotton Mather likened the Bible to a cup and claimed that the Jesuits had “put poison in the cup before giving it to the Indians, whereas the English, by translating the Bible into Indian Languages, have ‘set the cup wide open’ for them” (qtd. in Murray, *Indian Giving* 153). Cotton’s father Increase Mather recites a popular Anglo American joke that ridicules the textless Catholic missionary work among Amerindians. A Jesuit missionary “having lived in New France for a quarter of a century, wrote to a friend in Europe to ask him ‘to send him a Book called the Bible, for he heard there was such a Book in Europe; which might be of some use to him’” (qtd. in Lepore, *Name of the War* 10). The printing of the Bible in Wampanoag and other non-European languages was a direct result of the Reformation and, in a sense, made the Puritan demand of
literacy somewhat more attainable for converts. Nonetheless it represented a diametrically opposite attitude toward the reading of the Holy Scriptures from the Catholic approach, which restricted access tightly and censured publication through the Inquisition.

The Catholic missions, with their copious linguistic projects, never attempted to publish an indigenous Bible for Christian Amerindians to study. Quite the contrary, as Zamora notes, at the Council of Trent the translation of the Latin Bible into vernacular languages was prohibited and its printing was subject to extreme punishment (28). For those who desired to read the Bible in a modern vernacular the Council determined that permission was necessary from a local bishop, as promulgated in the Tridentine Index (1564) (MacCulloch 406). The Vulgate was sanctified and decreed free from error (to forestall heretical philologists), yet copies were hard to come by in the Americas – the Inquisition prohibited New World presses from printing it and shipments were rare (Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic 206). Borges Morán details the contents of the cargo for a Dominican expedition to the Americas in 1514. Of the books, there are thirty Artes de gramática by Nebrija, two Bible concordances, two breviaries, and one psalter; there are no Vulgates in the shipment, and the overwhelming majority consists of grammatical models for missionary linguists (El envío de misioneros 427). This is telling. The Inquisition’s prohibition against the importation of Bibles created a black market of trade in the Vulgate, as Castañeda notes, “Las Biblias no tenían autorización para pasar a la Nueva España, ni para venderse; sin embargo, se vendieron contra las leyes del reino” (52) [Bibles were not authorized for transport to New Spain, not even for sale; nonetheless, they were sold against the laws of the kingdom]. A later expedition’s cargo reveals the importance placed on religious adornment, with Christian ornamentation such as altars, urns, candlesticks, brocades, crucifixes, mirrors for the sacristy, and sacred paintings comprising a movable cathedral (Borges Morán 425). Given the
relatively small quantities of the Vulgate in Spanish America, it follows that preaching benefited from elaborate spectacle and that knowledge of Christian theology was transmitted orally to the Amerindians, thus securing the position of the Orders as religious authorities and cultural intermediaries. The printing presses in Spanish America consistently supported the project of Christianization by providing the Orders with language textbooks while cautiously avoiding the creation of indigenous-language Bibles. The first Castilian Bible, the “Biblia del Oso” (1569), is a case in point: printed in Switzerland, the Spanish Protestant translator Montemolín Casiodoro de Reina was hunted his whole life by the Inquisition.

Conversion and literacy were inseparable in New England (Lepore 10), and the Bible in Anglo America was ubiquitous, “to be found everywhere” (Elliott, Empires of the Atlantic 215). Cañizares-Esguerra notes that Puritans, “[a]lthough they rejected the Cross as idolatrous, they were willing to embrace the Bible as a charm,” much like the Catholic use of the Crucifix as a ward against satanic influence or as a tool to cast out demons in exorcisms (Puritan Conquistadors 115-18). The Bible contained profound symbolic value even for those who rejected Christianity in the Eastern Woodland in as much as it became a site for physical resistance. One anecdote from King Philip’s War holds that a colonist “whilst he held a Bible in his hand, looked upon himself as secure from all kinde of violence,” yet when hostile Narragansetts discovered him outside the garrison, they “ript him open, and put his Bible in his belly” (A New and Further Narrative of the State of New-England 7). The use of the Bible as a figural weapon was not isolated to the Europeans nor was such resistance to the Word so exceptional. The language slave Paquiquinco who led the 1571 assault against the Jesuits in La Florida acted symbolically when, after conquering the settlement, “the

97 Regarding Puritan exorcisms, Jennings writes, “When Cotton [Mather] got no response to his effort to exorcise a demon from a young woman by using Indian words for his incantation, he petulantly concluded that the Indian language was so hard and stupid that not even demons understood it” (Invasion of America 50).
Amerindians seize[d] and mock[ed] their Bible and bibelots, the very symbols of their faith” (Voigt 101). An earlier anecdote in 1532 from the conquest of Peru likewise places the Bible at the center of the colonial struggle for power. Jared Diamond skilfully weaves together the accounts of six conquistadors to narrate the moment at Cajamarca when the Spanish friar Vicente de Valverde approached the non-literate Inca Atahualpa and placed a Bible in his hand saying through his Amerindian interpreter Felipillo, “What I teach is what God says to us in this Book” (Guns, Germs 71). After opening the book and discovering that it was incapable of speech, Atahualpa flung it to the ground and thus the Spaniards were given legal reason for unleashing a just war against the Peruvians (68–74).

Jill Lepore ponders whether literacy can destroy, and given our understanding of the motivations of the missionaries we must affirm that yes, literacy was intended to destroy indigenous culture in the process of civilizing and Christianizing, if only because it was accompanied by the material destruction of Amerindian religious artefacts and cultural objects, such as the codices and quipus. The spread of alphabetic literacy was therefore an integral part of linguistic imperialism, although it had different motivations in the Protestant and Catholic spheres of influence inevitably resulting in divergent literacy rates. Even though the Spanish transmitted laws early in the colonization to promote literacy among the Amerindian population, specifically those retained by encomiendas, there was resistance to widespread literacy from certain factions of the religious Orders who feared misinterpretation. This contrasts almost diametrically with the Puritan model that insisted on individual interpretation of the Bible for full conversion. Reading education in Spanish America resulted in many excellent and influential Amerindian authors, but the spread of

98 Conforming to a prevalent attitude toward interpreters in the colonial period, de la Vega is derisive of Felipillo in the Historia general de Perú. De la Vega portrays Felipillo’s translations as incompetent and accuses him of plotting to have Atahualpa killed because of Felipillo’s attraction toward one of Atahualpa’s wives (General History of Peru Vol. 2:710).
literacy was not central to the evangelical mission in the way of the Puritans, who stressed biblical-literacy and thus made a translation of the Bible into Wampanoag an urgent part of mission work. A similar Amerindian-language Bible was strictly prohibited in Spanish America and the Vulgate was often in short supply. Nevertheless, Amerindians used the Bible as a site of resistance by destroying it, throwing and burning it, or plunging it into the bodies of European colonists.

Having examined the assemblage of linguistic technologies that the Europeans deployed in the colonies to civilize and Christianize the Amerindians, I turn now to a reading of the title pages of two Amerindian grammars for evidence of the symbolic erasure of Amerindian within the arts of empire.

5.6 Conversion Theology: Iconography and Textuality

Besides the institutional differences between Protestant England and Catholic Spain at the time of the colonization of the Americas, there were also differences between their respective theologies regarding conversion and the use of images in church ritual. Both Christian communities shared a religious heritage of mission work often punctuated by the violent death of martyrs with their subsequent beatification and glorification prior to the Reformation. Nonetheless, the theological revolution that gave birth to Protestantism, particularly Luther’s principles of *sola fide* and *sola scriptura*, placed the Puritan Anglo American community in a distinct and altogether new position regarding evangelism. The reticence of the Puritans in New England to evangelize the Amerindians on any significant terms led to criticism from back home, as described in the previous chapter, and this hesitance certainly had material and institutional justifications, for all the reasons I earlier proposed. Yet there were also theological motivations that hindered the progress of Puritanism in Anglo America, which is why Myra Jehlen insists, “the Puritans did not
conceive of their plantations in America as part of the expanding European empire” (“The Literature of Colonization” 90). For without the benefit of numbers or an ardently evangelical religion (and in occasional open antagonism to the parent country) by what means should they expand? Here I will consider the theological differences that affected the spread of religion in the New World and examine the title pages of two works of missionary linguistics to characterize the ways to conversion offered by Puritans and Catholics. In theological terms, the Spanish were quite simply more advantageously positioned to spread their religion and thus develop a robust tradition of missionary linguistics early in the colonization of the Americas.

The doctrine of justification by faith alone, or *sola fide*, created a fundamental problem for the spread of religion by divorcing one’s own salvation from works committed in the world and by “remov[ing] the center of authority from ecclesiastical institutions and relocat[ing] it in the elect soul” (Bercovitch, *Puritan Origins of American Self* 10). An extreme version of this was the antinomianism that held as a radical conclusion of *sola fide* that the redeemed were outside the laws of humans (MacCulloch 130, 350). The radical interpretation of *sola fide* reached fever pitch in the 1636 Antinomian Controversy in New England, leading to the expulsion from Massachusetts of Anne Hutchinson, who joined the separatist minister and early Amerindian linguist Roger Williams in Rhode Island (539). Salvation by faith alone was tied up intricately with the Calvinist doctrine of predestination (109, 118) and functioned to withdraw urgency from works and the compulsion to convert unbelievers. Nowhere was this more evident than in the New England experiment, where, regarding themselves as the besieged Elect, the Puritans were hardly motivated to convert their pagan neighbours. In part, this stemmed from a vigorous millenarianism that held that the Jews needed to be converted first before the Second Coming. John Eliot, a passionate
millenarian, slyly attempted to promote the view that the Amerindians spoke Hebrew (Gray, *Language Encounter* 175) – as I mentioned in a discussion Thorowgood in the previous chapter – in order to convince Puritans of the necessity of converting them. This push was somewhat successful in acquiring donors in the parent country. Within the New England community of saints, however, there was a conviction that the Amerindians should be attracted toward the Elect’s righteous living and pious countenance rather than the Puritans having to shepherd them in. “[B]elievers in covenant theology [such as the Puritans],” MacCulloch writes, “might well feel that the natives should prove their status as part of God’s elect by spontaneously showing an interest in and making an effort to imitate the Christian beliefs of their neighbours, without any artificial effort on the colonists’ part” (540). The force of *sola fide* among the Puritans of New England resituated spiritual authority to the individual will, freed the religious subject from salvation through works, and proved obstinately indifferent to mission work.

Bercovitch identifies the importance of the *solae* for Puritanism, yet his analysis of their effects on community addresses primarily the development of individualism through personal interpretation, as he writes, “[t]he doctrines of *sola scriptura* and *sola fides* threatened to liberate the self in the most fundamental way, by encouraging a willful, arbitrary mode of exegesis” (110). The liberation of *sola fide* manifested itself as a vehement rejection of an episcopal structure that might otherwise have benefited evangelical missions, and the doctrine of *sola scriptura* created a camel-through-the-eye-of-a-needle conversion process that demanded high level literacy combined with sophisticated, rational exegesis. “[T]he greatest obstacle to the rapid conversion of the [Amerindians],” writes Kellaway, “was the nature of
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99 For a discussion of Eliot’s millenarianism, see Gogley, “John Eliot in Recent Scholarship.” Rivett sees the connection with Thorowgood and the argument that the Amerindians were Jews leading to a vision of a unity of faith with them under a “Universal Language” (572).
conversion itself” (6), for Puritanism was a religion of the book, and the Eastern Woodland cultures therefore required literacy before they could receive the Word. For this reason, Andrews argues that Protestantism spread far more successfully under the “native apostles” who relied almost entirely on preaching sermons (24). The impetus toward literacy contained in the doctrine of *sola scriptura* was such that, in contrast to more ritual-based Catholicism, textuality is now often regarded as a defining characteristic of Puritanism, especially with regards to the conversion process. For just one example, Rivett notes, “Whereas the Puritans made literacy almost a prerequisite for conversion […] Catholic friars in New France] Chrestien Le Clercq and his successor, Pierre Maillard, actively discouraged it” (559). Just as the logic of *sola fide* could carry some to the extremes of antinomianism, that of *sola scriptura* could and often did result in the violent rejection and destruction of religious imagery, a movement known as iconoclasm. For a perspective on how Puritans and Catholics differed in regards to literacy and imagery as it is present in two works of missionary linguistics, I now examine the title pages of Alonso de Molina’s *Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana* (1571) and John Eliot’s *The Indian Grammar Begun* (1666).

A theological obstacle to the spread of Protestantism in English America existed in the resistance that Puritans held toward the use of ornate images in ritual, an attitude that contrasts sharply to the Catholic exploitation of iconography. These distinct attitudes are revealed on the title pages of works of missionary linguistics that, like the other texts of linguistic imperialism I analyzed earlier, omit the contribution of the Amerindian language consultant. Hernando de Ribas played a vital role in the development of friar Alonso de Molina’s Nahuatl grammar and dictionary, serving as both consultant and editor while receiving no explicit acknowledgement. This erasure is double in paratextual features such as
the title page, where the Spanish author and publisher are named and where appear illustrations of St. Francis, Jesus Christ, and a solitary friar.
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Figure 5.1

How do these images exemplify one of the important differences between the Catholic and Puritan missions in the Americas? To begin, the image adorning the title page of the *Arte de la lengua mexicana y castellana* is dominated by icons rather than text: St. Francis receives the miracle of stigmata on the body, a scribe labours in a wilderness cave, with a book resting in the grass along side the Renaissance symbol for written language, the ibis (the Egyptian god Thoth’s icon, known to the Greeks as Hermes). Imagining the solitary friar to be creating the grammar itself, the title page presents a profoundly concentrated assemblage of early modern imperial arts by unifying humanistic grammatical study, religious
iconography, and print technology. In gesturing toward linguistic practices, Christian
religion, humanist investigations, and the creative efforts of the solitary individual, it
generates a subjective absence not unlike the travel accounts and their word-lists. Gone is
the source of the language – the Amerindian speaker. There is furthermore no
representation of urban Tenochtitlan, the Nahuas, nor the actual workshop-like setting of
Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco in which many Amerindian grammars were developed. In fact, the
title page represents the friars in an “errand into the wilderness” context that is typically
associated with the Puritans.

This title page indicates the importance of iconography for the Catholic missionary
linguists, whose efforts at conversion combined Amerindian-language fluency with Catholic
symbolism and ritual. Ricard notes that, because he was ignorant of the local language, friar
Jacobo de Testera taught and evangelized by means of pictures (53). An early example of the
felicitous harmony of Catholic iconism and Mesoamerican ideo-pictographic writing systems
is a book published by one of the first twelve Dominicans to arrive in Tenochtitlan, Pedro
de Gante’s *El catecismo en pictogramas* (1547). One can find a representation of Pedro de Gante
(Petrus de Gate) instructing a group of Amerindians through pictograms in Diego Valadés’s
*Rhetorica christiana* (1579), where a stylized diagram of a cathedral complex depicts the full
array of evangelical practices deployed by Catholic friars, including sermons, lectures,
dialogue, singing, and a friar teaching the “creatio mundi” using a large image of the Holy
Father (207). In a separate illustration, we see a friar preaching before a congregation and
gesturing with a baton toward image boards representing the twelve passions of Christ (211).
Both Ricard (208-10) and MacCulloch (327) emphasize the Catholic reliance on icons,
imagery, and, in some cases, the pre-Columbian writing systems when transmitting their
religious message to Amerindian populations.
In contrast, the title pages of Puritan John Eliot’s *The Indian Grammar Begun* and *Mamusse wunneetupanatamwe Up-Biblium God* (1663), also known as the *Massachusett Bible*, display no such iconography but are instead filled with scriptural references, a virtual wall of text. In the early modern period there was no separating descriptive linguistics from evangelism, as I claimed previously, so it is not surprising that religious content inaugurates the English and Spanish grammatical studies, albeit in different modes. The Nahuatl and Wampanoag grammar similarly perform an erasure, however, for there is no recognition of either the Amerindian or Amerindians who collaborated in producing the *Indian Grammar*,
such as Hernando de Ribas, Cockenoe, John Sassamon, and Job Nesutan for translation or James Printer for the type-setting and printing (Lepore, *Name of War* 27).

The symbiosis between descriptive language science and religion is evident on Eliot’s title page where five Biblical verses (Isaiah 33: 19 and 66:18, Daniel 7:14, Psalms 19:3, and Matthew 3:11) make comment on and lend authority to Eliot’s linguistic project. “Thou shalt not see a fierce people, a people of a deeper speech then thou canst perceive, of a stammering tongue, that thou canst not understand” declares Isaiah 33:19, augmented by the universal translatability assured in Psalms 19:3, “There is no speech nor Language where their voice is not heard.” The imperial ambition of this linguistic text is summarized in the final millenarian passage that assures world dominion, declaring, “From the rising of the Sun, even to the going down of the same, my Name shall be great among the Gentiles” (Matthew 3:11). From the title page of Eliot’s Wampanoag grammar we witness how deeply embedded language learning was in religion, especially in Protestant textual practice for the New England missions. The title page of the *Massachuset Bible* is similarly devoid of iconography yet both title pages bear a distinct border reminiscent of the exclusionary and protecting “hedge” metaphor so beloved of Puritan preachers and writers (Bercovitch 67).

“In place of images came words,” writes Diarmaid MacCulloch of the Protestant rejection of papist imagery, continuing, “A church became a giant scrapbook of the Bible, and of course it also resounded to the Word of God from the pulpit” (*Reformation* 559). Although this description does not entirely capture the varieties of Protestantism, it does exemplify the degree to which textuality, at least for the New England Puritans and their missionary linguists, came to characterize Protestant religious practice. In the absence of religious symbols on the title page of Eliot’s grammar – where text pushes out image, figuratively enacting the destruction of icons – we find the Puritan emphasis on textual
citation and individual interpretation of scripture, of preaching over ritual, and the
privileging of word over image. Brimming with iconography, the grand cathedrals that were
raised in Spanish America on the foundations of Amerindian temples were absent in New
England, where religion lacked the episcopal structure necessary for large architectural works
and where spiritual practice embraced textuality. The absence of saints or crucifixes on the
title page exemplifies Puritan theology and iconoclasm, what Doran and Durston define as
“the widespread destruction of ‘popish’ images and ornamentation during the reigns of
Edward and Elizabeth” (Princes, Pastors 42). Iconoclasm among separatists, especially of the
Congregationalist variety, represented both a political rejection of the secular and religious
authority of the Roman papal state and a linguistic ideology that deeply embedded religious
conversion in literacy – in reading, interpretation, memorization, and writing. This strict
adherence to the Protestant creed of sola scriptura functioned to mitigate the spread of
Puritanism in Anglo America, as Ronda and Bowman indicate, noting that Puritan
missionaries “insisted that understanding must precede confession and that rational assent
prepare the way for ritual participation […] The Puritans made little use of pictorial art,
dance, rituals, dreams, or individualistic communion with spirit beings,” all practices that
might have facilitated the conversion of Eastern Woodland societies (qtd. in Freeman,
Distant Relations 88). Elliott confirms this, adding, “adaptation [to Amerindian customs] was
likely to be hampered by the close dependence of Protestantism on the printed word, and by
the absence of the kind of ceremonial and ritual to be found in Spanish Christianity, a form
of religion perhaps more easily appropriated by Indians to their sense of the sacred (Spain,
Europe 166).

Because of iconoclasm and the privileging of textual Christianity, the study of Eliot’s
Logick Primer (1672) was required for potential Amerindian converts because “Puritanism
could not contemplate the idea of conversion without full theological understanding” (Murray, *Forked Tongues* 6). There was however some slight pushback in the seventeenth century against the abhorrence of imagery. Kellaway reveals that a book called *The A B C* was the only illustrated book printed for Amerindians in Anglo America and John Usher recognized its value for evangelists, writing, “As to Bookes they are mightily taken with picktures; & therefore [I] judge bookes with pictures may win much upon them” (*New England Company* 140). However, iconoclasm stood in the way of practicality, for “his advice was not followed; indeed the [New England] Company feared that illustrated books would promote Popery” (140). A brief anecdote from Carmen Castañeda’s “Libros en la Nueva España” supports the idea that Amerindians delighted in viewing images. In 1571 a Michoacán man removed certain condemned books from the cathedral and distributed them among his friends; when later interviewed by the Inquisition, he reportedly stated, “no los quería para leer sino para verlos” [I didn’t want them to read but rather to look at them (the images)] (49). Puritan and Catholic theology benefited or impeded the missionary effort, sometimes in serendipitous ways, and this can be seen in each community’s attitude toward faith and the use of texts and images in the conversion process.

5.7 “these Ruines of Mankinde:” Cockenoe’s *Indian Grammar Begun*

John Eliot collaborated with the Montauk man Cockenoe in order to learn the Wampanoag language and develop *The Indian Grammar Begun*, although one would never know from the title page of the grammar. The rule with Amerindian grammars is for the European missionary linguist’s name to appear on the title page where the consultant’s name is missing, a form of authorship and authority that blocks out Amerindian presence. Even though presence and contribution are almost entirely erased, as Eliot’s “*prudent Enquirer*[s]”
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100 On Eliot’s *Logic Primer*, see Murray, *Indian Giving* 150; Rivett 568; Bragdon 179.
(66) we may interrogate the grammar for implicit features that demonstrate the survivance of Cockenoe. In fact, *The Indian Grammar Begun* never directly names Cockenoe, whose identity and agency I reconstruct here through historical research, figural reading, and narrative re-articulation. Here I will analyse *The Indian Grammar Begun* chiefly by pressing on metaphors contained in the work itself, albeit leaning, when necessary, on scholarly literature surrounding the text. Analysis proceeds through two contradictory yet complementary propositions: 1) that the primary text is *insufficient* in itself to establish the active contribution of the linguistic consultant Cockenoe and 2) that this text is *sufficient* in itself to demonstrate the Montauk’s agency. Eliot frames the grammar as part of a “Resurrection-work,” and here, too, I endeavour to reanimate and restore Cockenoe by reading the grammar as a narrative and attempting to identify traces of his presence. In eliciting his voice and agency through narrative re-articulation of the linguistic data I hope to manifest the Amerindian survivance theorized by Gerald Vizenor.

Regarding the lacuna occupied by the consultant, Murray briefly discusses Cockenoe in relation to early colonial translation work and writes, “[Cockenoe] appears later as an interpreter in a series of Indian land transfers, is later replaced by Job Nesutan, but *neither of them is given any real attention in comparison with Eliot*” (*Forked Tongues* 7, emphasis mine). William Wallace Tooker’s *John Eliot’s First Indian Teacher and Interpreter Cockenoe-de-Long Island* (1896) is the most complete account of the Montauk’s contribution to *The Indian Grammar Begun* specifically and Eliot’s “Indian Library” generally. Rather lamentably, Tooker’s history opens with an image of a grassy hill dotted with stones that slopes into placid, uninterrupted water, with the title “Indian Graves on Fort Hill, Montauk,” and a later quotation from Eliot on the title page states, “He was the first that I made use of to teach me words and to be my interpreter.” The “use” that Eliot made of Cockenoe leaves barrenness in its wake, for the
Montauk are reduced throughout Tooker’s book to desolate hills and empty waters. This all-to-common frame for Amerindian narratives is precisely what a story of survivance resists.

As I indicated in the first chapter, though Eliot refers to him in letters as a “house servant,” Cockenoe was a language slave taken in the Pequot War (Karttunen, “Interpreters Snatched” 220; Jennings, Invasion of America 233). Despite being diplomatically under the protection of the colonists, many Montauk, including Cockenoe, were captured and conscripted into forced labor, some of which was interpretation and translation. Tooker writes,

Many of the younger Indians captured in this war […] were carried to Boston, and there sold into slavery, or distributed around the country into a limited period of servitude – a period generally terminating when the individual so bound had arrived at the age of twenty-five. Among those so captured and allotted was a young Indian of Long Island, who became a servant in the family of a prominent citizen [Richard Collacot] of Dorchester, Mass, a sergeant in the same war, and therefore possibly his captor (Cockenoe-de-Long Island 11).

The role of Cockenoe as a teacher, interpreter, and translator is corroborated by John Eliot in a 12 February 1649 letter in which he admits studying Wampanoag under “an Indian living with Mr. Richard Calicott of Dorchester, who was taken in the Pequott warres” (Some unpublished correspondence 12). In the most explicit acknowledgment to appear in the grammar itself, Eliot writes in a brief epilogue, “I found out (by Gods wise providence) a pregnant witted young man, who had been a Servant in an English house, who pretty well understood our Language, and bath a clear pronunciation: Him I made my Interpreter” (Indian Grammar Begun 66). Tooker concedes that “there can arise no question whatever as to the great influence which the instruction and information thus obtained must have had on [Eliot’s] subsequent knowledge
of the Indian language” (15-6). In a loose bit of etymological work, Tooker speculates that the name Cockenoe – appearing also as Cheekanoo, Cickino, Chekkonnow, and Cockoo – derives from the Wampanoag verb *kuhkinneau* or *kehkinnoo*, meaning, “‘he marks, observes, takes knowledge, instructs, or imitates’; hence, ‘he interprets,’ and therefore indicating by a free translation ‘an interpreter or teacher’” (21). Whatever Cockenoe’s Montauk name may have been or meant, or whether he took a new name upon capture, his identity, when not entirely erased, is subsumed under his vocation as coerced language consultant, Wampanoag instructor, interpreter, and translator.

Given the evidence from the historical record and Eliot’s oblique reference to his teacher in the grammar itself, how can we otherwise uncover Cockenoe’s presence in the text in isolation? Can the text be made sufficient in itself to demonstrate what Vizenor calls “an active sense of presence over absence, deracination, and oblivion?” Just as before, there are a number of literary techniques that I use here to draw forth Cockenoe’s agency: a) spatial/temporal fixing, in which I treat as discrete events the otherwise out-of-time and out-of-place character of grammatical examples; b) flow, in which I create a narrative out of seemingly arbitrary lexical choices, placing them into meaningful groups; c) dialogizing, in which I invoke the coercive consultation event in order to root examples in linguistic exchange; and d) reconstitution, in which traces of the Amerindian body, which are otherwise disassembled, are brought together to form a whole. To begin, I press on analogies internal to the text itself to elicit a particular voice from what is presented as sourceless speech.

Eliot’s comparison between the Wampanoag language and a body or a building in the preface of *The Indian Grammar Begun* is a productive analogy that supports my restorative reading, for the continuity of both Cockenoe’s body and his linguistic heritage can be built
up from its “deracinated” representation in parts. This blended metaphor sets up my second proposition, that for the purposes of this investigation the text is self-sufficient. Eliot’s stated objective is

*to compile a Grammar of this Language, for the help of others who have a heart to study and learn the same, for the sake...of the poor Souls of these Ruines of Mankinde, among whom the Lord is now about a Resurrection-work, to call them into his holy Kingdome. I have made an Essay unto this difficult Service, and laid together some Bones and Ribs preparatory at least for such a work (A2).*

Here the inhabitants of the Eastern Woodland are likened to “ruines,” once whole structures that are now in gothic decadence, grown over by wilderness and uninhabited (by the Holy Spirit, presumably). In bringing the “Indian Language into Rules” and spreading the gospel among the unregenerate Amerindians, Eliot is rebuilding the “holy Kingdome” through “Resurrection-work.” Significantly, the grammar (and by extension the language) is compared to a body whose “Bones and Ribs” Eliot has “laid together.” Combined with the “heart,” which is the desire to learn, Eliot is not just making the language inhabitable for others but is bringing it back to life, resurrecting it from a moribund and uncultivated state. The hierarchy of languages that I schematized in the previous chapter is apparent here in figural language that raises a language upward from the dust to a spiritual vitality. The metaphor of a living language is, in fact, a common refrain among missionary linguists. Maturino Gilberti, for example, remembers Saint Jerome’s analogy of a language correctly or incorrectly written differing “como difiere el hombre bivo al pinto o muerto” (*Arte de la*
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101 In *Magnalia Christi Americana*, Cotton Mather likewise refers to the Easter Woodland peoples as “the veriest Ruines of Mankind” (III: 191).
102 Nonetheless, Eliot’s translations were often flawed, as Cotton Mather notes, “There are many words of Mr. Eliot’s forming which [the Amerindians] never understood. This they say is a grief to them” (quoted in Andrews 41).
The rules of grammar fragment being itself – the body in parts, the voice disconnected, and absence asserted in the place of presence. Eliot asserts, “Grammar goeth in concatenation with Logick: for there is Reason of Grammar. The Laying of Sentences together to make up a Speech, is performed by Logick” (Indian Grammar 5). The function of this logic is to atomize the language into “Parts of Speech” and these parts into their correct declensions, provided in pages and pages of lists that reduce expression to the merest affix. Reason de-articulates the language into logical fragments and discrete propositions, violently shaping the once aggregate and passionate verbiage into a frozen language resembling architecture. The suggestion that the dis-aggregating function of logic would return life to a language is somewhat counter-intuitive and creates a conflict between forms of life: the survivance of Cockenoe as a historical human subject and the survivance of Wampanoag as a language to be learned from books. That is, the language lives on because its morphology is demonstrated through declensions and yet the same process reduces Cockenoe’s body systematically to de-articulated parts. For the sake of this investigation, however, it is only the identification of Cockenoe’s agency that is at issue and therefore my reading coheres, aggregates, and re-articulates as a form of resistance.

In his reduction of Wampanoag, Eliot isolates the obviate mode, describes the dependent nouns formed by combining noun and pronoun, and distinguishes two types of substantives (the animate/inanimate gender distinction) (Bragdon, “Native Languages as Spoken and Written” 178). Regarding the last distinction, Eliot writes, “The Animate form or
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103 Thomas Gage describes reduction to grammar in his English-American, writing, “the Priests and Fyers have taken pains to learn the Native tongues of several places and Countryes, and have studied to bring them to a form and method of Rules, that so the use of them may be continued to such as shall succeed after them” (465, emphasis mine).
declension is, when the thing signified is a living Creature” and “The Inanimate form or declension of Nouns, is when the thing signified is not a living Creature” (9). He provides as an example of the animate “Muhhog, The Body” and the inanimate “all the parts of the Body as […] The Eye or Face […] A Tooth […] The Tongue […] A Lip […] A Mouth” (9-10). Given Cockenoe’s position as a captured slave we know that the consultation event, which was indisputably coercive, involved an extended interview that defined the body parts through ostension. The logic of the grammar is to reduce things to their minimal parts and this reduction obtains control through the list structure so prevalent in the previous stage of the language encounter. Note that only as an aggregate is the body treated as an animate gendered substantive, as a “living Creature;” Wampanoag grammar here reveals the tension between the de-articulated body as a corpse/object and the whole body as a living being/subject. The grammar reveals a narrative of conflict between Western modes of thought and the very structure of Wampanoag, for Eliot proposes to bring the language to life by reducing it to logical parts, yet Wampanoag situates animated life in aggregate and complete forms of being.

Perhaps the structure of the Wampanoag itself proposes a way to establish Cockenoe’s survivance? This is not to fall into the linguistic relativism that Eliot propounds in an odd little couplet that follows declensions in the “Optative” or subjunctive mode: “It seems their desires are slow, but strong; / Because they be utter’d double-breath’t, and long” (25). Rather, this reading extends the metaphor of the language as a living being for the purpose of restoring the agency buried under grammatical observation, providing a kind of narrative

104 In an otherwise remarkable essay, Rivett falls into a trap that, in my own research, I only discover literary critics falling into. In making an observation on the Mi’kmaq language she proposes, “The very structure of the language itself adheres to a part-to-whole relationship. Objects, ways of knowing, and experiences connect to a broader spiritual cosmology that exists throughout the natural world” (574, emphasis mine). Murray provides an excellent summary of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis and its relation to the representation of Amerindian languages in Forked Tongues 9-12.
cohesion to this “captivity without narrative.” If we are to discover Cockenoe in the text, he will be dispersed and disassembled, and bringing his parts of speech together will animate traces of him to such a degree that the texts “breathes” with his presence.

We may analyze Eliot’s description of the “Verb Substantive” in a similar way. On expressing existence with “am, art, is, are, was, were,” Eliot remarks, “Actuall being is above the nature of a Noun, and beneath the nature of a Verb Active. We have no compleat distinct word for the Verb Substantive, as other Learned Languages, and our English Tongue have, but it is under a regular composition” (15). Eliot’s desire for a distinct word is, as we have seen, a common reflex for the European colonists and missionary linguists. In comparing the language to Latin, ancient Greek, and English, Eliot’s description implies that “Actuall being” is contingent and partial in Wampanoag as it has “no compleat distinct word” to define existence in isolation. This “actual being” is attained only through combining the substantive verb with a noun, just as the parts of the body only become animate when joined into a whole. There is a transcendent quality to the formation of certain expressions in which life and being are suddenly achieved through articulation and community. As a literary rather than a linguistic text, The Indian Grammar Begun demands a figural reading when Eliot compares the language to a body or when descriptions of the structure of the language suggests a vital yet hidden presence. For the formation of the “Verb Substantive,” Eliot demonstrates by “adding any of these Terminations to the word, yeuoo, aoo, 0oo […] as Wosketompooo, He is a man” (16). Were this not presented as an example in abstraction one might ask, “Who is a man?”
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105 William Cowan writes, “In actual fact, Eliot spent very little of his effort trying to fit Massachusett into a Greek or Latin mould, however much he used or adapted terminology that was familiar from studies of the classical languages. On the matter of gerunds and supines […] his actual statement on this point consists of one 7-line paragraph in which he says in effect that the ‘Roman language’ has gerundives and supines but he cannot find such in Massachusett” (“John Eliot’s Indian Grammar” 295).
In disassembled body parts and incomplete being, Cockenoe begins to emerge from the linguistic data as a necessary presence in the text, participating in the coercive consultation event, responding to ostension with “Menutcheg, A Hand” (9), even in denying Eliot the satisfaction of an isolated word signifying existence. Cockenoe also speaks; he necessarily speaks, for the grammar otherwise exists not. Yet we also discover traces of his voice in two other features of the grammar: first, in descriptions of interjections and second, in a discussion of music and the emotions that necessarily produce melodic vocalizations.

The passion that resides in interjections resists Eliot’s attempts to reduce the sudden expression of emotion to a logical series or hierarchical structure while the sound of Amerindian song disrupts the typical pattern of colonial representations that represent Amerindian singing as animal-like grunts and howls.

As the seventh part of speech, Eliot calls interjections the “Independent Passions” which are outside of “Series or Order, but are of use in Speech, to express the passionate minde of man” (7). By stating that they are out of “Series or Order,” Eliot communicates to his reader that interjections defy the logic of grammar and therefore cannot be placed in a rational sequence or hierarchy. “An Interjection is a word or sound,” Eliot adds, “that uttereth the passion of the mind, without dependence on other words;” he offers as examples a short list of translations, “Of Sorrow: Woi, oowee. Of Marvelling: Hó, hoo. Of Disdaining: Quah. Of Encouraging: Hah, Ehoh” (22). Unlike the other parts of speech, interjections are “without dependence,” they resist ostension and are thus difficult to elicit as they arise from the consultant’s overall mood, sudden passions, or emotional reactions to situations. To represent sorrow in interjection is for the speaker to lament and to hear “Woi, oowee” is to have witnessed that lamentation. This places us within a fixed time and space more immediately than Eliot’s disaggregating analysis of the parts of the sentence because emotional expressions
tenaciously resist de-articulation from the speaker’s present circumstance. The voice of the consultant is ever more present in the interjections because they are explicitly emotional, rather than clinically grammatical – beyond denotation, tense, aspect, or mood, there are no declensions for lamenting, disdaining, or encouraging. They are, in a sense, bare expressions of being.

Emotion and voice are likewise present in three of the “four several sorts of Sounds or Tones uttered by Mankinde:” “2. Laughter; 3. Laetation and Joy: of which kinde of sounds our Musick and Song is made; 4. Ululation, Howling, Yelling, or Mourning: and of that kind of sound is their Musick and Song made” (4). It is unusual for a colonial text to portray the laughter of Amerindians. Colonial discourse by and large reserves for the Other threatening emotions and vocalizations such as those represented by Benjamin Tompson in New Englands crisis (1676), where “lust” (10) and “wrath” (24) drive the Amerindian’s actions and their voices are represented as “cr[ies]” (19) and dogs’ barking (11). Cultural responses to King Philip’s War, like Tompson’s, represented the Amerindian societies of the Eastern Woodland as “treacherous” (Lepore, Name of War x), vulgar, and inarticulate, the “fierce people” (Isaiah 33:19) referred to on the title page of the Indian Grammar. In another example from 1631, prior to open war, John Smith recounts a Powhatan ceremony performed on a sick person in which the voice of the healer is described as “extreame howling, showting, singing, and such violent gestures” (A True Relation 59). Eliot’s grammar is unusual in providing an instance of Amerindian merriment, though not unique, as Jean de Brébeuf vexingly relates learning the Wendat language and being “exposed to their laughter” (qtd. in Koerner, “Notes on Missionary Linguistics” 54). The mistakes made by a language learner are often unintentionally humorous and ripe for derision, and it is perhaps with a mix of humour and
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106 The OED defines “laetation” as “a manuring,” though its etymology is in the Latin “laetus” for “fertile, joyful.”
disdain ("Quah") that Eliot’s speech is received. The absence of deadly political tension, such as in the Pequot and King Philip’s wars or the Jamestown political manoeuvring, creates a gap in which laughter springs forth. 107

A distinction is made above between European and Amerindian musical practices, the first sounding of joy and the second of “Ululation, Howling, Yelling, or Mourning.” From the description of “Musical sounds” we have the image of the societies of the Eastern Woodland singing in unison, their voices blending together in “perfect Harmony,” though their songs arise from emotions of lamentation rather than exaltation. Community is rarely present in the Amerindian grammars because the language sciences abstract the object of analysis from its social context. Yet Eliot explicitly describes the community elsewhere through examples for the use of verbs in the “Imperative,” writing, “When a Superior speaks in this Mode, he commands. When an Inferior speaks in this Mode, he prays and intreats. When a Minister speaks in this Mode, he exHORTs, and blesseth” (19). The social hierarchy contained in this description is a binary of superiors and inferiors interrupted by the presence, from outside that binary, of the Christian missionary. The imposition of this imperial presence is likewise visible in the description of music. As with the spread of European religious and linguistic concepts, we witness in just a few lines the invasion of a musical tradition among the Amerindians who “are much pleased to have their Language and Words in Meeter and Rithme, as it now is in The singing Psalms [...] These they sing in our Musical Tone” (4). The voices of the Amerindians are described here approaching English patterns of vocalization

107 Eliot contrasts both laughter and mourning to “Articulation in Speech.” Elaine Scarry’s The Body in Pain could just as well be about the “near-absence” of laughter in colonial discourse, it being equal to pain in “not simply resist[ing] language but actively destroy[ing] it, bringing about an immediate reversion to a state anterior to language, to the sounds and cries a human being makes before language is learned” (4). The philosophical shortcomings of Scarry’s text all arise from the fact that the literary “absence” of pain – which itself is contentious, see “Woi, oowee” above – is better explained by socio-historical factors rather than the “nature” of language itself.
and assimilating to European musicality. It is perhaps for the very difference of Amerindian musical traditions that their singing is represented as animal-like before the introduction of Western song and, in an early instantiation of the “kill the Indian, save the man” process of colonization, we witness Amerindian music undergo a transformation that allows the expression of human-like joy in the harmonious singing of psalms.

Except for the representation of speech in the interjections, these examples of “Sounds or Tones uttered by Mankinde” are not accompanied with a phonemic transcription and so the representation is only partial, giving us a report of the event of laughter, joy, or mourning, without the sound itself. Eliot situates the vocalizations grammatically beyond the context of a speaker. Nonetheless, his being emerging from the linguistic data, Cockenoe is further reconstituted in the sections on interjections and musical sounds, for voice (“Woi, oowee […] Hó, hoo[…] Quah […] Hah, Ehoh”), emotion (joy, mourning, etc.), and singing are all features as human as body parts.

Eliot subverts Cockenoe’s presence by imposing an absence and even altering the consultant’s body itself. Subjective linguistic imperialism begins with his erasure from the title page and continues in the description of the “five Concordances of the Suffix form Active” where Eliot states, “I think there be some more, but I have beat out no more” (17). This line obfuscates the origin of Eliot’s grammatical knowledge and abstracts the language from speech. He does not indicate that Cockenoe offered no further clarification, but instead speaks of the investigation as if he were “beating out” pheasant from the brush. Here the consultant is set in a precarious relation to the linguist who, because of the choice of verb, likens him to an inanimate object from which data is collected through “beating.” Or worse, we are transported back to Jamestown where John Smith beat the information out of his captive Macanoe. The entirety of Eliot’s claim to authorial dominion rests here on
Cockenoe’s inaction and Eliot’s acting in his stead. The example of the “Suffix form advocate, or in stead form, when one acteth in the room or stead of another” resonates with imperial logic when Eliot provides as example, “Koowadchanumwanshun, I keep it for thee; I act in thy stead.” Nor does the displacement of Cockenoe reside only in the denial of presence, for later in the text the Amerindian body is bleached beyond recognition through a series of nouns transforming into verbs and verbs into nouns. Eliot illustrates this process, writing, “Noowompes, I am white. Koowompes, Thou art white. Noowompesuonk, My whiteness. Koowompesuonk, Thy whiteness” (20). Eliot negates Cockenoe’s presence by obscuring him as a source and transforming his Amerindian complexion – whether brown, copper, or the color of “Pearls in Puddles cover’d ore with mudd” (Taylor 76). Instead of an Amerindian speaker, Eliot constructs a metaphor of language as part of the natural world to be beaten out from wild brush and instead of a copper-skinned native consultant Eliot provides a dialogue in which white speakers refer to their whiteness.

Eliot acknowledges his gratitude to Cockenoe in the brief epilogue buried at the end of the Indian Grammar Begun. “By his help” Eliot translated the Commandments, the Lord’s Prayer, Exhortations and Prayers, and “many Texts of Scripture,” all of which had been impossible without the “pregnant witted young man” with “clear pronunciation” (66). Nevertheless, Eliot cannot but turn to himself. After mentioning the assistance he received from Cockenoe, Eliot then describes how “I diligently marked the difference of their Grammar” and “When I found the way of them, I would pursue a Word, a Noun, a Verb, through all variations I could think of. And thus I came at it.” The narrative flow from recognizing his debt to asserting authorial dominion is typical of the work and this subjective erasure is even greater when one considers that Eliot actually consulted several Amerindians while developing his “Indian Library.” Even while Eliot mentions the help he received from “a Servant in an English house,”
he fully ignores two other consultants that greatly benefited his work, Job Nesutan and John Sassamon. These men were similarly interpreters, aids in translation, and cultural intermediaries. In *An historical account of the doings and sufferings of the Christian Indians* (1677, unpublished until 1792) Daniel Gookin calls Job Nesutan “a very good linguist in the English tongue” and adds, “[Nesutan] was Mr. Eliot’s assistant and interpreter in his translations of the Bible, and other books of the Indian language” (qtd. in Tooker 16-17).

Increase Mather writes, “one reason why the Indians murthered John Sausaman, was out of hatred against him for his Religion,” and notes, “he translated part of the bible into the Indian language” (qtd. in Lepore 41). Both were killed in King Philip’s War, Sassamon murdered at the outbreak, sparking open war, and Nesutan killed in a military expedition of retribution against the Wampanoag (see Lepore 25-46). Eliot fails to name them on the title pages of the *Indian Grammar Begun* or the *Massachusetts Bible*, or acknowledge his debt to them in the epilogue along side his first instructor in Wampanoag, Cockenoe.

Either because his indentured service ended or because he was manumitted, Cockenoe returned to his home on Long Island some time between 1646 and 1649 and left Eliot to his missionary linguistics (Tooker 17). Nonetheless, it is to Cockenoe that Eliot refers when conceding the origin of his linguistic fluency. Given Cockenoe’s captivity, the long interviews in Dorchester at the home of Richard Collacot were undoubtedly emotional and likely physically exhausting, particularly because of Eliot’s humanist mania for declensions. The verbs “to keep” and “to pay,” declined for each subject and tense – eighteen pages in the positive and fourteen pages in the negative – transform through brute repetition into a dialogue of captivity and monetary negotiation (*Indian Grammar* 24-58).

Fixing the declensions in time and space, rather then obliging them as spatial/temporal abstractions, encourages an interpretation of the repeated verbs as a negotiation for
Cockenoe’s liberty and remuneration: “I keep thee […] I pay thee […] I keep him […] I pay him […] I keep not thee […] I pay not thee […] I wish I did not keep thee […] I wish I did not pay thee.”

One can hardly fail to identify a relationship of coercion in this odd choice of vocabulary that defies the Christian context one anticipates after the biblical references on the title page.

The explicit context of their linguistic consultation is absent, yet unlike Nesutan and Sassamon, after he taught Eliot the Wampanoag language Cockenoe returned to his people as a Montauk of Long Island and not as a Christian missionary. There he worked as an interpreter and intermediary between the colonists and the Montauk, marrying the sister of four sachems who, because of the death of her brother, became the “Sunck Squaw” or woman sachem of the Shinnecock, making Cockenoe a sagamore (Tooker 31). His contribution to the development of the first Protestant English missionary linguistic project in the Americas, the first Amerindian grammar printed in the English colonies, and the first Bible printed in the New World, is as obscured as his place of burial, his grave obliterated by “the tramping of cattle,” where “unmarked and unknown, he sleeps to await his resurrection” (59).

In reading for the body, voice, and emotions of the Amerindian consultant against subjective erasure and the de-articulating logic of Eliot’s grammatical description, we can recognize the survivance of Cockenoe, the continuity of his life and work carried forward even to the present in the recent project to revitalize the Wampanoag language.

5.8 “Quien te enseña:” Knowledge and Laughter in the Arte timuquana

If John Eliot is circumspect about the origins of his Wampanoag fluency and his indebtedness to Cockenoe (not to mention Nesutan and Sassamon), then friar Francisco Pareja is totally opaque. As is customary, the Arte de la lengua timuquana (1614) offers no explicit acknowledgment of the single or multiple Timucua speakers who contributed to the
grammar. Nonetheless, like Eliot and Cockenoe’s *The Indian Grammar Begun*, the *Arte timuqvana* can be read for traces of Amerindian presence and survivance, not just of voice and emotion but also of Timucuan ontology and epistemology, cultural practices, and social organization. Preceding the grammatical description of Wampanoag by nearly fifty years, I argue here that the *Arte timuqvana* is an important and understudied site to read for the historical presence of Amerindians in early American literature and, furthermore, that the survivance of the Timucua can be established through the identification of non-European cultural knowledge and linguistic practices.

“[R]emarkably little information was recorded about the language of the [Timucua],” writes Jerald T. Milanich, adding, “[i]ndeed, were it not for the writings of Father Francisco Pareja […] we would know almost nothing about the Timucua language” (*The Timucua* 38). Similar to Eliot’s “Indian Library,” Pareja’s Timucuan texts (in addition to two texts from friar Gregorio de Movilla and two Timucua letters) are the primary sources for Timucua history and language reconstruction projects, such as Julian Granberry’s recent *A Grammar and Dictionary of the Timucua Language*. Concerned principally with Pareja’s bilingual *Confessionario* (1613) in developing information about Timucuan history and culture, Milanich’s *The Timucua* by and large ignores the seventeenth-century grammar with its de-articulated account of Timucua lifeways. Through literary analysis of this grammar, however, I unveil unique insights into the Timucua people, including traces of their voices, thoughts, and emotions. Although the identification of a particular Timucuan consultant is not attainable in this investigation, the Timucua grammar is sufficient to make a number of observations on Spanish evangelical efforts, Spanish-Timucua social interactions, native spiritual practices and social roles, Timucuan concepts of being and knowing, Timucua laughter, as well as ideological structures hidden within the linguistic analysis. Incomplete as
it is, restoration of Amerindian agency is bolstered here with perceptions of Timucua society and evidence of European assimilation to cultural practices in La Florida.

The project of reanimating historical peoples and cultures from missionary linguistics again takes its cue from the primary text itself, where language is treated as a living being in a way reminiscent of Eliot. Similar to Maturino Gilberti a half-century before and many missionary linguists after, Pareja commences his grammar with the Quintilian method of instituting a phonemic alphabet and commenting on suitable orthography and pronunciation. Saint Jerome’s living-language analogy follows and very nearly copies Gilberti’s reference word-for-word. Between the two quotations, there are a similar number of words (roughly 31) with only slight differences in punctuation, orthography (amusingly enough), an extra adverb in Pareja (“bien”), and an extra adjective in Gilberti (“muerto”):

“La qual dize San Hieronimo, en vna Epistola. En tanto excede á la que no esta assi bien pronunciada, ni orthográphiada con deuidas letras, como difiere el hombre viuo del pintado”

(\textit{Arte de la lengua timvqvana} 3) [So Saint Jerome says in an epistle. That straying into that which is not pronounced well, nor spelled with the proper letters, differs as the living man from the painted]. It is not unusual for two friars to situate their authority in the translator of the Vulgate. What is unusual is the exactness of Pareja’s echo.\textsuperscript{108} This exactness indicates continuity in the Spanish tradition of missionary linguistics, but more importantly, it demonstrates that across English and Spanish imperial linguistic projects, the concept of grammar instilling life into a language – reduction animating a language – was consistent across the religious and cultural divide.

\textsuperscript{108} I am convinced that this quotation originates in Gilberti’s \textit{Arte de la lengua tarasca} (1558), though without sifting through the entire archive of Spanish missionary linguistics prior to 1614, it is impossible to know with absolute certainty. The only Amerindian grammar previous to Gilberti’s, Andrés de Olmos’s \textit{Arte para aprender la lengua mexicana} (1547), makes no mention of Saint Jerome in the section on orthography (196-202). Pareja reveals his knowledge of Olmos’s \textit{Arte} when he refers to Timucuan diphthongs that are missing from the Nahuatl (\textit{Arte timvqvana} 2).
What is more, the presence of this metaphor in both texts also signals one of a number of possible links between Gilberti and Pareja’s grammars. Because of a quantity of lexical parallels between Timucua and other languages of the Caribbean littoral, including Arawak, Warao, Chibchan, and Tucanoan, contemporary linguist Julian Granberry speculates that the Timucua are of Chibchan-related origin and migrated from South America to what is now northern Florida and south-eastern Georgia (Timucua Grammar 53-62). Milanich finds this hypothesis unconvincing and notes that the conjectured mass migration is absent from the archaeological record while providing two of his own explanations for the similarities. First, that the speakers of these languages shared a proto-language in the distant past and lexical correspondences are merely remnants (Timucua 65). Second, and perhaps more intriguing, that friar Pareja translated his Timucua texts with the help and guidance of other missionary grammars available to him in the libraries of St. Augustine and Mexico City (66). Milanich writes, “[i]Indeed, the format of his own Timucua-Spanish texts followed that of texts already printed in Spanish and one or more of the native languages of people in Mexico, Central America, Peru, Chile, and Brazil” (65). The suggestion here is that Pareja borrowed some vocabulary and/or modeled Timucua’s structure on other Amerindian languages to fill out his grammar while in Mexico preparing his manuscript for publication. These two indications of a shared tradition – an imitative metaphor and lexical parallels – may not prove definitively that Pareja based his Arte timucana on Gilberti’s, especially because Granberry does not analyze the Tarascan language. It does, however, allow me to register the interconnectedness of the mission system, the coordinated nature of descriptive linguistics in Spanish America, and the pervasiveness of the living language metaphor among missionary linguists.
Arriving in Florida in 1595 as part of a cohort of twelve Franciscan friars, Pareja evangelized among the Timucua for fifteen years before traveling to Mexico to print the *Cathecismo* (1612), the *Confessionario en lengua castellana y timuquana* (1613), and the *Arte de la lengua timvqvana*, returning then to his *doctrina* at San Juan del Puerto to continue his mission work. In the prologue to the *Arte timvqvana*, Pareja is quick to note the importance of language learning for missionaries, writing, “De totos es bien sabido, quan gran daño é incunuiniente sea, (assi en lo temporal como en lo espiritual) la falta de no entender las lenguas de los naturales” (1) [It is well known by all what great harm and how inconvenient it is (in the temporal as in the spiritual) the lack of understanding the languages of the natives]. To benefit “negocios espirituales y corporales de su saluación” [spiritual and corporal matters of their salvation], the purpose of missionary linguistics itself, Pareja develops a technical manual for learning the Timucua language. Nonetheless, there are already traces of Amerindian society in the prologue when Pareja complains of the unreliability of evangelizing through Timucua interpreters because “no alcançan muchas cosas ni secretos de nuestra lengua, y aun menos de los misterios de nuestra Fé” (1) [they don’t comprehend many features nor secrets of our language, much less the mysteries of our Faith].

Zimmerman designates the avoidance of “falso entendimiento” [false understanding] as one of the primary motivations for the demotion of interpreters and the production of Amerindian grammars (“Traducción, Préstamos y Teoría del Lenguaje” 122). Ricard shows that native speaking interpreters were an essential yet problematic component of a confessionary religion in the New World, writing, “[the friars] preached and heard confessions in Nahuatl, and only Indians who did not speak it were obliged to have recourse to interpreters” (*Spiritual Conquest* 54), adding, “instruction carried on by signs or with the
help of an interpreter could only be very imperfect” (46). The initial encounter with the Timucua in the *Arte timucvana* has the missionary depending on the Amerindian interpreter in a situation of cooperative communication frustrated by linguistic and cultural incomprehension. Like the later Massachusetts Bay Colony’s seal, Pareja cites Saint Paul, affirming, “se a de predicar en lengua inteligible de los oyentes” [one must preach in a language intelligible to the listener], and so makes it the responsibility of evangelists to learn well from the grammar, for the anxiety exists that missionaries may “mal induzir” [wrongly induce] the Timucua “no entendiendo bien lo que dizien” (Pareja 1) [not understanding well what they say].\(^{109}\) Pareja’s statements very slyly demonstrate the agency of the Timucua who functioned as interpreters and who inserted their own understanding of Christian doctrine, an understanding that, because it was neither orthodox nor Spanish, was Timucuan in its very wrongness. The heterodoxy of Amerindian interpreters was a threat that missionary linguistics attempted to eliminate, and so in the very construction of the grammar we discover the evangelist’s attempt to free himself of dependency on his language consultant.

Heterodox religious understanding was a concern for Catholic missionaries who feared mistranslation would lead potential converts into the Devil’s embrace. This was undoubtedly a bigger problem for the dogmatic Catholic clergy than it was for the Puritans because of their post-Reformation emphasis on individual interpretation through solitary reading. Nonetheless, interpreters for both English and Spanish missionaries were already in a precarious situation when attempting to bridge the linguistic gap, as Lepore details in her account of John Sassamon (*Name of War* 43). But if interpreters found themselves subject to distrust, then native spiritual guides, healers, and herbalists were an even greater threat to

\(^{109}\) See also Borges Morán, who describes some of the theological and practical imperatives motivating the friars’ study of the languages of potential converts (*El envío de misioneros* 270).
missionaries, particularly because native religious practices were viewed as evidence of paganism or even outright Satanism, which functioned to subvert potential converts’ beliefs.

It is therefore the presence of the Timucua bechizero [sorcerer, shaman] that next troubles Pareja’s linguistic analysis, appearing in a rich section of text that examines the verb natori [to teach]. “Con este verbo,” writes Pareja, “enseñaban los hechizeros á sus discípulos las ceremonias del demonio, y de aquí dezían: maestro que enseña, ano-natori-so-tema” (31) [With this verb the shamans teach their disciples the devil’s ceremonies, and from this they say: master who teaches, ano-natori-so-tema]. It is not uncommon for pagan practitioners in the early modern to be interpolated into Christian theology as agents of Lucifer. Nevertheless, beyond the demonological discourse in this description there is valuable ethnographic information, for Pareja incidentally exposes a broader social function for the shaman as a master and a teacher.

Shamans performed a mediating function in Timucuan society, enacting rituals to garner food, foretelling the future, finding lost objects, identifying the guilty party in cases of theft, healing sickness and injury (Milanich 173-4), and guiding members through ritual purification by concocting and consuming the “black drink” called cassina (made from the yaupon holly Ilex vomitoria) (177-87). Despite his reservations about the possible demonic affinity of ritual fasting, purgation, and consumption of the cassina brew, in the later Cathecismo, y examen para los que comulgan, En lengua Castellana y Timuquana (1627) Pareja recommends for evangelical purposes that readers use a Christian analogy built on the Timucuan practice, writing, “When you drink cassina and look into the cup, you see many reflections of your face in the bubbles, even though there is only one of you. So it is with God, although he is only one, he is everywhere” (qtd. in Milanich 187). The pragmatic syncretism of this recommendation is rooted in the recognition that the Timucuan shaman
held a position of prestige, filtered and transmitted divine information, organized cultural events, and initiated his mochate [apprentice, novice] in the traditional arts of healing and prophecy (31). Missionary work could benefit, in Pareja’s conception, from cultural practices already present in Timucua society by assimilating them into Christian doctrine – in this case, an analogy that teaches the omnipresence of God through Timucua ritual drink. With the incorporation of Timucua religious practice into a Christian interpretive frame, the survivance of indigenous spirituality is assured. The obstinate continuance of the native “black drink” purification ceremony Pareja domesticates because his ability to restrict its consumption is denied by the Timucua community. Sanctioning a practice with demonic connotations is a means of neutralizing it through interpretation, a kind of last-ditch Christianization in the face of community resistance – outright prohibition recedes here in the face of a robust indigenous tradition.110

Compared with the language of shamanic teaching, according to Pareja, Christian teaching is expressed through a different verb: “Pero lo mas comun de que usan los ya Christianos para enseñar son: hebuano ecasino, hebuano quachino y hebuano ohono” (31) [But the most common [verbs] that the already Christian use for teaching are…]. (Granberry translates eca, heba, isamolo, natori, obo, quachi, and uqua as “to teach” without making Pareja’s Christian/pagan cultural distinction [Timucua Grammar 128, 134, 143, 153, 156, 164, 172].) Here we have evidence of the Timucua choosing to convert to Catholicism and this cultural change influencing the way they speak about teaching in the mission, at least according to Pareja’s representation of the matter. The use of these “teaching” verbs in the San Pedro del Puerto mission would have been common, especially because, like Vasco de Quiroga’s pueblo-

110 The “black drink” cassina was made from the yaupon holly and appears to be related to the drinking of yerba mate (Ilex paraguariensis) in South America where, some argue, it formed a part of pre-Columbian culture among Incan aristocrats and Guaranís. See Folch, “Stimulating Consumption” 9-12.
hospitales and Eliot’s praying villages, Pareja established an educational program among the Timucua that used as reading materials Timucua-language primers and devotional booklets (of which, none have survived). Milanich states, “Mission villagers, including children, also were taught to read and write in the Timucua language,” noting additionally friar Alonso de Jesus’s opinion that “literacy was a very efficient way to secure the devotion and conversion of the native people. Some of the Timucua even wrote letters to one another” (Timucua 187).

Beyond personal letters, it is unclear what purpose learning to write would serve the Timucua, a problem that Eliot also questions when he states, “[Cockenoe] is ingenious, can read, and I taught him to write, which he quickly learnt, though I know not what use he now maketh of it” (Some unpublished correspondence 12). One letter, which appears in Lucien Adam and Julien Vinson’s 1886 edition of Pareja’s Arte timvqvana, provides us with a glimpse of Timucua writing practices. Addressed to Carlos II of Spain in 1688, this letter “Escripta y firmada de los caciques” [Written and signed by the caciques] was overseen and mediated by Francisco de Rojas, who is credited as “ynterprete del idioma timuqano” [Timucua language interpreter] (Pareja xxvii-xxx). Seeking the continuation of Don Diego as governor of Timucua, the north-eastern region of La Florida, the document is signed by five caciques with Christian names: Don Francisco, Don Pedro, Don Bentura, Don Diego, and Gregorio. While occurring outside Pareja’s original grammar, the appearance of Amerindian names, the recognition of their status in Timucua society, their authorial status, and their necessary consultation all indicate for us what purpose the introduction of writing in Timucua culture might have served. Although likely not limited to petitions requesting the further tenure of Spanish friars, this Timucua writing provides evidence of their political engagement with the Spanish Crown, for the introduction of writing in Timucua society gave them, as vassals of
the king and queen, a voice (highly mediated by the friars) to speak concerns to their distant sovereigns and therefore integrate themselves into the empire.

The theme of education continues in the grammar, for lessons are also learned from animal instructors in the section on the verb natori. Applied generally to living beings and not isolated to humans, belu combines with ano to designate “El animal que enseña bachipile bebuano eca-te-ma Pl. los animales que enseñan, bachipile eca-tenicala” (31) [the animal who teaches […] Pl. the animals who teach]. Granberry translates ano variously as “male human being, person, man” and “lord, master” (Grammar and Dictionary 116), yet Pareja is not so certain about this human denotation, for he earlier defines it as, “persona, tambien se toma por cualquiera animal ó criatura ó pollo ya formado dentro del huebo” (Arte timvqvana 12) [person, also it is used for whatever animal or creature or chick already formed in the egg].

Pareja’s observations on the Timucua language raise ontological and epistemological questions and perhaps indicate that being and knowing in Timucua culture were not rarefied states, that the human was not a hard conceptual category and that knowledge was not isolated to human culture.

Like the drinking of cassina and ritual vomiting, Pareja understands the belief in animal instruction to be satanic in nature – superstitious, fundamentally perverse (because not Christian) forms of knowledge. In his Confessionario he writes, “these abuses and tremors of the body and signs of birds and animals, none of it is to be believed” (qtd. in Milanich 186). According to Milanich, snakes, owls, blue jays, and woodpeckers all conveyed omens to the Timucua, who interpreted their environment for signs of future happenings, whether

---

111 Anthony Pagden notes that in compiling his Spanish-Nahuatl dictionary Alonso de Molina had difficulty in isolating a term for hombre, encountering only words for social positions, such as for rulers or peasants. “For the rest,” Pagden writes, “[Molina] could only discover words which described particular types of men – holy-men, men-without-pity, men-experienced-in-war, men with big noses or large cheeks, men with six fingers or six toes. But no word to translate the expression of homo sapiens” (Fall of Natural Man 17).
the arrival of a visitor or a portent of death (176-7). Although not containing the
ethnographic detail of Ramón Pané’s Relación acerca de los antigüedades de los Indios (1498), the
cultural information implicit in Pareja’s linguistic analysis is reaffirmed in his Confessionario,
where he warns later missionaries about the Timucuas’ heretical social life and customs.
Milanich finds this ironic, writing, “the Franciscan friars’ desire to eradicate aboriginal beliefs
and practices […] has provided students of the Timucua with one of our main sources of
information on those aspects of Timucuan life” (172). This irony is mitigated if the grammar
is taken as evidence of the missionary desire to control the lives of the Timucua rather than
to record indigenous practices for disinterested ethnographic understanding. Further still if
we consider that these representations of Timucua ontology and epistemology are mere
traces of a people’s philosophy deduced by an outsider, a Christian missionary, and a non-
native speaker of Timucua. These fragments of Timucua philosophy and other Amerindian
beliefs that arrive to us in oblique and splintered form may be compared to the doxography
of ancient philosophy, which are those works that take “as their subject matter the tenets or
doctrines of [other] philosophers” (Mansfeld, “Doxography”), a form of writing that Spanish
friars like Sahagún developed in order to police heretical belief and idolatry (Jennings,
Founders 112).

Smith-Stark reminds us that the success of the missionary linguists derived not only
from their education and commitment, but also from “the gifted speakers who served them
as informants, consultants, interpreters, translators, teachers, and models” (51). He also

112 Cervantes makes the distinction between Christian and pagan or satanic knowledge neatly in the
Cave of Montesinos episode in Don Quijote. When approaching the mouth of the cave, a startled and
“infinite” flock of crows and rooks flies out, collides with the errant knight, and knocks him to the
ground. The fictional Muslim author, Cide Hamete Benengeli, speculates, “si [Don Quijote] fuera tan
agorero como católico cristiano, lo tuviera a mala señal” (721) [if he had been as much of a believer
in augury as he was a Catholic Christian he would have taken it as a bad omen] (Quixote 548). The
birds are not just insignificant to a Christian, they are not even a sign.
notes that even orthographical choices can reveal traces of Amerindian consultants, such as in his example of Andrés de Olmos hearing [g] and the Nahuas writing a [e] as a realization of [k] (36). Following a similar example, Smith-Stark asks, “If Olmos didn’t hear it, then how is it that he wrote it?” He responds to his own question: “It seems to me likely that the native speakers themselves who wrote their language served as his model” (51). Linguistic consultants are essentially language teachers and traces of their instruction and their agency are sometimes located in the differentiation of sounds that are imperceptible or insignificant to the European linguist. Thus, the importance of orthography for making a language live.

Because of the predominance of the verb “to teach” throughout the grammar, the reader is given the impression that Pareja agonized over pedagogy and truth while conducting his mission. In contrast, “to learn” is never given a translation in the text and so the question of Pareja’s linguistic fluency is not addressed even obliquely through example in his Arte timuqvana. Interestingly, we ourselves learn from Granberry that Pareja translated talaca elsewhere for both the verb “to learn” and noun “catechism” (168), thus yoking together Christian theology and knowledge in a way similar to the Timucuan shamanic tradition.

The conquest of the Americas by Europeans may be glimpsed here in miniature as a struggle to impose Western epistemologies over indigenous forms. Colonizers designated and imposed “legitimate” sources of knowledge while condemning non-Western forms as pagan, barbaric, and demonic. To return to the epistemological polemic in an earlier chapter, for Mignolo what counts as knowledge is culturally determined (e.g. the “Spanish view” of hard truth in written script versus ambiguity in pictograms), but for Cañizares-Esguerra epistemologies are seldom monolithic or static – the Spanish accepted some indigenous sources and allowed limited syncretism in religion, though the more ecumenical early modern gave way to an ethnically-defined objectivity in the Enlightenment. This process of
assimilating and/or dominating indigenous culture is figurally present in the narrative flow of an extensive passage in the Arte timucana that translates derivative pronouns: “cosa de nuestra tierra […] persona de nuestra tierra […] hombre de nuestra tierra […] pajaro de nuestra tierra […] animal de nuestra tierra […] Animal de tu tierra ó de vuestra tierra […] cosa de vuestra tierra […] hombre de vuestra tierra” [thing from our land […] person from our land […] man from our land […] bird from our land […] animal from our land […] Animal from your land or thy land […] thing from thy land […] man from thy land] (51).

The conceptual movement from pagan animal teaching to Christian catechistic learning is replicated here in the multiple colonizations of the Americas by things, people, and animals.


By learning who taught someone, Pareja could presumably learn if they were a mochase or novice of a Timucua shaman and from this the missionary would understand whether his or her knowledge posed a threat. Unfortunately for us, Pareja does not provide the replies to this sequence. The dialogue is as troublingly one-sided as the historical record, the interviewer questioning an unspeaking consultant.

This missed opportunity for voice in the Timucua grammar yields however to recorded speech in the form of interjections, just as happens in The Indian Grammar Begun and even Alonso de Olmos’s Arte para aprender la lengua mexicana. Occurring as a supplement to
the eight parts of speech, interjections are coupled with strong emotions. Because their
expression is non-grammatical and analysis cannot atomize their utterance into rational parts,
the missionary must provide interjections as statements complete unto themselves and
explain their use by identifying the feelings they describe. This section is lamentably even
more limited than Eliot’s survey of Wampanoag emotions, such that the list only expresses
two emotions: grief and happiness. “INTERIECCION de dolor, de pesar, ó despecho” (9),
Pareja translates, “cha” [INTERJECTION of pain, of regret, of hopelessness, cha]. The
expression of pain and the implicit consultation process that frame it situationally appear in a
later section wherein Pareja declines several phrases expressing suffering – harm directed at
the subject’s body by the self and the other. These two incidents of translations centered on
expressions of physical and emotional pain cohere together into a historically fixed
consultation event, despite the fact that they are separated by a number of pages. After the
interjections Pareja analyses other expressions of hurt, a strange give-and-take of corporal
punishment between two interlocutors. “Yo me aflixo á mi mismo ó á mi propio,” Pareja
and his consultant translate as, “namache tuqii-so-ntala,” and immediately following, “Tu te
aflixes, etc., bochic namache” (52) [I punish myself or my body […] You punish yourself, etc.].
On the following page a drama of physical harm continues with Pareja writing, “Yo te aflixo
[…] tu me aflixes […] aquel nos aflixe […] nosotros os afliximos” (53) [I harm you […] you
harm me […] he harms us […] we harm you all], and pursuing the theme with another
systematic conjugation, Pareja translates, “Istitimosono es dañar, ó hazer mal á otro: yo me
daño á mi, ó me hago mal […] tu te hazes á ti mal, ó te dañas” (53) [Istitimosono is to hurt, or
damage someone else: I hurt myself, or damage myself […] you damage yourself, you hurt
yourself].
Spatial/temporal fixing of passages like this is exceedingly difficult in certain Amerindian grammars because the consultation event is almost entirely beyond reach. The body as a site of translation is absent in the Arte timvqvana, and Pareja is even more reluctant to reveal the source of linguistic knowledge than the explorers, colonists, and historians who produced the word-lists. Even if our attempt to ground these early linguistic texts in specific historical events is hindered by the way in which the grammars abstract language from speech, this process itself may reveal much about the arts of empire. The rise to abstraction, the formation of language as an object of analysis beyond its physical, cultural, and historical context results in the expressions of harm located in the Arte timvqvana to be without subject. The interlocutors who self-flagellate, who punish themselves and each other, and who cry out “Chu!” when the instrument of suffering lands, these interlocutors are entombed in the text, their presence ghostly.

The text is not only haunted by crying, wailing, and violence, for Pareja translates several interjections of happiness immediately following this sorrowful expression. If we take the Timucua speaker as a textual construct derived entirely from the grammar, this subject is not emotionally sophisticated, lurching like a newborn from tears to laughter in the space of a period. That is to say, the Timucua subject is reduced through the grammar to a character with limited emotional range. Nonetheless, the implicit Timucua consultant manifests happiness in several ways: “chanimantemano, ayá ayá, hupu” (9). (Granberry recognizes only one of these interjections, translating hupu as an “Exclamation of joy” [137].) This happiness is restorative and like the un-voiced laughter of the Wampanoag it disrupts the otherwise unremitting gloom that typifies Amerindian histories, such as our own Milanich, whose The Timucua unfortunately yet predictably ends with a sombre description of the effects of virulent disease on the native population. We observe traces of the living Timucua in
expressions of happiness folded into the grammatical description, a remnant of Timucua voice that coheres to the linguistic data. “Exclamations of joy” occur not only in the section on interjections, but also earlier in the text when Pareja continues his comments on the proper pronunciation of his Timucua orthography – on rightly spelled and pronounced words being like a living man.

When writing the exhortative qere qere – “para que con animo y brio y donayre se haga lo que se va, ó esta haziendo” (5) [so that with energy and spirit and grace one does what one is about to do, or is doing] – Pareja excludes the u following the q, as Spanish orthography demands, to avoid mispronunciation. He writes, “Si se le pusierá u, dixerá "quere", imperatiuo del verbo latino que significa buscar, y los Indios se reirán quando lo oygan” [If one adds a u, they would say “quere,” the imperative of the Latin verb signifying “to search for,” and the Indians hearing this would laugh]. Mispronunciation is a common source of humor. For example, in Don Quijote the shepherd Pedro mispronounces the name of Abraham’s wife Sara as the word for rash (sarna) causing Don Quijote to interrupt his humorous if inelegant tale (Quijote 105-6). Sometimes the humour of mispronunciation is in the clumsiness that causes a word or phrase to verge on the incomprehensible. Yet mispronunciation is not always innocent, for in pronouncing an intended word or phrase incorrectly, one may be producing an unintended word or phrase correctly, placing the speaker in the awkward position of having said the wrong thing rightly. For this reason and others, Pareja insists that his readers pay close attention to his orthography. In pronouncing an [s] instead of a [k] one may speak nonsense: “el que no sabe […] [por] onaqi, [dice] onaqi, lo qual fuera cosa ridicula, y no darse á entender” (5) [he who doesn’t know […] [for] onaqi, [says] onaqi, which is something ridiculous, and not given to be understood]. In both instances, the reader may have the impression that it is Pareja who has been ridiculed and
laughed at and that his clumsiness with the language was an object for playful Timucua mockery. But there may be something more to the Timucua laughter here that is, given the available data, beyond our reach, for his examples of mispronunciation (*quere* and *onași*) are not recorded in Granberry’s Timucua dictionary. Perhaps tellingly, the nearest definition is for the second of these, the Timucua verb *naqi* which Granberry translates as “to laugh” (152).

Murray’s *Indian Giving* offers us another approach to contextualize the humour of Pareja’s mispronunciations. Regarding the word-list in Jean de Léry’s *History of A Voyage to the Land of Brazil* (1548), described as “the first to develop, through grammatical exercises and variations, into an exchange of views as well as words,” Murray notes that translations for certain body parts were often given obliquely or enigmatically (86). “[A]fter the colloquy [Léry] gives in both languages a list of the parts of the body,” Murray writes, “followed by three terms in Tupinamba only. These he describes as ‘Names of parts of the body that it is not decent to name’” (87). Theodor de Bry’s later edition uses the Latin “nomina partium corporis pudendorum,” translated roughly as “names of the shameful parts of the body.”

The prudish obscuring of sexuality and the genitalia was a pattern in early modern word-lists and grammars, what I call colonial decency and what Murray characterizes as, “the linguistic decorum […] that led scholars to translate offensive passages from Indian and other texts not into English [or other vernaculars] but into Latin” (88).

As a Franciscan friar Pareja would have been keenly aware of the temptations of the flesh and even if his behaviour were exemplary, representing the body part *cume* and *chocolo*, “the breast,” would be far less incriminating than translating terms for the female genitalia (Granberry 126, 124). Perhaps for this reason, we do not know what the words for the vulva or the vagina are in Timucua; if Pareja does not provide it in his texts then the word is
beyond our reach. Granberry, though she translates yuchino as “male genitalia” (177), does not offer the equivalent female reproductive organs, which could indicate that Pareja was more comfortable exploring male nudity, perhaps in bathing rituals. In relation to Timucua laughter, the closest we may come to knowing the words for the “shameful parts” may be a slip of the tongue that causes the Timucua to giggle and ridicule the speaker. Granted, this is necessarily speculative because the Timucua dictionary that Pareja is said to have written did not survive into the present. Nonetheless, if Pareja generally conceals the Timucua body in his grammar then he doubly conceals female body parts, for the only Timucua term for genitalia that arrives to us from his literature is the male yuchino.

Timucua laughter reveals an emotion not often represented in colonial literature, and the object of this humour is for us imperceptible, available only through speculation, and therefore historically and textually ephemeral. The representation of laughter without a laugher can be understood as part of the abstracting function of missionary linguistics and the formation of a discipline that separates its object from the speaking subject, the flipside of the coin to anthropology. In Time and the Other, Johannes Fabian discusses the “literary sleight-of-hand camouflaging the second subject” in Lévi-Strauss’s representation of an Amerindian following a trail by “means of imperceptible clues” (91). In order to “mark the observation as objective fact,” the anthropologist disappears himself from the text and records the Amerindian’s jungle wayfinding proceeding from indications that are not perceptible. This statement, as Fabian points out, is a “logical impossibility,” for the clues are perceptible to the Amerindian, and thus the statement reveals the subjective experience of the French anthropologist. If in anthropological and ethnographic work the second subject is the invisible observer, then in missionary linguistics the second subject is the invisible consultant. The presence of the missionary linguist is always explicit and posited as an
authority from which linguistic mastery can be derived, yet the implicit consultant is disassembled (bodily, vocally, emotionally) such that language is not fixed in an individual speaker: instead language is a kind of ahistorical and objective presence. It exists regardless of the source. Or rather, it exists only by presenting itself as sourceless. It attains a rational disposition because the second subject (the Timucua consultant) is not there to subvert linguistic observations by signaling the subjective nature of his or her linguistic experience.

Walking down a jungle path with his Amerindian consultant, Lévi-Strauss disappears into his own narrative, and Fabian reveals the anthropologist’s presence only through a close reading of the posited “imperceptible clue.” The Arte timvqvana hints at the presence of a Timucua perspective on Pareja’s language use or even more generally on the Timucua world by presenting emotional vocalizations while withholding the presence of a specific Timucua speaker or Timucua body. Laughter and lamentations provide a trace of the Timucua subject within the grammatical arts of empire, a kind of survivance grammatica. In the early sixteenth century Antonio de Nebrija expressed a similar idea in his Reglas de Ortografía en la lengua castellana, stating, “the letter is nothing more than the trace or figure by means of which the voice is represented” (qtd. in Mignolo, “Nebrija in the New World” 189). Such is laughter in the Arte timvqvana, a trace of the laugher whose exclamations of “ayá ayá” and “hupu” nevertheless provide the reader with a representation of Timucua being.

The object of laughter, whether it is Pareja’s verbal clumsiness or an indelicate mispronunciation, is perceptible to the Timucua yet imperceptible to the reader of the grammar. Laughter is a sign left by the absent Timucua consultant(s), and despite the impetus of this investigation to restore agency to the linguistic collaborators who make the Arte timvqvana possible, and despite the reassuring statement Pareja translates as “yo vivo ó estoy despierto” (“I live or I’m awake”), the grammar denies the Timucua “full being” or
even that implicit being attained by Cockenoe (57). Further historical research may elicit a name for the Timucua consultant(s) – perhaps one of the local sachems, such as Don Francisco, Don Pedro, or Don Diego – but the paratextual features of preface or epilogue, unlike those of *The Indian Grammar Begun*, do not provide us with adequate clues to locate a specific historical figure. Nonetheless, where the Timucua individual is glimpsed only through a glass darkly, Timucua epistemology and ontology emerge within the linguistic data. From the verb *natori* and substantive *ano*, we are given the impression that the Timucua concepts of knowledge and being were decidedly not anthropocentric in that they were not centered entirely on human epistemology and ontology. The laughter of the Timucua disrupts the image of the missionary linguist in control of language, restores voice to the Timucua in a manner contrary to the tragic and bleak historical record – it is a laughter that, if it does not shatter, then it at least perturbs the familiar landmarks of our thought, where knowledge and being are distinctly human and the continuity of indigenous communities is forever disrupted by European presence.

**5.9 Conclusion**

The desire to “kill the Indian to save the man” manifested early in the colonization of the Americas, where projects to civilize the indigenous inhabitants could not be separated from Christian evangelism. It is unknown whether Eliot was aware of missionary linguistics in Spanish America. Regardless his *Indian Grammar Begun* and Francisco Pareja’s *Arte de la lengua timuquana* both contributed to the projects for assimilation, even if their uses were quite disparate. Eliot’s grammar was ostensibly for teaching English preachers Wampanoag, yet the success of Puritanism in New England resulted largely from the efforts of the Amerindian missionaries who vastly outnumbered their English counterparts (Andrews 24). This indicates a lack of institutional support for the study of Amerindian languages in Anglo
America. Pareja’s grammar, in contrast, formed part of a robust institutional apparatus that printed indigenous grammars for numerous languages and facilitated their study at monasteries and colleges. The differences radiate outward from the Reformation. Catholic missionaries broadcast religious orthodoxy orally, skirting the threat of Amerindian converts interpreting an indigenous Bible freely. Protestant missionaries believing that “by Scripture alone” could a pagan be saved, stressed literacy and individual interpretation of the Word.

The presence of the Bible in Anglo America and its relative scarcity in Spanish America indicates that the grammars were conceived of quite differently, as part of a network of texts that included or excluded the Bible. In either case, the grammars were essential to educational efforts in the colonies in allowing teachers and missionaries to communicate Christian theology to Amerindian students. The schools were diverse in structure, size, and student populations, ranging from the small yet inclusive grammar schools in Eliot’s praying towns to the larger yet exclusive colleges of both Cambridge and Tlatelolco. The Harvard Indian College and the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco started from a similar place of hope for the spread of Christianity by Amerindian missionaries. Despair for this project, however, soon descended in Spanish America when Amerindian students proposed unorthodox interpretations and continued pagan idolatry and the marriage of clergy, a form of cultural resistance. Support for the Colegio de Santa Cruz was withdrawn when this resistance continued and a native clergy was deemed too threatening. Although study there continued in a minor way, its original raison d’être – the creation of an indigenous clergy – was officially forbidden. Funded by the same corporation as Eliot’s grammar, the New England Company, the Harvard Indian College was demolished in 1693 because of a lack of students and the resentments that lingered after the devastating King Philip’s War.
The arts of empire were designed to destroy Amerindian culture as an alternative to military conquest and they culminated in the production of Amerindian grammars that enabled the civilizing powers of Christian conversion. As the height of linguistic imperialism, it is no surprise that these grammars erase the necessary Amerindian language consultant, who is de-articulated from the language in name. Nonetheless, I establish the survivance of language consultants such as Cockenoe and the persistence of Amerindian epistemologies and ontologies by re-articulating the abstracted linguistic data to the consultation event and the living, breathing language consultants to the historical narrative.
Epilogue

The *translatio studii* that I trace here, with its rudimentary beginnings in simple word-lists and its later, fuller manifestation in a monumental assemblage of linguistic technologies, defies somewhat the common understanding of linguistic imperialism as the spread of a nation’s language to a different linguistic community. Certainly, that is what Ostler’s *Empire of the Word* and Phillipson’s *Linguistic Imperialism* are largely concerned with, although Ostler’s account of the spread of Castilian under the Spanish empire confronts the reality of the roughly two hundred and fifty years in which the *lenguas generales* were the predominant means of communication between Amerindians and European colonists (17). Mignolo’s approach expands the notion of linguistic imperialism to include the transmission of a way of thinking about language that results in the colonization of minds – the transfer of a linguistic ideology that favoured European cultures and language practices. Mignolo contemplates the ideological status of the letter, a theory of the letter that was also a theory of writing, exemplified in Nebrija’s axiom “to write as we pronounce and to pronounce as we write” (41) and in the idea that “the letter is nothing more than a trace or figure by means of which the voice is represented” (42). Despite being a powerful approach for understanding linguistic change in the Americas, Mignolo’s interpretation has met with criticism that demonstrates the incompleteness of the theory of the letter as a linguistic ideology.

Regardless of later criticism, Mignolo’s line of inquiry has greatly influenced my approach and aided me in discovering linguistic ideology in the form of a “theory of the word” that arose out of the word as a socio-historical technology derived from the unique

---

113 In the fifteenth century the Inca similarly adopted Quechua, the language of their vassals, “in order to secure orderly acceptance of a vast extension of power” (Ostler, *Empire of the Word* 21).
morphosyntactic structure of European languages. It is through a theory of the word that Amerindian languages were represented as if they shared the same structure as European languages. The arrival of the European arts of empire in the Americas meant therefore the arrival of the Word in number of ways: the chopping up of polysynthetic Amerindian languages to create linguistic units recognizable to Europeans; the slow spread of both European vernacular and prestige languages; the de-articulation of Amerindian speech from Amerindian bodies; the penetration of the assemblage of linguistic technologies (printing presses, ink, paper, grammars, dictionaries) and language practices (classical rhetoric, textual studies, exegesis, adult language learning); and at the centre of all this, the spread of the Christian religion through evangelical missions.

Notwithstanding the Leviathan-like character of the colonization of the Americas advancing in legion, from military, to economic, to ecological, to religious, and to linguistic, both historical Amerindian figures and Amerindian cultural and linguistic practices endure into the present. The first and most obvious example is the expansion of the lenguas generales under Spanish dominion, three of which are currently official languages of Bolivia – Quechua, Aymara, and Guaraní. Many other non-hegemonic languages persisted under colonialism and even those lost for several generations, such as Wampanoag, are currently being revived from the very arts of empire that sought to civilize and Christianize them. The presence of Amerindian bodies, their crying and laughing voices, and their traditions in linguistic texts allows for the re-articulation of Amerindians to the historical record, a narrative discourse that has traditionally resulted in their erasure. Mignolo’s discussion of Guaman Poma de Ayala’s use of illustrations in his El primer nueva corónica y buen gobierno (1615) exhibits the survivance of an Incan conception of spatial representation, particularly in his reading of Poma de Ayala’s maps (Darker Side 246-54). In regards to a linguistic
tradition, León-Portilla’s *El destino de la palabra* is perhaps the most explicit identification of the transmission of pre-Columbian texts, the combination of an oral and a pictographic tradition, in the face of the cultural and demographic cataclysm of European dominion. Amerindian authors such as Domingo Francisco de San Anton Muñón Chimalpahin, who studied at the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco and wrote his *Diferentes historias originales* (ca. 1620) in Nahuatl based on interviews and original codices, indicate the continuity of indigenous culture and language not just despite the arts of empire but through them. This study is a sustained effort to think about the early modern language sciences in a different way and to develop from historical research, literary critical approaches, and linguistic analyses an interpretive model that, like Mignolo and León-Portilla, demonstrates the survivance of Amerindian language consultants and traditions within colonial linguistic texts.

Moving past the boundaries of the project at hand, these observations on the language encounter beg the question whether descriptive linguistics in the Americas had a measurable effect on the language sciences and philosophies of language in Europe. Even though Rowe claims “[p]robably no grammarian of the period before 1700 even knew of the existence of more than a few grammars of languages other than the language he worked on” (364), more recent transatlantic studies attempt to prove that the language encounter changed the way that Europeans understood language and theorized about it. While Rüdiger Schreyer has convincingly demonstrated, with regard to such authors as Lord Monboddo and Jean-Jacques Rousseau, the effects of “savage” languages on the eighteenth-century search for the origins of language (“‘Savage’ Languages in Eighteenth-Century Theoretical History of Language”), I am compelled to search for the influence of Amerindian languages on other forms of philosophy of language. Rivett’s “Learning to Write Algonquian Letters,” for example, makes the claim that John Eliot’s mission work influenced the *Essay concerning
human understanding (1690) by John Locke, who presumably encountered the Wampanoag grammar and antagonism toward linguistic mysticism through his associates at the Royal Society, particularly Robert Boyle (552). Likewise, Ann Talbot notes, “what travel literature offered Locke was a way of breaking out of the intellectual confines of his own society” (19) and though her investigation concerns Locke’s developments in political philosophy the motivation to demonstrate new offshoots in intellectual history blossoming out of the language encounter with the Amerindians is much the same.

Both Rivett and Talbot point to the inclusion of French travel books in Locke’s personal library – such as Chrestien Le Clerq’s Nouvelle Relation de la Gaspesie (1691) and Gabriel Sagard’s Le grand voyage au pays des Hurons (1632) – and Hans Aarsleff indicates that Locke sent home to Britain a number of European vernacular grammars while visiting Port Royal in France (From Locke to Saussure 45). Aarsleff reproduces part of a letter from 1679 in which Locke requests that a friend ship him books from abroad “because I very much wish for an entirely open exchange of good books printed in [France] (and especially of good travel accounts) and because I fear that our country produces too few to supply me with enough merchandise of this sort to maintain a proper exchange with you” (71, emphasis mine).

Locke’s fear is precisely where Rivett’s claim of continuity begins to unravel. Although she admits “the Eliot Tracts do not appear in the ‘Voyages and Travel’ section of Locke’s library” (551), the premise of her investigation is precisely to show “the indigenous place of

\[114\] Hans Aarsleff describes this linguistic mysticism as “Adamicism,” a natural relation between word and thing not based, like Foucault’s épistémé, on resemblance but rather divine order (From Locke to Saussure 22, 26, 27).

\[115\] Talbot notes that Locke possessed de la Vega’s Comentarios reales (72), which may have had a significant and understudied influence on Locke’s philosophy of language in book three of his Essay concerning human understanding. Although Rivett speculates that Locke benefited from the work of John Eliot (551-2), she is unable to demonstrate that his work was known to the philosopher, unlike the travel account of Chrestien Le Clercq. This author, however, published his two volume work on the Mi’kmaq culture and writing system in 1691, a year after Locke’s essay, which Rivett fails to mention.
language philosophy in seventeenth-century Atlantic world,” asking “how did indigenous languages transform the structure of European thought?” (554).

Rivett has not proven that Amerindian languages did transform the way Locke conceived of language through any explicit connection with *The Indian Grammar Begun* or other Amerindian grammars. If we grant that Locke did view representations of Amerindian languages, then it would most definitely be in the form of bilingual word-lists. This is because the religious Orders in New France had no printing press (Rivett 560) and so French grammars of Amerindian languages were not printed in the seventeenth century. The works that introduced Locke to the language encounter in the Americas were travel books, whose most complex form of language representation, as we have seen, were word-lists and later more extended Amerindian vocabularies. But perhaps Rivett is onto something. As I noted earlier, Dawson describes early-modern philosophy of language as a “philosophy of words” (7), and the word as a privileged unit of meaning for grammarians such as Nebrija has already been cited. However, Dawson’s account of language theory in seventeenth-century Europe is entirely concerned with the internal cultural disposition, with education in the *trivium* and contemporary metaphysics, theology, and political science, thus ignoring the possible influence of the Americas and Amerindian languages on the emergence of a modern philosophy of language.

J. H. Elliott’s recapitulation of scholarship that attempts to measure the effects of the colonization of the Americas on European culture is a good place for this investigation to end, for Elliott’s works of comparative history on the English and Spanish empires most certainly motivated this project. In the essay “Final Reflections” that concludes the collection *America in European Consciousness*, Elliott detects the formation of two camps of scholars differing in their answers to the question of American influence, two groups that we
might call “internalists” and “externalists.” The first of these groups continues the argument first proposed in Elliott’s *The Old World in the New* where he posits an “uncertain impact,” a line of reasoning suggesting that advances in areas such as language theory were almost entirely due to internal cultural developments (e.g. Dawson). The second group is more appreciably postcolonial and asserts that the Americas, Amerindians, and Amerindian cultures were external factors that changed the trajectory of European culture in significant ways (e.g. Talbot, Rivett). Elliott’s description of America in the European consciousness as a “blunted impact” (401) perhaps describes best the externalist and internalist perspectives reconciling on a degree of influence that is present and yet often hard to trace. Elliott raises three questions about impact to schematize the problem, seeking to measure European interest in the Americas, to gauge assimilation of information emerging from experiences of the New World, and finally to assess the transforming effect on European consciousness and culture (394-5).

Rivett’s very recent study of the effects of Amerindian languages on European language philosophy only partially addresses the problems of interest and assimilation, demonstrating only that Locke’s library contained travel books with Amerindian vocabularies and answering the question of his access to Amerindian grammars with indirect influence and speculation. Nonetheless, she quite explicitly argues for a transforming effect, much as Talbot, who more clearly demonstrates Locke’s interest in and assimilation of Amerindian models of social organization. This brief foray into scholarship that connects the literature of the Americas (whether descriptive linguistics or ethnography) with advances in European language theory and political philosophy is an attempt to set the various pieces on the board before making the next move. That is, the continuation of this project would confront the very problem of influence by tracing the course of the Amerindian grammars
across the Atlantic and into the early modern language theory. Although at least one attempt has been made to demonstrate Locke’s engagement with Amerindian languages, it is my opinion that this study has not adequately documented an explicit influence on Locke’s linguistic innovations in his *Essay concerning human understanding*. Just as this present study is comparative, I would like to research the connections between the Amerindian linguistic texts and philosophers of language such as the English John Locke and the Spanish Francisco Sánchez de las Brozas, also known as El Brocense or Sanctius. Much like Dawson’s assessment of Locke’s theories, Rowe’s description is that of an internalist as he presents Sanctius’s theories on language in his *Minerva* (1587) developing out of the humanist tradition of philosophical grammar. This intellectual tradition later encouraged similar work from the Port Royal grammarians (366). The proximity that Sanctius held both temporally and spatially with the Amerindian grammars suggests however that his universalist approach to Latin grammar – and especially the word – may have been influenced by the descriptive linguistics returning from the New World. The connection with Port Royal that Locke and Sanctius share may be the approach that establishes a more explicit line of interest, assimilation, and transforming effect than has previously been accounted for.

Finally, that Amerindian authors emerged in a lopsided way from the English and Spanish colonies provides another historical problem that may be resolved through research into the explicit connection of individual authors to the arts of empire. While it is certain that the Mexica writer Chimalpahin studied at the Colegio de Santa Cruz de Tlatelolco, where collaborative work on Amerindian languages and cultures was enormously productive, similar kinds of connections between Amerindian authors in Anglo America and the arts of empire demand more explicit documentation of a link to descriptive linguistics. Joseph Johnson is the first Amerindian author to be published in Anglo America in 1772, as already
mentioned, so such an approach would require more research into the continuation of missionary linguistics in the eighteenth century. As always, it is my conviction that a comparative approach to this problem will reveal much about the lacunas and aporias in the historical narrative that are taken for granted by tradition-specific investigations.

These two lines of investigation, into the influence of Amerindian languages on philosophies of language in Europe and the influence of the language sciences on Amerindian authors, would be the natural expansion of this research project, whose constant target has been to demonstrate the broad effects of the language encounter on both Amerindian and European cultures, as well as the persistence of Amerindian agency against and through the arts of empire.
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