



Whittaker · Seminar für Romanische Philologie · Humboldtallee 19 · 37073 Göttingen

Wydział „Artes Liberales“
Uniwersytet Warszawski
00-46 Warszawa, Nowy Świat 69
Poland

Prof. Dr. Gordon Whittaker
Linguistische Anthropologie und Altamerikanistik

Tel. +49 551 39-4188
Fax +49 551 39-5667

gwhitta4@gmail.com

Göttingen, 16 May 2018

Review of Katarzyna Granicka's dissertation "Confronting Cultural Difference. The 1548 *Doctrina* as a vehicle for contact-induced change in Nahuatl language and culture"

This dissertation by Ms. Katarzyna Granicka is a well-conceived, persuasively argued, and very important study of the painstaking manner in which Christian theological concepts were adapted and transferred by Dominicans into the Nahuatl language of the mid-16th century, beginning in print with the 1548 *Doctrina Christiana*.

Ms. Granicka has carefully and in discerning detail mapped out the paths pursued by the Dominican order in selecting and, where necessary, creating or transferring terminology appropriate to the fine points of Christian theology. Of great significance is her discussion of the explanatory nature of the *Doctrina*, which contrasts sharply with the Franciscan order's approach to doctrinal works in the same and following periods. She sheds considerable light on the patterns of terminological adaptation as attested in the *Doctrina* and on the rationale behind these patterns. Furthermore, her identification of source material, such as Thomas Aquinas' *Summa Theologiae* and *Quaestio Disputata*, as models for the *Doctrina*, adds a significant dimension to her analysis, one frequently lacking in other academic treatises in this level of quality. For this reason, and for the incisive nature of her discussions of terminological decisions and distinctions reflected in the *Doctrina*, such as concern *ixquich huel* and *mochi hueli* (1.4.6) and *-yolia* and *anima* (4.4.1), this dissertation will surely inject fresh impulses into this area of Mesoamerican scholarship.

Although not crucial to the main thrust of Ms. Granicka's study, it would be interesting to see the latter expanded, when published, to include a discussion of the manner in which a member

of the Dominican order, fray Diego Durán, alerted his readership a quarter-century later in his *Libro de los ritos y ceremonias* to the dangers of overlooking parallels between Nahuatl concepts and practices, on the one hand, and of replacing (or accepting) Christian terms and names with (or as) substitutes for earlier Nahuatl terms and names, including those of deities. I should emphasize that Ms. Granicka had no need to include such a discussion in the thesis, since it would have represented a digression from her chosen topic. It would, however, provide further data on the Dominican approach to theological transfers.

I am not entirely convinced that the final subsection of the “Language” chapter in the dissertation, in which the use of *itlan* is contrasted with *ihuan* (2.2.3), will be the last word on this intriguing distinction. Here, Ms. Granicka highlights the interesting use of *itlan*, which she translates as ‘next to, below, under him,’ in the *Doctrina* to describe the relation of the fallen angels to Lucifer, as opposed to *ihuan*, ‘with him,’ in reference to God. The cited phrase *-tlan nemi* ‘be domestic dependent of’ is related but not identical to the former, given the choice of verb, and, thus, not necessarily pertinent to the contrast we have here. It should be noted that a standard greeting formula in the early colonial period was *Ma Dios motlan moyetztiye* ‘May God be with you’ (cf. Arenas (1611: 1): *Ma Dios motlā motetztiye* [sic for *moyetztiye*]), in which *-tlan*, not *-huan*, is employed. God is not being invoked as subordinate to mankind but rather as ‘next to, right beside’ us. It would be useful to gather more material on the uses of *-tlan* and *-huan*, especially in theologically relevant passages. I regard it as entirely possible that Ms. Granicka is correct in her contrast of the terms as used in the *Doctrina* itself, though more refinement of this would be advisable in future.

To sum up: this is a brilliant thesis, one that will have a major impact on our thinking with regard to the early development of standard terminology for representing central Christian concepts in Nahuatl-speaking Mesoamerica. Ms. Granicka has demonstrated an exceptional ability to finely analyze this intricate subject matter. Furthermore, she clearly has acquired a thorough command not only of the pertinent academic and early colonial literature but also of the Nahuatl language. I highly recommend acceptance of this thesis and of its subsequent publication. I would, however, suggest replacing the phrase “Nahua language and culture” with the slightly more accurate “Nahuatl language and culture,” since the language is the primary focal point in the work. “Nahua,” as opposed to “Nahuatl,” is above all used when non-linguistic matters are under discussion. However, this is a very minor quibble.

The thesis by Ms. Katarzyna Granicka fulfils all formal requirements for a PhD dissertation. I propose, therefore, that she be granted permission to proceed with the subsequent steps of the PhD dissertation process.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'G. D. ...' with a large, stylized flourish at the end.