

Some notes on the Portuguese-English and English-Portuguese Grammars to 1830

1. No WORKS FOUND OF THIS KIND PREVIOUS TO 1700.

Although a new current of research, with Dr. Zachrisson and Professor Wyld as chief exponents, emphasizes the importance of occasional phonetic spellings for the study of the history of English sounds, and thus has deeply modified, specially as regards chronology, the conclusions arrived at by the great pioneers and their followers — Ellis, Sweet, Viétor, Jespersen, etc., yet the works of the grammarians, and particularly those for the use of foreigners, all due allowances made, still have their own place in the whole scheme. Wyld expressly says: Our best chance of help is from the works of foreigners, who, having no prejudices in favour of one sound more than another, have no hesitation, if they are acute enough to observe a difference between the English pronunciation of a "letter" and their own, in pointing it out. (1)

English grammars in German, French, and other languages, have been thoroughly studied by Viétor, Spira, etc. The desire to know what could be done in a systematic way, on the Portuguese side, as a collateral contribution to the study of the history of English pronunciation, led us first of all, naturally, to a bibliographic research.

Going through the catalogues of our large public libraries, rich in class-books from the incorporation therein of the conventual libraries, we have been able to supplement and complete the indications given by our great bibliographer Innocencio Francisco da Silva, to whose authority everyone in my position will naturally resort.

We could not come upon any work of the kind previous to the eighteenth century, and in this way our principal purpose was at once, we may well say, invalidated,

Some notes, however, bibliographic and otherwise, which we took during our search, we are going to record in the following lines; in their modest scale, one or another of them may still peradventure be of some interest, however slight and transient, to those who have an inclination for this line of reading.

2. A VERY PROBLEMATIC MENTION OF A XVI CENTURY ENGLISH GRAMMAR. In a book of 1700, *Lenitivos da Dor*, by Fr. Francisco da Natividade, some mention is made of an "*Arte para aprender o Inglez, e Olande*", by Paula Vicente (morte 1576), the daughter of our great pisy-writer Gil Vicente. Others after him repeat this statement, including Barbosa Machado in his *Biblioteca Lusitana*; but the book, printed or in manuscript, has never been discovered, and nobody nowadays believes in its existence, neither our illustrious Romanist D. Carolina Michaelis de Vasconcelos (2), nor the late critic and historiographer Braamcamp Freire, who just before his death published an exhaustive book upon Gil Vicente (3).

As a mere possibility we may be allowed to suggest that such a work may have existed, not from the pen of the playwright's daughter, but from some unknown P. Vicente, the same being afterwards attributed to her; and we should be thankful, in any case, to anybody who would kindly point out to us the existence in a foreign library, of a work or works of the kind previous to, or different from, those we mention.

3. TWO UNACKNOWLEDGED TRANSLATIONS FROM LATIN-PORTUGUESE WORKS. The first grammar of either language, studied as a foreign one, we actually come upon is:

Grammatica Anglo-Lusitanica, by A. J. London, 1701.

It is a Portuguese grammar for the English—we state it, because we are concerned with both lines of grammars, and these titles are liable to ambiguity.

This 1701 grammar is appended to an English-Portuguese and Portuguese-English Dictionary bearing that date, published in London under the title: *A Cotnpleat Account of the Portugeze Language. Being a copious Dictionary English with. Portuguese and Portugaese with English*, by A. J.

It was also, with some bilingual dialogues added, separately reprinted in Portugal with the title

Grammatica Anglo-Lusitanica -Lisboa, 1705.,

only that here the work is entirely anonymous, not even the initials A. J. appearing on its front page.

According to our great novelist, and whole-hearted bibliophile, Camilo Castelo Branco (⁴), both this grammar and the dictionary were attributed to Raphael Bluteau, a most learned French Theatine, to whom we owe our first extensive Portuguese dictionary.

Bluteau, born in London in 1638, but the son of French parents, studied in France and became renowned as a preacher, coming in 1668 to Portugal, where he became a favourite with the Court and the learned. He knew and spoke fluently English, French, Italian, Portuguese, Spanish, Latin and Oreek. In 1697 he was obliged, for political reasons, to go to France, whence he came in 1704, but still in disfavour. In this way he would have published the dictionary while away from Portugal, and the separate grammar just after his return; and his reason for not putting his name to these works may naturally have been his disgrace.

Camilo, in his usual dicíatoria! way, does not tell us anything as to the sources of his information. The publication in Lisbon of a Portuguese grammar for the English is rather unexpected, and, taken together with the broad accordance of the hypothesis with biographical circumstances, would seem to render this probable—although we are unable to find any concordance of this book with Bluteau's better known works, or even with their general make and style.

We were rather puzzled with the whole matter—and are explaining it so fully — because both Bluteau and Camilo are such big men among us, and it would prove of some interest if the work were Bluteau's; but, as a matter of fact, in the course of our investigations we found out that it is but the translation from the Latin of the *Ars Grammaticae pro Lingua Lusitana*, of 1672, by our grammarian Bento Pereyra, the Dictionary in the same way being a translation from his *Prosodia* and *Thesouro da Lingua Portuguesa*. Where the unknown translator found Latin, he put English.

May this translation at least be Bluteau's? At first I would not credit such an idea.

Bluteau tells us in his dedication to the Marquês de Cascaes of the 3rd volume of his sermons (5), that when he went to France he had his *Vocabulario Portuguez e Latino* ready for the press: he was going to have it printed in that country; and D. Thomas Caetano do Bem, in his *Memorias Historicas dos Clerigos Regalares* (⁶), relegates the date of its completion to 1691. Now if Bluteau's own work were so far advanced at that date, it is not likely that he, in 1701, translated another's, instead of using his own.

So it would seem that not even the hypothesis of these English translations representing his beginnings in philology, is acceptable. And he was not, we should be inclined to say, the man to translate instead of creating or at least improving.

But when I have found that in his *Prosa Grammatonica* (⁷), he makes use of whole paragraphs, *ipsis verbis*, of a former work—*Ortografia da Lingua Portuguesa* by Joam Franco Barreto, Lisboa, 1671 — without any acknowledgement, I dont know what to think.

Be this as it may, the question of "translatorship" is after all of very little interest for our special purpose. Nevertheless we may add that, Bento Pereyra having been for a time director of the Irish Seminary of Lisbon, and the prefaces at least of both works being cast in perfectly idiomatic English, we may suspect the translation to have been made by a former Irish pupil of Pereyra, on his return to England.

The initials A. J. may possibly mean "A Jesuit", Bento Pereyra belonging to that order.

4. THE FIRST TRANSCRIPTIONS. Also largely based upon, although not a literal translation of Pereyra's *Ars Grammaticae* as regards morphology and syntax, but perhaps original as regards phonology, is

Grammatica Lusitano-Anglica—London, 1731. Anonymous. ;

To it is appended

Epitome Grammaticae Lusitano-Anglicae, ou Huma breve instrução para aprender a língua ingleza (London, 1731).

This is a very short compendium of English grammar for the use of the Portuguese.

I have not been able to find out who was the author of these works.

The *Grammatica* was later on reprinted in another volume, where the *Epitome* is substituted by a longer English Grammar. There J. Castro appears as the name of the author, at first inspection in an ambiguous way, as he is solely the author of the new part, the preface of which is the only one signed "Castro"; and we could not find any affinity between the *Epitome* and the grammar that takes its place, as there would certainly be if they were by the same pen.

From the study of the languages in which both parts are written, the first in English, the second in Portuguese, we come to the conclusion that their author knew both languages as a foreigner, though his English is remarkably correct, and his Portuguese a little less so.

On the other hand, by the knowledge he reveals of French, and from the large part he gives to that language in the formation of Portuguese—he says, for instance, that Henry Duke of Burgundy "introduced the Gaulic Dialect" into Lusitânia, and that "the difference there is between Spanish and Portuguese pronunciation is in all conformable to the Gaulic or French Dialect", which assertion he tries to prove by many examples—this grammar seems to be the work of a Frenchman. (8)

This hypothesis of its author being a Frenchman seems to receive confirmation from his transcriptions, which are numerous in both parts, but incorrect and incoherent. For instance he transcribes both Port. [e] and [s] by Engl. *a*, but also by *e*, while for the unstressed Port. [e] he uses rather indiscriminately these same signs, etc. As a sample we reproduce a few lines of a continuous piece of transcription he gives in the English-Portuguese part.

PORTUQUESE.

Tive a honra de suas de
quinze e vinte do mês passa-
do pello correo, e de 22 ditto
pello navio A Capitam j pel-
las quais recebi suas ordens
de carregar por seu risco e

ENGLISH.

Teeve au honra de suaus
de kinze e veente do mês
paussado pello Corrao, de
22 ditto pello Nau-veeo A.
Caupitaung j pellaus qu-aus
recebee soo-aus ordengs do

Conta a bordo do primeiro	cauregaur por sa-oo risco a
bom navio, fazendo a viagem	Conta au bordo do primái-ro
para Amburgo 25 caixas de	bong nauveeo, fauzendo au
Açucares com 6. Caixas de	veeaugeng pauraum
brancos, e 50 rolos de Ta-	boorgo 25 Cau-ishausde Aus-
baco	soocaures cong 6 Caú-ishaus
	de braucos, a 50 rolos de Tau
	bauco.....

As a transcription from the Portuguese, this is inconsistent enough; we have already seen how incorrectly he deals with Port. *e*; in the same way he uses Engl. *au* both for Port [a] and [a]. But if we regard him right away as a Frenchman transcribing French *a* by Engl. *au*, then he is simply to be placed by the side of those, like Boyer, who use *aw* for the same purpose.

5. WHO WAS J. CASTRO? We find Castro thrice quoted in Professor Jespersen's *Modern English Grammar* (⁹); it would be of some interest to know something about him.

The title of his grammar is: —

Grammatica Lusitano-Anglica ou Grammatica Portugueza e Ingleza, by J. Castro, Mestre e Traductor de ambas as Linguas (teacher and translator of both languages). London, 1751.

As we have seen, this grammar forms one volume with a second edition of the English-Portuguese Grammar of 1731; in place of the *Epitome* we have this *Grammatica Lusitano-Anglica*, solely the work of Castro. The first part is unaltered.

There is another edition of this second part which has neither the date, nor the place where it was printed, but only the indication that it was sold by Bertrand, of Lisbon. On the authority of our bibliographer Innocencio, however, it bears the stamp of the Lisbon editions of that time. Another reason to believe that it is so, and at the same time to conclude that the London edition is the earlier, is the fact that its many mistakes in Portuguese, the spelling, use of capitais, etc., are here corrected. The London edition was printed by workmen who did not know Portuguese, and very badly revised: if made from an accurate printed edition it would have been itself much more correct.

The date of this Lisbon edition must have been 1759.

Innocencio, speaking of a 1777 reprint of this same edition, says that "according to some notes that had been shown him, (Bertrand the bookseller's apparently) an edition had been made in 1759.

This date perfectly agrees with the hypothesis of this being a reproduction of the London 1751 Grammar.

Now who was J. Castro? It has been generally held that J. Castro is Jacob de Castro Sarmento, our great physician, a Portuguese Jew who for fear of the Inquisition, went into voluntary exile in England, just after taking his medical degree. In England he spent his whole life and worked with some of the most notable scientists of the time, as Hans Sloane, Stephen Gray, Bevan, Thomas Short, the celebrated anatomist James Douglas⁽¹⁰⁾, etc. He soon became a member of the Royal College of Physicians and of the Royal Society of London, and wrote several medical treatises in Portuguese.

His memory has no need of this small additional stone to increase its glory: but, of course, it would render references to the work more valuable were it proved that it was indeed his. But I have reasons for believing that it is not. These are:—

1st. All the London editions up to 1811 bear the name of J. Castio: the Lisbon editions, made upon that of London of 1751, have Jacob de Castro, but the alteration must have been the result of guesswork. Now Jacob de Castro's medical works bear his surname Sarmento, and his professional titles.

2nd. Ali Sarmento's acknowledged works, although printed in London, are accurately printed, and their Portuguese is very correct: this is not the case with the Grammar in question.

3rd. The London edition of 1751 prints for the first time — as it does not figure in the 1731 volume, — the following curious "Advertisement":—

"The author of this Grammar, who has lately publish'd a treatise, intitled, *A Present for young gentlemen on entering the comptin-house*, teaches, either at his House at Houndsditch, between the Sun and the Crown, near *Bishopsgate*, or abroad, young Gentlemen, Ladies, etc., Writing, Arithmetick and the true *Italian* Method of Book-keeping, in a short Time (without the common Detail of Rules, Tables, and impertinent or rather unnecessary Questions) by a

successful and approved Method of Instruction in a Merchant-like Manner."

It is highly improbable that this should apply to Jacob de Castro Sarmiento—a learned man and a physician of note, as we have said. As to the actual identity of J. Castro we have so far learnt nothing with certainty. But this, of course, does not destroy the value of his transcriptions, although it may somewhat lessen their authority.

The Lisbon edition has some alterations due to the reviser's ignorance of the subject: for example, finding that out of four different pronunciations given for English *o*, of two it is said that they sound "like the Portuguese *a*" the latter of the two is simply eliminated.

6. A JUDICIOUS CRITIC. The next-grammar to be met with is: —

Grammatica ingleza ordenada em portuguez, etc., by Carlos da Silva Teles de Menezes. Lisboa, 1702.

Although the author of this grammar tells the reader that he composed it "on finding himself possessed of a sufficient knowledge of that language" the truth is that we have here only very poor work, widely and incorrectly based on French models.

Far more valuable is its criticism published in the

Gazeta Literaria for March, 1702. By Francisco Bernardo de Lima. Porto.

Lima, as he himself tells us and we might infer from the English names which figure in the list of subscribers to his *Gazeta*, lived in close touch with the British colony, already numerous in Oporto, and had given special care, he asserts, to learning at first hand the correct sounds of the languages he knew: "the only possible way in which to learn the true pronunciation is through the practice of hearing the most polished Englishmen."

He is the first, as we shall see, to direct attention to a more correct valuation of the digraphs *au* and *aw*, as well as of the *a in al*, etc., noting that "it is intermediate, in the opening of the mouth, between *a* and *o*."

But we give the translation of the principal passages in his article, as respects phonetics:

"The letters, and syllables, have sometimes so different a sound from our corresponding Portuguese, that it is impossible to make it known in writing; the author therefore uses the sound that is somewhat similar to ours, but he forgets to tell us that this substitution is imperfect, and that we can only learn the true pronunciation by the habit of hearing the most polished Englishmen."

"... our first rule in learning the languages we to-day know, was to try and acquire as good a pronunciation as a Portuguese may attain to, and only after this seek the true meaning of the words..."

"The author knows that there are in English letters and syllables for which there is no corresponding sound in Portuguese, and so it would seem proper to make this preliminary remark..."

"Under the letter *a* the author says that *table, miracle, cable*, etc., are pronounced *téble, mirécle*; but a little attention causes us to perceive the sound of *tébel, mirékel, kébel*... We do not find this remark, even under the letter *l*..."

"It would not be improper to say in this place that the letter *a*, when followed by *ll*, must be pronounced as German *a*, the sound between *a* and *o* in opening the mouth, which we do not possess in Portuguese... The same applies to the diphthong *au*, or *aw*..."

"Under the letter *i* he says that this vowel before a consonant and final *e* is pronounced as *ai*; but it is certain that only when we pronounce *ai* with close *a*, and very rapidly, do we get the true English sound." ⁽¹¹⁾

"When it sounds like *e*, as in *girl*, it is impossible to indicate its true sound in writing."

"The author, in speaking of the letter *o*, says that, placed in the middle of monosyllables ending in a consonant, it sounds like *a*. It would be correct to say that we have no sound equivalent to the abovesaid *o*; because, for instance, the *o* in *pod* is not pronounced by opening the mouth so much as the Portuguese do for their *c*; and we feel sure that if a Portuguese pronounces in conversation any of these words, isolatedly, *God, rod, clock*, pronouncing them *Gad, rad, clack*, no Englishman will understand him..."

"The letter *u* before a final consonant, or before those

consonants which make a syllable with this letter, has some resemblance to the Portuguese *o*; it is pronounced, however, with the mouth slightly open, so that there is no Portuguese word with an *o* of the same sound."

These reflections, however vague, have at least the merit of showing that Lima was fully conscious of the difficulties of the problem. Syllabic *l*, the clear quality of the first element in [ai], the pronunciation of *girl* (¹²), the unrounded representatives of M. E. short *o* and short *a*, all are more or less clearly hinted at.

In the next grammar we come to: —

Nova grammática da língua ingleza, por Agostinho Neri da Silva. Lisboa, 1779.,

notwithstanding that it very closely follows Miede's *Grammaire Angloise-Françoise*, not only Portuguese *o* is frankly admitted as the corresponding sound to English *au*, *aw*, *a* in *all*, etc., but also *to ou* in *ought*, *nought*, *brought*, etc., transcribed as *ôte*, *note*, *brote*, where Miede has *ât*, *nât*, *brât*.

7. THE QUESTION OF THE EVOLUTIONAL STAGE OF M. E. *ai*, *ei*, IN THE XVIII CENTURY. Professor Jespersen — *Mod. Eng. Gram.*, 11,43 — quotes many transcriptions from Castro's grammar in support of his idea that the levelled M.E. *ai*, *ei* were never monophthongized. Dr. Zachrisson thinks that much is to be said in favour of this theory; but Professor Wyld, in his last extensive work, argues that this cannot have been the case, among other reasons given because there existed from the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries inclusive a pronunciation [ei] for M.E. long *i*. (9)

We need not repeat here Jespersen's quotations from Castro. Menezes' grammar of 1762 is of no help, but in Neri, 1779, of which we have just spoken, we find, in the same way, the equivalences: Eng. *ay*, *ei*, *ey* = Port. *ei*. And, as well as in Castro, to the *ai* in the words *fair*, *hair*, *dairy*, that is, before *r*, the pronunciation *e* is assigned.

His positive assertion that "*ei* is pronounced by the English just as in Portuguese" is unhappily somewhat

weakened by the fact that he is translating too closely from his French model: " *ei* se prononce en Anglois comme en François". He follows Miede rather too closely. Nevertheless he neatly and coherently distinguishes where Miede equalizes, and so it seems after all that Castro's transcriptions receive confirmation from his.

If M.E. *ai*, *ei* were necessarily monophthongs for a time, may this mean that their re-diphthongization had already begun about 1751?

In Walker's Dictionary, in its "Directions to Foreigners", in a revised edition of the French-English Grammar of Siret, *Éléments de la langue anglaise*, London, 1800, not quoted by Theo Spira in his "Englische Lautentwicklung nach Französischen Grammatiker-Zeugnissen" — the name of the reviser is not given — and most probably elsewhere, we find the French digraph *ei* given as the equivalent of the English digraphs *ai*, *ei*, *ay*, *ey*, and also of the letter *a*. Now that *ei* having the same value as the French *è* or *ai* more commonly given before, the change is puzzling; in the grammar however we have the transcriptions *care* = *keire*, *fare* = *feire*.⁽¹³⁾

All subsequent editions of Castro's grammar give the same equivalences: Engl. *a*=Port. *e*, Eng. *ai*, *ei*=Port. *ei* (in the transcriptions, not by the rule). Only in the revised edition of 1828, and possibly in one of 1818, that we have not seen — both of which bear the name of H. J. da Costa (Hipólito José da Costa) as the author — we have for the first time in our language the equivalence Eng. *a*=Port. *ei* in all transcriptions.

The first to say expressly that Eng. *a* is pronounced like Port. *ei* is D. José de Urcullu, a Spanish exile who published a *Grammatica ingleza para uso dos aortuguezes*, Lisboa, 1830.

8. A CONTINUOUS TRANSCRIPTION FROM CASTRO'S GRAMMAR ANALYSED. Following the example set him by the unknown author of the English-Portuguese grammar to which he furnished the Portuguese-English counterpart, Castro also transcribes a complete business letter by means of Portuguese sounds. Only he is much more consistent than his anonymous colleague, as we shall see.

First of all we reproduce his transcription:

INGLEZ

Since mine of the 16th instant I have yours of the 14th ditto, and refer myself to what I have already written in answer to your said Letter. This serves at present to desire you to furnish and pay to Mr. J. M. to the Value of two hundred Pounds, at one or more Times, according as he shall desire it from you, taking his Bill or Bills of Exchange for what you shall so furnish him with, and put it to my Account, and this my Letter of Credit shall be your sufficient Warrant for so doing.

O MESMO INGLEZ POR ESTYLO PORTUQUEZ

Sénce máin av thi 16 instant Ai ev iúars av thi 14 ditto, end rifár máiself tu uát Ai ev alrédy rítin in énsar tu iúar séid Létar. This sár-vés et présent tu dizáir iú tu fárnix end péy tu Mítar J. M. tu thi vélhu av tu hán-dad Páunds, et uán ar mor Táims, eccarding es hi xal dizáitar it fram iú, teking his Bill ar Bills av Exchéngé far uat iú xal so fárnix him úith end pát it to mái Eccáunt, end this mái Létar av Credit xal be iúar sáffixient Uárant far so duing.

We are going now to represent — in the notation of the International Phonetic Association, as used for our language by Gonçalves Vianna in his *Portugals* (¹⁴), but necessarily simplified from want of special type for some of the more minute peculiarities — the way in which we think the above passage would be read by a Portuguese ignorant of English — with some indispensable corrections.

These result from the following considerations:

1. He cannot have endowed English with nasal vowels.
2. He surely intended the reader to employ [] for *a* in unstressed syllables and in monosyllables, just as we pronounce our article *a*, the preposition *mas*, etc.
3. For *h* and *th* he meant their English values. Having no information as to which of the values of the digraph *th* he means, we assumed it was everywhere the breathed [].
4. For final *s* he cannot have intended its Portuguese

pronunciations of [] and [ʒ], but seems to mean either [s] or [z], according to whether the following word begins with a vowel or not. A proof of this is the fact that when he really means [] he transcribes *x*, as in *fárnix*. But what sound did he mean for the letter *s* in *maiself* (Port. *s* between vowels —*z*), *es*, *his*?

5. He must also have meant Eng. [j] and [w] initially, sounds which do not exactly occur in Portuguese.

6. We must analyse our diphthong *el* as [ei], as it was then pronounced, and not as [si], as it is pronounced nowadays⁽¹⁵⁾.

7. For Port. In = [] he evidently means in Eng. [lj].

Further than this it is, we think, difficult to proceed, if we are to base ourselves exclusively on Castro's own evidence. What sounds, for instance, did he transcribe in every case by *a* or by *e*?

In his rules he gives Port. *a* as the equivalent:

a) for Engl. *o*, as in *hot*, *not*, *plot*, that is, for unrounded short *o*: transcriptions: *hat*, *nat*, *piai* — without an accent.

b) for Engl. *o* again, in *some*, *mouth*, *monk*: *sám*, *máuth*, *mánk*: here he puts together [A] and [a]. As to his *a* as equivalent for [A], see Jespersen, *Mod. Eng. Gram.*, 11.62.

c) for Engl. *u* in *rub*, *gun*, *burst*, *custam*, etc: *ráb*, *gán*, *bárst*, *cástam*.

In this way it would seem that he uses *á* both for [a] — in [ai] and [au] — and for [], *a* both for short *o*, and for [sj].

As to the pronunciation or pronunciations of *e* he hinted at, we think it very difficult to determine what they were. In Portuguese the [e] pronunciation of *e* was then prevalent in many more cases than nowadays⁽¹⁶⁾, and from this we may conclude the greater probability of his meaning generally [e] rather than [s],

He puts an accent over the *e* in *énsar*, *vélhu*, *alrédi*, *létar*; he transcribes without an accent *teking*, *ev*, *end*, *eccaut*, *sáffixient*, *et*, *eccarding*; he has both kinds in *exchége*. He even transcribes the auxiliary as *be*, only this, from his E rule, we conclude to be a misprint. But how are we to distinguish, always basing ourselves only upon his evidence, whether he means [], [e] or []? And what about his *e* in *teking*?

Taking all these points into consideration, may we be allowed to offer the following hybrid transcription, where English sounds (within parenthesis) and Portuguese sounds are taken together:

Under this form we can see better as to how far Castro is consistent.

His weak forms, his exact transcription of *sense* for *since*, then still a London vulgarism (¹⁷), that of *sarvs* for *serves* (¹⁸), etc, the murmur vowel represented in *iuars*, his *hândad*, which reminds us of Coçper's "facilitatis causa dicitur *handurd*, (¹⁹)" the pronunciation given for the suffix *cient*, all bear testimony to his general accuracy.

9. AN ADDITIONAL NOTE: WHO WAS J. CASTRO (ii)?

When this article was already in type, we received from our friend W. Bentley, who last year worked with us, and now has been appointed Lecturer on Portuguesa in King's College, the results of some research work he kindly did for us in the British Museum Library.

From these we learn unmistakably that J. Castro was an accountant and teacher of languages, and therefore not Jacob de Castro Sarmento.

The proof lies in the title page of another book of his, which we had seen mentioned in Allibone's *Critical Dictionary of English Literature*, only attributing him a different Christian name. We reproduce it almost in full:

" *The Merchant's Assistant and Clerk's Instructor, etc.*, by J. Castro, Writing Master and Accountant; also Teacher of the true Italian Method of Book Keeping. — NB. He likewise fairly states and faithfully settles all Sorts of Accounts, of which kind soever, with Expedition. — London Printed for the author and sold by B. Milles, in Houndsditch near Bishopsgate, etc., 1742."

This seems to be the "Present for Young Gentlemen" advertised in the grammar, and in any way it appears to us well established that their author, J. Castro, was an accountant who dwelt in Houndsditch; but of his life and qualifications we know unhappily nothing more.

Luís CARDIM.

(1) *A History of Modern Colloquial English*, p. 197. (2) *A Infanta D. Maria*, p. 43. (3) *Vida e Obras de Gil Vicente*, p. 254. We now see that we have misquoted Braamcamp Freire: the first mention of the grammar is to be found in *Portugal Ilustrado pelo Sexo Feminino*, by Ayres de Azevedo (P.^e Manuel Tavares), Lisboa, 1734, p. 92. (4) *Bibliographia portuguesa e estrangeira*, Porto, 1879, p. 75, reprinted in *Narcóticos*, vol. II, pp. 16-17. (?) *Primícias Evangélicas*, printed in Paris in 1698; the *Vocabulário* was first printed in 1712. (5) Vol. I, p. 301. (6) *Prosas portuguesas*, vol. II, p. 186. (8) There is a Portuguese-French grammar also largely based on Pereyra's — *Ensayo de Arte Grammatical Portuguesa e Francesa*, Lisboa, 1705 — by one Josué Rousseau, a Frenchman, who also wrote a phantastic History of Portugal from the creation of the world or thereabouts; but, from comparison, we conclude that he is not the author of this grammar. (9) 9.03, 11.43, 11.62. (10) Maximiano de Lemos, *Jacob de Castro Sarmiento*, p. 20. (11) Cp. Ripman, *The Sounds of Spoken English*, 40.101: Foreigners may dwell "much longer on the first element" (of the diphthong [ai]), and make it "more open". p) Jespersen, *Mod. Eng. Gram.*, 12.63. (12) Almost by the same time, in Siret-Parquet 1796, we find such transcriptions as Eng. *affraid*=*frēnci efreide*, *away*=*éuaie*, etc.. Cf. Spira, op. cit., § 641. (14) In the *Skizzen Lebender Sprachen* edited by Viëtor. (15) Gonçalves Vianna, *Pronuncia Normal Portuguesa*, p. 92. (16) Cf. Gonçalves Guimarães, in the 1st Appendix to his edition of the "*Luziadas*", p. 21. (17) Wyld, op. cit., p. 226. (18) *Ibid.*, pp. 214, 219. (19) Jespersen, op. cit., 9.111.