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1. Introduction

The aim of this paper is to show the importance of the study of the Portuguese orthography of Father João Rodriguez for the understanding of Japanese 16th - 17th century Christian books and documents, especially his two Japanese grammars: *Arte do linguo de Iapoa* (1604-05) and *Arte breve do linguo Iapoa* (1620).

Such orthographic studies can sometimes shed light on the formation of the books in question, and also help us to understand the characteristics of the Roman alphabet transliteration of Japanese. It would of course be unwarranted to draw any parallels between Rodriguez' or other missionaries' accounts of Japanese and their Portuguese orthography, because the languages in question are quite different. Nevertheless, at the same time, we cannot totally exclude the possibility that Rodriguez as well as other missionaries as a Portuguese speaking human being with all the irrational tendencies that all human beings have, was influenced in some way or other by the background of contemporary controversies of Portuguese orthography in writing works in Romanized Japanese as well as Portuguese.
2. The transcription of the final diphthong /əu/

The origin of the modern Portuguese /əu/ (= [əu]) is relatively complex as is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latin forms</th>
<th>ANUM</th>
<th>-ÂN (N) EM</th>
<th>-ANT</th>
<th>-ÂN (TUM)</th>
<th>-ÕNEM</th>
<th>-ÕBINEM</th>
<th>-UNT</th>
<th>-UNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~14ᵗʰ</td>
<td>ə̂o</td>
<td>ə̄  1 ə̄k</td>
<td>ə̄  1 ə̄k</td>
<td>ə̄  1 ə̄k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14ᵗʰ–15ᵗʰ</td>
<td>ə̂ ə̂</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15ᵗʰ–16ᵗʰ</td>
<td>ə̂ ə̂</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td>ə̄ ə̄</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the above sound change is believed to have been completed by the 16th century, it is quite reasonable that the spelling differences representing the phonological distinctions shown above are not found in the first Japanese grammar written in a Western language, Arte da língua de Japam (1604–08) by Rodrigues. Various transcriptions for /əu/ in the Arte, such as /ə̄o, ə̄o/, etc., therefore, can be considered as purely orthographic variations. The distinctive use of /ə̄o/ and /ə̄o/ according to the stress accent in modern Portuguese, of course, cannot be seen in the text.

The number of instances of the transcription for /əu/ in the Arte is as follows.
It cannot be recommended, here, to take the above result just as an arbitrary choice of the transcriptions. Something important might be read from it, just as sociolinguistics today revealed that so called ‘free variations’ are not actually free, but are conditioned by various sociological factors.

The Arie by Rodríguez is suspected to have been printed at two different times⁶, that is to say, the first half of the text (until folio 94) in 1604 and the rest of the text in 1608. The clear difference in transcription for /ãu/ can also be seen between the former and the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>-am</th>
<th>-an</th>
<th>-ã</th>
<th>-ão</th>
<th>-ãã</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of instances</td>
<td>2,327</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>-am</th>
<th>-an</th>
<th>-ã</th>
<th>-ão</th>
<th>-ãã</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~f. 94</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95~</td>
<td>2,014</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Up until f. 94 the majority of the transcriptions for /ãu/ is -ão, while it is -am after f. 95. It is important to keep in mind this different tendency of spellings when one thinks about the formation of the Arie⁶. It is small wonder that there is some difference in the tendency of spellings between the former and the latter half of the Arie, because Rodríguez must have rewritten the manuscripts during the interruption of printing. But how should such a considerable difference in the transcriptions for /ãu/ be interpreted? One cannot help thinking that there must have been some influence by somebody else other than João Rodrigues in...
compiling the manuscripts of the Arte or in printing it.

3. The transcription for the diphthong /ei/

The use of y, j, i is one of the major controversies in 16th century Portuguese orthography. The first orthographer who took up a firm position concerning this controversy was Gandavo (1574). His principle can be summed up as follows:

1. The letter j is used only for transcribing consonants as in joanao, sbeio etc.
2. The letter y is never used for consonants but is used (as a semivowel) between vowels or after vowels at the end of the words as in joas, mayor, Rey, dasay etc.

Applying these principles to the diphthong /ei/ in question, the following sub-principles are evolved:

1. /ei/ is transcribed as ey before a vowel or at the end of words, and elsewhere is transcribed as ei.
2. /ei/ is never transcribed as e.

In the entire text, Gandavo (1574) observes these principles, writing in the following way, meyo, achey, maneira etc.

Nunez do Lobo (1576) also set up the following principle concerning i, j, y as follows:

The letter j is used for consonants, and i for vowels, while y is employed only for words of Greek origin.

The two precedent orthographers, Oliveira (1536) and Barros (1549), however, did not take such a clear position concerning i, j, y, and the transcription for /ei/, for example, is not necessarily consistent in the text. But at least the use of j for consonants seems to have been established by that time judging from the transcription in Oliveira.
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(1596), Barros (1540), Gandavo (1574) and Nunez do Liço (1576).

The customary transcription of /ei/ in the 16th century seems to be able to summed up as follows.

The diphthong /ei/ is never transcribed as ej, (or the letter j is used only for consonants, e.g. seja, dasjar etc.), and is transcribed either ei or ey according to the orthographic principle of the writer.

The transcription for /ei/ in the Arte by Rodriguez shows almost the same tendency with that for /iu/, with the exception of six specific words; rei (rey), meio (meyo), lei (ley), perfeito (perfeyto), primeiro (primeyro), and terceiro (terceyro).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>ei</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— f. 94</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95 —</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result of the above research shows a considerable difference in the transcriptions for /ei/ between in the text up until f. 94 and in that from f. 95 onwards, and also shows a clear transition from ey to ei. The transcription for /ei/ in the Arte Breve (1620) supports the above assumption of the transition. Almost all the transcriptions for /ei/ in the Arte Breve are ei^{111}.

The six exceptional words in the Arte (1604–08) mentioned above also do not contradict the assumption. The three exceptional words which still have transcriptions ey in the latter half of the Arte are as follows.

rei (rey)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>ei</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>— f. 94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95 —</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
meio (meio)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>el</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~f. 94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95~</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lei (ley)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>el</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~f. 94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95~</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three words indeed have the transcription ey in the latter half of the Arte, unlike the other words with /el/, but the following two points are worth noticing.

1. The transcription el is never used in the first half of the Arte.
2. The transcription ei can be seen in the latter half of the text even if the number of instances is fairly small.

The other three words which show another exceptional tendency in the Arte are as follows.

perfeito (perfeto)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>el</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~f. 94</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95~</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

primeiro (primeyro)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>el</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~f. 94</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95~</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>ei</th>
<th>ey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f. 94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 95</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These three words already have a considerable number of instances ei in the first half of the Arte unlike the other words, but the following two points are confirmed.

1. There is no instance of ey in the latter half of the Arte.
2. There is "residual" ey in the first half of the text.

Taking the above four points into consideration, all of the words with /ei/ in the Arte, including the six seemingly exceptional ones, display approximately the same tendency, that is, ey to ei.

The same tendency is confirmed here both in the transcription /3u/ and in the /ei/. That is to say, there is a clear difference in the orthographic tendency in the Arte between f.1-f. 94 and from f. 95.

| Ro > am |
| ey > ei |

The orthographic situation, however, is completely different in the letters and manuscripts by Rodriguez. There are more than 1,000 instances of /ei/, most of which are transcribed as ei or ej with a few examples of ey and no instance of ey. The manuscripts by Manuel Barreto, another missionary to Japan in the 16th century, give us a slightly different picture. His transcriptions for /ei/ are ei, ey, ej as in caneiros, reino, passarei, cheio, meio, chejo, mejo, alevantarei etc.

It may be concluded that for the Portuguese missionaries to Japan
in the 16th and 17th century the four different transcriptions, ei, eí, eý, ey were used for /ei/ in manuscripts, while the two, ei and ey were employed in printed matters, ey being in the process to be substituted.

The question of which of these four or two should be used was completely up to the writer, or maybe the printer.

The same kind of investigation into the works of Romanized Japanese by Portuguese missionaries yields a very interesting result. The transcriptions for Japanese /ei/ in the printed form of *Sanctos no Gosagyo* and in the manuscripts of the same literature are as follows, ei in the printed form and eí, eý, ey in the manuscripts. This clearly shows the parallelism between the Romanized Japanese by missionaries and the contemporary Portuguese orthography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription for Portuguese /ei/</th>
<th>Printed Matters</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arte</td>
<td>Arte Breve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ey &gt; ei</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eí</td>
<td>ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eý</td>
<td>ey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription for Japanese /ei/</th>
<th>Printed Matters</th>
<th>Manuscripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanctos no Gosagyo</td>
<td>Sanctos no Gosagyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eí</td>
<td>ej</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eý</td>
<td>ey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite the assertion by some Japanese scholars that the missionaries' Romanized transcription in manuscripts reflects the oscillation of the contemporary pronunciation more than that of printed form, it is concluded that at least as long as the transcriptions i, i̇, ĭ, y are concerned, they are just a mere reflection of the contemporary Por-
4. The transcription for 'acento'\(^{141}\)

There seems to have been at least three different concepts of 'acento' in the 16th century, which were sometimes used in a mixed way. They are:

1. acento oratório
2. acento prosódico
3. acento ortográfico

The 'acento oratório' has a fairly broad sense which refers to the modulation of the voice or intonation of utterances\(^{11}\). The 'acento prosódico' refers to stress accent on vowels and the modulation which accompanies it. The 'acento ortográfico' is a designation for a diacritical mark on vowels, and it is in this sense that the 'acento' or accent is referred to in this section.

For the 16th century Portuguese orthographers the use of the accent was never consistent, as it also has various roles in modern Portuguese.\(^{19}\).

Oliveyra (1536) uses the word 'acento' various times to refer to the stress accent, but never employs the 'acento ortográfico' in his text, even in the section where he gives examples for the explanation of the stress accent\(^{17}\). Barros (1540) makes use of what can be called 'acento ortográfico' to indicate the open-close distinction of the vowels a and o.

While Oliveyra made use of the Greek letters alpha and omega to indicate the open-close opposition of the vowels, Barros employed the acute accent on a and o, and a comma below e, which he called grãdez.

Gandavoz\(^{52}\), in his Regras (1574) does not distinguish functional
differences between the acute, grave and circumflex accents. For example, the crisis of the preposition a and the article a is indicated by all three accents indifferently. The acute and the circumflex accents also marked the crisis in the monosyllables só and ső; the acute or the grave marked the final stressed a in the words with homographs, such as aumant, or aumantí, está or está, or even the ones which lacked them, such as porás or porás. In this particular case, the phonological accent becomes redundant, since it marks both elements in homography. Both the paroxytone past (alcançáv, lavam, agradecerá) as well as the oxytone future (alcançará, lavará, agradecerá) are accentuated. Another feature of Gandavo's system is the fact that the accent does not necessarily imply timbre. In the same way that the stressed, closed vowel of agradecerá presents an acute accent, the open ones of the prepositional location fora de and of por (plural form of the modern põ) receive the circumflex accent. It seems, then, that the single notation in Gandavo which marks vowel stress and timbre at the same time is to be found in the verbal form por (as opposed to the unstressed preposition por). Besides, the stressed vowel most accentuated by Gandavo is the final -a.

Duarte Núñez do Llano106, in his Ortografia (1576), accentuates the oxytones ending in any vowel (except o), even if followed by s or a. So we find dardén (f. 4), raptè (f. 23); até (f. 12v, and f. 41), esedré, garrapéz, cargóz, rudo (f. 23); cheafrot, perdéo (ibid.); and nigot, arato (ibid.). As for the monosyllables ending in vowels, including even if followed by s or a, sometimes they are accentuated according to their stress (hid f. 15; at f. 37v; oss, pôs f. 23; þás f. 23v); other times, according to homographic forms (the verbal forms ò, ò or ke as opposed to the conjunction e; and the adverb þó as opposed to the disyllabic verbal
form of it).

Lisbo made use, again in a redundant way, of the acute and circumflex accents, for contrasting purposes. At times they represent phonological oppositions, such as B[a]ia and B[a]ia (f. 73v and f. 74), anda and andar (ibid.); or anda and andar (f. 66 and f. 67). ə and jə (f. 66v). Other times they mark contrastive oppositions in timbre, such as dêna, with closed, stressed ə, and dêna, with open, stressed a (f. 17); and əvə, and əvə or avə (f. 17 and f. 74); əvə, and əvə, ʃə ə and ʃə; ʃə ə and ʃə, ʃə and ʃə (f. 17v and f. 66v). They also mark oppositions in stress and absence of stress, as in the verbal form é (f. 43) or ê (f. 68) and the conjunction e. The list of metaphonic feminine and plural forms is exhaustive. At the end of the Ostrogofia (f. 73-f. 74) there are 17 words listed “que mudado o acento, significação de diversa maneira”.

The concern with marking the hiatus makes Lisbo accentuate with the acute or circumflex accent the stressed subjunctive vowel, as in saída (f. 30v) and ceômes (f. 31v); abait (f. 23) or the prepositional of the hiatus, as in Lâbbia (f. 31v). The verbal forms presenting enclitic pronouns are also accentuated; andouave and ãmave, perhaps being considered as paroxytones.

As for the excessive use of accents, the practice of the licenciate Duarte Nunez seems to echo his ideas:

multas dições se parecem com outras, por serem as mesmas letras, & todavia por serem diferentes na significação, tem diferença no acento, releu avar destes acenos, para demonstração da diferença. Dos casos nas dições, que não tem outras semelhantes, não destacou avar. Porq não seriação de man, que de causar confusão na gente vulgar, & fazer cair em erro, os que os quiserem imitar, não o sabendo per arte. (ff.56v-r)

As is seen above, the use of the accent in 16th century Portuguese was
not established at all and was totally up to the writer.

The main feature of João Rodrigues’ work, also found in that of other Jesuits in Japan at the same time, constitutes the use of the circumflex accent inverted so as to mark open timbre of the stressed vowel o, as opposed to the usual circumflex accent, indicating a closed o with the same stress. Thus, both Artes (1604 and 1620) register avó, bêca, mítico, idéia and so on, together with avô, bôa, onça, pô with an opposite timbre. This form of accentuation can also be seen in his letters, now in the Archivum Romanum Societatis Jesu, and in other manuscripts kept in the Biblioteca de la Real Academia de la Historia.

The number of accents, including the inverted circumflex accent explained above, is by and large fairly small in the Arte (1604-08), Arte Breve (1629), and in the letters and manuscripts of Rodrigues
t, although more instances can be seen in the printed forms than in the letters and manuscripts. The accents were in principle optional for him and were not used unless it was necessary to distinguish otherwise homographic words. In this sense the usage of Rodrigues is in line with that of Gandavo and Nunez do LIsão.

For example the future tense form of the verb ‘dizer’ appears 41 times in the Arte, 22 of which are with the grave accentديدة, while the rest 19 are without the accent. The 3rd person plural of the futuro do presente do indicativo ‘apontar’, however, always appears with the grave accent to be distinguished from the pretérito perfeito of the same verb as follows.

apontarão(-ão) vs. apontaram

By the same token the 3rd person singular of the futuro do presente do indicativo ‘aprender’ or ‘oferecer’ always appears with the grave accent to be distinguished from the pretérito mais-que-perfeito of the same verb.
as shown below.

aprenderã vs. aprendera
offrecerã(s) vs. ofrecerã(s)

In relation to the use of crasis, the following three phases are registered in the Arte, Arte breve and the letters and manuscripts of Rodriguez.

1. The earlier practice of equal and surrounding vowels:
   *aetã, fãe, perã(ê), wãw* etc.
2. the contraction by crasis of these vowels:
   *dãh, dão, dãu* : *fi, fi* ;
   *pãh, pão, pãu* : *so, so, so, so*.
3. the later phase of not accentuating the vowel containing crasis:
   *otã, fã, perã, wã*.

The same kind of tendencies in the use of accent can be confirmed in the dictionaries compiled by other missionaries in Japan i.e. *diccionarium latino luisitaneum ac japonicum* (1595) and *vocabulário da lingoa de japam* (1603).

The following three points are confirmed.

1. The use of the accent is optional:
   *aêh, aê / atã (DLLI)*
   *dêh, dêh / dor(dDLLI)*
   *de êh, pêh / de ca pêh êh (DLLI)*
   *nêh / ne (DLLI)*
   *pêh, pêh / pe(p) (DLLI)*
   *ahbhehe (VLI) / abohhehe (DLLI)*

2. There is no difference in use between the acute, grave and circumflex accents:
   *ahbhehe, ahbhehe, ahbhehe (DLLI)*
   *pêh antê pêh (DLLI)*
   *pêh, pêh, pêh (all verbs) (DLLI)*
   *sê, sê (DLLI)*
   *de, de, de (DLLI)*
   *de, de, de (VLI)*
está, está, está (all verbs) (VLJ)

alimenta, alimente (VLJ)

3. The accents are made use of to distinguish otherwise homagramic words\(^{144}\).

avô vs. avô

está, está (verb) vs. esta (demonstrative)
pôr, por (verb) vs. por (preposition)

The accent marks (‘accent ortográfico’) were utilized in the Romanized transliteration of Japanese, for example, to show the phonological opposition\(^{145}\) of the rounded vs. unrounded (phonetically, perhaps the close \(\text{[a]}\) vs. open \(\text{[a]}\) ) of the long \(a\) as \(\text{ō}\) and \(\text{ã}\). These kinds of accent are conserved fairly consistently in the printed books by Portuguese missionaries, while in the manuscripts by Manuel Barreto, for example, they are almost totally omitted. This is due to the contemporary custom of the use of the accents in Portuguese and also due to the writer’s personal habits, and it has nothing to do with the possibility that the manuscripts reflect more the linguistic situation losing the phonological distinction between \(\text{ō}\) and \(\text{ã}\), as some Japanese scholars suspect.

As was seen in the section dealing with the Rodrigues’ system of placing accents, the accent was utilized more in printed form than in manuscripts. Besides, it can be confirmed that Manuel Barreto especially inclined not to use accents in manuscripts. In the Portuguese manuscripts\(^{146}\) by Barreto concerning the *Tale of Heike*, only one word is identified with the accent mark, namely *fõnta*.

5. Concluding remark

Up until recently the Romanized transliteration of Japanese by
Portuguese missionaries has been studied almost only from the side of Japanese philology. But since the system of Romanization is based mainly on the contemporary Portuguese orthography, it is also worth shedding light on it from the side of Portuguese philology, which is what this paper attempts to do.

In this study it was reconfirmed from the analysis of Portuguese orthography that the Arte of Father João Rodrigues must have been printed at two different times, presumably in 1604 and in 1608, with a period of interruption, and it was also proved that some of the differences in the Romanized transliteration of Japanese between the printed forms and in manuscripts are mere reflections of the social customs or the personal habits of the contemporary Portuguese orthography.

NB This paper is a revised and expanded English version of the following papers published by the author in Japanese.

(1) 「ロドリゲス日本文書におけるポルトガル語正書法」(南山国文論集 8, 1984)

(2) 「通事伴天観ジェアン・ロドリゲスのポルトガル語正書法」(南山国文論集 9, 1985)

(3) 「キリスト教資料『開合読記』成立の背景」(南山国文論集 12, 1988)

The author is grateful to Prof. Masayuki Toyoshima for permission to consult his alphabetical index of the vocabulary of the works of Father João Rodrigues; to Prof. Tadao Dai for permission to examine the copies of the manuscripts and letters of Father João Rodrigues; and to Prof. J. Patrick Barron for his valuable comments on the English of the earlier version of this paper.
NOTES

1) Concerning the study of Japanese, Father João Rodrigues is one of the greatest figures among the Christian missionaries who came to Japan in the 16th and 17th centuries. His major works are two Japanese grammars written in Portuguese, one published in Nagasaki, the other in Macao.


3) The distinctive use of -do and -am in Modern Portuguese is said to be derived from Barreto (1671).

4) ],$[1971], ],$[1970]

5) There are no existing manuscripts of the Arte written by Rodrigues himself, but the orthographic oscillation between -do and -am can be seen in the letters and other documents written by him. However the problem remains of how we should interpret the clear difference in orthographic tendencies between the first and second halves of the Arte.

6) (1) Deste j. comprido se viar, quando secuir de consoante, quer em princípio de díção, quer em moyo, assimico, jornada, sobeja, & c.

   (2) Este y grego se seguirá sempre o meio de díção, sendo acontecer entre duas vogues, & nunca tera pronunciaçao de consoante, assimico, jôya, mayor, moyos, & c. E noutra nhembá parte se deve viar, nem sera sofrível, salvo se for em cabo de díção diante vogal, assimico, Rey, darey, for, may, & c. -----

7) I. he letra vogal, -----.

   -----, & quando he cónsante, faizândo mais cícrido, & raçado para baxo assim.

   -----Ami, õ temos de seguir nisto os Latinos, & somente escrever e o. as dições Gregas,-----

8) Oliveira (1538) Cap.23, Barros (1549) 44v (p. 144).

9) Oliveira (1538), employing the principle of using y in the intervocalic position, is not as thoroughgoing as Gandavo or Nunez do Liko, when Oliveira uses the expressions like 'more often than not' (as mais das vezes), or 'not always' (não sempre). In the non-intervocalic positions,
oscillations can be seen in the text between ei and ey (beixo ~ baya, primeiro ~ primeyro). Barras (1548) is also not consistent in the use of y in the text, although he extensively set up the principle of the use of y ‘always (sempre) at the end of words, and sometime (as vezes) within a word.

10. Bussac (1971) ascribes the use of j to represent consonants, distinct from i for vowels, to Regole grammaticali by G. Fortunio (1516).

11. The cy is used for /ai/ in the Arie Bross only in the following words: bay, moyeu (modi), rev, once each; moyo, nine times.

12. By ‘letters and manuscripts by Rodrigues’ the author means letters written by Rodriguez himself. In 1612, 1616, 1622, 1636, 1627, the first one from Canton, the others from Macao; and parts of the manuscript of the Historia Exclusiva do Japon written by Rodriguez in his own hand.


15. 威格 (1882)

16. This chapter was published in part under the title “The Accentuation of the Novissimo Acordo Ortográfico in the light of early Portuguese Treaties” by Maruyama & Aranjo (Academia 45, 1988).

17. The ‘acentos’ used in the following stanza of Os Lasidas (1572) means a modulation of the voice (Santos Alves 1971), or ‘acentos oratórios’.

    Cantaua a bella Ninfa, & cos acentos
    Que pellos altos paços vão soando,
    Em consonancia ygoal, os instrumentos
    Suemes vem a hum tempo conformeando:

18. In Modern Portuguese the ‘acentos ortográficos’ has various roles as follows:

    1. To indicate stress
       a sôplica vs. ela sôplica

    2. To indicate the difference in person
       eles mantêm vs. eles mantém
3. To indicate the open - close opposition of vowels
   a pão vs. eu pão

4. To differentiate tonic words from atonic words
   pôr (verb) vs. par (prep.)

5. To indicate contraction
   a (prep.) + a (article) → à

19. For example, Oliveira does not employ 'acento ortográfico' at all, even in words used as examples such as: "rapos, pardos, arras — banudos, pinchel, corf"—19— in the section where he states that Portuguese words have 'acentos' on the final syllables ending with z or l.

20. Gandavo (1574) uses 'acento ortográfico' for the following words:
   süa, súi, siu
   ajantar, ajantar
   está, estar
   vaar, viar
   etc.

21. Nunes do Lobo (1576) uses 'acento ortográfico' for the following words:
   (1) appearing in the general text:
   dá vezas há será
   até já sintrir
   dará molver está(estar)
   darará pode(m) virão
   ensinará pôlo, póllo vos, vósso etc.

(2) appearing in the text explaining 'acento':
   fêgo, fêgos, fêrmo, fêrmos, õsso, ôsso, ôlho, ôlhos, pêso, pêssas, pêrco, pêrcos, têjo, têjos (16v)
   pôco, pôco-môco, têrto, têrtes, tôsso, tôssas, tôssas, ôssas, ôlhos, ôlhos (16v)
   côpo, mãdo, môlho, sólho, vêm, vêm, câllo, frôco, ligoo (17r)
   têrto, tôrta, pêrco, pêrca, côrun, côrria (17r)
   moço, moço, frôco, frôxas, côxoa, côxoa, gôrdo, gôrdes (17r)
   dêno, dêna, dênto, pônto, nôso, nôsas (17r)
   xarrêco, xarrêcos, barrêco, barrêcos, peixôto, canhêco, rapôsas (17r)
   barrêco, peixêta, formêsa, irêsa, rapôsas, ralêso, rabôsas (17r)
   cârro, cârco, pêdho, cânxoa, jêgo, pêrco, ôlgo, trôc (17v)
côr vs. cór, pôde vs. pôde (17v)
Esrás, Esdrás (22v)
aganház, cabáiz, rapkt (33v)
bebharráz, ladrauziz, luinauz, trumbe (53v)
axedrész, vêz, pez, trez, trez, garoupés (53v)
Portugues, hugrás, Marquás, muela, comuls (23r)
abuz, atmoñar, chañariz, chamariz, codorniz, juto, perdiz, ririz, vernóiz (23r)
albordóz, algóz, arrós, atró (23r)
Badaász, Extremó (23r)
avóde, alaúde, ataúde (30v)
celenes, teñño, matoñóo, metido (31r)
Lisbóna, borúa, azambúa (31v)
amérre vs. amará, leñórre vs. leñórr, umúra vs. umúrra (66v)
côr vs. cór, ñís vs. ñís, ia vs. iá, 8 vs. e (66v)
aceto vs. acero, amérre vs. amará, anóo (aussa) vs. aoó, báloa vs. bata,
ceo vs. cêa, cópo vs. cópo, cór vs. córr, córte vs. córtre, güste vs. güsto,
mólho vs. mólhu, pégo vs. pégo, péso vs. pêso, pêsame vs. pêsame,
pôde vs. pôde, sâio vs. salo, sôllo vs. sôllo, vêo vs. vêo (72v-74r)
22) (1) Number of appearances in the Arie (m=many times)
(i) in the general text:
  az (6/âte) 35/m
  âquelle/âquelle 2/m
  alhuarà/aluara (del Rey) 2/1
  apontarâm (-4e) 4
  (apontaram 2)
  aprenderâ 6
  (aprendera 20)
  auerà/auerra 7/5
  câ/câ 4/4
  cortès/cortes 11/9
  dirâ/dirà 22/19
  dôr/dôr 1/7
está/está/esta 1/2/8/m
geral/geral 14/29
lá/la 6/4
lá/le 3/16
mór/mor 2/m
offrecerá(s) 13
(offrecerá(s)) 35
pente/péto/pétio 4/11/50
poderá/podera 11/14
será/sera 17/25
soo/só/so 96/2/1
sómente/sómente/sómente/somente 152/2/1/1
verá/vera 10/12
viré/vira 3/1
yrb/yra 2/3 etc.

(ii) in the text explaining 'acento' of the Japanese language:
asó, enxó, capa de déó, auó, bóca, íbé (é/é)
asó, capa de dô, enxó, lóbó, filhó, Nô da taboa, muyto pô, aoó (119v)

(ii) Number of appearances in the *Art Breve*

(i) in the general text:
ô(s)/ôs/ôs 5/m/m
á/e/ate 2/m
córdes 6
estilo/estillo 1/m
pé(s)/pé(s) 5/2
sô/só/só/só/só 29/11/1/7/2
sómente/sómente/sómente/soemente/soemente 10/1/1/7/7

(ii) in the text explaining 'acento' of the Japanese language:
asó, Bóca, Môcho, Córpo
asó, capa de dô, Enxó, Pô
Côr, Nô, Peré, Mêrê (112)

(iii) Number of appearances in the letters and manuscripts
à (Europa etc.) 2
cas/câa 1/1
corté/corte 1/m
feo/féo/fe 14/20/2/3
jk/ja 1/m
la/la 2/m
pê/pê/pe 5/3/3
soa/sh/sh/so 8/12/2/1
sómente/sómente/sómente 3/12/2/6
vâ/ve 12/12

23) Site of appearances (r-recto, v-verso, d-right column, e-left column)

ante DLLI 85d
ante DLLI 579e
ante DLLI 580e
dôr DLLI 234d etc.
dôr DLLI 722d
dôr DLLI 224d
de ca pera à DLLI 146c etc.
de ca pera à DLLI 250e etc.

24) Site of appearances

abôbêda DLLI 96d
abôbêda DLLI 97e
(abôbêda DLLI 142b)
pê ante pê DLLI 556d
às vezes VLI 193ve etc.
às vezes VLI 19rd
às vezes VLI 2159vd
sómente VLI 284re
sómente VLI 159re

abôbêra VLI 399e
abôbêra DLLI 121b
ôô DLLI 244e
un DLLI 33e etc.
pôô DLLI 138d etc.
pôôô DLLI 168d etc.
pêôôô DLLI 181e
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