*recto, dilecto.* Lat. *cs* becomes *is: seis* (sex); or *isc, x* ( = Fr. *ich, ch) : seixo* (s a x u m), *luxo* (l u x u m) ; or even *ss*; *disse* (d i x i).

*Inflexion.*—The Portuguese article, now reduced to the vocalic form *o, a, os, as,* was *lo* (exceptionally also *el,* which still survives in the expression *El-Rei), la, los, las* in the old language. Words ending in *l* in the singular lose the *l* in the plural (because it then becomes median, and so is dropped) : *sol* (s o l e m), but *soes* (soles); those having *ao* in the sing. form the plural either in *aes* or in õ*es* according to the etymology: thus *cão* (canem) makes *caes,* but *raçao* makes *raζoes.* As regards the pronoun, mention must be made of the non-etymological forms of the personal *mim* and of the feminine possessive *minha,* where the second *n* has been brought in by the initial nasal. Portuguese conjugation has more that is interesting. In the personal suffixes the forms of the 2nd pers. ph in *ades, edes, ides* lost the *d* in the 15th century, and have now become *ais, eis, is,* through the intermediate forms *aes, ees, eis.* The form in *des* has persisted only in those verbs where it was protected by the consonants *n* or *r* preceding it: *pondes, tendes, υindes, amardes,* and also no doubt in some forms of the present of the imperative, where the theme has been reduced to an extraordinary degree by the disappearance of a consonant and the contraction of vowels: *ides, credes, ledes,* &c. Portuguese is the only Romance language which possesses a personal or conjugated infinitive: *amαr, amar-es, amar, amar-mos, amar-des, amar-em;* e.g. *antes de sair-mos, "*before we go out.” Again, Portuguese alone has preserved the pluperfect in its original meaning, so that, for example, *amαra* (a m a ν e r a m) signifies not merely as elsewhere “ I would love,” but also “ I had loved.” The future perfect, retained as in Castilian, has lost its vowel of inflexion in the 1st and 3rd pers. sing, and consequently becomes liable to be confounded with the infinitive *(amar, render, partir).* Portuguese, though less frequently than Castilian, employs *ter* (t e n e r e) as an auxiliary, alongside of *aver;* and it also supple­ments the use of e s s e r e with sedere, which furnished thesubj. *sefa,* the imperative *se, sede,* the gerundive *sendo,* the participle *sido,* and some other tenses in the old language. Among the peculiarities of Portuguese conjugation may be mentioned—(1) the assimilation of the 3rd pers. sing. to the 1st in strong perfects (*houve, pude, quiz, fez),* while Castilian has *hube* and *hubo\*,* (2) the imperfects *punha, tinha, vinha* (from *por, ter* and *vir),* which are accented on the radical in order to avoid the loss of the *n (ponía* would have made *poia),* and which substitute *u* and *i* for *o* and *e* in order to distinguish from the present subjunctive *(ponha, tenha, venha).*

*Galician.—*Almost all the phonetic features which distinguish Portuguese from Castilian are possessed by Gallego also. Portuguese and Galician even now are practically one language, and, still more was this the case formerly: the identity of the two idioms would become still more obvious if the orthography employed by the Galicians were more strictly phonetic, and if certain transcrip­tions of sounds borrowed from the grammar of the official language (Castilian) did not veil the true pronunciation of the dialect. It is stated, for example, that Gallego does not possess nasal diphthongs; still it may be conceded once for all that such a word as p l a n u s, which in Galician is written sometimes *chau* and sometimes *chan,* cannot be very remote from the Portuguese nasal pronunciation *chao.* One of the most notably differences between normal Portuguese and Galician is the substitution of the surd spirant in place of the sonant spirant for the Lat. *j* before all vowels and *g* before *e* and *i : xuez* (j u d i c e m), Port, *juiz; xunto* (j u nctu m), Port. *junto; xente* (gentem), Port. *gente.* In conjugation the peculiarities of Gallego are more marked; some find their explanation within the dialect itself, others seem to be due to Castilian influence. The 2nd persons plural have still their old form *ades, edes, ides,* so that in this instance it would seem as if Gallego had been arrested in its progress while Portuguese had gone on progressing; but it is to be observed that with these full forms the grammarians admit contracted forms as well: á*s* (Port. *ais), és* (Port, *eis), is* (Port. *is).* The 1st pers. sing. of the perfect of conjugations in *er* and *ir* has come to be complicated by a nasal resonance similar to that which we find in the Portuguese *mim,* we have *vendin, partin,* instead of *vendi, parti,* and by analogy this form in *in* has extended itself also to the perfect of the conjugation in *ar,* and *falin, gardin,* for *falei, gardei* are found. The second persons of the same tense take the ending *che, ches* in the singular and *chedes* in the plural : *falache* or *falaches* (f a b u l a s t i), *fala- chedes* as well as *falástedes* (fabulastis), *bateche* or *batiche,*  pl. *batestes* or *batechedes,* &c. *Ti* (t i b i) having given *che* in Galician, we see that *falasti* has become *falache* by a phonetic process. The 3rd pers. sing. of strong perfect is not in *e* as in Portuguese *houve, pode),* but in *o (houbo, puido, soubo, coubo,* &c.); Castilian influence may be traceable here. If a contemporary grammarian, Saco Arce, is to be trusted, Gallego would form an absolute exception to the law of Spanish accentuation in the imperfect and pluperfect indicative: *falabámos, falabádes; batiámos, batiddes\*, pidiámos, pididdes\*,* and *falarámos, falaráAes ; baterámos, baterddes ; pidirámos, pidirádes.* The future perfect indicative and the imperfect subjunctive, on the other hand, would seem to be accented regularly: *faláremos, fald- semos.* The important question is worth further study in detail.
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(A. M.-Fa. ; J. F.-K.) Spanish Literature

The name Spanish in connexion with literature is now generaIly restricted to works in the Castilian tongue. In the present article it is taken\* in the wider sense as embracing the literary productions of the whole Iberian Peninsula, with the exceptions of PortugaI and of Galicia, the latter of which, as regards language and literature, belongs to the Portuguese domain. Spanish literature thus considered falls into two divisions—Castilian and Catalan.

I. *Castilian Literature.—*Of the Castilian texts now extant none is of earlier date than the 12th century, and very probabIy none goes farther back than 1150. The text generally accepted as the oIdest—the *Mystery of the Magian Kings,* as it is rather inappropriately designated by most historians of literature— is a fragment of a short semi-Hturgical play meant to be acted