

千里への道 第13号 (2015年6月) 抜刷

## A Preliminary Study of *Kōsei shinpen*

Kewei XU

関西大学大学院外国語教育学研究科紀要

Journal of Kansai University  
Graduate School of Foreign Language  
Education and Research  
Vol. 13

研究論文

## A Preliminary Study of *Kōsei shinpen*<sup>1)</sup>

Kewei XU

蘭学とは、江戸時代に日本人学者がオランダ語文献などを通じ、積極的に西洋文化を取り入れた学術運動である。本論文は、1811年から1845年にかけて十数人の蘭学者によって翻訳（または校訂）された西洋百科事典である『厚生新編』を研究対象として、書誌情報、「厚生」という訳語、和文体、ラテン語学習など、四方面から考察を行っている。まず書誌問題と訳語「厚生」を考察し、西洋文化の受容とその軌跡を示す。さらに、訳文の文体を解析することで、漢文や漢文訓読の衰退を検討しつつ、翻訳手段としての和文の重要性の認識過程を明らかにする。最後に、訳文に見られるラテン語からの翻訳語彙を手掛かりとして、蘭学者のラテン語研究を探る。特に禁教と鎖国という背景下において、その学術言語へのアクセスを究明する。本研究では、『厚生新編』を中心として、蘭学者が如何に西洋文化を受容していたか、またどのようなルートと方法を採用していたか、について検討し、書籍及び知識の伝播の視座から、日欧ないし東西文化交流の一側面を覗いてみる。

Key Word: *Kōsei shinpen*, Dutch learning, cultural exchange

*Kōsei shinpen* (厚生新編, literally *New Volumes for the Public Welfare*), an encyclopedia running to more than one hundred volumes, was translated into Japanese from Dutch by many Dutch learners (Rangakusha, 蘭學者) from 1811 to the 1840s. Although it was not completed and remained in manuscript form during this era, as one work of Dutch learning (Rangaku, 蘭學), I think it is a superb sample for studying historical information about cultural exchange during the Tokugawa Period (江戸時代, 1603–1868) in Japan, Dutch Learning, and the ideas of Japanese scholars and of the era in general.

### 1. Bibliographical Information: From Europe to Japan

Thanks to Itazawa (1932, pp.949–994) and Ishiyama (1979, pp.89–104), some bibliographical information concerning the manuscript of the translation and different versions of the original text have been verified. Since a lot of relevant material was not available to either of them, I will here present a brief introduction to the encyclopedia working from previous research and other digital books that I have collected.

The original text of *Kōsei shinpen* is a French book with the title *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*. The book was first published in Paris in the year 1709, and was written by a Frenchman named

Noel Chomel (1632–1712), who was a priest of Saint Vincent in Lyons<sup>2</sup>. The first edition was a folio containing 1, 200 pages, and was divided into two volumes. Three years later, the author died, but in the same year, one supplement was published. After that, the book was expanded and reprinted many times. So far, I have found five editions in the Bibliothèque Nationale de France and on Google Books: one from 1718, one from 1732, two from 1741, and one from 1767. In the last edition, there were three volumes and nearly 3,000 pages.

In 1725, an English translation, entitled *Dictionaire Oeconomique, or The Family Dictionary*, based on the second French edition of 1718, was published in London. It was reprinted in Dublin in the years 1727 and 1758. A German translation of eight volumes appeared in Leipzig from 1750 to 1757.

In 1743, the first Dutch translation, consisting of two volumes of 1,500 pages, entitled *Huishoudelyk Woordboek*, was published in both Amsterdam and Leiden. This Dutch version, too, was expanded and reprinted repeatedly. With the title *Algemeen Huishoudelijk-, Natuur-, Zedekundig-, en Konst- Woordenboek* (lit. General Household, Nature, Ethics, and Art Dictionary), it grew into seven volumes in the second version (1768–1777, 1778) and then into sixteen volumes including nine sequels<sup>3</sup>.

This is the publication history of the book in eighteenth century Europe; what about in Japan?

I don't know the exact year of its arrival in Japan, but I think it was not very long after publication of the Dutch version. In fact, there was already reference to it in the beginning of 1773, in one of letters by Sugita Genpaku (杉田玄白, 1733–1817), who was the main translator of the *Kaitai shinsho* (解體新書, lit. *New Text on Anatomy*, 1774). Sugita regarded it as a work on medical and surgical treatments<sup>4</sup>.

As Ishiyama (1979, p.97) has pointed out, it was also referenced in the *Kōmō zatsuwa* (紅毛雜話, lit. *Idle Talk about Ang-mo*, 1787) and *Rangaku kaitei* (蘭學階梯, lit. *Ladder to Dutch Learning*, 1788); according to the latter, there were two Dutch versions, one consisting of two volumes and the other of seven volumes, collected by Japanese.

In 1811, the Tokugawa Shogunate, on the advice of Takahashi Kageyasu (高橋景保, 1785–1829), ordered two Dutch learners, Baba Sadayoshi (馬場貞由, 1787–1822), an interpreter from Nagasaki, and Ōtsuki Gentaku (大槻玄澤, 1757–1827), a doctor from Sendai, to translate the work from Dutch. The translators noted that they had a version of the Dutch book that contained eight volumes (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 1, Introduction to the Draft Translation [譯編初稿大意], in *Kōsei shinpen*, Vol.I)<sup>5</sup>. In fact, they had the version that included seven volumes; the other volume was from the sequels because they said it was an encyclopedia of seven volumes with one more supplement. They also said that they heard through Hendrik Doeff (1777–1835), the Dutch commissioner in the Dejima Trading Post in Nagasaki from 1803 to 1817, that the Dutch version had 18 volumes (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 3). The number 18, I think, is a mistake, however.

Besides these two translators, other scholars also participated in the translation and revision, such as Utagawa Genshin (宇田川玄真, 1770–1835), Sugita Rikkei (杉田立卿, 1786–1845), Ōtsuki Genkan (大槻玄幹, 1785–1838), Udagawa Yōan (宇田川榕庵, 1798–1846), Minato Chōan (湊長安, 1786–1838), and Koseki Sanei (小關三英, 1787–1839), Ōtsuki Gentō (大槻玄東, 1813–1842), Mitsukuri Genpo (箕作阮甫, 1799–1863), Sugita Seikei (杉田成卿, 1817–1859), and Takenouchi Gendō (竹内玄同, 1805–1880). Yet in spite of the efforts of so many talented scholars during a 30 year-period, this translation work, which was massive, was not completed. I don't know why exactly the translation task was not completed. I suppose that it was because of the Bansha no Goku (蠻社の獄). With the indictment, scholars who criticized the government's isolationist policy (鎖國政策) were put into prison by the Shogunate. Koseki, one of the translators of the encyclopedia, committed suicide in 1839. The task of translation was surely influenced by his death. After the death of the last translator, Udagawa Yōan, the translation stopped completely, and the encyclopedia remained in manuscript form.

The manuscript written for the Shogunate is kept in the Aoi-Bunko Collection (葵文庫, books and publications collected by the Shogunate) of the Shizuoka Prefectural Central Library. Seventy volumes of the manuscript were first printed in 1937 (the Vol.XIV and Vol.XV is a separate summary of medical matters and medications; the XXXI and Vol.XXXII are lost). Later, another thirty-two volumes (eight of them are overlapping) were discovered; the entire set of hundred volumes was published photographically in 1978.

Sugimoto (1998, p.117) points out that manuscripts other than those in the Aoi-Bunko Collection are available today. I have summarized his research data and mine into the list following:

List 1. Collectors of the Manuscripts of *Kōsei shinpen*

Collector	Volumes	Note
University of Tsukuba Library	5	Anonymous, Medical Treatments (醫治部卷之一), Beer I (麥酒第一), Field I (地土集第一), Collections (雜集), Collections on Fields (地土集說), Plants VI (生植部卷之六)
Kagoshima University Library	57	In 玉里文庫
Shizuoka Prefectural Central Library	132	Hundred volumes titled <i>Kōsei shinpen</i> ; thirty-two <i>Kōsei shinpen iji ranyō</i> (厚生新編醫事攬要)
National Diet Library	11	In 伊藤文庫 (Two of Udagawa Genshi, four of Udagawa Yōan, one book including 3 volumes of Baba Sadayoshi, Ōtsuki Gentaku, Udagawa Yōan) & 白井文庫 (Two of Wine and Beasts, one on Plants IV, Collections on Fields II)
Miyagi Prefectural Library	88	In 伊達文庫, one of contents, some are under the title <i>Seikei sanyō</i> (生計纂要)
Waseda University Library	8	One of <i>Introduction to the Draft Translation</i> , one of <i>Iji ranyō bassui mokuroku</i> (醫事攬要抜粋目録), manuscripts of Udagawa Genshi and others
Kyōu Shōku	3	Udagawa Yōan

So far I only have collected parts of these documents; some are translators' drafts, and others have been copied on condition of anonymity. I don't know the details of every manuscript. I have found from the website of the National Institute of Japanese Literature that there are also other manuscripts in Tōyō Bunko and Seikado Bunko Art Museum, but I haven't checked the information yet, so I will do a more detailed survey on them later.

## 2. On the Title and the Term of *Kōsei*

I have said that the original text is titled *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*. In fact, I have shortened it. The main title of this book, in French, English, and Dutch, is:

*Dictionnaire oeconomique, contenant divers moyens d'augmenter et conserver son bien, et meme sa santé.* (1709, French)

*Dictionnaire oeconomique: or, The Family Dictionary. Containing the most experienced Methods of improving estates and of preserving health.* (1725, English)

*Huishoudelyk woordboek, vervattende vele middelen om zyn goed te vermeerderen, en zyne gozondheid te behouden.* (1743, Dutch)

In 1811, Japanese translators entitled it *Kōsei shinpen*. They said that if the title is translated literally, it means:

*Dictionary of improving estates and of preserving health, remedies, and methods of physical and other arts.* (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 2)

(厚生諸事務本然理學禮式法度及諸藝術韻會)

They also explained:

*Huishoudely*[/ij]k means that each family has a profession and makes a living. It may be translated as *housheng* in Chinese. In the “Counsels of Great Yu” of the *Shu jing*, there is this sentence: “there are the rectification of (the people’s) virtue, (the tools and other things) that supply the conveniences of life, and the securing abundant means of sustentation - these must be harmoniously attended to.”<sup>6)</sup> Note: Rectify virtue, to lead subjects; provide benefit, to improve estates and preserve citizens’ lives. If these are attended to harmoniously, good politic will be achieved. So this term is suitable. (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 4)

(「ホイスハウデレーキ」といふ辞を訳すれば人各家職を務めそれぞれの生産を計り修めらるべき云々という語義ありこれに漢語をあてハ厚生ともいふ義なるへし書經の大禹謨に正<sub>レ</sub>徳利<sub>レ</sub>用厚<sub>レ</sub>生惟<sub>レ</sub>和と見へたる字面にて註に徳を正して以て下を率

ひ用を利して以て財を阜し生を厚ふして以民を養ふ三つの者和すれハ所謂善政なり  
となりされハ此語にひたとあたるが如し)

They thought the Dutch word *huishoudelyk*, which means domestic or household in English, corresponded with the Chinese term *housheng* (厚生) from the *Book of Documents* (尚書), which is one of the Five Classics in ancient China. They were searching for authoritative evidence for the term that they used in their translation.

For the word, *Woordboek* (*Woordenboek*), which means dictionary in English, the translators said that it means a book that gives and explains terms for things (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 4: 「ウーワード・ブック」ハ 即ちそれら事物の寄語の書といふ事なり). They connected the European dictionary with the Eastern documents, *Inkai* (韻會), *Inpu* (韻府), and *Setsuyōshū* (節用集). The former two are dictionaries on Chinese poetry rhyme, while the latter is a Japanese dictionary. This was because they found that all of them were edited in alphabetical order. Although the text might have been translated as *Kōsei inpu*, for example, because of the difference in content, they decided on *Shinpen*, and titled their translation *Kōsei shinpen* (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 4).

Admittedly, there is also another translation of the title from that era, *Seikei sanyō* (生計纂要), which is seen in the manuscript held in the Miyagi Prefectural Library. That manuscript was a copy given to the Sendai Domain by Ōtsuki Gentaku. In the front-page, the title *Kōsei shinpen* was replaced with *Seikei sanyō*. In terms of the reason for this change, Satō Shōsuke (1993, pp.134–142) points out the translation was a secret task under the Shogunate, and that Ōtsuki changed the title of his copy to avoid risk.

Nowadays, in Japan, *kōsei* is used in the organization name, *Kōsei Rōdōshō* (厚生労働省, the Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare), whose meaning is the same as that of *Kōsei shinpen*. But why was *seikei* chosen? Ōtsuki had referred to it with the name of *Kyōka sanyō* (居家纂要) long before (Ōtsuki, 1788, Vol. II, p.23b). Which one is right, or is there some mistake? To eliminate this doubt, some etymological knowledge may be useful.

The original title of the encyclopedia is *Oeconomique Dictionnaire*. *Oeconomique*, an adjective, is written as *économique* in modern French and *economic* in English. It is derived from the Latin *oeconomicus* and the ancient Greek *οικονομικός* (, ή, όν). It means management of a household or family; hence, it has the meaning of thrifty, frugal, and economical (Linddel & Scoll, 1940). In the English translation, therefore, the title was kept and an English explanation, “the family dictionary,” was added, so the term *seikei and kyōka*, too, are correct.

Here I will refer to China. Yan Fu (嚴復, 1854–1921) and Liang Qichao (梁啓超, 1873–1929), two scholars from the late Qing period, translated political economy or economics into *jixue* (計學) and *shengjixue* (生計學), although those terms were replaced by the Japanese loan word

*jingjixue* (*keizaigaku*, 經濟學). Many scholars have discussed this topic already, but I think that the question still needs to be explored further from the point of view of etymology and the related issue of *kōsei*. Because this is a very complex question, I am simply pointing it out here and will do further research on it later.

Japanese translators wrote an introduction to the contents, which is translated from the title page (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 2)<sup>7)</sup>. They roughly divided the manuscript into Plants (生植部), Livestock and Fowl (畜禽部), Technology (技巧部), Medicine (醫法), Pharmacy (藥劑部), and Fishing and Hunting (漁獵部). In terms of modern learning, it contains knowledge of physiology, zoology, botany, agriculture, horticulture, physics, medicine, astronomy, etc. They also said they would classify it when they finished translation of the encyclopedia (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 4).

### 3. Japanese Style

Japanese scholars translated the text from Dutch, but why didn't they read and translate it directly from French? That is because of the Tokugawa Shogunate's isolationist policy. As you know, the government closed the country from the 1630s to 1853, when the arrival of the Black Ships of Commodore Matthew Perry opened the country to the world again. In that era, no one from Western countries, except Holland, was permitted to enter Japan, and no Japanese was allowed to leave his country. Thus, Japanese scholars were only able to learn Western languages through Dutch businessmen or doctors.

Although the document was first written in French, it was translated into Japanese from Dutch. Today we expect translated works by Japanese scholars to be composed in Japanese, but this was a very rare phenomenon in that era. Shen (2010, p.66) has examined the entirety of translations in Dutch Learning since 1774, in which year the first full-blown translation of the *Kaitai shinsho* was translated from Dutch and published in *kanbuntai* (漢文體, classical Chinese). He finds that most translations were composed in *kanbun* or *kanbun kundokutai* (漢文訓讀體, Sino-Japanese). If we have some knowledge of Confucianism in modern Asia, we can much more clearly understand this situation. Kuwabara (1993, p.257) points out that all Japanese scholars naturally had received Confucian educations since their childhoods. Almost all Japanese intellectuals could read and compose in *kanbun* or *kanbun kundokutai*.

But with *Kōsei shinpen*, the official task of translation was carried out in Japanese. The translators explained:

We received an order to translate this Dutch book. To achieve the Shogunate's aim to make many more people, even peasants or laborers who lack education, able to read and understand it, we tried our best to translate it into simple and clear Japanese (Baba &

Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 4).

(此和蘭書の和解新たに厳命を下し給ふ御趣意は行き弘く天下に公けに布かせ給ひ不学盲なる野夫工職の輩に至るまで 遍くこれを読みて能くこれを理会し其用を利せしめんとなれば和解文法通俗平和を専らとすべし)

In a word, they thought it would be more accessible to common people, especially those who lacked education, if the document were written in Japanese. They also said that it was much more understandable if they translated the text into Japanese (俗文國字) first. They or other scholars would revise the unrefined translation and make it more elegant (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 9).

The fact that they composed the work in Japanese is symbolic of a gradual change in status of *kanbuntai* and *kanbun kundokutai* and Japanese. During this process, Chinese and Chinese culture began losing their respected position, while Japanese began to be recognized as an important means for translation. Perhaps the process of change was very long and slow. As a linguistic phenomenon during the history of Japanese, I think, *Kōsei shinpen* is very special.

#### 4. On the Latin

In the Japanese translation, I have found Latin and some Japanese transliterations of Latin words. Why was there Latin in the works translated from Dutch? What was the level of proficiency of Dutch learners in Latin? To solve these puzzles, I will shift my discussion to Latin studies amongst Dutch learners.

In Vol.I, some terms are marked with katakana (片仮名) transliterations of the Latin, for example<sup>8)</sup>:

List 2. Five Terms of Chinese, Dutch, and Latin

Translated Term	Transliteration of Dutch	Transliteration of Latin
1 鷲 [Eagle]	アーデラアル [Adelaar] アーレント [Arend]	アグイラ [Aquila]
2 鶺鴒 [Magpie]	アークステルト [Aakster]	ピカ [Pica]
3 - [孔雀, peafowl]	アールス・フート [Aarsvoet]	キリスタテユス [Christatus]
4 - [信天翁, Albatross]	アルバトロス [Albatross]	エキシユランス [Exulans]
5 - [海雀, Auk]	アルク [Alk]	トルタ [Torda]

But where did translators get these Latin terms?

In general, each term was annotated in both Latin and Dutch in the second Dutch version, which was the reference work for Japanese translation, meaning that translators could perhaps transliterate Latin terms fairly easily. In *Kōsei shinpen*, the two translators explained their reasons



for glossing the Latin terms:

In the draft, Latin terms for some translated words are mentioned. In Europe, where Holland and France are, Latin has been treated as a common language since ancient times, and it is also the origin of every national language. Although there are lots of different names in different languages, Latin terms are treated as the common ones for communicating with each other. Generally, everything has a term in Latin and one in every national language. It's similar to our having a Chinese term and Japanese one for things in this country. (Baba & Ōtsuki, 1811, Section 15)

(編中毎條の名物に間々羅甸名といふものを記す羅甸といふハ歐邏巴大洲阿蘭陀拂郎察等の一世界の物名なりに係る惣州中に通する古来よりの言語にて其諸国言辞の本源なりとなり故に其諸国辞類ハそれぞれにかはりあれとも名物の称谓等ハこの羅甸名を以て弘く通称するもの多しこれハ此邦ニて何某と呼ふものハ羅甸舊稱の某何なりと示すためなり近くこれを譬ふれば本邦にて漢名和名といふか如し)

From the above quote, it is clear that they knew that Latin was the common language of Europe, and that Latin in Holland was like Chinese in Japan.

Baba, the first translator of this encyclopedia, was a talented linguistic learner who had a high level of proficiency in Dutch, English, and Russian, but I have not seen any material on his Latin studies. I don't know whether the above quote reflects his own opinion or not. I have to delay discussing this subject until later. Ōtsuki expressed similar thinking before. He said:

Latin is a classical language, i.e. an ancient language in Europe. Similarly, there are differences between elegant language and slang in Chinese and Japanese. This topic will be discussed further in another place (Ōtsuki, 1788, Explanation 例言, p.3b)<sup>9</sup>.

(羅甸語トハ彼邦ノ雅言ニテ乃チ古語ナリ 猶和漢トモニ雅俗ノ差別アルカ如シ 其詳ナルヲハ別ニ記ス)

Admittedly, such thinking was not original. It was very early that Japanese scholars discovered the importance of Latin.

In fact, his tutors, Maeno Ryōtaku (前野良澤, 1723-1803) and Sugita Genpaku, who were the main translators of *Kaitai shinsho*, expressed similar thinking long before in their work:

France, England, and Spain, which are three different countries, have one common language, Latin. Similarly, Japan, China, Korea etc., every country has a different language, but the writing is the same in each. In the country of Holland, everything has a

Latin term and a Dutch term. Now we are translating every term directly from Dutch generally; however, for things that don't have Dutch names such as this term, we make our translations from Latin (Sugita, 1774, Vol.I, p.5a).<sup>10)</sup>

(然弗卵察。諳厄利亞。伊斯把你亞之三州。有互相通者呼云羅甸。猶吾邦漢朝鮮等。各雖異言語其文一也。蓋和蘭為州也。凡有物必有羅甸與國語。今所直譯悉用和蘭國語也。間有羅甸而無國語者。如此之類。用羅甸譯焉。)

Their thinking was not very precise perhaps, but they did realize the importance of that language in Western learning.

On the topic of Latin studies in Japan, Miyanaga (2004, pp.1-110) has done historical research. He says that Japanese formally began to learn Latin when some schools of the Society of Jesus, such as seminaries and colleges, were set up in the 1550s. In those schools, Japanese Christians learned how to read and write both Japanese and Latin. Students were taught the catechism and songs in Latin. Grammar, too, was taught (pp.23-26). But Latin studies were interrupted as a result of the banning of Catholicism and the isolationist policy of the government.

How could they obtain such information under the isolationist policy of the Tokugawa Shogunate? So far, I have found two clues in some works of Maeno and Arai Hakuseki (新井白石, 1657-1725).

In the work titled *Rangen zuihitsu shokō* (蘭言隨筆初稿, 1772, lit. *The First Draft of Essays on Dutch*), the former not only talked about Latin especially (In Oita Prefecture Ancient Sages Historical Archives, 2011, Vol.II, pp.15-16), but also remarked on the origin of his information. In Section 2, he said:

It is said that there are four languages in the world: Hebreuws [Hebrew], Latijn [Latin], Grieks [Greek], and Hoog-Duits [High German]. All of the languages of the world derive from them. The language of Holland was separated from High German. This is the theory of Yoshio (In Oita Prefecture Ancient Sages Historical Archives, 2011, Vol.II, p.10).

(世界ノ四言ト云モノアリ「ヘブレウス」「ラテイン」「キリイキス」「ホーゴトイチ」是也凡世界ノ言語皆是ヨリ出タリ「オランダ」ノ言語モ「ホーゴトイチ」ヨリ分タルヨシ 吉雄の説ナリ)

Yoshio, whose full name was Yoshio Kōgyū (吉雄耕牛, 1724-1800), was the chief Dutch interpreter (阿蘭陀大通詞) who wrote the preface for the *Kaitai shinsho*.

In Section 3, he also said that Narabayashi, another Dutch interpreter, told him the word *woordenboek* [dictionary] was called “dictionnaire” [dictionarium] in Latin, and there were eight different written languages, such as Latijn [Latin], Inglês [English], and Italiaans [Italian], and

that each of them also was a country name except Latin (In Oita Prefecture Ancient Sages Historical Archives, 2011, Vol. II, p.10). I thus feel confident that Maeno must have learned some Latin when he studied Dutch and other Western cultures with these interpreters.

In Edo, Dutch interpreters from Nagasaki played an important role in Latin studies amongst scholars. They often accompanied the Dutch to visit the Shogunate in Edo. Dutch learners came to obtain Western knowledge from them as well as from the Dutch. Some also went to Nagasaki to study with them. Maeno and Ōtsuki were the ones who kept constant contact with them.

Japanese scholars in Edo learned Dutch following Dutch interpreters, beginning officially with Aoki Kon'yō (青木昆陽, 1698-1769) and Noro Genjō (野呂元丈, 1694-1761), who started their studies of Dutch and knowledge of the West by order of the eighth Shogun Yoshimune (吉宗, 1684-1751). Noro, too, referred to the Latin language. He said:

Latin is the language of Latin. The words are different with Dutch, and difficult to read. Even if one can read them, the meanings are not understandable. This language is widespread in both medicine and surgery. In each nation of Europe, scholars learn and master this elegant language (Sugimoto, 1977, Vol. II, p.116).

(羅語トハラテン詞ニテ御座候此体ハ文字ノ書ヤウ阿蘭陀ト違候而読カネ又ヨメ候而モ義理通シ不申候由其内医方ニカ、リ候事ハ外科ハ大概解シ申候由此文体ハ横文字ノ通スル国ハ何レノ国ニテモ学者ハ通シ候ヨシ雅言相聞ヘ申候)

Obviously, he obtained his knowledge of Latin from his tutors of Dutch and Western knowledge, the interpreters. In a word, Noro, Maeno, and Ōtsuki's studies of Latin received much benefit from them.

On Latin, Arai, a scholar-official during the middle of the Tokugawa Period, said:

All the languages over there [Europe] are different from each other. There are about three main languages: Hebreewus [Hebrew], Latijn [Latin], and Grieks [Greek], also called Hellas. Generally, all major works are written in one of these languages. ... Latin was the name of an ancient country whose details are unknown now. Greek is similar, too. The pronunciation of Latin bears considerable similarity to ours. Every person must study this language there. There are two scripts: one is Latin, and the other Italian [Italic]. Latin is similar to regular script in Chinese, while Italic is alike to cursive script (Matsumura, Bitō, and Katō, 1975, p.39)<sup>11)</sup>.

(此方諸国の方言、同じからず。しかれども其大約三つに出ず。一つに曰ヘイペレイウス、二つにラテン、三つにキリイキス、又云ヘレッキスともいふ。凡記大事を記すには、必ず此等の語を用ふ。(中略) ラテンといふは、古の国名、今はその地詳な

らず、キリイキス、亦それに同じ、ラテンに致ては、此方語音に相通ぜずといふ所なし。されば、諸国の人、これを学び [ば] ずといふものあらず。又諸国用ゆる所の字躰、二つあり。一つに、ラテンの字、二つにイタリヤの字、其ラテンは、漢に楷書の躰あるごとく、イタリヤの字は、漢に草書の躰あるに似たり。

He not only thought that Latin was a script, but also that it was as ancient and important a written language as Hebrew or Greek, and that everyone in Europe had to learn it.

Arai mainly gained his information from an Italian missionary named Giovanni Battista Sidotti (1668-1714), who entered Japan in 1708 but was soon arrested. In 1709, Sidotti was taken to Edo and questioned by Arai. Based on their conversations, Arai completed his works on Western culture, *Seiyō kibun* (西洋紀聞, lit. *Annals of the Western Ocean*) in Japanese and *Sairan igen* (采覧異言, lit. *Varying Words Observed*) in Chinese during the second decade of the eighteenth century; some information on Latin was included.

They were able to converse with the help of Dutch interpreters. The main language used was perhaps Dutch, but Latin was used, too. Arai said:

When the interpreters made mistakes in the pronunciation of his Latin words, he told them again and again how to pronounce them, and when they were right, he greatly praised them. On hearing me speak Latin words, he laughingly said, “The interpreters, unfortunately, as a consequence of having learned the Dutch language, find it difficult to get rid of their Dutch pronunciation, and do not speak like you. Perhaps it is because you once learned our language (Brown, 1865, p.64).

From this quote, we can see that Latin was used, but not to what extent.

This issue is much clearer in a copy of a document titled *A Roman in Nagasaki* (長崎注進邏馬人事, 1708) given to the Shogunate from the Nagasaki bugyō (長崎奉行). At the end of the document the name of the Dutchman who was director of the Dutch Trading Post in Dejima, and some of the interpreters employed during interrogation, are listed. This document clearly states that the Dutchman interpreted questions into Latin, and Sidotti answered in Latin, too; then the Dutchman told them what Sidotti had said (Matsumura, etc. 1975, p.95).

About the interrogation of Sidotti in Nagasaki and Edo, Katagiri found that one of main interpreters, named Imamura Gen'emon (今村源右衛門, 1671-1736), was the chamber assistant (*heya-kodukai*, 部屋小使い) of Engelbert Kaempfer (1651-1716)<sup>12</sup>, a German, and the author of *The History of Japan*. Kaempfer served as the doctor in Dejima, and lived in Japan from 1690 to 1692. Kaempfer taught Imamura Dutch, Physick [physics], surgery, and other Western learning; in return, Imamura provided the former with massive amounts of information on Japan. Some

researchers have said that Imamura had a high proficiency of Latin and interpreted the conversations between Arai and Sidotti. Although Kaempfer, too, said Imamura could read and write Dutch better than any of the other interpreters (1727, p.iv), I have not found any direct material to prove that Imamura knew or studied Latin. I will do more research on this later.

About their conversations, I want to point out another thing—that is, Western books in Chinese (漢譯西書) were very important, too. Arai often asked Sidotti for information on geography with the help of Matteo Ricci's *Map of the World* (萬國坤輿圖), *The Three Powers, illustrated with plates* (三才圖繪), *The Philosophy of the Seasons* (月令廣義), and *Questions on Astronomy* (天經或問). *Compilation of Books* (圖書編) was mentioned, too. All of these books were popular among other Dutch learners, such as Ōtsuki Gentaku and his tutor Maeno Ryōtaku.

Based on Arai's material, I find that he had obtained some Latin knowledge from his conversations with Sidotti; Dutch, interpreters, and Western books in Chinese took an active role in their communication. The interpreters' studies gained benefit from not only Dutch and Dutch books, but also some Westerners from other countries, such as Kaempfer. Then Dutch learners gleaned Arai's thinking from his works.

Perhaps the Latin level of Dutch learners was not very high; their focus was specialized terminology<sup>13</sup>. Besides transliterations, several Latin glossaries, such as (羅甸語解, lit. *Explanation of Latin Words*, 1824), are available. As a common language in Western Learning, Latin and its importance were recognized. On the valuableness of their Latin studies, it is perhaps as one of the Dutch learners said:

The Latin term of each disease is marked out. The transliteration today is possibly like a wart [white elephant]. However, Latin is an elegant language of the West, and the origin of terminologies. As a common language all over the Europe, Latin is widespread. A scholar who masters Latin will easily understand the meaning when he reads Dutch books, like meeting old acquaintances on a foreign trip, or seeing the Pole-Star when lost in the wilds provides much benefit for further study. Thus, no avoiding duplication, I list Latin terms here to set an example. (Udagawa, 1796, Introduction [凡例], p.2b)

(每病門襲舉羅甸名。於今所譯。如贅疣然。然羅甸名是西洋雅言。名物稱謂所原據。闔洲共國所通用學者識之則當博涉荷蘭醫籍之際隨遇即解不煩質訪。譬猶羈行異域忽逢故舊中野失鄉直得斗極。大有進步之助焉。故不厭重複而示之以充馬前之車也。)

To some extent, Latin studies expanded the scholars' horizons and affected acquiring fully Western knowledge and science after 1853, and when the country opened even after the Meiji Restoration (明治維新).

## Conclusion

*Kōsei shinpen*, as an uncompleted and unpublished historical book, contains extensive information on its translators and the time they lived in. In this paper, I have given a simple summary of *Kōsei shinpen*, including some interesting and important information about the text and something of its era. I will try to understand the ideas of the Dutch learners with the help of the encyclopedia. The questions of *kōsei*, and Japanese style in particular, need to be discussed further.

## Notes

- 1) This paper was written for “2014 The International Conference on the Next Generation Scholarship in Humanities” (at Yeungnam University, Korea) and “The Fifth Italian-Sino-Japanese Researchers Seminar on Language and Culture Relations” (at Sapienza University of Rome, Italy). I have received much help and advice from Prof. Shen Guowei, Prof. Uchida Keiichi, Prof. Matsuda Kiyoshi, Prof. Jenine Heaton, Prof. A. S. Gibbs, and PD. Ninomiya Satoshi. To them, I would like to express my deepest gratitude.
- 2) For information on the author, I mainly referred to the Avertissement du Libraire (Warning of the Bookseller) of the first French edition (1709) and the Preface of the first English translation (1725).
- 3) The title of the sequels is *Vervolg op M. Noël Chomel Algemeen Huishoudelyk*... I have only collected parts of them, Vol.VIII, published in the year of 1786, and Vol.XV in 1793.
- 4) This letter with others was published with the title *Rangaku iji mondō* (蘭學医事問答, lit. *Questions and Answers on Dutch Medical Matters*) in 1795, see: Kokusho Kankōkai (Ed). (1914, Vol.II, p.390).
- 5) As there are no numbers in the manuscript, I have marked the sections myself for ease of explanation.
- 6) The English translation is quoted from James Legge (1879).
- 7) I can't quote the title page because it is long; you can see it in the front of each volume in any French, English, German, or Dutch version.
- 8) This list is made on the basis of Vol.I of the Japanese translation (1811) and the Dutch translation (1778). I use “—” here to mean that translators said the corresponding Japanese or Chinese term was unknown and needed further study; [ ] to mean the contents in it are added myself.
- 9) The material mentioned here cannot be seen today.
- 10) Although Maeno was the leader of the translators, he didn't sign his name in the publication.
- 11) Arai Hakuseki: *Annals of the Western Ocean*, in *Arai Hakuseki* (1975), p.39. There also was a similar view in his *Sairan igen* (采覽異言) (Vol.I-Europe) in Chinese: 「如其方言、有古今

雅俗之辨。諸国方言不同、而其大約有三、曰ヘイペレイウス、ラテン、キリイキス、又云ヘシツキス、凡記大事、必用此等語耳（中略）文字體製、有如篆籀者、如行草者。字体凡二、曰ラテン、曰イタアリヤ、其ラテン如篆籀、イタアリヤ如行草、尋常者皆用草体者耳。」(Manuscript held in the Waseda University Library.)

- 12) I have not read the work of Katagiri, see “Gen’emon Imamura: CHRONOLOGY” made by Wolfgang Michel ([http://wolfgangmichel.web.fc2.com/serv/ek/imamura/chronology\\_engl.html](http://wolfgangmichel.web.fc2.com/serv/ek/imamura/chronology_engl.html)) (Aug. 18, 2014)
- 13) Today, some translations from Latin, such as Maeno’s *Seiyōgasan yakubunkō* (西洋画讀譯文稿, lit. *Draft Translation of Inscriptions on Western Pictures*, 1779), are available. See Harada Hirosius, 2000 & 2001.

## References:

### I. Different Versions of the *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*

#### A. French

Chomel, Noel. (1709). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*, Paris: Le Conte & Montalant.

— (1718). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*, Paris: Etienne Ganeau & Jacques Etienne.

— & Roger, Pierre. (1741). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*, Paris: Henry Thomas & Compagnie.

— & De La Marre. (1767). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique*, Paris: Ganeau, Bauche, les Freres Estinenne, & D’Houry.

#### B. English

Chomel, Noel, & Bradley, R. (1725). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique: or The Family Dictionary*, London: D. Midwinter.

— (1758). *Dictionnaire Oeconomique: or The Family Dictionary*, Dublin: L. Flinn, Bookseller.

#### C. Dutch

Chomel, Noel, & Bradley, R. (1743). *Huishoudelyk Woordboek*, Leyden & Amsterdam: S. Luchtmans & H. Uytwerf.

— & De Chalmot. (1778). *Algemeen Huishoudelyk, Natuur, Zedekundig, en Konst Woordenboek*, Leyden & Leeuwarden: Joh. Le Mair, & De Chalmot.

De Chalmot. (1786-?). *Vervolg op M. Noël Chomel Algemeen Huishoudelyk Natuur, Zedekundig, en Konst Woordenboek*, Campen & Amsteldam: De Chalmot. & J. Yntema.

#### D. Japanese

Kishi Shōzō. (Ed.) (1978-79). *Kōsei Shinpen* (厚生新編), Tokyo: Kōwa Shuppan.

Sadamatsu Shūzō. (Ed.) (1937). *Kōsei Shinpen* (厚生新編), Shizuoka: Kōsei Shinpen Kankōkai.

## II. Primary Documents

- Arai Hakuseki. (?) *Varying Words Observed* (采覧異言). (Manuscript, in Waseda University Library)
- Udagawa Genzui. (Trans.) (1796-1797). *Medical Selections* (内科撰要), Muromachi (Edo): Suharaya Yaichibee.
- Udagawa Yōan. (1824). *Explanation of Latin Words* (羅甸語解). (Manuscript, in Waseda University Library)
- Matsumura Akira. etc. (Ed. & Re.) (1975). *Arai Hakuseki* (新井白石), Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- Morishima Chūryō (1787). *Idle Talk about Ang-mo* (紅毛雜話), Tōto (Edo): Suharaya Yaichibee.
- Ōtsuki Gentaku. (1788). *Ladder to Dutch Learning* (蘭學階梯), [City?] Gungyokudō
- Sugita Genpaku. (Trans.) (1774). *New Text on Anatomy* (解體新書), Edo: Suharaya Yaichibee.
- . & Tatebu Seian. (1795). *Questions and Answers on Dutch Medical Matters* (蘭學醫事問答), in Kokusho Kankōkai (Ed.) (1914). *Bumei Genryū Sōsho* (文明源流叢書) II, Tokyo: Kokusho Kankōkai.

## III. Research

### A. Books

- Kampfer, Engelbertus. (1727). *History of Japan*, Scheuchzer, J. G. trans. London: [Publiser?]
- Linddel, H. G., Scoll, Robert. etc. (Ed.) (1940). *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miyanaga Takashi. (2004). *The History of Western Learning in Japan: Receptions of Portuguese, Latin, Dutch, English, German, French, and Russian* (日本洋学史：葡・羅・蘭・英・独・仏・露語の受容), Tokyo: Sanshusha Publishing Co., Ltd.
- Oita Prefecture Ancient Sages Historical Archives. (Ed.) (2009 & 2011). *Document Collection of Maeno Ryōtaku* (前野良沢資料集), Oita: Oita Kyōiku Inkai.
- Satō Shōsuke. (1993). *Historical Research of Western Learning* (洋学史論考), Tokyo: Shibunkaku Co., LTD.
- Shen Guowei. (2010). *A Study of Modern Lexical Exchange between China and Japan: The Formation, Spread, and Sharing of New Lexicons in Chinese* (近代中日词汇交流研究：汉字新词的创制、容受与共享), Peking: Zhong Hwa Book Co.
- Sugimoto Tsutomu. (1977-1982). *Dutch Linguistics, Its Formation, Growth and Development* (江戸時代蘭学語の成立とその展開), Tokyo: Waseda University Press.
- . (1998). *The Western Encyclopedia during the Edo Period: A Study of Kōsei Shinpen* (江戸時代西洋百科事典——「厚生新編」の研究), Tokyo: Yūzankaku.



**B. Monographs**

- Browns, S.R. (Trans.) (1865 & 1866). Annals of the Western Ocean (西洋紀聞), *Journal of the North-China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, New Series No.II, December 1865, pp.53-84 & New Series No.III, December 1866, pp.40-62.
- Harada Hirosius. (2000). De carminibus Latinis quae saeculo XVIII<sup>o</sup> interpretatus est Maeno Ryotaku grammaticus Iapo (前野良沢『西洋画賛訳文稿』のラテン語), *Studies in Language and Culture* 26, pp.149-178.
- . (2001). Additamenta commentarii ‘De carminibus Latinis quae saeculo XVIII<sup>o</sup> interpretatus est Maeno Ryotaku grammaticus Iapo (前野良沢『西洋画賛訳文稿』のラテン語 [補遺]), *Studies in Language and Culture* 27, pp.255-259.
- Ishiyama Hiroshi. (1979). An Introduction to *Kōsei Shinpen* (『厚生新編』解題), in Kishi Shōzō. (Ed.), *Kōsei Shinpen* (厚生新編) (pp.89-104), Tokyo: Kōwa Shuppan.
- Kuwabara Megumi. (1993). Classics Studies and Kokugaku Thought (古典研究と国学思想), in Rai Kiichi. (Ed.) *Confucianism, Kokugaku and Western Learning* (儒学・国学・洋学) (pp.257-294), Tokyo: Chūōkōron-sha.
- Takeo Itazawa. (1932). A Study on the Translation of *Kōsei shinpen* (厚生新編譯述考), *Shigaku zasshi* Vol.43, No.8, pp.949-994.