



Notes on the Manuscript Precursors of Collado's *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ lingvæ* in the British Library (Sloane Ms. 3459) and Especially Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Borg. lat. 771)

Sven Osterkamp

Printed in Rome in 1632, Diego Collado's *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ lingvæ* was the earliest grammar of Japanese ever to be printed in Europe. It is well known that this edition in Latin was preceded by a manuscript version in Spanish, a copy of which is kept at the British Library. At the end of the 19th century Ernest Satow had already drawn scholars' attention to another Spanish as well as to an Italian manuscript at the Museo Borgiano. Their later whereabouts were however deemed unknown for about a century. The "rediscovery" of these manuscripts, which are now in the possession of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, enables us to give some preliminary comments especially on the two Spanish manuscripts as well as on their relationship to each other and to the Latin edition.

Diego Collado's *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ lingvæ* (Rome 1632) is well known as the third in a line of missionary grammars of Japanese, preceded only by João Rodriguez's *Arte da lingoa de Iapam* (Nagasaki 1604–1608) and *Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa* (Macao 1620). More importantly it was also the earliest grammar of Japanese ever to be printed in Europe, namely as part of a trilogy published by the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide which consisted of this grammar, a manual for confessions, and a dictionary (Collado 1632a–c). It is by virtue of the latter circumstances and the fact that it was published in Latin that Collado's work was arguably nothing less than the chief reference on Japanese for about two centuries of European scholarship. Having however become the target of harsh criticism, especially since the early 19th century, it began to be replaced by newer materials in the decades that followed.¹

Now while the *Arte de la lengua Japona* (Mexico 1738) by Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés has recently been called "the first grammar of Japanese to be written in Spanish",² it is well known that the above-mentioned print in Latin was preceded by a manuscript version in Spanish. This is parallel to Collado's dictionary, which from a bilingual Spanish–Japanese dictionary at the manuscript stage had become a trilingual Latin–Spanish–Japanese dictionary when it went to press. This was done on his supe-

¹ To quote just a few influential scholars of that time: In Adelung's (1806: 571) assessment the grammar is already "dunkel, unordentlich und unvollständig", i. e. "obscure, in disorder and incomplete". Opinions are even more negative as soon as it is compared to the grammars of Rodriguez. Thus, for Landresse (1825: vj) in his preface to the French adaptation of *Arte breve* it ranges as "la plus imparfaite de toutes", or "the most imperfect of all" early grammars. This view is shared by Abel-Rémusat (1825: 606), who arrives at virtually the same verdict for both the grammar and the dictionary, calling them "les plus incomplets et les plus fautifs de tous", or "the most incomplete and incorrect ones of all".

² Zwartjes (2009: 21): "la primera gramática del japonés que está escrita en español".

riors' orders and "acceleratissimè", so that the readers are even asked to rely more on the Spanish than the Latin equivalents given (Collado 1632c: 157).

There are several manuscripts which reflect either a stage predating the Latin printed edition (henceforth abbreviated as L, following common practice), or alternatively are based on that edition and are retranslations of it.³ Only manuscripts of the former type, of which there are at least three, will concern us in the following: The only one of these to have been treated in detail is a complete manuscript in Spanish kept at the British Library (S_{BL}). Another complete Spanish one (S_{BAV}) as well as an incomplete Italian one (I_{BAV}) are in the possession of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. However, as their whereabouts were deemed unknown for about a century they have not yet been treated in any detail. It is thanks to the landmark study of Orsatti (1996) on the Borgia collection in the Vatican Library that the current whereabouts could be ascertained by this author in late 2013.

1 The Spanish manuscript at the British Library

Before introducing the latter two manuscripts, let us turn briefly to the one kept in London, entitled *Arte de lengua Iapona por las ocho partes de la Oracion* ("Grammar of the Japanese Language According to the Eight Parts of Speech"; Sloane Ms. 3459). As it derives from the collection of Hans Sloane (1660–1753) it must date from the first half of the 18th century at the latest, but it probably goes back to the 17th century (see below). Its first appearance in a published catalogue is in Ayscough (1782, II: 710, #3459) as "Arte de lingue [!] Japona, por las ocho parte [!] de la oracion". Previous scholarship remained silent on the provenance of Sloane's manuscript, but we may note that folio 87r/v contains – in a different hand from the main text – a number of Japanese expressions with (mostly) French explanations obviously excerpted from *Ambassades mémorables* (Amsterdam 1680; seconde partie, pp. 49f.), the French edition of Arnoldus Montanus's *Gedenkwaerdige gesantschappen* (Amsterdam 1669). Apart from a few minor changes there is not much to be noted here.⁴ The presence of these lines taken from a French book may have some other significance, however, as it may be considered an indicator of it having formerly been in French possession. For the time being we would like to suggest that it derives from the library of Alexandre Petau (d. 1672) or François Mansart (1598–1666), the combined auction catalogue of which contains the following entry. If some minor errors are ignored, the Spanish title given here coincides fully with that of S_{BL} (de Hondt 1722: 429, no. 172):

³ On the latter type see e. g. Noma (1965) who treats a manuscript by Juan de Jesús, likewise entitled *Arte de la lengua Japona*, which was in the Franciscan Archives in Pastrana at the time and is probably now in Madrid.

⁴ The only change that goes beyond a minor variation in either spelling or arrangement is turning the circuitous "Bobbo. Certe partie de la femme que la pudeur défend de nommer" into the more direct "Bobbo, pudendum muliebre".

“*Arte de lingua [!] Japona por los oche [!] partes de la Oracion, ou grammaire Japonnoise, très exacte & curieuse, qui n’a jamais veu le jour, écrite sur du papier Chinois. 8.*”

(*Arte* [...], or: Japanese grammar, very correct and curious, which has never seen the light of day;⁵ written on Chinese paper, in octavo.)

Another piece of evidence showing that a manuscript precursor of Collado's grammar was found in France in the early years of the 18th century comes from a letter addressed to Hadrian Reland by Philippe Masson, dated 25 March 1713. Here Masson (1713: 54) refers to several languages making use of “postpositions” rather than prepositions, with Japanese being among them:

“Ajoûtons que les *Japonois* se servent de cette même façon de parler; car ils disent *Tagoniyotte*, *péchés à cause*, pour à cause des péchés, *niyotte* veut dire à cause: *Sonatanotame*, *nous pour*, c’est-à-dire, *pour nous*; *tame* signifie *pour*. Tout cela est expliqué assez nettement dans une *Grammaire Japonnoise* Manuscrite que j’ai, & qui est fort curieuse & exacte, quoi qu’abrégee.”

(In addition the Japanese make use of the same way of speaking, as they say *Tagoniyotte* [read: *Toganiyotte*], “faults due to” for “due to faults”, *niyotte* meaning “due to”. *Sonatanotame*, “us for”, that is to say, “for us”; *tame* signifying “for”. All this is explained quite clearly in a manuscript *Japanese Grammar* I have, which is very curious and correct, even though abridged.)

While the second example might well be taken from L (57), the first cannot – though both could derive from the Spanish manuscripts (see S_{BL} 64v, 64r and S_{BAV} 242v respectively). Whether the manuscript to which Masson had access (“fort curieuse & exacte”) is the same as Petau's or Mansart's (“très exacte & curieuse”) and this in turn is the same as the one acquired by Sloane is far from clear, but at least this seems plausible enough.

2 The Spanish manuscript at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Let us now turn to the manuscripts in the BAV, which were part of the Museo Borgiano – named after Cardinal Stefano Borgia (1731–1804) – at the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide before being incorporated into the Vatican Library in 1902. The earliest notice of the manuscript precursors of Collado's publications in Rome appears to be that found in the *Bibliographie japonaise* (1859) by Léon Pagès. He states for both the grammar and the dictionary: “Le manuscrit portugais [!] est à la Propagande” (the Portuguese manuscript is at the S. C. P. F.; Pagès 1859: 26, nos. 220, 221). Cordier (1912: 325) merely repeats this. Other bibliographies usually mention

⁵ This is of course only partially true. Note however that neither S_{BL} nor S_{BAV} carries Collado's or any other author's name, so that the relationship of the manuscript to the published *Ars* may not have been obvious to a cursory observer.

not a single one of the manuscript precursors of Collado's works, including even Lares (1957; see pp. 122–125, nos. 54–56 for Collado's works).

In early 1888 Ernest Satow visited the Museo Borgiano where he found three manuscripts of interest which he mentions in an article on “The origin of Spanish and Portuguese rivalry in Japan” (1890). When he examined them they were distributed over two different pressmarks: (1) “Sc.7. F.4. Vol.5” for Collado's autograph of *Vocabulario de la Lengua Japona*, which corresponds to today's Borg. cin. 501 and will not be treated in any detail here. Its whereabouts have long been known and the entire dictionary has even been reproduced in facsimile and transliteration together with a useful index by Ōtsuka (1985). It is however in Spanish rather than Portuguese – contra Pagès –, and by extension we may assume that the same error on Pagès's part also applies to the manuscript of the grammar.⁶ — (2) “Sc.7. F.4. Vol.4”, which is described as follows (Satow 1890: 135):

“(Pressmark Sc. 7. fila 4. vol. 4) *Arte de la lengua Japona que ira por las partes de la oracion, conviene a saber, nomine, pronomine, verbo, participio, conjunction, interjeccion, syntaxis, y quentas* (Manual of the Japanese language, arranged according to the parts of speech, that is to say, noun, pronoun, verb, participle, conjunction, interjection, syntax, numbers).’ It is anonymous, but is evidently the original of the grammar published in Rome in 1632 under the title of *Ars Grammaticæ Japonicæ linguæ*. M. Pagès (No. 220 of his *Bibliographie Japonaise*) remarks ‘*Le manuscrit portugais est à la Propagande,*’ but he cannot have seen it, as it is in Spanish. In the same volume is bound up an Italian MS. of 27 pp., which looks like a translation of the foregoing. [...]

From the statement in § 2 of the introduction, it might appear that this translation of the Spanish original had been made in Japan; but if I remember correctly, it is written on European paper, as is not the case with most of the original manuscripts of that time which came from Japan.”

At least S_{BAV} (but not I_{BAV}) was also briefly mentioned by Cabaton (1911: 53) who saw it in 1910. His description, apart from quoting the title, is as follows: “Ecriture du XVI^e siècle, papier japonais, encre de Chine” (in a 17th century hand, Japanese paper, Chinese ink). Generally however these two manuscripts appear to have been largely forgotten and it seems that after Satow a number of decades passed without anyone with expertise in Japanese ever noting them, let alone inspecting them closely. Doi (1938: 262) claimed that the whereabouts of the Museo Borgiano manuscripts, after Satow had inspected them, were unknown and this has remained the standard view until now (see e. g. Ogahara 2009: 4). Ōtsuka (1979: 359) even explicitly considered S_{BL} to be “the only one extant” (現存唯一のもの).

Fortunately, however, not a single one of the manuscripts referred to by Satow is lost, they are merely placed in different sub-collections of the Borgia collection today.

⁶ It cannot be ruled out that a Portuguese manuscript existed (cf. Ogahara 2009: 14), but there is no positive evidence of this. Given that Pagès refers to the manuscript of Collado's dictionary as a Portuguese one as well – which is certainly incorrect – his words alone are hardly sufficient for such an assumption.

Borg. cin. 501 has already been mentioned above; the other two manuscripts are now part of Borg. lat. 771, a collection of several language- and script-related items, some of which are in print and some in manuscript.⁷ Based on the most valuable information provided by Orsatti (1996: 215, 230) and the various inscriptions in the manuscripts themselves, the changes in the pressmarks of these manuscripts over the last two centuries can be traced and summarized as follows. The earliest numbers quoted here are especially important, as they demonstrate that rather than being later additions these items were already present in the collection when Gaetano Marini and Filippo Aurelio Visconti drew up an inventory of Borgia's collection in 1806.

	1806	1839	1855	today
<i>Arte della lingua giapponese</i> (fol. 184–200), <i>Arte de lengua Japona</i> (fol. 201–260) etc.	134/3	Sc.6. F.8. Vol.3	Sc.7. F.4. Vol.4	Borg. lat. 771
<i>Vocabulario de la Lengua Japona</i>	350/?	Sc.6. F.8. Vol.5	Sc.7. F.4. Vol.5	Borg. cin. 501

As Doi (1938: 266) has already pointed out, it is essential to take into account both Rodriguez's *Arte* and the Spanish manuscript(s) together with the Latin printed edition in order to properly understand and evaluate Collado's grammar of Japanese. Now the available translations of L have already long done so: Ōtsuka (1957) contains the fruits of the combined efforts of the "Brothers Grimm of Japan",⁸ namely a Japanese translation of L by Ōtsuka Takanobu and a careful collation of L with S_{BL} in the footnotes by Ōtsuka Mitsunobu. Likewise, Spear's (1975) English translation includes references to the corresponding passages in *Arte*. As it now turns out, however, with S_{BAV} having become available for study, S_{BL} has the potential to mislead scholars if L is deemed to derive directly from S_{BL}. While a full collation of L with all available manuscripts is a task for the future, a few preliminary notes on the relationship of L, S_{BAV} and S_{BL} are possible at this point, based on a complete transliteration of S_{BAV} and L and a first comparison of both with S_{BL}:

First, the main texts of the two Spanish manuscripts are largely identical, especially if we disregard orthographic variations and the fact that S_{BAV} makes more frequent use of abbreviations than S_{BL}. This is true to such an extent as to suggest that either

⁷ Folios 1–183 do not contain anything pertaining to the Japanese language, but instead: an account of the Ethiopic script (fol. 1–4); *Fidei orthodoxae brevis, et explicata confesio* (Rome 1566; fol. 8–22); *Professio orthodoxae fidei ab orientalibus facienda* (Rome 1633; proofs with handwritten corrections; fol. 24–29); *Brevis orthodoxae fidei professio* (Rome 1595; fol. 30–43); *Professio orthodoxae fidei ab orientalibus facienda* (Rome 1648; fol. 44–63); *Alphabetvm Chaldaicvm* (Rome 1634; title page wanting; fol. 64–67); some portions (title page, preface, dedication etc.; includes imprimatur) of Alesio da Todi's *Dottrina Christiana* and *Li sette salmi penitentiali* in manuscript (published Rome 1642, 1668; fol. 68–73); a manuscript grammar of Arabic (fol. 76–183). It is unlikely to be coincidental that most of these works were published by the Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, which also printed and published Collado's entire trilogy.

⁸ This fitting designation is due to Fukushima (1968: 21).

the one is a copy of the other (probably in the direction $S_{BAV} \rightarrow S_{BL}$, cf. below), or alternatively that both derive from a common but yet to be discovered manuscript source.

Second, there are also a number of characteristics common to both, which distinguish them from L: (1) There is neither a preface nor anything corresponding to L's final chapter on "Aliquæ regulæ coniugationum in scriptura librorum" (Some rules on conjugations in the written language) – arguably one of the weakest chapters in the entire grammar, even if its brevity of less than a single page is disregarded, which may indicate that it was a last-minute addition. — (2) Neither of the manuscripts make use of accent marks or tildes to indicate prenasalization, whereas L does. — (3) Where the manuscripts refer to places such as Sevilla (S_{BAV} 202r / S_{BL} 3v) or Manila (209r / 14v) in some of the examples, L has Madrid (8) and Marseille (18) instead; likewise, the personal names Castellet and Vazquez (201v / 2r) become Pedro and João in L (7).⁹ — (4) Probably in an attempt to make the grammar more user-friendly, L tends to stick to the same default verbs for its single word examples. Thus where S_{BAV} (213r), e. g., has "aguredomo", "niguetaedomo" and "coxirayôzuredomo", that is 'offers but', 'has escaped but' and 'will prepare but', L (23) sticks to the same verb throughout: "ãgurêdômò", "aguetarêdomo", "ãgueôzurêdomo". — (5) Similarly, L at times also gives concrete examples in places where the manuscripts merely provide a rule, usually by simply applying the rule to one of the default verbs used for examples (cf. L 3 where this point is explicitly addressed). Thus, where S_{BAV} (214r) only explains how to form the "preterit infinitive", L (24) adds examples – again sticking to the verb 'to offer'. — (6) There are a few additions and omissions, mostly minor ones. — (7) Needless to say there are also various misprints in L, such as "mode" (L 9) for "made" (=made 'until') or "Tarauaxu xitè" (L 36) with <x> in place of correct <z> (*taraw.azu si.te* 'is not sufficient and').

Third, there are nevertheless a number of significant differences between the two Spanish manuscripts. (1) While the division of the text into chapters and the titles provided for these are almost identical in both manuscripts, S_{BL} introduces chapter numbers from 1 to 47. Also, as all titles are written in larger script the overall structure of the texts becomes somewhat clearer here as in S_{BAV} . — (2) Whereas diacritical marks in the transcriptions of Japanese are frequently omitted in S_{BL} and spacing appears to be almost random in some places, all this is carefully done in S_{BAV} . — (3) There are a considerable number of omissions in S_{BL} , some of which are clearly accidental rather than deliberate. For instance S_{BL} sometimes skips one or more words that are present in S_{BAV} and are essential for a proper understanding of the passage in question. Con-

⁹ For reasons unknown Collado prefers the Portuguese form João here, despite using the corresponding Spanish form Juan elsewhere. The two names as found in the manuscripts are of greater interest, however, as they may well refer to two of Collado's confreres in Japan who carried precisely these names, i. e. martyrs Pedro Vázquez (d. 1624) and Domingo Castellet (d. 1628).

sider (a) and (b) below for examples of S_{BL} jumping from one example in Japanese straight to the gloss belonging to another example.¹⁰

a	L	“ <i>dicitur etiam, āgūru vomotte, offerendo, uel cum hoc quod est offerre, āgūru iōri, ex hoc quod est offerre, āguru nitçuite, circa hoc quod est offerre</i> ” (25). [“They also say <i>aguru vo motte</i> ‘by offering, or with the fact that he is to offer,’ <i>aguru iori</i> ‘from the fact that he is to offer,’ <i>aguru nitçuite</i> ‘about the fact that he is to offer’” (Spear 1975: 130).]
	S_{BAV}	“Tambien se dize (<i>aguruuo motte</i>) con ofrecer. (<i>aguru yori</i>) de leuantar. (<i>aguruni tçuite</i>) acerca de leuantar” (214v).
	S_{BL}	“Tambien se dize <i>aguruuo motte</i> [_____] acerca de leuantar” (23v–24r).

b	L	“v. g. <i>fucaqu ua, si es profundum, uonajiqu ua, si est idem</i> ” (34). [“e. g., <i>fucaqu va</i> ‘if it be deep,’ <i>vonajiqu va</i> ‘if it be the same’” (Spear 1975: 139).]
	S_{BAV}	“vg[.] (<i>fucaqu ua</i>) <i>si es hondo. (vonajiquua)</i> si es lo mismo” (221v).
	S_{BL}	“vg. <i>fucaquua</i> . [_____] si es lo mismo” (35r).

Such examples – many others are easily found throughout the grammar – suggest that if there is a direct relationship between the two Spanish manuscripts at all, S_{BL} is more likely to be a copy of S_{BAV} and not the other way around.

In this context the portion of Collado's manuscript *Vocabulario* that consists of expressions extracted from the grammar is also of some interest. Example (c) below is not merely another case parallel to (a) and (b) above, it also serves to illustrate that Collado was either working directly with S_{BAV} or least with a manuscript near-identical with S_{BAV} , while S_{BL} is insufficient to explain the data. Note also that L skips a brief portion of S_{BAV} in (c), while the same portion is present in Borg. cin. 501 – which suggests that it was available to Collado but was then intentionally skipped in L. Example (d) even suggests that S_{BL} constitutes a copy of S_{BAV} , executed at a time before the first “nōte” was corrected to yield “nō” in the latter manuscript. At an earlier stage S_{BAV} contained “nōte” twice, so that one of the two may well have been judged superfluous and therefore omitted in the process of copying. The result is what we see in S_{BL} . On the other hand, both *Vocabulario* and L reflect the corrected version, with “nōte” alongside “nō”.

¹⁰ For better readability the Japanese portions of the text in examples (a) to (f) below are italicized, whereas the surrounding passages in Latin and Spanish are not. Abbreviations in the manuscripts are spelled out without further indication for technical and practical reasons; handwritten additions are enclosed by angle brackets: {...}.

c	L	“v. g. <i>ivōgatoruru</i> , <i>pisces capiuntur</i> , <i>cajēga torūru</i> , <i>ventus cessat</i> ” (38). [“For example: <i>ivo ga toruru</i> ‘the fish are caught,’ <i>caje ga toruru</i> ‘the wind ceases’” (Spear 1975: 144).]
	S _{BAV}	“vg. (<i>tore</i> , <i>uru</i>) <i>tomarse</i> , o <i>cojerse</i>) <i>vg</i> [.] (<i>iuoga toruru</i>) <i>tomarse pescado</i> . (<i>cajega toruru</i>) <i>çesar el viento</i> ” (225r).
	S _{BL}	“vg. <i>tore</i> , <i>toruru</i> . <i>tomarse</i> . [_____] <i>cajega toruru</i> , <i>çesar el viento</i> ” (40r).
	Voc.	“cesar el viento. <i>càjeḡa tòre</i> . <i>uru</i> . <i>tomarse cogerse</i> . <i>tòre</i> . <i>uru</i> . <i>ivo ga toruru</i> . <i>coge se pescado</i> ” (66r).

d	L	“Gerundium est, <i>nó</i> , <i>nôte</i> , vel, <i>naqu xitè</i> , vel, <i>nacatte</i> , cum non sit” (32). [“The gerund is <i>nó</i> , <i>nôte</i> , <i>naqu xite</i> , or <i>nacatte</i> ‘since it is not’” (Spear 1975: 138).]
	S _{BAV}	“el gerundio es [(<i>nôte</i> (<i>nôte</i>), corrected into:] (<i>nō</i> , (<i>nôte</i>) <i>naquxite</i> , y (<i>nacatte</i>) que es por la regla de arriba, no auiendo” (220r).
	S _{BL}	“El Gerundio es [_____] <i>nôte naqu xite</i> , y <i>nacatte</i> , que es por la regla de arriba, no auiendo” (32v).
	Voc.	“ <i>nôte</i> , l. <i>nō</i> . l. <i>naquxite</i> . l. <i>nacatte</i> ” (66r).

Possibly the most telling example suggesting a straight line of transmission from S_{BAV} to S_{BL} is however one of the words listed as second person pronouns: “*çonofō*” (S_{BAV} 206v). In what is a single, isolated instance in the entire manuscript S_{BAV} here renders Japanese /s/ as <ç> instead of <s> as elsewhere. In preparing L (14) this was interpreted correctly and subsequently replaced by the orthographically normalized form “*sòno fō*”. On the other hand, whoever copied the manuscript was less successful and misinterpreted <ç> as being equal to <c>. S_{BL} (10v) thus writes “*Conofō*” instead. The highly irregular use of <ç> in this place neatly explains the corresponding word forms in both L and S_{BL}.

(4) There are likewise additions in S_{BAV} which are reflected in L but not in S_{BL} as in the following example or also as in (f) further below.

e	L	„nisi dicamus hoc vltimum esse gerundium in ni” (25). [“unless this should be considered a gerund in ni [<i>Di</i>]” (Spear 1975: 130).]
	S _{BAV}	“{sino es que sea este vltimo gerundio en, di}” (215r).
	S _{BL}	“[_____]” (24v).

Fourth, some differences between S_{BAV} and S_{BL} are not errors but can only be interpreted as deliberate changes requiring a certain background in Japanese – or at the very least other reference works on the language. Thus, instead of “*mma domo*” for ‘horses’

as seen in both L (8) and S_{BAV} (202v), S_{BL} (4r) prefers “vma domo”. Likewise, where L (58) and S_{BAV} (243r) have “sama” for ‘window’, S_{BL} (66r) has synonymous “mado” instead. As the former is stigmatized as a Kyūshū dialect form in *Vocabulario da lingoa de Iapam* (Nagasaki 1603; see p. 217r; cf. also already Ōtsuka 1957: 90, n. 1), one is tempted to consider this an endeavor at purifying the manuscript grammar from dialectal influence. Then again, however, it may also be that whoever copied the manuscript simply checked these words against a dictionary, most likely *Dictionarium Latino Ivsitanicum, ac Iaponicum* (Amakusa 1595), which gives “Vma” and “Mado” (247 [entry for “Equus”], 281 [“Fenestra”]) – whereas Collado (1632b: 42, 48) sticks to “mma” and “sáma”¹¹ in his corresponding entries. The most remarkable of such deliberate changes in the Japanese portions of the text is, however, the following concerning the verbal core of (=ni) *sitagat.te* ~ *sitagoo.te* ‘according to’: In L (58) the two variants are said to be the “gerunds” of the verbs “xitagari: u, &, xitagai: ó”, just as in S_{BAV} (243r). In other words, the two variants are derived from two synonymous verbs *sitagar-* and *sitagaw-* here – the former of which is non-existent however.¹² S_{BL} (65r) on the other hand correctly derives both from the same verb “xitagai, gō”.

The example sentences borrowed from Rodríguez's *Arte* also show up differently in the two manuscripts at times. In part at least this appears to involve the same kind of deliberate changes. Ogahara (2009: 13) counts seven cases in which example sentences found in L are closer to their originals in *Arte* than the corresponding ones in S_{BL}. This would indeed suggest, as he assumes, that *Arte* was available for consultation to Collado when he prepared the Latin translation. If, however, we compare the example adduced by Ogahara (2009: 13) – involving “xiro caneno dōguuo” (‘implements of silver’) in S_{BL} (73v), whereas *Arte* (138v) has “coganeno cusariuo” (‘gold chains’), which is reflected in L (63) as “cōganeno cusari uo” – with the corresponding passage in S_{BAV}, which has “coganeno cusariuo” (249r), we learn that this textual divergence is peculiar to S_{BL}. If S_{BAV} is what underlies L, no involvement of *Arte* has to be assumed at the time L was prepared. This is yet another aspect where S_{BAV} apparently reflects the original text of the grammar considerably better than S_{BL}.

Ogahara (2009: 12f.) also draws attention to an example sentence containing the word “nhóbó” in L (22), whereas S_{BL} (20r) has “riobó” (for Middle Japanese *nyouboo*

¹¹ Probably a misprint for *sàma* (cf. Borg. cin. 501: 85v).

¹² The cause of this misunderstanding on the part of the original author of the grammar is easily found: From the perspective of (Western) Middle Japanese, only *sitagoo.te* can be considered a regular and productive form of *sitagaw-*, but not *sitagat.te*. Taken as a colloquial form the latter could only derive from verbs such as either *sitagar-* or *sitagat-*, neither of which actually existed however. The reason for the co-existence of *sitagat.te* and *sitagoo.te* is that the former is a borrowing from the literary language – and by virtue of this outside the scope of productive morphology in *colloquial* Middle Japanese –, whereas the latter is the usual colloquial form. Rodríguez notes both forms in his *Arte* (73v, 113r, 146r, esp. 147r) and unsurprisingly his examples involving “xitagatte” are in literary Japanese (e.g. 41r, 147r). Also, when Collado lists “xitağari, u” next to “xitağatte” in Borg. cin. 501 (12r), this is based on the latter's appearance in a text written in literary Japanese as well (*Virgen S. Mariano tattoqi Rosario iardin* etc.; Binondo 1623).

[taken literally, L suggests *nyooboo*] 女房 ‘wife’ and *ryooboo* 両方 ‘two directions’ respectively). The sentence ultimately derives from *Esopo no fabvlas* (Amakusa 1593; see p. 477), which has “riöbö” here, the immediate source for the Spanish manuscripts was however probably *Arte* (16v) again, which similarly has “Riöbö”. Now while this may indeed be taken as a deliberate change to increase the textual distance to Rodríguez’s grammar (cf. Ogahara 2009: 13), a comparison with S_{BAV} (212v) suggests a different explanation: What is intended here is undoubtedly “riöbö” as in *Arte*, but ⟨ri⟩ is written in such a way as to closely resemble ⟨ñ⟩. If misread as ⟨n⟩ plus some diacritical mark this could easily be interpreted in the sense of ⟨ñ̃⟩ (which is written in various ways here, including ⟨ñ̃⟩, ⟨ñ̄⟩, and ⟨ñ̇⟩), the Spanish equivalent of Portuguese ⟨nh̃⟩. What makes such an explanation for the appearance of “nhóbó” in L plausible apart from the graphical similarity involved is the circumstance that Collado was probably unfamiliar with the word “riöbö”.¹³ The derivation “riöbö” → “ñöbö” → “nhöbö” (= “nhóbó”) furthermore helps to explain the irregular vowel correspondence in the first syllable: While S_{BAV} (203r, 214r) writes “nhôbö” for *nyouboo* throughout as expected,¹⁴ L (9, 24) and Collado’s dictionary (1632c: 83) consistently have “nhóbó” and “nhöbö” instead, both corresponding to *nyooboo*. Having misinterpreted the intended *ryooboo* as *nyooboo*, Collado evidently unified all instances of the latter word to yield this form, thereby erasing all traces of the correct *nyouboo* as it is still found in the manuscripts.¹⁵

Lastly, the question naturally arises whether we are then possibly dealing with the autograph of Collado here. While this author is not prepared to answer this question with certainty, the answer is probably negative.¹⁶ Not only is the handwriting distinct from that of Collado’s autograph of *Vocabulario*, there are also at least two significant systematic differences between S_{BAV} and the manuscript of *Vocabulario*: First, S_{BAV} does not carry Collado’s name anywhere. In fact there is no indication as to the manuscript’s authorship at all here, which is likewise true of both S_{BL} and I_{BAV}. These circumstances support Ogahara’s (2009: 14) hypothesis that Collado was not the original author of the grammar published under his name, but rather one or several of his confreres with more extensive experience in Japan. Second, the renderings of Japanese comprise neither accent marks nor tildes to indicate prenasalization, whereas the printed trilogy and the autograph do.¹⁷ Interestingly, however, we find a small number of

¹³ As Ogahara already pointed out it is not found in the printed dictionary (which is confirmed by Ōtsuka 1966: 109) and the same is true of the underlying manuscript (cf. Ōtsuka 1985: 226). Only its variant *ryoofoo* was certainly known to Collado (1632b: 40 [“riofö”]; 1632c: 296 [“riöfö”]).

¹⁴ S_{BL} likewise has “nhôbö” for the former case (5v), but omits all diacritical marks to yield simple “nhobo” for the latter (23r).

¹⁵ Besides S_{BAV} the word is also found in the manuscript *Vocabulario* (64v) as “nhôbö”.

¹⁶ Ogahara (2009: 4, 16) takes Satow’s wording “the original of the grammar published in Rome” to refer to an autograph by Collado, but this is not necessarily the only possible interpretation.

¹⁷ There is a single exception to the latter: *wonago* ‘woman’ is written as “vonãgo”, or possibly “vonaço” (237r). The expected spelling “vonago” is likewise found for this word (203r).

additions and corrections here in a hand different from that of the main text – a hand that is more consistent with Collado's in his *Vocabulario*. This is the case for instance with the following superlinear addition:

f	L	“Particula seu radix verbi, <i>macàri, u, [...]</i> ” (43). [“The particle, or better root of the verb, <i>macari, u, [...]</i> ” (Spear 1975: 149).]
	S _{BAV}	“La particula, ⟨o raiz de verbo⟩ (<i>macari, u</i>) [...]” (229r).
	S _{BL}	“La Particula [_____] <i>macari [...]</i> ” (46r).

Everything considered, it therefore even seems likely that S_{BAV} is the very manuscript Collado used in preparing L. The partial rearrangement of the text as well as the few additions and changes to it are overall unsubstantial and could easily have been carried out at the draft stage of the Latin version for publication.¹⁸

3 The Italian manuscript at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Before closing, at least a few very preliminary notes concerning I_{BAV} – in all likelihood the earliest extant example of an account of Japanese grammar written in Italian, even if unfortunately neither its exact age nor its creator is known¹⁹ – seem in order. Orsatti (1996: 183) considers the Spanish manuscript to be a translation of the Italian one, though Satow's (1890: 135) impression that it “looks like a translation of the foregoing” (i. e. S_{BAV}) is probably correct after all.

¹⁸ Doi (1938: 262) assumes the existence of a Spanish version between S_{BL} and L, containing a preface with identical content to the one seen in L. This assumption is based on the fact that while the Spanish-like spellings ⟨ya, yu, ye, yo⟩ are generally replaced with the more Latin-like ⟨ia, iu, ie, io⟩ in L, the former spellings are accidentally retained in the notes on pronunciation in the preface (L 5). This alone, however, does not indicate the existence of yet another Spanish manuscript. It is equally possible and even more likely that ⟨y⟩ was carried over into the Latin manuscript at first and only changed (albeit somewhat inconsistently) to ⟨i⟩ at a later drafting stage. In fact the instances of ⟨y⟩ scattered throughout the grammar (cf. e. g. L 33.14, 40.24, 44.14, 68.8) are likely to be witnesses of such an early drafting stage of the Latin translation that still made use of ⟨y⟩. Incidentally the same can be said about *Modvs confitendi*: On its title page only ⟨y⟩ is used, while the main text is more or less consistent in using ⟨i⟩ in its place – again however with a number of exceptions betraying the original mode of transcription (cf. e. g. Collado 1632b: 14.39, 18.29, 48.11, 52.4, and so on). Finally, Collado's *Dictionarivm* retains far too many instances of ⟨y⟩ to mention here. The only thing all these cases of retained ⟨y⟩ throughout the trilogy tell us is that a change in plans occurred at some point – and judging from the rather sloppy results the necessary changes were applied “acceleratissimè” here as well.

¹⁹ Antelmo Severini's translation of Léon de Rosny's *Guide de la conversation japonaise*, published under the title *Guida della conversazione giapponese* (Firenze 1866) is probably among the earliest examples, even if grammar as such does not stand in the focus here. Also see Giulio Gattinoni's *Grammatica giapponese della lingua parlata* (Venice 1890).

The Italian text starts with an introduction (“Al Lettore”; fol. 184v), which at first glance may resemble (parts of) the one found in L. Seen in its entirety, however, the Italian manuscript cannot possibly be based on the Latin print; rather it shows various characteristics of the Spanish manuscripts, especially S_{BAV} . Also, on closer examination the two prefaces turn out to have only relatively little in common – their most obvious shared feature is a reference to Rodriguez’s *Arte* and its rather obvious role in the compilation of the grammar – so that they may well have been written entirely independently from each other. They were probably only added at the drafting stage of the Latin and Italian translation respectively.

Where S_{BAV} and S_{BL} differ, I_{BAV} is closer to the former of the two. This applies for instance not only to the title, but also to the division of the chapters. The first three chapter headings in S_{BL} are not indicated as such in S_{BAV} and are likewise not found in the Italian version.

I_{BAV}	S_{BAV}	S_{BL}
Del nome.	De el nombre.	Del nombre.
—	—	Cap. 1. Del nombre y de su Declinacion en singular.
—	—	Cap. 2. De como se hazen los plurales.
—	—	Cap. 3. De los generos.
De nomi sostantiui composti, et astratti	De nombres sustantiuos compuestos y abstractos.	Cap. 4. De los nombres sustantiuos. Compuestos y Abstractos.

Regrettably the Italian version is not only incomplete – it ends abruptly in the middle of the chapter on verbs on fol. 200v, almost immediately after the subheading “Infinitiuo” (chapter 17 in S_{BL}) –, the manuscript also appears to have suffered some water damage, thus rendering some paragraphs almost illegible, at least judging from the reproduction available to this author.

* * *

As already stated above, a full collation of L with all three manuscripts available to us now is a task for the future – but certainly one that will provide us with new and valuable insights into the textual prehistory of Collado’s *Ars grammaticæ Iaponicæ lingvæ*. An edition of the Spanish text of the grammar is currently being prepared by this author – and it is to be hoped that the “rediscovery” of the two manuscripts kept at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana will give an impetus to further research on Collado’s trilogy and its surroundings.

References

- Abel-Rémusat, Jean-Pierre (1825): “*Éléments de la Grammaire Japonaise*, [...] Paris, Dondey-Dupré, 1825, grand in-8.° de xx et 142 pages”. In: *Journal des savans* 1825 (Octobre): 605–611.
- Adelung, Johann Christoph (1806): *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachkunde mit dem Vater Unser als Sprachprobe in bey nahe fünfhundert Sprachen und Mundarten. Erster Theil*. Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung.
- Ayscough, Samuel (1782): *A catalogue of the manuscripts preserved in the British Museum hitherto undescribed*. 2 vols. London: John Rivington.
- Cabaton, Antoine (1911): “Mission en Italie”. In: *Bulletin de géographie historique et descriptive* 1911.1–2: 37–55.
- Collado, Diego (1632a): *Ars grammaticæ iaponicæ lingvæ in gratiam et adivutorivm eorum, qui prædicandi Euangelij causa ad Iaponiæ Regnum se voluerint conferre*. Rome: Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.
- (1632b): *Modvs confitendi et examinandi Pœnitentem Iaponensem, formula suamet lingua Iaponica*. Rome: Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.
- (1632c): *Dictionarivm sive thesavri lingvæ iaponicæ compendivm*. Rome: Sacra Congregatio de Propaganda Fide.
- Cordier, Henri (1912): *Bibliotheca Japonica: Dictionnaire bibliographique des ouvrages relatifs à l'Empire japonais*. Paris: Ernest Leroux.
- de Hondt, Abraham (1722): *Bibliothecæ Petaviana et Mansartiana. Ou catalogue des bibliothèques de feu messieurs Alexandre Petau[,] Conseiller au Parlement de Paris; et Francois Mansart[,] Intendant des Bâtimens de France. Aux quelles on a ajouté le Cabinet considérable des Manuscrits du fameux Justus Lipsius. La vente se fera par Abrah. de Hondt, Le 23 Fevrier & suiv. 1722*. The Hague: Abraham de Hondt.
- Doi Tadao 土井忠生 (1938): “Koryado Nihon bunten no seiritsu” コリヤド日本文典の成立. In: Kyōgakukyoku (ed.): *Nihon shogaku shinkō iinkai kenkyū hōkoku* 日本諸學振興委員會研究報告, vol. 3: *Kokugo kokubungaku* 國語國文學. Tōkyō: Kyōgakukyoku, pp. 261–266.
- Fukushima Kunimichi 福島邦道 (1968): “Kokugoshi (kindai)” 国語史(近代). In: *Kokugogaku* 国語学 73: 20–30.
- Landresse, Ernest Augustin Xavier Clerc de (1825): *Éléments de la grammaire japonaise, Par le P. Rodriguez*. Paris: Dondey-Dupré.
- Laures, Johannes (1957): *Kirishitan bunko* 吉利支丹文庫: *A manual of books and documents on the early Christian mission in Japan*. Tōkyō: Sophia University.
- Masson, Philippe (1713): “Dissertation Critique sur la Langue Chinoise, [...] adressée à Mr. Reland, Professeur en Langues Orientales dans l'Université d'Utrecht”. In: *Histoire critique de la republique des lettres, tant Ancienne que Moderne* 3: 29–106.
- Montanus, Arnoldus (1669): *Gedenkwaardige gesantschappen der Oost-Indische Maetschhappy in 't Vereenigde Nederland, aan de kaisaren van Japan*. Amsterdam: Jacob Meurs.

- (1680): *Ambassades mémorables De la Compagnie des Indes Orientales des Provinces Unies, Vers les Empereurs du Japon*. Amsterdam: Jacob Meurs.
- Noma Kazumasa 野間一正 (1965): “Fuan de Hesūsu no Nihongo bunten ni tsuite” フアン・デ・ヘスースの日本語文典について. In: *Hispanica* 10: 1–11.
- Ogahara Toshio 小鹿原敏夫 (2009): “Koryādo Nihon bunten Supeingo sōkōbon ni tsuite” 『コリヤード日本文典スペイン語草稿本』について. In: *Kokugo kokubun* 国語国文 78.12: 1–18.
- Orsatti, Paola (1996): *Il fondo Borgia della biblioteca vaticana e gli studi orientali a Roma tra sette e ottocento*. Città del Vaticano: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana.
- Ōtsuka Mitsunobu 大塚光信 (1966): *Koryādo Ra-Sei-Nichi jiten* コリヤード羅西日辞典. Kyōto: Rinsen shoten.
- (1979): *Ra-Sei-Nichi jisho* 羅西日辞書. Tōkyō: Benseisha.
- ; Kojima Yukie 小島幸枝 (eds.) (1985): *Koryādo jihitsu Sei-Nichi jisho: fukusei, honkoku, sakuin oyobi kaisetsu* コリヤード自筆西日辞書：複製・翻刻・索引および解説. Kyōto: Rinsen shoten.
- Ōtsuka Takanobu 大塚高信 (1957): *Koryādo Nihon bunten* コリヤード日本文典. Tōkyō: Kazama shobō.
- Oyanguren de Santa Inés, Melchor (1738): *Arte de la lengua japona, dividido en quatro libros segun el arte de Nebrixa*. Mexico: Joseph Bernardo de Hogal.
- Pagès, Léon (1859): *Bibliographie japonaise ou catalogue des ouvrages relatifs au Japon qui ont été publiés depuis le XV^e siècle jusqu’à nos jours*. Paris: Duprat.
- Rodriguez, João (1604–1608): *Arte da lingoa de Iapam*. Nangasaqui [Nagasaki]: Collegio de Iapão da Companhia de Iesv.
- (1620): *Arte breve da lingoa Iapoa*. Amacao [Macao]: Collegio da Madre de Deos da Companhia de Iesv.
- Satow, Ernest (1890): “The origin of Spanish and Portuguese rivalry in Japan”. In: *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan* 18: 133–156.
- Spear, Richard L. (1975): *Diego Collado’s grammar of the Japanese language*. (International studies, East Asian series research publication; 9). [Lawrence]: University of Kansas, Center for East Asian Studies.
- Zwartjes, Otto (ed.) (2009): *Melchor Oyanguren de Santa Inés: Arte de la lengua japona (1738)*. (Lingüística misionera; 2). Madrid: Iberoamericana.