

# Sino-Western-Japanese Lexical Exchanges in China between the Late Ming and the Late Qing Dynasties

Federico MASINI

University of Rome “la Sapienza”

Translation is the art of rendering ideas and concepts expressed in one language into another language; the more remote and isolated the language of translation, the more difficult it is to solve the terminological problems that inevitably arise. In some cases, the solution is to coin completely new terms; in others, to adapt already existing terms, possibly coined by others in a different period and for a different goal. If this is true for alphabetical languages, it is even more so for languages, like Chinese and Japanese, which employ other writing systems. In China, with extremely few exceptions—such as the phonemic loans created on the basis of the Indian originals for Buddhist terminology—whenever it was necessary to coin new terms, already existing terms were used but with new meanings. A further complication arose from the fact that, until the very end of the nineteenth century, the Chinese were unable to distinguish between the concept of “word” (*ci* 詞) and its graphic representation by one or more characters (*zi* 字)<sup>1</sup>. Even Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873-1929) believed that word and character were equal, inverting the natural order of spoken language preceding written representation.

In 1898, in the context of the debate on the coining of new terms, Liang Qichao suggested inventing new Chinese characters.

In the West, language and writing are united, thus for each thing there is a sound, a character (*zi* 字), and a name. In China, language and writing are separate, thus things that existed in ancient times but no longer exist now, have a character invented by the ancients. If a thing no longer exists, then the character is no longer used. There are no characters for the things that exist today, so there is no alternative but to borrow ancient characters and employ them for naming these things. This is the example of a loan.... Since there are many new things and it is not always possible to borrow ancient characters, our first task is to invent new characters. All the terms that have been translated recently, for example those using the character “steam” (*qi* 氣), are loans. But new characters have been used for the sixty-four elements, such as zinc, platinum, and potassium. In his translations of chemical works, John Fryer 傅蘭雅 [1839-1928] translated the names of elements by taking the first syllable of the foreign term, translating it into Chinese, and adding a radical. In the case of ferrous substances, he

added the radical “iron” (*jin* 金); of metalloids, the radical “stone” (*shi* 石). This is the best system. In future his example will have to be followed for translating the names of things. For things belonging to the fish category, we will add the radical “fish” (*yu* 魚); for those belonging to the bird category (*niao* 鳥), the radical “bird”; for those belonging to the category of trees (*mu* 木), the radical “tree”; for those belonging to the “utensil” (*qi* 器) category, the radical “basket” (*fang* 匚) and so on.<sup>2</sup>

I quote this passage from Liang at length to show the perception—or misperception—of the Chinese language by one of the most acute scholars of the late Qing. Despite Liang’s suggestion, for many centuries the tendency in the Chinese language was to create neologisms, not by inventing new characters, but by creating new combinations of existing characters, thus creating polysyllabic neologisms.

In the following pages, I shall try to demonstrate that the Chinese works edited or translated by the Jesuit missionaries active in China from the end of the sixteenth century and, to a greater extent, by the Protestant missionaries during the nineteenth century, were an important source of such polysyllabic neologisms. In the last two decades scholars in the West, and in Japan and in China, have addressed the issue of the lexical contribution of Western missionaries to the Chinese language. Much remains to be done in terms of tracing the possible interaction, in linguistic terms, between the Chinese texts produced by Westerners in China, the original Western sources they employed, the Japanese reaction to the Chinese texts that eventually reached Japan, the production of texts on the West in Japan, and, finally, the linguistic contribution of these latter texts to the formation of the modern Chinese language.

It is clearly not possible in this paper to examine in detail each of the above phases of interaction. I propose therefore to examine only whether it is possible to trace two distinct lines of diffusion for a certain number of Chinese neologisms, from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jesuit Chinese works to nineteenth-century Protestant Chinese works, and from seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jesuit Chinese works and nineteenth-century Protestant Chinese works to late-Tokugawa and early-Meiji Japan and, thence, back to China in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century.

## FROM JESUIT WORKS TO PROTESTANT WORKS

Toward the very end of the sixteenth century, the Jesuit missionaries in China were the first Westerners to face the problem of creating neologisms in the Chinese language. In the course of their activity, they produced hundreds of books in Chinese on topics ranging from religion to philosophy, the calendar, arithmetic, geography, mechan-

ics, optics, medicine, and the like.<sup>3</sup> Because these texts contained completely new concepts and ideas, the missionaries were obliged to solve the problem of how to render new ideas in the Chinese language. In some cases they created neologisms of which a few are presumably still in use today.

In addressing this issue, first we must determine the number of neologisms created by the Jesuits in the works they wrote in Chinese with the assistance of Chinese literati; secondly, how many of these new creations are still in use in Chinese; and, lastly, to what extent they have had an impact on the formation of modern Chinese terminology.<sup>4</sup> In tracing the history of neologisms, it is important to establish whether the translation activity of the Protestant missionaries in the early nineteenth century can be related to the work produced by the Jesuits in the previous centuries. It seems that there were two distinct positions among the Protestant missionaries: some, intentionally or unintentionally, decided to ignore the earlier Jesuit translations and, therefore, the neologisms they contained; others acknowledged the importance of giving due consideration to the contribution of Jesuit missionaries in translating Western terms.

Robert Morrison 馬禮遜 (1782-1834), the founder of the Protestant Mission in China, who had arrived in Canton in 1807, was the first to compile a Chinese-English dictionary. The preface to this famous dictionary published in Macao in 1815 contains an explicit acknowledgement of the extent to which Morrison considered himself indebted to the translation activity of the Jesuits.

Of the following Dictionary, Kang-he's Tsze-t'een [康熙字典], forms the ground works; the arrangement and number of Characters in the First Part, are according to it. The Definitions and Examples, are derived chiefly from it; from Personal knowledge on the use of the Character; from the Manuscript Dictionaries of Romish Church; from Native Scholars; and from Miscellaneous Works perused on purpose.

The Manuscript Dictionaries contain from Ten to Thirteen thousand Characters; the late Printed French Copy, contains, Thirteen thousand, three hundred and sixteen. Neither the Manuscript Dictionaries, nor Printed Copies, insert the Chinese Characters in the Examples, which leaves the Learner at great uncertainty, as to the Characters or Words which compose the Examples given. In this Work, that material defect is supplied. The Examples are also more numerous, and the illustrations generally fuller than that in the Manuscripts and Printed Copy of the Missionaries' Dictionaries.

That the Chinese Language has no Compound Words, seems a misapprehension. That the Characters are not actually joined to each other is a fact; but to the intelligent Reader, Speaker, and Hearer, the Syllables are often understood in

a compound sense.<sup>5</sup>

Morrison clearly based his work on the *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典, published in 1716, and took into consideration “the Manuscript Dictionaries of Romish Church” and one of “the late Printed French Copy.” The latter is certainly the *Dictionnaire Chinois, Français et Latin*, published in Paris under the auspices of Napoleon in 1813, by the former French Consul in Canton, C. L. Joseph de Guignes (1721-1800). The question is still open with regard to which dictionaries in manuscript form Morrison was referring to. I am presently conducting research on this point, in an attempt to demonstrate to what extent Morrison relied on the earlier Chinese dictionaries prepared by Catholic missionaries, mainly the manuscripts of the two Chinese-Latin dictionaries prepared by the Franciscan Basilio Brollo (1648-1701, born in Gemona del Friuli): the 1694 dictionary arranged according to radicals and containing more than 7000 characters; and the 1699 dictionary arranged according to phonetics and containing more than 9000 characters. Morrison may also have used even earlier dictionaries, such as the one written in 1640 by Francisco Diaz (1606-46), the Spanish Dominican, who prepared a voluminous *Vocabulario de Letra China con la Explication castellana*, giving the pronunciation and the meaning of 7169 characters, along with some compounds, and those prepared by Matteo Ricci 利瑪竇 (1552-1610) around the year 1600.<sup>6</sup>

In relation to the above, it is also important to note that, as early as the beginning of the nineteenth century, Morrison was certainly aware that the Chinese language was using compound words and, therefore, that a dictionary of that language had to include not only single characters but also compound words.

Another missionary who definitely took into consideration the neologisms introduced into Chinese by the Jesuits was Alexander Wylie 威烈亞力 (1815-87) who continued the translation of Euclid’s *Elements of Geometry* (*Jihe yuanben* 幾何原本), begun by Matteo Ricci and Xu Guangqi 徐光啟 (1562-1633). The first six volumes of Euclid’s book were published in 1607 and the translation was completed by Wylie and the Chinese mathematician Li Shanlan 李善蘭 (1810-82), with the publication, in 1857, of the last nine volumes with the title *Xu jihe yuanben* 續幾何原本. In this work Wylie preserved most of the neologisms already employed by Ricci and Xu Guangqi in their earlier text.

The decision of the newly arrived Protestant missionaries either to regard or disregard the translation activity of their Jesuit predecessors seems to have been based on fairly obvious considerations. For example, in preparing a Chinese-English dictionary, Morrison was opening a completely new field and understandably chose to consult all the previous material available in other languages. In discussing problems related to the creation of new terminology in the framework of the translation activity conducted at the



Jiangnan Arsenal of Shanghai, in 1867 John Fryer, one of the most active translators of Western scientific texts in the nineteenth century, stated:

After considerable discussion the following plan was agreed upon by those who organised the department: -

1. Existing nomenclature—Where it is probable a term exists in Chinese, though not to be found in Dictionaries,

(a) To search in the principal native works on the arts and sciences; as well as those by the Jesuit missionaries and recent Protestant missionaries.

(b) To enquire of such Chinese merchants, manufacturers, mechanics &c., as would be likely to have the terms in current use.<sup>7</sup>

The contributors to the first Chinese magazines published by Westerners in China, around the middle of the nineteenth century, adopted a completely different approach. For example in the *Dong-Xiyang kao meiyue tongji zhuan* 東西洋考每月統記傳—a magazine published between 1833 and 1837, first in Canton and later in Singapore, under the direction of the Prussian missionary Karl Friedrich August Gützlaff 郭實獵 (1803-51)—there is no direct reference to the activity of Jesuit missionaries in general, or to their translations.<sup>8</sup> In another magazine, the *Liuhe congtan* 六合叢談—the first Chinese magazine to deal mainly with scientific subjects, edited in Shanghai between January 1857 and January 1858 by the most active Protestant missionaries of the time, Alexander Wylie, William Muirhead 莫維廉 (1822-1900), Alexander Williamson 韋廉臣 (1829-1890), Joseph Edkins 艾約瑟 (1823-1905), and others—few direct references are made to Catholicism (*Tianzhujiao* 天主教). There are only three references in the over 1000 pages published by the magazine in fifteen volumes: volume I, no. 8 contains the one reference in the entire magazine to Matteo Ricci (Li Madou) and Johann Adam Schall von Bell (Tang Ruowang 湯若望, 1591-1666) in a ten-line review of the French book by Évariste-Régis Huc (1813-60), *Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie et au Thibet* (4 vols. 1857-58); the two other references are both in volume I, no. 11, in a six-line review of William Charles Milne's 美魏茶 (1815-63) book, *Life in China* (London, 1857) and in an article on the "Progress of Astronomical Discovery in the West."<sup>9</sup>

It therefore seems that the Protestants were extremely careful to take into consideration previous results, if specifically addressing terminological questions. If instead they were writing for religious propaganda or discussing scientific matters, they tried to avoid any reference to their Jesuit predecessors.

Surprisingly, the Chinese literati contributed most to spreading the Chinese neologisms coined by the Jesuit missionaries. Excerpts mostly from the geographical texts prepared by the Jesuits are to be found in various encyclopedias or historical works related to the "barbarians" in general or the West in particular. For example, in the *Sancai*

*tuhui* 三才圖會 (Illustrated encyclopaedia of three powers [of heaven, earth and man]) (1609), which reproduces the legend of Ricci's world map; in the chapters on the West in the *Mingshi* 明史 (Ming history) (1739) and those in the *Qingchao wenxian tongkao* 清朝文獻通考 (Encyclopaedia of documents of the Qing dynasty [ordered by Emperor Qianlong in 1747]); in the abstracts of some Chinese works prepared by the Jesuits included in the *Siku quanshu zongmu* 四庫全書總目 (Contents of the complete works in the four treasuries, completed in 1782), in the *Aomen jilüe* 澳門記略 (Short description of Macao, 1752), in the *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖志 (Maps and documents on maritime countries, 1844, 1847, 1852, 1895) by Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794-1856), in the *Yinghuan zhilüe* 瀛環志略 (Short treatise of the maritime circuit, 1848, 1850, 1866) by Xu Jiyou 徐繼畲 (1795-1873), and in various texts included in the *Xiaofang huzhai yudi congchao* 小方壺齋輿地叢鈔 (Collection of geographical works from the studio of the small square pot; editions of 1877, 1891, 1894, 1897) compiled by Wang Xiqi 王錫祺.

All these works contain traces of the compounds created by the Jesuits for indicating products or institutions unknown to the Chinese. For example, *bingyuan* 病院 for "hospital," first employed by Giulio Aleni 艾儒略 (1582-1649) in his *Zhifang waiji* 職方外紀 (Record of the places outside the jurisdiction of the Office of Geography, Hangzhou, 1623)<sup>10</sup> and in his *Xifang dawen* 西方答問 (Questions and answers on the West, Hangzhou, 1637).<sup>11</sup> They were preserved in the language through their use in encyclopaedic works such as the *Qingchao wenxian tongkao* (juan 298, p. 7468). Eventually some were superseded by other new creations, which are still in use today. For example, *bingyuan* was superseded at the beginning of the nineteenth century, at least as early as 1835, by the expression *yi yuan* 醫院.<sup>12</sup>

In some cases the Protestant missionaries did keep the new formations created by the Jesuits, and geographical place names or specific terms related to geography in general continued to exert a certain influence even in Japan.

On the basis of the work done thus far, it does seem possible to identify a trend—albeit not a very strong one—of lexical creation, linking the activity of the Catholic missionaries to that of the Protestants. It would be worth comparing the morphological process of creation of neologisms by the Jesuits and the Protestants, in order to gain further information on the evolution of the morphological structures of Chinese lexicon.<sup>13</sup>

## FROM JESUIT AND PROTESTANT WORKS TO LATE-TOKUGAWA AND EARLY-MEIJI JAPAN AND EVENTUALLY BACK TO CHINA

We know that some of the Jesuit Chinese texts reached Japan and that thirty-two of them were proscribed as early as 1630 by an imperial edict of the Kan'ei period. The

ban against these works was eventually lifted in 1720 by an edict of the Kyōhō period.<sup>14</sup> Some of the neologisms included in those texts could have been used in both Japan and China. Almost all were compound words, which were easily absorbed by the Japanese language given that Japanese, unlike Chinese, is not an isolating language and was therefore completely ready to integrate such formations.

Among these first neologisms imported to Japan from early Jesuit texts, we find scientific terms, such the Chinese *jihe* 幾何 (Jp., *kika*) for geometry, and many geographic terms such as *redai* 熱帶 (Jp., *nettai*) for “torrid zone,” *wendai* 溫帶 (Jp., *ontai*) for “temperate zone,” and such other terms such as *daxue* 大學 (Jp., *daigaku*) for “university” and *zhongxue* 中學 (Jp., *chūgaku*) for “middle school,” *wenke* 文科 (Jp., *bunka*) for “literary subjects,” and *like* 理科 (Jp., *rika*) for “scientific subjects.”<sup>15</sup>

Some of these neologisms remained in use in China. Others disappeared and were later re-introduced into China via Japan in the late nineteenth century. This was the case, for example, with the term *daxue*, first used by Aleni in 1623 to refer to Western universities. We find it again in one of the earliest Chinese travel narratives ever written of a trip abroad, the diary written by the seaman Fan Shouyi 樊守義 (1682-1753) during his journey to the West in the early eighteenth century (approximately 1720), *Shenjian lu* 身見錄 (Record of things heard and seen)<sup>16</sup>; and in a text by Ye Zhongjin 葉鍾進, *Yingjiliguoyi qingji lue* 英吉利國夷情記略 (Short notes on the condition of the English barbarians) published in 1834. Officially, however, the term *daxue* was not used in China with the meaning of “university” until the beginning of the twentieth century. We know that in Japan the term was used to name the newly established Tokyo University (*daigaku*) in 1877. Therefore, it is possible that the term was introduced into Japan from China and then returned to China as a “Japanese graphic loan” at the beginning or the twentieth century.

With regard to Japan, we can therefore divide Jesuits loans into the following tentative categories:

- 1) Jesuit neologisms which reached Japan and were also used in China (such as *redai*).
- 2) Jesuit neologisms which reached Japan but were discarded in China (I have been unable to find a good example at this point).
- 3) Jesuit neologisms which reached Japan, were initially discarded in China, and were eventually re-introduced (such as *daxue*).

Something similar happened to some of the earliest Protestant Chinese works two centuries later at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Chinese literati included many excerpts from the earliest Chinese texts prepared by Protestant missionaries in the geographical collection *Haiguo tuzhi*, subsequently re-published in Japan.<sup>17</sup>

The word *tielu* 鐵路 was introduced into Chinese as a loan-translation of the German ‘Eisenbahn’ by the Prussian missionary Karl Friederich Gützlaff in his Chinese text *Maoyi tongzhi* 貿易通知 (Treatise on trade), first published in Canton in 1840. The text would most probably have been completely forgotten had it not been re-published four times after 1840 in the various re-editions of the *Haiguo tuzhi*. In Japan the term was used to indicate the railways built soon after the beginning of the Meiji period. Possibly by analogy with *tielu*, the term *tiedao* 鐵道 was eventually coined, probably in China, where it was used by Zhang Deyi 張德彝 (1847-1919) in his 1866 account of a journey to the West, *Hanghai shuqi* 航海述奇. These two terms were not widely used in China, inasmuch as railway construction only began in 1876. In Japan, however, the building of railroads was well under way in 1872. In China *tiedao* is now obsolete but not in Japan, where instead *tielu* is obsolete.

In other cases, terms coined in China were only used there for a certain period but remained and are still in use in Japan. Such is the case of *xinwenzhi* 新聞紙 (Jp., *shinbunshi*), a loan-translation of the English “news-paper.” It is now obsolete in Chinese, having been replaced at the end of the nineteenth century by its analogic replica *baozhi* 報紙, while in Japanese *shinbunshi* is still in use (although much less frequently than the shorter *shinbun*).

Some of the words that were coined in China and spread rapidly to Japan were so widely used there that they were then re-imported back into China several decades later. Until recently, these were considered to be Japanese loans by Chinese scholars; in fact, they were Chinese neologisms that went back and forth between China and Japan. Such is the case with such terms as *quanli* 權利 (Jp., *kenri*), introduced into Chinese by W. A. P. Martin 丁韋良 (1827-1916) in his translation of Henry Wheaton’s 惠頓 (1785-1848) *Elements of International Law* (London and Philadelphia, 1836), published in 1864 at the Beijing Tongwenguan 同文官 under the title *Wanguo gongfa* 萬國公法 (*juan* 1, p. 17a). It was immediately exported to Japan, where Martin’s translation was reprinted in 1865 under the title *Bankoku kōhō*, and later re-imported to China as a Japanese loan.

Thus, we can say that some of the words, introduced into Chinese in Protestant Chinese works, rapidly reached Japan and were widely used there, creating a situation in which certain neologisms were employed simultaneously in China and in Japan. Other words were forgotten in China but kept alive in Japan and were considered to be Chinese loans from Japanese when they were re-introduced into China at the end of the century. A few years ago I suggested that these loans could be called “return graphic loans from Japanese,” given that they were initially coined in Chinese, then forgotten, and eventually re-introduced into Chinese.

A division by category of the Protestant Chinese neologisms, similar to the one

drawn up for the Jesuit Chinese neologisms, shows the following groups:

- a) Protestant neologisms which reached Japan and were also used in China (such as *tielu* or *tetsuro*).
- b) Protestant neologisms which reached Japan but were mostly discarded in Chinese (such as *tiedao* or *tetsudō*, *xinwenzhi* or *shinbunshi*).
- c) Protestant neologisms which reached Japan, were initially discarded in China, and eventually re-introduced into Chinese (such as *quanli* or *kenri*, *minzhu* 民主 or *minshu* [democracy]).

The above trends in lexical borrowings, from Jesuit works to Protestant works and from Chinese to Japanese, resemble somewhat similar trends currently at work in the Chinese language. In fact, in the large community of people still employing Chinese characters for written communication—various Chinese speaking communities within the People's Republic of China (Beijing, Shanghai, Guangzhou, Hong Kong, Macao, etc.) or outside of it (Taiwan, Singapore, Japan, communities of overseas Chinese, etc.)—we can observe similar exchanges of graphic forms, creating various forms of interaction and exchange, which show how lively this writing system still is, notwithstanding pessimism as to the future of Chinese characters.

## NOTES

- 1 The term *ci* was traditionally employed only to indicate *xuci* 虛詞 or “empty words.” Zhang Shizhao 章士釗 (1881-1973) was the first to distinguish *ci* from *zi* 字 (characters) in his *Zhongdeng guowendian* 中等國文典 (1907).
- 2 Liang Qichao, *Yinbing shi heji, wenji* 飲冰室合集 文集, vol. I, p. 74. Cited in Federico Masini, *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon and Its Evolution toward a National Language: The Period from 1840 to 1898*, Monograph No. 6 of the *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* (Berkeley: University of California, 1993), pp. 80-81.
- 3 A complete survey of Chinese texts prepared by Western missionaries in China from the sixteenth century is still in the process of being written. Some of the first catalogues of such books, give the following figures. Henri Cordier, *L'imprimerie sino-européenne en Chine. Bibliographie des ouvrages publiés en Chine par les Européens au XVIIe et au XVIIIe siècles* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1901). Cordier's list is mostly based upon the books preserved into the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris and accounts for a total of 395 titles edited by missionaries of different orders. Henri Bernard, S. J., “Les adaptations chinoises d'ouvrages européens, bibliographie chronologique depuis la venue des Portugais à Canton jusqu'à la Mission française de Pékin, 1514-1688,” *Monumenta Serica* X (1945), pp. 1-57, 309-88.

Bernard takes into consideration all the previous lists prepared by the missionaries themselves beginning in 1627. His general list, including works by missionaries of different orders and reprints, contains 550 items. The list presented by Xu Zongze 徐宗澤 in his *Ming-Qing jian Yesu huishi yizhu tiyao* 明清間耶穌會士譯著提要 (Taipei: Zhonghua shuju, 1958) includes the text found by Xu Zongze in the Shanghai Xuhui (徐匯) Library with the addition of other materials, and he gives a figure of 210 texts.

- 4 Some sampling of this lexical innovation has already been conducted. See Federico Masini, "The Legacy of Seventeenth Century Jesuit Works: Geography, Mathematics and Scientific Terminology in Nineteenth Century China," in *L'Europe en Chine, Interactions Scientifiques, Religieuses et Culturelles aux XVIIe et XVIIIe Siecles* (Paris: Collège de France, 1993), pp. 137-46; Masini, "Aleni's contribution to the Chinese language," in Tiziana Lippiello and Roman Malek, eds., "*Scholar from the West*" Giulio Aleni S.J (1582-1649) and the Dialogue between Christianity and China (Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica Monograph Series XLII, 1997), pp. 539-54; and we are currently working on a project for the compilation of a "Dictionary of Chinese Neologisms in Jesuit Works" (DCNJW).
- 5 Robert Morrison, *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language in three parts. Part the First; containing Chinese and English, arranged according to the Radicals; Part the Second, Chinese and English arranged alphabetically; and Part the Third, English and Chinese*. Printed at the Honorable East India Company's Press by P. P. Thoms (Macao, 1815), vol. 1, Introduction, pp. ix-x.
- 6 Cf. "The First Chinese Dictionary Published in Europe (1670) as a Source for the Study of Ming-Qing Chinese Vernacular Language," *Monumenta Serica*, in press.
- 7 Italics as in original text: John Fryer, *An Account of the Department for the Translation of Foreign Books at the Kiangnan Arsenal Shanghai, American Presbyterian Association of China, Shanghai 1884*, pp. 9-10. Cit. in Masini, *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon and Its Evolution Toward a National Language*, p. 62-63.
- 8 See the complete index of the magazine in Huang Shijian 黃時鑑, ed., *Dong-Xiyang kao meiyue tongji zhuan* (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1997).
- 9 See the complete index of the magazine in Shen Guowei 沈國威, ed., "*Rikugō sōdan*" (1857-58) no gakusaiteki kenkyū 「六合叢談」(1857-58) の学際的研究 (Tokyo: Hakuteisha, 1999), where this passage can be found on pp. 647, 676, 685.
- 10 Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Roma 72, C494, 2, *juan* 2, p. 6b.
- 11 Second ed., 1642, Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale, Roma 72, C466, 1, *juan* 1, p. 20b.
- 12 Reprint edition, Huang Shijian, ed., *Dong-Xiyang kao meiyue tongji zhuan*, p. 187.
- 13 Most of the neologisms discussed in this paper have been included in the following



- publications: Masini, “Aleni’s contribution to the Chinese language” (cited above) and Masini, *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon*; see also *Jinxiandai Hanyu xinci ciyuan cidian* 近现代汉语新词词源词典 (Shanghai: Xianggang Zhongguo yuwen xuehui, Hanyu da cidian chubanshe, 2001). With regard to this last publication, it is interesting to note its acceptance of most of these “foreign” etymologies. Since this dictionary appeared, the Chinese edition of my work, *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon* was published by the publishing house of the Hanyu da cidian; hopefully these etymologies will be absorbed in an eventual revised edition of the *Hanyu da cidian*. Ma Xini 马西尼, *Xiandai Hanyu cihui de xingcheng, shijiu shiji Hanyu wailaici yanjiu* 现代汉语词汇的形成, 十九世纪汉语外来词研究, trans. Huang Heqing 黄河清 (Shanghai: Hanyu da cidian chubanshe, 1997).
- 14 See Henri Bernard, S.J., “Traductions chinoises d’ouvrages européens au Japon, durant la période de fermeture (1614-1835),” *Monumenta Nipponica* III.1 (1940), pp. 40-60.
  - 15 For example, *nettai* and *ontai* can be found in many geographical Japanese works, see Arakawa Kiyohide 荒川清秀, *Kindai Nit-Chū gakujutsu yōgo no keisei to denpa: chirigaku yōgo o chūshin ni* 近代日中学術用語の形成と伝播：地理学用語を中心に (Tokyo: Hakuteisha, 1997).
  - 16 A complete Italian version, with the Chinese original, has been published by Giuliano Bertuccioli, “Fan Shouyi e il suo viaggio in occidente,” in Michele Fatica and Francesco D’Arelli, eds., *La Missione Cattolica in Cina tra i secoli XVIII-XIX, Matteo Ripa e il Collegio dei Cinesi, Atti del Colloquio Internazionale, Napoli, 11-12 febbraio 1997* (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, Collana “Matteo Ripa, 1999”), vol. XVI, pp. 341-419.
  - 17 The second edition of the *Haiguo tuzhi* (1847; *Kaikoku zushi* in Japanese) arrived in Japan in 1850 but was immediately proscribed. Not long afterwards, many excerpts of the collection were translated into Japanese; see Masini, *The Formation of Modern Chinese Lexicon*, pp. 84-85.