

# Annotations in *Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum* (1595) in the Context of Latin Education by the Jesuits in Japan<sup>1</sup>

Emi Kishimoto  
Kyoto Prefectural University

*The Jesuits in Japan began establishing schools in the 1580s to mentor young native men in priesthood. In 1594, their students received a printed abridged edition of the Latin grammar, originally written by Manuel Alvarez, and the next year they received Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum (DLLI), a Latin-Portuguese-Japanese dictionary based on the Latin dictionary compiled by Ambrogio Calepino.*

*One of the features, when comparing the DLLI with the original, is that it cites the names of Latin classical writers without quoting sentences in several entries. This paper attempts to clarify the reasons for these annotations in this edition and reflects on the purpose of the DLLI.*

*Plautus is cited in about 70 entries, the most citations among all the names found in the DLLI. However, this number does not reflect the number in the original, which includes many classical writers, especially Cicero, whose works were regarded as a model for Latin prose. We also have no evidence showing that Jesuits in Japan regarded Plautus's writing as more important than Cicero's in teaching Latin.*

*The editors of the DLLI cite Vergilius most frequently after Plautus; we also find many annotations from the original showing the differences in usages such as 'apud veteres' (used by ancient people) or 'apud poetas' (used by poets). Similarly, it is reasonable to suppose that the editors included notes on 'Plaut' to describe the differences in older usages. They appear to retain the citations of writers and other annotations on special usages in order to teach the various nuances of Latin vocabulary to students in Japan, many of whom had elementary or intermediate language skills and needed good Latin proficiency to work as priests.*

## 1. *Dictionarium*

*Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum* (DLLI) is a Latin-Portuguese-Japanese dictionary printed in 1595 by the Jesuits in Japan. Its lengthy title and preface indicate that the DLLI is clearly based on the dictionary compiled by Ambrogio Calepino, but it omits the entries for proper nouns and unusual words and includes all meanings of words along with elegant examples of usage, so that it may serve as a guide for young Japanese people studying the Latin language and for Europeans who wished to study Japanese further. Historical background according to Lares (1957), tells us that the Jesuits printed the DLLI mainly for students studying Latin at their schools, which they established for the purpose of mentoring young native men into priesthood.

Ambrogio Calepino's Latin dictionary—the so-called Calepinus—has often been referenced but not studied much, except for the bibliography of Labarre (1975), and in those days Calepinus seemed to be used less for missionary works in non-European areas other than Japan, which may indicate a high standard of Latin education in Japan. Kishimoto (2005) has recently begun detailed comparative studies between the original European Calepinus and the DLLI. One notable feature is that the DLLI cites the names of Latin classic writers without quoting sentences in several entries spread throughout the dictionary. This paper attempts to clarify the reasons for these annotations in this edition and to reflect on the purpose of the DLLI, which differs considerably from the original European edition.

---

<sup>1</sup> This research was supported by the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology KAKENHI (21720163) in 2009–2010.

## 2. Classic Writers Cited in *Dictionarium*

The original version of the DLLI is based on Calepinus, which was first printed in 1502 in Italy and was then followed by many editions published in Europe over the sixteenth–eighteenth centuries. Labarre (1975) lists 160 editions before the publication of the DLLI. Kishimoto (2005) shows that a comparison of the Latin entries and the definitions reveals that the DLLI is likely to have been edited based on an edition of the Calepinus that was derived from the 1570 edition published in Lyons, which includes translations in six languages, Hebrew, Greek, French, Italian, Spanish and German, after the Latin entries. In this paper, I use the 1570 Lyons edition when quoting the original European Calepinus.

In a comparison between the DLLI and the original, Kishimoto (2006) summarizes the process of the translation as follows: the editors of the DLLI first selected the essential portions of the original Latin explanations and then translated them into Portuguese and Japanese, which is clearly seen in the following example ‘Mithrax, acis’ (a Persian gem). In the DLLI, the quotation of Plinius was omitted and the explanation in Latin ‘Gemma est, variis coloribus contra Solem refulgens’ (it is a gem which radiates various colours against the sun) was translated into Portuguese and Japanese almost verbatim.

1570 Lyon Calepinus

Mithrax, (in Greek) Gemma est, variis coloribus contra Solem refulgens: de qua Plin. lib. 37. cap. 10. Mithrax à Persis accepta est, & Rubri maris montibus multicolor, contra Solem variè refulgens.

DLLI

Mithrax, acis. Lus. Hũa pedra preciosa que posta ao sol reluz com varias côres. Iap. Nichirinni mucote xujuno iroou misuru tama.

The DLLI was an abridged translation of the original Calepinus, which contained a great deal of information about the entries themselves as well as quotations from the Latin classics for the Europeans of those days. Thus, the editors of the DLLI retained only the names for over 100 entries, citing writers such as Plautus (‘Plaut.’), Vergilius (‘Virg.’) and Plinius (‘Plin.’) without the sentences, after the Portuguese and Japanese translations. As Considine (2008:30) indicates, the original Calepinus often refers to writers without quotations, but the difference is that the DLLI adopted in the usual style. The two examples below show the difference between quotations:

1570 Lyon Calepinus

Abstineo, es, pen. corr. ex Abs, & Teneo, significat. Tempero, contineo, cohibeo. {(equivalents in six languages)} Et iungitur cum accus. Terent. Non manum abstines mastigia? Aliquando cum ablatiuo sine praepositione. Iusti. lib. 1, Contentique victoria, imperio abstinebant. Hora. lib. 3. Carm. cum genituo iunxit. Mox vbi lusit satis, abstineto, Dixit, irarum. Plaut. in Amphit. pro Arcere posuit, Nunc quando factis me impudicis abstines, id est, Quoniam me arces & prohibes ab impudicitia.

DLLI

Abstineo, es, ui. Lus. Refrease, reprimir. Iap. Ficayuru. ¶ Item, Afastar, ou apatar. Iap. Noquru, voxifanasu. Plaut.

In the example above ‘Abstineo, es, ui’ (to abstain from something, to keep off), in the original we find a Plautus quote from *Amphitruo* ‘Nunc quando factis me impudicis abstines’ (now I

would like to keep away from shameless words) among the four quotations, but only the abbreviation ‘Plaut.’ was found in the subentry of the DLLI, with the meaning given as ‘to keep away’.

In the example below ‘Putitius, ij’ (fool), the original Calepinus does not include the quotation while referring to the writer’s name, saying, fool used by Plautus as Festus testified and the DLLI retains only his name. There are many such entries.

1570 Lyon Calepinus  
Putitius, pro stulto à Plauto vsurpatur, teste Festo.

DLLI  
Putítius, ij. Lus. Paruo. Iap. Vtçuqe, afô. Plaut.

Most quotations and writers’ names were reduced in the DLLI; however, among the examples like those above, we find Plautus cited in about 70 entries, accounting for the most citations among all the names in the DLLI, followed by Vergilius, cited in around 30 entries and Plinius and Festus in more than 10 entries. However, these numbers do not reflect the number of quotations in the original, which includes many classic writers, especially Cicero, whose works were regarded as a model for Latin prose.

### 3. Latin Education by the Jesuits in Japan

It is well known that the comedies written by Plautus were printed and translated into vernacular languages during the Renaissance in Europe, but we cannot find historical evidence to show that Jesuits in both Europe and Japan encouraged their students to read Plautus. Plautus’ works were likely to have been regarded as obscene, just as Terentius’ comedies were likely to have been banned by the Jesuits’ global educational rules as stated in *Ratio Studiorum*, or the ‘Plan of Studies’, the principle of which was already applied in Japan since the school was started before the final version of the plan was drawn up in 1599 in Europe.

When considering other classic works in Latin printed in Japan, the most important one related to the DLLI is perhaps Manuel Alvarez’s Latin grammar book *De institutione grammatica*. The grammar book was first printed in 1572 in Lisbon, targeting students studying at Jesuit schools; later, *Ratio Studiorum* stipulated that it be used as a textbook in all such schools. The Jesuits in Japan printed an abridged edition with partial Portuguese and Japanese translations in 1594, a year before the DLLI was printed. Again, we can see many example sentences from the classics in the Japanese edition, as well as in the European editions. It is well known that the Jesuits exercised flexibility along with precision on the usage of pagan works written by the ancient Romans and the same could be said of Alvarez’s book in Japan: the grammar book contained references to not only Cicero but also Plautus and Terentius. However, it is clear that the Jesuits in Japan did not regard Plautus’ writing as featuring model Latin, because they quoted him less than they did Cicero in the Japanese edition, which is identical to the European edition.

Moreover, according to Laures (1957:87, 90-91), the Jesuits’ letters from Japan reveal that they had also printed Cicero’s orations in 1592 and Vergilius’s book in 1600; however, these texts have not been retrieved and are therefore not extant today. Thus, it is clear that the Jesuits in

Japan hold almost the same principles as in their European school—although, strictly speaking, displaying greater assiduity on the view of propaganda in the non-Christian area—on teaching ancient Latin works.

#### 4. Notes in *Dictionarium*

Let us consider other notes and abbreviations in the DLLI relative to ‘Plaut’. The editors of the DLLI cite Vergilius the most frequently after Plautus; we also see many annotations from the original, showing the differences in usages such as ‘apud veteres’ (used by ancient people) or ‘apud poetas’ (used by poets), as in the following example ‘Frigêdo, inis’(cold). Similarly, it is reasonable to assume that they included notes on ‘Plaut’ to describe the differences in the usages.

1570 Lyon Calepinus

Frigedo, dinis, antique dicebant pro frigore. {(equivalents in six languages)} Varro, Atque in igni feruido medullitus Aquiloniam feruat frigidinem. Ex Nonio.

DLLI

Frigêdo, inis. Lus. Frio. Iap. Samusa, canten. apud veteres.

Here I would like to focus on the difference between Plautus and Terentius in the DLLI in order to further consider the reason why the editors especially noted Plautus. They are both Roman writers of comedies, but while the original also cited Terentius in many entries, in the DLLI we hardly find his name. As we have seen earlier, the Jesuits in Japan did not remove both of them in teaching Latin. We can presume that the difference between the two was that the Latin language Plautus (ca BC254–BC184) used is more archaic than what Terentius (ca BC195–BC159) used. Considine (2008:41) indicates that the Spanish humanist Juan Luis Vives called Plautus *an antiquaries* and pointed out that he is therefore much less pure in style than Terentius. ‘Plaut.’ in the DLLI must have indicated a similar meaning with ‘apud veteres’, a kind of rare usage. For example ‘Grandigro, as’ (to walk with long strides) seems to support the assumption, regarding the verb Plautus used in *Truculentus* as an antique word (‘antiquum verbum’).

1570 Lyon Calepinus

Grandigro, as, Antiquum verbum est, quo Plautus in Trucul vsus est, pro grandi gradu eo, magnum gradum facio. Quid, inquit, clamitas insane? Abire hinc ni properè grandigras, iam ego istos fictos, Compositos, crispas, cinnos tuos vnguentatos vsque ex cerebro Expellam.

DLLI

Grandigro, as. Lus. Andar a passo largo. Iap. Matagatte ayumu. Plaut.

Vergilius was also thought to need annotation because his works were verses and ‘Vir.’ seems to be a note similar to ‘apud poetas’. The title and the preface of the DLLI say that they omitted unusual vocabulary from the original, but in actuality they did not remove such vocabulary and usage completely, instead they translated them with notes. Here is an example of Vergilius, in which the basic meaning is ‘to make rough or uneven’ and Vergilius’s different usage ‘to make solid’ in *Aeneis* was noted.

1570 Lyon Calepinus

Aspero, as, pen. corr. Asperum facio. {(equivalents in six languages)} Colu. li. 9, Iunctis parieti modicis afferculis, qui paulum formatis gradibus asperantur, ne sint volantibus lubrici. Virgilius pro Coagulo, siue

durum facio, posuit, AEneï 3, Et glacialis hyems, Aquilonibus asperat vndas.

DLLI

Aspero, as. Lus. Fazer aspero. Iap. Araqu nasu, arasu. ¶ Item, Coalhar, & indurecer. Iap. Catamuru, couorasuru. Virg.

Kishimoto (2005) indicated several improvements made in the DLLI from the original European version, targeting students of Latin in Japan: the rearrangement of the alphabetical order of entries, provision of the declension and conjugation of the entries, differentiation between definitions under an entry and presentation of new entries derived from subentries. Citing writers of the ancient classics possibly also constituted additional information that was provided to students in Japan, most of whom had elementary or intermediate level language skills and needed good Latin skills for working as priests. We seldom spot Cicero's name in this case, probably because the Jesuits in Japan did not think it necessary to add notes on his model of Latin.

We can confirm that fact that the Jesuits in Japan, even missionaries from Europe, found it difficult to write their letters and various documents in pure Latin and regarded Cicero's writing as their model, by analyzing Manoel Barreto's manuscript *Vocabulario Lusitanico Latino*, which had recently begun to be studied by Kishimoto and Toyoshima (2005). Barreto stated in the preface that they found the purity of Latin in the works of Cicero and used many quotations from his works by making much of *Thesaurus Ciceronianus* that was edited by Mario Nizzoli.

It is necessary to conduct further research on the difference between the entries that retain the citations and the many others in which the citations were reduced in the DLLI; however, it is likely that the writers were cited to explain practical usages in the Latin language.

## 5. Conclusion

According to the title and preface, the DLLI features all the definitions for a range of vocabulary as well as elegant usages based on the original Calepinus. However, the original actually included various definitions and usages, some of which were unusual. The editors of the DLLI appeared to have made attempts to include as many definitions as possible and retained the citations of the writers and other annotations on special usages. This enabled students in Japan to internalize the various nuances of Latin vocabulary.

## References

### Primary Sources

- Alvarez, M. (1594). *Emmanuelis Alvari e Sositate Iesu de Institutione Grammatica*. Amakusa: Collegio Amacusensis Societatis Iesu. (facsimile. Tokyo: Yushodo, 1974.)
- Ambrosii Calepini Dictionarium, quanta maxima fide ac diligencia fieri potuit accuratè emendatum, multisque partibus cumulatum. Lyons: Symphorien Berauld, 1570.
- Barreto, M. (1606–1607). *Vocabulario Lusitanico Latino*. manuscript. (microfilm. Biblioteca da Academia das Ciências de Lisboa)
- Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum, ex Ambrosii Calepini volumine depromptum. Amakusa: Collegio Iaponico Societatis Iesu, 1595. (facsimile. Tokyo: Benseisha, 1979.)
- Ratio atque Institutio Studiorum Societatis Iesu, 1599. (reprint and English translation by Pavur, C. Saint Louis: The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 2005.)

### Secondary Sources

- Considine, J. (2008). *Dictionaries in Early Modern Europe: Lexicography and the Making of Heritage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kishimoto, E. (2005). ‘The Adaptation of the European Polyglot Dictionary of Calepino in Japan: Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum (1595)’. In O. Zwartjes and C. Altman. (eds.). *Missionary Linguistics II / Lingüística misionera II*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 205–223.
- Kishimoto, E. (2006). ‘The Process of Translation in Dictionarium Latino Lusitanicum, ac Iaponicum’. In *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 72. 17–26.
- Kishimoto, E.; Toyoshima, M. (2005). ‘Barreto-cho Porajisho no Kirishitan-gogaku ni okeru igi’. *Nihon-gaku Tonko-gaku, kanbun-kundoku no shin-tenkai*, Ed. Ishizuka Harumichi kyoju taishoku kinen-kai, Tokyo: Kyuko-shoin. 247–306.
- Labarre, A. (1975). *Bibliographie du Dictionarium d’Ambrogio Calepino (1502–1779)*. Baden-Baden: Valentin Koerner.
- Laures, J. (1957). *Kirishitan Bunko*. 3rd ed. Tokyo: Sophia University.