

# A Brief History of Western Knowledge about the Korean Language and Script— from the Beginnings to Pallas (1786/87–89)

Sven Osterkamp

The aim of the present article is to outline Western knowledge and studies pertaining to the Korean language and script from its vague beginnings in the late 16th century to the monumental linguistic works of the 1780s. The latter date will appear somewhat arbitrary, and it certainly *is* to some extent. It can, if at all, only be justified by the circumstances out of which this study developed. Originally intended to be little more than a prolegomenon to the investigation of Philipp Franz von Siebold's (1796–1866) contribution to the study of Korean in the West,<sup>1</sup> with the modest aim of situating his work in an appropriate manner, it soon became apparent that the subject matter at hand presented a field of study in its own right—and one undoubtedly still in need of plowing.

As work on the topic progressed, the list of sources to be covered and problems to be solved grew ever longer, resulting in a split of the period into the one treated herein, and another one from the last decade of the 18th century to the 1830s. The latter period will be treated separately on another occasion and is therefore merely outlined in rough strokes towards the end of this contribution.

Among the prior studies in this field, the pioneering efforts by Ogura Shinpei 小倉進平 (1882–1944) in the 1920s are the first that have to be mentioned.<sup>2</sup> Despite the

1 For some preliminary results see the present author's »Selected Materials on Korean from the Siebold Archive in Bochum—Preceded by Some General Remarks Regarding Siebold's Study of Korean«, *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 33 (2009), 187–216.

2 See especially Ogura Shinpei 小倉進平, »Ōbcijin-no Chōsenko kenkyū-no shiryō-to natta wakansho 歐米人の朝鮮語研究の資料となつた和漢書« [Japanese and Chinese books that served as sources in Westerners' studies of Korean], *Minzoku* 民族 3,1 (1927), 75–86. Idem, »Seiyōjin-ni yotte shūshūserareta hayai jidai-no Chōsen goi 西洋人によつて蒐集せられた早い時代の朝鮮語彙« [Early Glossaries of Korean Collected by Westerners], in *Chosen Shina bunka-no kenkyū* 朝鮮支那文化の研究 [Studies in Korean and Chinese Culture], ed. by Tabohashi Kiyoshi 田保橋潔 (Tōkyō: Tōkō shoin, 1929), 43–91. Rather of interest for the time following the period in focus here, but impossible to leave unmentioned is furthermore: Idem, *Zōtei Chōsen-gogakushi* 増訂朝鮮語学史 [A History of Language Studies in and Concerning Korea, Revised and Enlarged]. (Tōkyō: Tōkō shoin, 1940), especially p. 69.

decades that have lapsed since their publication, they were still superseded only slightly up to the time of Siebold's work on Korean.<sup>3</sup> While Hamel and Witsen (see below) have attracted considerable attention, neither the initial, i.e. pre-Hamel/Witsen period—that is to say, from the late 16th century to the end of the second third of the 17th century—has been outlined sufficiently, nor have the developments from the writings of these two authors to the various other ones throughout the 18th century. In general, the focus has been on sources containing lexical specimens of Korean, leading to the neglect of those writers treating the language and script in general terms or for instance the former's affinity to other languages. Furthermore, even this focus did not necessarily lead to the solution of the many problems posed by those works of the 18th century containing glossaries of Korean, although the sharp-witted study by Norbert R. Adami in 1980 did add significantly to Ogura's original efforts.<sup>4</sup>

In the following we will therefore survey texts ranging from letters to full monographs which were either actually published or at least written during the named period and which are considered relevant for tracing the transmission and development of knowledge pertaining to Korean. Seldom do the relevant passages not show considerable redundancies; nevertheless, every attempt has been made to cover not only such works containing new materials or novel ideas, but also those merely reproducing older knowledge or views which at the same time are known for their impact on contemporary readers and/or later scholars.

3 The 19th century fared considerably better. Apart from studies on Siebold (on which cf. the references in Osterkamp, »Selected Materials«) see especially Ko Yōnggūn 高永根, »19 segi chōnban'gi-ūi sōyangin-ūi kugō yōn'gu charyo 19世紀前半期の西洋人の國語研究資料« [Works on the study of Korean by Westerners in the first half of the 19th century], *Kwanak ōmun yōn'gu* 冠嶽語文研究 3 (1978), 27–40. Idem, »Ch'oki sōyangin-ūi Han'gugō yōn'gu 初期西洋人の韓國語研究« [Studies of Korean by early Westerners], *Sōnch'ōng ōmun* 先清語文 11,1 (1981), 1–13. Specifically concerning the script: Yi Kimun 李基文, »19 segi sōgu hakchadūr-ūi han'gūl yōn'gu 十九世紀西歐學者들의 한글研究« [Studies on *han'gūl* by Western scholars of the 19th century]. In: *Haksurwōn nonmunjip* 학술원논문집 39 (2000), 107–155.

Cf. also Pentti Aalto, »Proposals concerning the affinities of Koreans«, in *Voces amicorum Sorijärvi. In honorem Antti Sorijärvi septuagesimum annum agentis die XXII mensis aprilis anno MCMLXXXII*, ed. by Antti Iivonen, Seppo Suhonen and Pertti Virtaranta (Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura, 1982. Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran toimituksia / Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne; 181), 19–29. The first paragraphs treat part of the late 18th century works and are thus of direct relevance here.

4 Norbert R. Adami, »Die Geschichte der Koreaforschung im zaristischen Russland« [The History of Korean Studies in Czarist Russia], *Bochumer Jahrbuch zur Ostasienforschung* 3 (1980), 3–97.

*The Late 16th and 17th Centuries*

Pointing out that significant amounts of information concerning the Korean language and script first become widely known in the West only as late as the second half of the 17th century via the publications of Hamel and Witsen is by no means tantamount to saying that nothing at all can be gleaned from earlier sources. While exceedingly brief and often rather vague, references of interest are found from the closing years of the 16th century, initially almost exclusively in the writings of missionaries to Japan and China or in works based on these sources. If only the early published and widely read of these are considered, this period can be characterized as one of at least an *awareness* of the existence of the Korean language as well as of its *not* being identical to Chinese.

*Luís Fróis 1591/92*

One of the earliest references to Korean is found in the letters of the Portuguese missionary to Japan Luís Fróis (1532–1597), for instance in those dated 1591 and 1592:

This kingdome of *Coray* extendeth in length about 100. and in bredth 60. leagues. And albeit the inhabitants in nation, language, and strength of body (which maketh the people of *China* to dread them) be different from the *Chinians*, yet because they pay tribute to the king of *China*, and exercise traffique with his subjects, they doe after a sort imitate the Lawes, apparell, customes, and gouvernement of the *Chinians*.<sup>5</sup>

As early as the late 16th century we thus have a clear statement to the extent that Korea had its own language distinct from Chinese, and furthermore in a text published early on in several languages, ensuring a wide readership.<sup>6</sup> The view put forward only recently that until the publication of Hamel's report in the late 1660s, discourse on Korea had been dominated by the »generally accepted theme« of the non-existence of an indigenous language and of cultural subordination to China, even on a linguistic level, is therefore hardly tenable.<sup>7</sup>

Fróis writes further on this issue in his *Historia de Japam*, finished not much later than the above letters, yet unpublished until recent times and therefore without influence on the period under review here:

5 Quoted here from the English adaptation found in Richard Hakluyt, *The voyages, navigations, traffiques, and discoveries of the English Nation*, 3 vols. (London: George Bishop etc., 1598–1600), 3: 858.

6 A translation of the letters into Italian (*Lettera del Giappone degli anni 1591. et 1592*. [Letters from Japan of the years 1591 and 1592], Roma: Luigi Zannetti, 1595; see 124) and based on that version another one into Latin (*Litterae annuae Iaponenses anni 1591 Et 1592* [Annual Letters from Japan of the Years 1591 and 1592], Cologne: Henricus Falckenburg, 1596; p. 103) were already published at the time.

7 Thus in Chi Myōngsuk, »Repositioning Hamel: The Linguistic Significance of the First European Cross-Cultural Account of Chosŏn«, in *Korea in the Middle. Korean Studies and Area Studies* (CNWS publications; 153), ed. by Remco E. Breuker. (Leiden: CNWS Publications, 2007), 97–117, esp. 110–111.

Das letras, que são os mesmos caracteres que os da China, da religião e policia humana, se preza muito esta nação. Têm primeira, segunda e terceira pessoa, e modo de conjunções; a lingua hé mais facil de pronunciar que a da China. Alem do uzo commum e vulgar da gente plebea, têm outra lingua mais polida e aprimorada, de que uzão os letrados e nobreza da corte.<sup>8</sup>

Although the reference to part of this statement is difficult to recover, Fróis appears to have had at least some idea of what Korean was like and was therefore probably qualified for the above-mentioned comment in his earlier letters. It seems likely that his knowledge derived from contact with Korean captives in Japan.<sup>9</sup>

#### Francesco Carletti 1606

The travelogue of Florentine merchant Francesco Carletti (ca 1573–1636) is noteworthy as an early non-missionary source and concerns his voyage around the world in the years 1594–1606. Its publication had to wait until about a century later, when *Ragionamenti di Francesco Carletti fiorentino sopra le cose da lui vedute ne' suoi viaggi* (Discourses of Florentine Francesco Carletti about the things seen by him on his travels; Firenze: Giuseppe Manni, 1701) finally appeared, but manuscripts of his report for the Grand Duke of Tuscany dating from after his return to Florence in 1606 have survived.

8 Quoted from *Historia de Japam*, ed. by José Wicki, 5 vols. (Lisbon: Biblioteca Nacional, 1976–1984), 5: 545–546.

9 At least as far as the Korean place names in his *Historia* are concerned. It is obvious at first sight, however, that (part of) his knowledge derives from Japanese sources or informants: »Chiguju« (553; Ch'ungju 忠州), »Comûgay« (573 etc.; Komgae [Ungp'o] 熊浦), »Fusancay« (548 etc.) ~ »Fusangai« (571; Pusangae [Pusan-p'o] 釜山浦), »Pean« (570 etc.; Ph'yongan 平安), »Toqinengi« (550; referring to Tongnae 東萊, but likely based on \*Tongnyong 東令 as an abbreviation of Tongnae yonggam 東萊令監—see p. 75 in Tsuji Seiji 辻星児, »*Sonkai tokai nikki*-ni shirusareta Chôsengo[-ni] tsuite 「尊海渡海日記」に記された朝鮮語[こ]について« [On the Korean words recorded in *Sonkai tokai nikki*], *Bunka kyôseigaku kenkyû* 文化共生学研究 5,1 (2007), 71–84), and so on.

This likewise applies to Luis de Guzmán's (1544–1605) roughly contemporary *Historia de las misiones que han hecho los religiosos de la Compañia de Iesus, para predicar el Sancto Euangelio en la India Oriental, y en los Reynos de la China y Japon* (History of the missions undertaken by the Jesuits to preach the holy gospel in the East Indies and in the empires of China and Japan; 2 vols., Alcalá: Biuda de Iuan Gracian, 1601). Again we find »Fusancay« (502 etc.), »Pean« (517 etc.) or also »Foquinangui« (503; error for »Toquinengi«—for the confusion of »T« and »F« cf. »Fusancay« as »Tosancay« on p. 511).

From Guzmán's work these transcriptions spread into numerous later ones, most importantly François Solier's (1558–1628) *Histoire ecclesiastique des isles et royaumes du Japon* [Ecclesiastical History of the Islands and Kingdoms of Japan], 2 vols. (Paris: Sebastien Cramoisy, 1627–29), Jean Crasset's (1618–1692) *Histoire de l'Eglise du Japon* [History of the Church of Japan], 2 vols. (Paris: François Montalant, 1689), and Pierre-François-Xavier de Charlevoix's (1682–1761) *Histoire et description generale du Japon* [History and General Description of Japan] 2 vols. (Paris: Julien-Michel Gandouin, 1736), as well as their respective later editions and translations.

As Carletti bought several Korean slaves in Japan during his stay there in 1597 and 1598 (one of whom, called Antonio Corea, Carletti is even known to have brought back with him to Italy), native informants were readily available, yet regrettably little use was made of this opportunity. Even after its belated publication, Carletti's work did not grant his readers any insights into the language or script as such. However, what we do find is a full list of Korean province names in Sino-Korean. For one thing, they are noteworthy in view of the fact that these names were generally indicated in their Chinese (not Sino-Korean) form in considerably more recent times on Western maps or in accounts of Korea. Additionally, these romanizations belong to the earliest of their kind and even predate Hamel by more than half a century. They are thus of considerable value for the historical linguist, however minuscule their appearance might have been for those longing for specimens of the language. They are as follows:<sup>10</sup>

<i>Carletti</i>	<i>Korean (Yale)</i>
Quienqui	Kyengki 京畿 < Kyengkuy 경기
Conguan	Kangwen 江原 < Kangwen 강원
Honhay (Honliay)	Hwanghay 黄海 < Hwanghoy 황 ·
Ciuala (Ciḡala)	Cenla 全羅 < Cyenla 전라
Hiension	Kyengsang 慶尙 < Kyengsyang 경상
Tioncion	Chwungcheng 忠淸 < Thywungchyeng 통청
Hanquien	Hamkyeng 咸鏡 < Hamkyeng 함경
Pianchin	Phyengan 平安 < Phyengan 평안

Apart from this Carletti also independently confirms Fróis statement concerning the distinctness of the Korean and Chinese languages. This is done in a specific type of statement concerning the Chinese script, which will be treated presently:

Con il pennello formano le loro lettere, che sono caratteri ieroglifici (et con ciascuno di loro significano una cosa composta et pronuntiata con una sol sillaba) intesi non solamente da loro, ma da tutti i loro vicini, cioè è Coccincini, Corei, Giapponesi et altri, non ostante che abbino diverse lingue tra loro: nondimeno conoscono il significato di quelle lettere, sí come nel suo paese

10 The modern edition on the manuscript basis used here is *Ragionamenti del mio viaggio intorno al mondo* [Discourses on my voyage around the world], ed. by Gianfranco Silvestro (Turin: Giulio Einaudi, 1958), 125. Deviations in the 1701 edition (p. 39) are given in brackets where necessary.

The degree of confusion in the transcription of the three nasal codas of Korean is striking. Problematic here were not in all likeliness the underlying Korean forms, but rather the native language of Carletti: Italian allows only /n/ in coda position, albeit the phonetic realization can vary due to assimilation. Thus, Korean final /ng/ [ŋ] is simply rendered as <n> (#1, #3, #5–#8) with the exception of #2, and original /m/ likewise becomes <n> (#7).

conosce ciascuno nella sua imaginatione tutte le cose chiamandole per il suo nome secondo il suo parlare; [...].<sup>11</sup>

*Matteo Ricci 1615*

Statements that the peoples of China and the countries adjacent to it could communicate in writing, despite using mutually unintelligible languages in conversation owing to the logographic nature of the Chinese script, can be found from the second half of the 16th century. The earliest cases do not yet mention Korea,<sup>12</sup> which is only later added to the list. Besides Carletti, there is also the following passage from *De Christiana expeditione apud Sinas* (On the Christian expedition to the Chinese; Augsburg: Christoph. Mangius, 1615), based on Matteo Ricci's (1552–1610) writings and edited by Nicolas Trigault (1577–1628):

[...], maximè quod alias sit res admirabilis, & orbi reliquo plane inusitata, quod liber quilibet editus non solum per quindecim vastissimas huius regni Prouincias cum fructu percurrat, sed ab Iaponensibus etiam atque Corianis, imò & Caucincinensibus, Leuchicis etiam & alijs Regnis intelligatur, non secus atque ab Sinis, tametsi sint inter se sermone toto cælo diuersi, quod ideo fit, quia characteres hieroglyphici singuli res singulas designant. & si in hunc modum totus orbis conspirasset, poteramus scriptis characteribus animi nostri sensus ijs aperire, quibus cum loqui sermonis varietate prohibemur.<sup>13</sup>

Passages like the above—now including Korea—would reappear in most works treating the countries of the Chinese cultural sphere, including for instance those by Rodrigues, Varenus, Kircher, Becmann, Kaempfer (on all of which see below), de Charlevoix<sup>14</sup> and others.

*João Rodrigues 1620*

In the second grammar of Japanese compiled by Jesuit missionary João Rodrigues (ca 1562–1633), entitled *Arte breve da lingua Iapoa* (A Short Grammar of the Japanese Language), we find a reference not to Korean as such, but to the Japanese language skills of Koreans:

11 Carletti/Silvestro, *Ragionamenti*, 177 (cf. pp. 163–164 in the 1701 edition).

12 Gaspar da Cruz (1520–1570) in his *Tractado em que se cõtam muito por esteso as cousas da China, cõ suas particularidades, e assi do reyno dormuz* (Treatise in which are narrated at great length matters pertaining to China, with its particularities, and to the kingdom of Ormuz; Évora 1569, »Capítu. xvij.«) mentions the Cochinchinese and Japanese besides the Chinese, to which Bernardino de Escalante (born 1537) adds »los Lechios« (*Discurso de la navegacion que los Portugueses hazen à los reinos y prouincias del Oriente* [Discourse on the navigations which the Portuguese undertake to the empires and provinces of the Orient]; Sevilla 1577, pp. 62–63) and Juan González de Mendoza (1545–1618) furthermore »los de samatra« (*Historia de las cosas mas notables, ritos y costumbres, Del gran Reyno dela China* [History of the most noteworthy matters, rites and customs of the great empire of China]; Rome 1585, p. 105).

13 Ricci, *Expeditione*, 487.

14 Charlevoix, *Histoire et description generale du Japon*, 1 (1736): 40.

O primeiro modo de aprender he mais firme & se falla por elle som mais propriedade, por feir aquirindo por modo de habito natural, como se tem visto por experiencia em muitos dos nossos de Europa, & em outros de outras naçoens, que andam entre os Iapoens, como sam os Coreas, que no fallar parecem naturaes.<sup>15</sup>

The history of Western knowledge of Korean would certainly have been an entirely different one had Rodriguez written a grammar of Korean as well. While this is unfortunately not the case, at least some of his observations concerning Korean in comparison to Japanese found their way into his *Historia da Igreja do Japão* (History of the Church of Japan), written after his *Arte breve* but left unpublished until the 20th century. In a passage on the settlement of Japan from the Korean peninsula, »called Kore by the natives«, and the Paekche origin of nobles of the Chūgoku region, Rodrigues turns to the languages:

But it is most probable that the first inhabitants of Japan, which at that time was without form of nationhood or kings, settled in that part of Chūgoku facing Korea, for the kingdom of Korea is about as old as China and is so close to these parts that the crossing may be made on one tide. For this reason the rough tone and the manner of speaking of the Japanese people of that part of Chūgoku are different from those of other parts of Japan and are very similar to the tone of the Koreans. The current native language of Japan has many similarities with the Korean tongue as regards its grammatical construction and parts of speech.<sup>16</sup>

At least the closing remark on the typological similarities of Korean and Japanese was significant at this early stage, especially insofar as it came from someone with an unparalleled knowledge and command of the latter language. Rodrigues' years in Japan doubtlessly blessed him with various opportunities for direct contact with Korean native speakers, of which the above observations can be deemed by-products.<sup>17</sup>

Rodrigues' encounter with a Korean embassy to China and at least hearsay about similar occasions in Japan may be credited for providing him with the background information for the following elaborate version of the otherwise often brief and unspecific statements concerning the use of the Chinese script in East Asia:

The Japanese also adopted the Chinese names of these letters or figures. [...] In addition to this Chinese name, they also put another Japanese one in their native language according to the meaning of the letter, and all the other nations that have taken over Chinese letters have

15 Rodrigues, *Arte breve da lingua Iapoa* (Macao 1620), 2b.

16 Quoted here from *João Rodrigues's Account of Sixteenth-Century Japan*, tr. and annot. by Michael Cooper (London: The Hakluyt Society, 2001), 56. Regrettably, however, Cooper does not give the original romanisations as found in the manuscript, unlike the Japanese edition *Nihon kyōkaishi* 日本教会史 [History of the Japanese Church] (Daikōkai jidai sōsho 大航海時代叢書; IX–X), 2 vols., tr. and annot. by Sano Yasuhiko 佐野泰彦, Ikegami Mineo 池上岑夫 & al. (Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten 1967, 1970). The original spelling for »Kore« in the manuscript of the Biblioteca da Ajuda is given here as »Corê« (1: 173).

17 For some scenarios, see the discussion of these passages in Yasuda Akira 安田章, »Chōsen shiryō-no ichi 朝鮮資料の位置« [The position of the Korean materials on Japanese], *Kokugo kokubun* 国語国文 50,12 (1981), 42–56. Repr. in idem, *Gaikoku shiryō-to chūsei kokugo* 外国資料と中世国語 [Foreign Materials and the Middle Japanese Language] (Tōkyō: Sanseidō, 1990), 9–34 (see esp. 9–11 and 31n2).

done the same. Each of these nations reads the same book, epistle, or anything at all written with these letters, according to its own native language, but all form the same idea. No nation can understand the words of other nations, but only its own. This is rather like the numerical ciphers among the European nations speaking different languages, or like the figures or characters of the celestial signs, the planets, and conjunctions, used by mathematicians. For each nation pronounces in its own language with a variety of words the symbols of numbers, signs, and planets, but they always mean and are worth the same idea in all these countries.

This has resulted in a great benefit for these nations, because the books of each of them are written in these letters that are common to all, although they use different languages. It follows from this that they can also communicate among themselves, as indeed they do, by using only the same letters and books and not speaking by word. Thus embassies sent from one country to another communicate through the medium of these letters. Although they may not have an interpreter when they meet, they can make themselves understood through using only these letters, and through these letters they speak by writing down the idea or what they want to express.

This in fact happens among the Chinese, Japanese, Koreans, and others who use these letters, although their own languages are so different.<sup>18</sup>

#### *Bernhard Varenius 1649*

While better known for his *Geographia generalis* (General Geography; first published Amsterdam 1650), which had countless editions, including two by Isaac Newton (1643–1727), and translations into several languages, Bernhard Varenius (1622–1650) was also the author of *Descriptio regni Iaponia* (Description of the Japanese Empire).<sup>19</sup> Having never visited Asia himself, Varenius bases his description on written sources, including various missionary ones. Similarly to Ricci above for instance, we read:

Notatu verò dignum est, quod Chinensium, Iaponensium, Coreensium, & Tonquinensium tam vulgaris quàm doctorum sermo nihil habeat commune, adeò ut ne verbo quidem unus alterum loquentem intelligat, & præterea in quotidiano usu diversos usurpent literarum characteres, unum tamen aliquod illæ gentes commune habent literarum genus, quibus scientias & disciplinas chartæ mandant. Hisce literis quicquid scriptum fuerit, diversarum illarum quatuor nationum docti & periti æque bene intelligunt & legunt, sed suâ & propriâ unusquisque dialecto: indocti & vulgus nihil eorum vel legere vel lectum intelligere queunt: sicut nostrum vulgus Latinum ignorat sermonem.<sup>20</sup>

18 Rodrigues/Cooper, *Account*, 334–335. For the use of the Chinese script in Korea and elsewhere also compare pp. 330 and 336.

19 Varenius, *Descriptio regni Iaponia* (Amsterdam: Ludovicus Elzevirius, 1649; Cambridge: Joan. Hayes, 1673).

20 Varenius, *Descriptio* (1649), 178–179; cf. 1673 edition, p. 80.

*Athanasius Kircher 1654*

Within the vast scholarship of Athanasius Kircher (1602–1680), Korean first figures in *Oedipus Aegyptiacus* (The Egyptian Oedipus; Rome: Vitalis Mascardus, 1652–1654) in his discussion of Egyptian hieroglyphs and the Chinese script in a well-known constellation:

Characteres toti Regno Sinarum, vti & Iaponia, Corea, Conchinchina, Tonchini communes sunt; idioma diuersissimum est: hinc Iapones, Conchinchina, Corea, & Tonchini gentes, libros & literas hoc characterum genere scriptas intelligunt quidem, sibi tamen mutuò loqui, ac se inuicem intelligere loquentes non possunt; non secus ac figuræ numerorum toti passim Europæ vsitatæ ab omnibus intelliguntur, tametsi voces, quibus pronunciantur, diuersissimæ sint; characteres enim signa sunt conceptuum rerum omnibus communium.<sup>21</sup>

These lines, together with the remainder of the chapter to which they belong, were repeated in one of the most important and widely read books on China, namely Kircher's *China monumentis qua Sacris quàm Profanis [...] illustrata* (China illustrated by monuments both sacred and profane; Amsterdam: Joannes Janssonius, 1667; cf. p. 235 herein). Early standard references concerning China and Japan therefore made it at least clear that Korea (just like other countries adjacent to China) also had a language distinct from Chinese, which nonetheless served as a *lingua franca* in the region.

*Martino Martini 1655*

Martino Martini's (1614–1661) influential *Novus Atlas Sinensis* (New Atlas of China) does not only contain two maps showing Korea,<sup>22</sup> but also a brief description of this country in its textual part. It has only a little to say concerning language and writing in a passage comparing Korea with China: »Men vind hier een selve gedaente van heerschappy, kleeding, tael, en wijze van schrijven, als by de Sinesen; [...]«<sup>23</sup>

Needless to say, this refers to the use of Chinese in Korea, whereas the existence of a native language and script—while certainly not ruled out—is not even hinted at. In view of the sources reviewed so far, this was clearly a step back. In a similar fashion, the Korean province names indicated on the two above-mentioned maps follow with slight irregularities in their Chinese pronunciations. Thus, we read from top to bottom:<sup>24</sup> Hienking, Pinggan (Pingan), Kiangyuen (Kiangyuen), Kingki (Kinki), Hanghai (Hoanchai), Kingxan,

21 Kircher, *Oedipus...*, 3 vols. (Rome: Vitalis Mascardus, 1652–54), 3 (1654): 15.

22 Albeit not in the focus of either of them, as is already obvious from their titles, namely »Imperii Sinarvm nova descriptio« [New Description of the Chinese Empire] and »Iaponia regnvm« [The Realm of Japan] respectively.

23 Quoted from p. 208a of the Dutch translation of Martini's *Atlas*, published as vol. 4 of Joan Blaeu's *Nieuwe Atlas, oft Toonneel des Aerdrjcx* [New Atlas, or Theatre of the World] (Amsterdam: Joan Blaeu, 1655). The account of Korea spans pp. 207a–209b.

24 If different, the spellings as found on p. 208a are given in brackets.

Chungcing and Ciuenlo. Despite claims to the contrary, no words or names in their actual Korean form are found here.<sup>25</sup>

*Hendrik Hamel 1668*

The latter half of the 17th century saw the publication of some of the most important sources on Korea and its language for a long time to come, all ultimately going back to a single event that hardly needs any introduction: the shipwrecking of the *De Sperwer* in 1653 and its crew's subsequent thirteen years in Korea before some of them escaped to Japan. Hendrik Hamel's (1630–1692) report on these experiences was first published in Dutch in 1668.<sup>26</sup> Before long, translations into French (1670), German (1672) and English (1705) followed, most of which were re-published and re-translated various times, especially in 18th and 19th century collections of travelogues, thereby ensuring a broad readership.

Those seeking first-hand knowledge of Korean were probably rather disappointed with the report: No specimen whatsoever of *han'gŭl* is found here and with the exception of a number of Korean place names interspersed throughout the main text, the data provided on the language is minimal. The following passage ranks as the most informative one:

Sooveel haer spraeck, schrijven en reekenen belanght, haer spraeck is alle andere spraeken different. Is seer moeijelijck om te leeren, doordien sij een dingh op verscheijde maniere noemen; spreekken seer prompt ende langhsaem, voornamenlijck onder d'grooten ende geleerde; schrijven op drierlij maniere, 't eerste ofte principaelste is gelijk dat vande Chinese ende Japanders, op dese wijze worden alle hare boecken gedruet, ende gesz, [read: »ende geschriften,«] 't land ende de overheijt rakende, gesz tweede, [read: »rakende, geschreven. Het tweede«] Is seer radt, gelijk 't loopt int vaderlant; wort veel bij d'grooten ende d'gouverneurs gebruijct om vonnisse in, ende apostille op recquesten te stellen, mitsgaders brieven aan malcandere te schrijven, alsoo d'gemeene man niet wel lesen can; het derde ofte slechtste wort vande vrouwen ende gemeene man geschreven. Is seer licht voor haer te leeren, doch connen daardoor alle dingen ende noijt

25 Ogura (»Chōsen goi«, 85, #146), basing himself on the French translation of Martini's account in vol. 3 of *Recueil de voyages au Nord* [Collection of Voyages to the North] (Amsterdam: Jean Frederic Bernard, 1715), 3: 142–179, interprets »Cie« in the following passage as probably rendering the Korean *chae* 'ash', while »Sandaracha« is said to be of unclear meaning: »Il ne se trouve point ailleurs de meilleure gomme de Sandaracha, ou de Cie à la couleur d'or, dont aussi bien qu'au Japon ils ont accoûtumé de vernir toute sorte de meubles« (3: 178; equivalent to 208b in the Dutch edition quoted above). Now the latter is sandarac resin and the alleged Korean word »Cie« is nothing but the Chinese reading of *qi* 漆—albeit deprived of its diacritics: The fully spelled-out romanisation in the system of Nicolas Trigault's *Xiru ermuji* 西儒耳目資 [An Aid to the Ears and Eyes of Western Scholars] (Hangzhou, 1626) is *ç'iè*, or *ç'iè* (see e.g. 2: 66b).

26 Among the earliest editions is: *Journal, Van de Ongeluckige Voyagie van 't Jacht de Sperwer* [Journal of the Unfortunate Voyage of the *Jacht* De Sperwer]. (Rotterdam: Johannes Stichter, 1668).

gehoorde namen seer licht ende beter als met 't voorgaende schrijven; dit geschiet alles met penseelen, seer vaerdigh en rat.<sup>27</sup>

While the above is admittedly still somewhat vague, it reaffirms the previously available piece of information that the Koreans spoke a language different from Chinese—here now expanded to »different from *all* other languages«. Also, and more importantly, we finally find a non-Chinese writing system mentioned here. The notion of no less than three distinct writing systems<sup>28</sup> turned out to be persistent until the emergence of the first actual specimens of Korean script in the last years of the 18th century.

Interestingly, Hamel's claim that »sij een dingh op verscheijde maniere noemen« is reminiscent of how Japanese was repeatedly described from the second half of the 16th century.<sup>29</sup> After all, this might not be such a great surprise as the two languages share certain characteristics which undoubtedly contributed to that impression, such as the extensive use of Sinoxenic vocabulary (i.e. Sino-Korean and Sino-Japanese respectively) in addition to native vocabulary or the existence of a sophisticated system of honorifics.

*Arnoldus Montanus 1669*

Arnoldus Montanus' (1625–1683) *Gedenkwaerdige gesantschappen der Oost-Indische Maetschappy in 't Vereenigde Nederland, aen de kaisaren van Japan* (Remarkable Embassies of the East-India Company in the United Netherlands to the Emperors of Japan; Amsterdam: Jacob Meurs, 1669) naturally touches upon Korea in its account of the Japanese invasions in the 1590s. The strong influence of Martini is apparent at first sight, when the province names are read in Chinese (pp. 108, 159) just as in the following passage: »De steeden zijn seer veel: leggen meest vierkant: gebouwt na de wijze *der Sineesen*: welker dracht, tael, letteren, godsdiens en land-bestier *de Coreers* volkomen navolgen.«<sup>30</sup>

27 Following the celebrated edition of B. Hoetink, *Verhaal van het vergaan van het jacht De Sperwer* [Narrative of the Shipwreck of the *jacht* De Sperwer]. (s-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1920), 50–51. The emendations in square brackets are his.

28 Nowadays usually identified as Chinese writing in *kaishu* 楷書 and *caoshu* 草書 as well as *han'gil*. Cf. Yi Pyōngdo 李丙燾, »Nansōn Chejudo nanp'agi (wan) 蘭船濟州島難破記 (完)« [Account of the shipwreck of a Dutch vessel on Cheju Island (final installment)], *Chindan hakpo* 震檀學報 3 (1935), 166–189; also Ikuta Shigeru 生田滋, *Chōsen yūshūki* 朝鮮幽囚記 [Account of Our Imprisonment in Korea] (Tōkyō: Heibonsha, 1969. Tōyō bunko; 132), 176 and 112n261, respectively.

29 Compare Giovanni Pietro Maffei's (1533–1603) description in his *Historiarum Indicarum libri XVI* [Sixteen Books on the History of the Indies] (Venice: Damianus Zenarius, 1589), 207, to which also the above-mentioned Varenius (*Descriptio* [1649], 179–180; [1673], 81) refers: »Sermo Iaponiorum, vnus & communis est omnium; sed ita varius idem & multiplex, vti plures haud immerito videantur esse. quippe vnus cuiusque notionis ac rei, multa vocabula sunt, quorum alia contemptus, alia honoris causa; alia apud principes, alia apud plebem; alia denique viri, alia fœminæ vsurpant. ad hæc, aliter loquuntur ac scribunt; & in ipsa scriptione, aliter epistolas, aliter volumina librosque conficiunt«.

30 Montanus, *Gesantschappen*, 160.

Just as with Martini's account, Montanus was quoted soon after by Nicolaas Witsen and incorporated into his *Noord en Oost Tartarye*—as far as the topic at hand is concerned, there is little more than this and the fact that both works enjoyed considerable attention that makes quoting these statements worthwhile.

*Johann Christoph Becmann 1673*

Johann Christoph Becmann's (1641–1717) *Historia Orbis Terrarum geographica et civilis* (Geographical and Civil History of the World) enjoyed numerous editions in 1673, 1680, 1685, 1692, 1698 and 1707. Of interest is a passage concerning the different directions of writing observed in the world: »Chinenses, Tatari, Coreani, Japanenses scribunt a superiori parte Recta Linea descendendo ad inferiorem.«<sup>31</sup> While repeating the usual account of the Chinese script being used and understood in adjacent countries despite their divergent spoken languages (see pp. 384, 391), he does not appear to have Chinese writing in mind here, needless to say except for the »Chinenses«.

*Christian Mentzel 1681*

In the title of his *Index Nominum Plantarum Universalis...*<sup>32</sup> (General Index of Botanical Names), Christian Mentzel (1622–1701) claims to include the Korean names of plants and accordingly we find »Cor. Coreenses, Coreæ Insulæ« among the abbreviations listed near the beginning of this work. However, unfortunately the present author was not able to locate any passage making use of the named abbreviation, let alone any actual Korean in the main body of this lexicon.

*Nicolaas Witsen 1692*

Nicolaas Witsen's (1641–1717) *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (Northern and Eastern Tartary) and its account of Korea<sup>33</sup> is a compilation from various sources, including both published and unpublished writings as well as informants from Hamel's group. It thus incorporates

31 Becmann, *Historia* (Frankfurt/Oder: Hiob Wilhelm Finckel, 1673), 224.

32 The title is too lengthy to quote in full here, but its relevant portions are as follows: *Index Nominum Plantarum Universalis, Diversis Terrarum, Gentiumque Linguis, quotquot ex Auctoribus ad singula Plantarum Nomina excerpti & juxta seriem A. B. C. collocari poterunt, ad Unum redactus, videlicet: EUROPEORUM [...]. ASLATICORUM, Hebræâ, Chaldaicâ, Syriacâ, [...] Sinicâ, Japonicâ, Malaicâ, Coreicâ. &c. AFRICANORUM [...]. AMERICANORUM [...]* [General index of botanical names in the different languages of all countries and peoples, as many as can be gathered from the various writers for each botanical name and be arranged in alphabetical order reduced to one, namely: OF THE EUROPEAN ONES: [...]. OF THE ASIAN ONES: In Hebrew, Chaldean, Syriac, [...] Chinese, Japanese, Malay, Korean etc. OF THE AFRICAN ONES: [...]. OF THE AMERICAN ONES: [...]] (Berlin: Officina Rungiana, 1682).

33 Nicolaas Witsen, *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (Amsterdam, 1692), 2: 19–27.

two longer passages from Montanus and Martini,<sup>34</sup> and furthermore draws upon an unpublished manuscript by »a certain Slavonic author«<sup>35</sup>—all of which contain little to nothing not already well known. It is thus the remainder that is of interest here. In the introductory passage we merely read: »De wijze van leven der *Koreers* helt ten deele na de Tartars, ten deele na de Sinesen. [...] Hunne spraek en schrift komt ten naesten by met die van de Sinesen overeen.«<sup>36</sup> However, things get curious after the passage from Montanus, where we find the earliest long list of Korean words in a printed Western work going beyond proper nouns. In fact, little exaggeration is needed if we were to describe this work, together with its expanded version of 1705 (dealt with below), as being *the* source on Korean up to the early 19th century.

De telling by die van *Korea*, onder de grooten, is als volgt:

1 <i>Ana.</i> ¶	2 <i>Toue.</i> ¶	3 <i>Sewe.</i> ¶	4 <i>Deijye.</i> ¶	5 <i>Tasset.</i>
6 <i>Josef.</i> ¶	7 <i>Girgap.</i> ¶	8 <i>Joderp.</i> ¶	9 <i>Agop.</i> ¶	10 <i>Iaer.</i>

De gemeene man telt aldus:

1 <i>Jagnir.</i> ¶	2 <i>Tourgy.</i> ¶	3 <i>Socsom.</i> ¶	4 <i>Docso.</i> ¶	5 <i>Casetoo.</i> ¶
6 <i>Josefjone.</i> ¶	7 <i>Jeroptchil.</i> ¶	8 <i>Jaderpal.</i> ¶	9 <i>Abopcon.</i> ¶	10 <i>Jorchip.</i>

Als zy tot tien getelt hebben, dan gaen zy voort tot hondert aldus:

20 <i>Somer.</i> ¶	30 <i>Schierrri.</i> ¶	40 <i>Maban.</i> ¶	50 <i>Swin.</i> ¶	60 <i>Jegu.</i>
70 <i>Hierugum.</i> ¶	80 <i>Jader.</i> ¶	90 <i>Habam.</i> ¶	100 <i>Hirpee.</i>	

*Pontchaa*, betekent by hen Godt:

*Mool*, een paerdt:

*Moolboot*, meer paerden:

*Hiechep*, een wijf.<sup>37</sup>

The glossary ends as suddenly as it began and carries neither a title nor any indication as to where it was taken from or who contributed to it. However, it is followed by a brief reference to the shipwrecked Dutchmen of the *De Sperwer*, which is hardly incidental. Their influence is likewise seen in a number of Korean place names in the passages written by Witsen himself, which reflect their actual Korean pronunciations<sup>38</sup>—yet the province names are still given in their Chinese forms (pp. 20, 21–22, 26).

34 The former section (pp. 21–23) is an almost verbatim quote from the Dutch edition of Montanus, namely from columns 159b–161a and 163a.

The latter section (pp. 25–27) appears to be translated from some other edition of Martini's *Atlas* despite the existence of the Dutch one referred to above. In any case, the two Dutch texts are neither identical in terms of their internal structure nor their exact wording, as a comparison of Witsen's version with Martini's (207a–209b) demonstrates.

35 Witsen, *Tartarye*, 2: 24–25.

36 Witsen, *Tartarye*, 2: 20.

37 Witsen, *Tartarye*, 2: 23.

38 Witsen does not name his source, but Hamel's *Journal* is a likely candidate, as the place name spellings conform well. Compare the following (page numbers and spellings in Stichter's edition, if different, indicated in square brackets): p. 19: Tyocenkoek [title: Tyocen-koeck]; p. 20: Heinan [Heynan], Iyan [Jyan], Najo, Sansiangh,

The distinction made between two ways of counting is noteworthy: one used by »de grooten«, i.e. high-ranking persons, (which comprises the native numerals), the other by »de gemeene man«, which involves Sino-Korean.<sup>39</sup> As we shall see below, this will give rise to a variety of misunderstandings in the later literature but is certainly not entirely groundless in itself. For such a distinction is not only found in Witsen and works based on him either directly or through one or more intermediaries, but also with some variations in entirely unrelated and non-Western sources.<sup>40</sup>

Finally, we should in passing mention another passage found right before the conclusion of the account with Martini (p. 25), as it hints at yet another opportunity for Westerners to get a glimpse at Korean from native informants. Here we find quoted a few lines by Andreas Cleyer (1634–?1697/98), who in 1682 had the opportunity to see the Korean embassy to Edo under ambassador Yun Chiwan 尹趾完 (1635–1718) on the occasion of Tsunayoshi's succession as *shogun*.<sup>41</sup> More than a few notices concerning the Korean language and/or script in Edo-period sources derive from Japanese-Korean encounters during the various embassies, but as before with Richard Cocks (1566–1624) for instance,<sup>42</sup> Cleyer's case was different and did not lead to any new materials.

Tyongap, Tayan, Tonge [Tunge], Sendy, Iesoen, Thielado [all on p. 10], Saising [Saysing], Suttén [Sutnen], Mammon [Nammon; all three on p. 15], Consio, Tionsangdo, Sengado, Sioor [all four on p. 10]; p. 21: Moese [Moese], Meggan (corrected to Moggan in the second edition: *Tartary* [1705], 1: 46) [Moggan; both on p. 6].

39 Most of the examples by »the common man« quoted here are hybrids consisting of a native element followed by a Sino-Korean one, but as is obvious from the last numeral (*Hirpee*, i.e. *ilbaek* 一百) and especially from the expanded list in the 1705 edition, this category likewise includes purely Sino-Korean words.

40 See for instance Motoori Norinaga's 本居宣長 (1730–1801) *Tamakatsuma* 玉勝間 (The Jeweled Basket; printed 1795–1812), 7: #392, see *Motoori Norinaga zenshū* 本居宣長全集 [The Complete Works of Motoori Norinaga], 20 vols., ed. by Ōno Susumu 大野晋 and Ōkubo Tadashi 大久保正. (Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō, 1968–93). 1: 221. Lowborn persons are said to use combinations of native plus Sino-Korean elements, whereas those of higher standing use purely Sino-Korean words. While details vary, Witsen and Motoori agree on the *mixed* use among *lower* persons, which is hardly coincidental.

Missionary Karl Gützlaff (1803–1851) probably had the same in mind when he wrote that »the present spoken language consists in great part of composite words, in which the words of both languages are united to express one single idea«. See his »Remarks on the Corean language«, *The Chinese Repository* 1,7 (1832), 276–279 (here 278).

41 Cf. the entry for Dec 2, 1682 in his diary. *Andreas Cleyer. Tagebuch des Kontors zu Nagasaki auf der Insel Deshima. 20. Oktober 1682 – 5. November 1683* (Bonner Zeitschrift für Japanologie; 6), ed. by Eva S. Kraft (Bonn: Förderverein Bonner Zeitschrift für Japanologie), 73–74.

42 Cocks—whose focus of interest as head of the English Factory in Hirado was trade—experienced the 1617 embassy to Japan, headed by O Yun'gyōm 吳允謙 (1559–1636).

*Andreas Müller 1694*

Orientalist Andreas Müller (1630–1694) was not only in contact with Witsen and published extensively on matters Chinese, he also had a wider interest in the various languages and writing systems of the world. His *Alphabeta ac Notæ* (1703) does not contain any Korean as such, but in its previous half, besides a number of brief accounts of various writing systems, there is a list of all the scripts known to the author. This »Alphabetorum index universalis« (General Index of Alphabets) spans no less than ten pages and even includes an entry for »Coreanum«,<sup>43</sup> thus demonstrating Müller's awareness of a distinct Korean script. The columns providing pieces of information about some of the scripts, i.e. about their age, number of letters or characters and direction of writing as well as their creatorship, are left blank.

*Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz 1697–1705*

One of the correspondents of both Witsen and Müller who certainly is in no need of introduction was Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646–1716), whose interest in things Chinese is widely known. Less so are his attempts concerning Korean summarized below, gleaned from his correspondence with missionaries to China.<sup>44</sup> First, in a letter to Joachim Bouvet (1656–1730), French Jesuit and missionary to China, dated Dec 12, 1697, he expresses his interest in the languages of the peoples adjacent to China:

A l'occasion de la langue chinoise, il seroit fort à souhaiter qu'on pût avoir aussi des bonnes notices des langues de tous les peuples voisins; et au commencement quelque petit vocabulaire, avec quelque notice des letters et aussi avec le *Pater* ou oraison dominicale, tant en caracteres qui nous sont connus, qu'en ceux du pays où est la langue; et tousjours avec une version interlineaire. La collation des langues est la chose du monde qui peut donner le plus de lumieres touchant les origines et migrations des peuples. Or sans parler des langues de la Coree, du Japon, du Siam, Ava, et du reste des Indes dont il faudroit tacher d'estre informé avec le temps; je ne parleray maintenant que des langues Tartares, ou qui sont au septentrion de la Chine, des Indes et de la Perse.<sup>45</sup>

At this point, Manchu, Mongolian and Tibetan are of foremost interest to Leibniz, whereas Korean is named among others as secondary—for the time being. While in another letter to Bouvet several years later, dated Feb 15, 1701, the focus for Leibniz is still on roughly the same selection of languages,<sup>46</sup> the situation for Leibniz is quite different in a subsequent letter to Bouvet dated July 28, 1704, where we read: »On dit qu'il y a des langues

43 Andreas Müller, *Alphabeta ac Notæ* (Berlin: Johannes Liebermann, 1703), 21.

44 All quotes follow Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, *Der Briefwechsel mit den Jesuiten in China (1689–1714)* [Correspondence with the Jesuits in China], ed. by Rita Widmaier (Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag, 2006. Philosophische Bibliothek; 548).

45 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 140; in letter #18, 136–157.

46 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 300–325, letter #42, esp. 318.

particulieres dans les differentes provinces de la Chine, et dans la Corée, il seroit bon d'en avoir des *Pater* et quelques mots.<sup>47</sup>

Interestingly Leibniz directed another letter to Jean de Fontaney (1643–1710) apparently the same day,<sup>48</sup> which contains among other things almost the same request as above: »J'ay lû, qu'il y a des differentes langues particulieres dans diverses provinces de la Chine meme; et que la Corée aussi a une langue particuliere, il seroit bon d'en avoir des *Pater* et autres échantillons.<sup>49</sup>

Whether the two letters ever reached their addressee is regrettably uncertain.<sup>50</sup> One more year having passed, it is again de Fontaney who is addressed in a letter dated Aug 15, 1705. Leibniz' desire to learn more about the Korean language appears to have grown considerably judging from his words:

Mais sur tout je voudrois avoir des lumieres sur les langues des peuples, comme s'il y a plusieurs Langues differentes dans les diverses provinces de la Chine; si ces langues ont du rapport entre elles, ou avec la langue Mandarine ou universelle de la Chine ou si elles en ont avec les langues voisines des Tartares, Japonois[;], Tonquinois[;] particulièrement quelle est la langue de la Corée et si elle a quelque rapport particulier au japponnois.<sup>51</sup>

At the time of writing, just as at the time of De Fontaney's reply dated Sep 10, 1705,<sup>52</sup> the latter had already returned to Europe.<sup>53</sup> Not being in China anymore, de Fontaney could answer only part of Leibniz' inquiries and therefore forwarded them to China—to what avail is difficult to tell. At least it is clear that de Fontaney himself had nothing to say about Korean, while he *did* provide Leibniz with some information regarding all other languages found in the quote above, from regional varieties of Chinese, through Manchu to Japanese and Vietnamese.

Whether any of Leibniz' attempts at acquiring information about the Korean language ever yielded any results is uncertain. While Bouvet did indeed supply Leibniz with considerable information, including for instance a translation of the Lord's Prayer into Manchu,<sup>54</sup> the case of Korean needs further study. A lack of knowledge on the matter is not the only possible reason for his inquiries having been unsuccessful; this indeed is demonstrated by an earlier letter from Antoine Verjus to Leibniz, dated March 30, 1695, where we are informed of an unfortunate event that might have prevented the permeation of at least some knowledge pertaining to Korean in Europe:

On m'avoit envoyé une Carte, et une explication exacte du Royaume de Corée, de ses huit provinces, et des villes du 1<sup>r</sup> 2<sup>d</sup> 3<sup>me</sup> et 4<sup>me</sup> rang de chaque Province, de la langue, du gouverne-

47 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 458; in letter #53, 456–461.

48 On its dating see Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 745.

49 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 452; in letter #52, 452–455.

50 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 745 and 746.

51 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 462; in letter #54, 462–467.

52 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 508–515, letter #60.

53 Cf. his biographical sketch in Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 706–707.

54 Found in his letter dated Feb 28, 1698; Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 164–175, letter #21.

ment, des mœurs, mais comme je devois l'avoir receuë il y a deux ans, je la croy perduë et surprise et retenuë par les Hollandois.<sup>55</sup>

### *The 18th Century*

When the closing decade of the 18th century with its appearance of the first actual specimens of the script are not considered, it is especially the publication of the second edition of Witsen's work which is of greater interest here. While the amount of materials available was stagnating throughout the century, Korean now became part of linguistic discourse and saw several classifications and comparisons with other languages.

#### *Nicolaas Witsen 1705*

While by and large retaining the account found in the 1692 edition, the section on Korea was expanded significantly in the second—and content-wise final—edition of Witsen's *Noord en Oost Tartarye* (Northern and Eastern Tartary). The greatest merit of this updated account lay without doubt in its glossary,<sup>56</sup> which here had grown to almost five times its original size. A number of numerals, which are still split into two kinds using the same designations as before, are added anew while others are provided with alternatives. The list of general vocabulary was now long enough to be a valuable resource for the various comparative studies which were to follow from the mid-18th century onwards. We will refrain from reproducing the glossary in full here as it has been treated extensively before.<sup>57</sup>

Even the updated account (I: 42–63) is, however, still to be understood as a mere concatenation of various sources, without necessarily aiming at a homogenic whole. This is apparent from contradictions such as the following: in the original version we are told that »their language and script agrees best with those of the Chinese«.<sup>58</sup> In one of the newly added passages, this is further strengthened by noting that »the language has a lot in common with the Chinese one«<sup>59</sup>—which might aim at the lexical layer of Sino-Korean. It

55 Leibniz, *Briefwechsel*, 58; in letter #9, 52–59.

56 Nicolaas Witsen, *Noord en Oost Tartarye. Tweede Druk* (Amsterdam: François Halma, 1705), 52a–53a.

57 See especially Frits Vos, »Master Eibokken on Korea and the Korean language: Supplementary Remarks to Hamel's Narratives«, *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* 50 (1975), 7–42. More recently also Kim Kyōnghwōn 金徑暄, »Sōyangin-ūi kirog-e nat'ananūn 17 segi kugō ōhwi-e kwanhayō: ōhwi, ūmullonjōk ch'ūngmyōn-ūl chungsim-ūro« 서양인의 기록에 나타나는 17 세기 국어 어휘에 관하여- 어휘 · 음운론적 측면을 중심으로 [On the Words of 17th Century Korean Appearing in the Records of Westerners: Focusing on Lexical and Phonological Aspects], *Inmun kwabak* 人文科學 31 (2001), 65–87.

58 »Hunne spræk en schrift komt ten naesten by met die van de Sinceezen overeen«; Witsen, *Tartary* (1705), 43. Cf. Witsen, *Tartary* (1692), 2: 20.

59 »De spræk heeft eenige gemeenschap met het Sineesch« (Witsen, *Tartary* [1705], 47).

any case, it is rather puzzling why Witsen does not attempt to reconcile these claims with the clear statement by one of Hamel's companions, Mattheus Eibokken, that Korean and Chinese have nothing in common, even if only in sound:

De spraek op *Korea*, heeft in klank geen gemeenschap met 't *Sineesch*, 't geen Meester *Eibokken* oordeelde, om dat hy de *Koresche* Tael zeer wel spreekende, van de *Sineezen* op *Batavia* niet wierde verstaen, doch zy konnen malkanders schriften leezen: zy hebben meer als eenderlei schriften; *Oonjek* is een schrift by hen, als by ons het loopend, hangende alle de letteren aen malkander: van het zelve bedient zich de gemeene man; de andere lettergrepen zijn met die van Sina eenderlei.<sup>60</sup>

Considerably clearer than in Hamel's report, it is now also stated that besides Chinese writing there exists another script, called *önyók* 諺譯 by the natives.<sup>61</sup>

*Engelbert Kaempfer 1727*

As numerous writers before him, Engelbert Kaempfer (1651–1716) notes in his *History of Japan*<sup>62</sup> (London: Printed for the Translator, 1727) that »the learned and significant Character language« of China is not merely known in Japan, but »likewise receiv'd in *Corea*, *Tunquin*, and other neighbouring Kingdoms, much after the same manner as the Latin is in most European Countries«.<sup>63</sup> However, this is not all.

In chapter VI on the origin of the Japanese people<sup>64</sup> (pp. 81–96) Kaempfer seeks to disprove »the constant opinion of most European Geographers, that the Japanese are originally of Chinese Extraction« whereby linguistic evidence plays a significant role. Having argued that the Japanese and Chinese languages are in fact entirely different,<sup>65</sup> Kaempfer notes the following before turning his attention to the religious evidence:

I could give several other instances of this kind, and further shew, that, what hath been observ'd of the difference between the Chinese and Japanese languages, holds equally true with regard to the languages spoken in *Corea* and *Jedso*, compared with that of the Natives of Japan, but it

60 Witsen, *Tartary* (1705), 59.

61 In his translation of this passage Vos (»Eibokken«, 29n91) comments that the actual meaning is »translation [from the Chinese] into *önmun* 諺文 = *han'gük*. Instead of assuming an error here one might also consider the possibility that it was indeed used (as well) in the general meaning of 'Korean script'. In fact it is also met with in exactly the same general meaning in John Ross' *Corean Primer* (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1877) for instance, where it occurs as *nyug* 언역 'Corean Letters' (p. 7).

62 Engelbert Kaempfer, *History of Japan* (London: Printed for the Translator, 1727).

63 Kaempfer, *History*, 84. The list of countries is later expanded, cf. »Appendix«, 36–37.

64 Kaempfer, *History*, 81–96.

65 One of the most pronounced differences lying in the »pronunciation of the Japanese language, [which] in general, is pure, articulate and distinct,« unlike »that of the Chinese on the contrary, [which] is nothing but a confused noise of many consonants pronounc'd with a sort of a singing accent, very disagreeable to the Ear« (Kaempfer, *History*, 85).

is needless to give the Reader, and myself, so much trouble, the rather since no body ever pretended to draw the original descent of the Japanese from either of these two Nations.<sup>66</sup> Basing himself on unknown sources, possibly hearsay from his Japanese informants, Kaempfer thus gives an answer to one of the questions earlier posed by Leibniz regarding the affinity of Korean with Japanese (see the quote above from his letter to de Fontaney dated Aug 15, 1705). However, it is regrettable that Kaempfer did not in the end take the trouble to demonstrate that his claims were equally true for Korean.

There is another passage referring vaguely to the Korean language, which somewhat misleadingly is rendered as follows by Johann Gaspar Scheuchzer (1702–1729): »The Language of *Jedso* is said to have something of that, which is spoke in *Coraa*.«<sup>67</sup> However, from Christian Wilhelm Dohm's (1751–1820) edition it becomes apparent that the language of Jedso, i.e. Ezo or Hokkaidō, is not actually meant here. Following a few paragraphs on the same place we read:

Der umliegenden etwas entfernten Inseln wil ich gar nicht erwähnen, [...]. Die Bewohner derselben werden als ein rauhes, starkes Volk beschrieben, mit langem Haar und Bart. [...] Die Sprache dieser Menschen sol mit der *coräischen* Aenlichkeit haben.<sup>68</sup>

From this »*Jedso*« appears to be an addition by the translator, based on a misunderstanding as to which people are referred to. The language meant here is not the one spoken on Hokkaidō but on the islands surrounding it. Be that as it may, Kaempfer's source is once more unclear, as is the exact other language which is meant.

#### *Jean-Baptiste du Halde 1735*

Being the standard reference on China in the 18th century, French Jesuit Jean-Baptiste du Halde's (1674–1743) *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise* (Geographical, Historical, Chronological, Political and Physical Description of the Empire of China and Chinese Tartary)<sup>69</sup> is a valuable resource on Korea, but not necessarily on its language and script. However, the following passage is noteworthy and later became an obstacle to scholars seeking a Manchu origin for the language of Korea:

Leur langue est différente de la langue Chinoise & de la Langue Tartare; c'est pourquoi quand ils vont à la Chine, ils menent avec eux un Interprete. L'Empereur en a aussi à ses gages & à *Peking*, & à *Fong hoang tchin*, par par où ils sont obligez d'entrer à la Chine.

66 Kaempfer, *History*, 85.

67 Kaempfer, *History*, 65.

68 Engelbert Kaempfer, *Geschichte und Beschreibung von Japan* [History and Description of Japan], 2 vols., ed. by Christian Wilhelm Dohm (Lemgo: Meyersche Buchhandlung, 1777–79), 1: 79. Korea is sometimes referred as »*Coräa*« (e.g. *Geschichte*, 1: 77, 78) besides the more common »*Corea*« and »*Corey*«, the corresponding adjective »*coräisch*« is as well found close to the passage in question (p. 78). Likewise the spelling »*Coraa*« is rare in Scheuchzer's edition, but also found elsewhere (e.g. *History*, 62).

69 Jean-Baptiste du Halde, *Description...*, 20 vols. (Paris: P. G. le Mercier, 1730–35).

Les lettres Chinoises sont cependant en usage dans tout le Royaume: le dernier Envoyé qui vint nous voir il y a peu d'années, se servit du pinceau pour nous faire entendre en Chinois ce qu'il vouloit.<sup>70</sup>

*Benjamin Schultze 1748*<sup>71</sup>

*Orientalisch- und Occidentalischer Sprachmeister* (Teacher of Oriental and Occidental Languages)<sup>72</sup> is a relatively rare example of an early collection of writing systems as well as languages, the latter in the Lord's Prayer, which was the usual form of the time. Naturally, as neither a Korean translation of the Lord's Prayer nor anything substantial on the script was available, the appearance of Korean is therefore limited to the chapter on numerals and a multilingual glossary entitled »Appendix. Continens quatuor præcipuas voces, in Orationibus Dominicis occurrentes« (Appendix Containing the Four Chief Words Occurring in the Lord's Prayer) The four words in question are 'father', 'heaven', 'earth' and 'bread', translated into Korean as follows:<sup>73</sup>

	<i>Pater.</i>	<i>Calum.</i>	<i>Terra.</i>	<i>Panis.</i>
*Coreanice	Saeram	Hanel	Moet	Stock

It takes little to identify these with words #97 'een Mensch', #61 'Hemel', #71 'd'Aerde' and #110 'Brood' in Witsen's 1705 glossary; even the spellings match perfectly. This is not necessarily the case throughout the longer list of numerals, which is likewise taken from Witsen and given here only with omissions, as we will presently come back to the numerals in several 18th century works (see the tables under Pallas below):

*Coreisch nach der gemeinen Aussprache.*

1 Jagner ¶	2 Tourgy ¶	3 Socsom ¶	[...] ¶
80000 Joeoock ¶	90000 Paerroock ¶	100000 Jyrpoock	

<sup>70</sup> Halde, *Description*, 4: 426: *Fong boang tchin* [read *tching*], i.e. Fenghuang cheng 鳳凰城.

<sup>71</sup> The exact authorship of *Sprachmeister* is somewhat problematic and a considerable part of the collection is obviously due to the efforts of Christian Friedrich Geßner (d1756), who besides this work had already published and at least in part also authored several works in the 1740s containing portions of its contents. We here merely follow the traditional attribution of this work to Benjamin Schultze (1689–1760), who not only signed the first preface, but indeed appears to have taken part in its compilation – and when the work was posthumously republished in 1769 (cf. note 75 below), Schultze's name is even indicated on the title page. On the history of *Sprachmeister* and Schultze's role in its compilation see Johann Christoph Adelung, *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde* [Mithridates, or General Science of Languages], 4 parts in 5 vols. (Berlin: Vossische Buchhandlung, 1806–17), 1: 668–670, #34–35.

<sup>72</sup> Leipzig: Christian Friedrich Geßner, 1748.

<sup>73</sup> The asterisk apparently marks languages of which no full Lord's Prayer is provided in the collection, albeit this appears to receive no explanation anywhere.

*Nach der Vornehmen Aussprache.*

1 Ana ¶                      2 Toue oder Toul ¶                      3 Sewe oder Suy ¶                      [...] ¶  
 8 Joderp oder jadarp ¶                      9 Agop oder Ahob ¶                      10 Jaer.<sup>74</sup>

Even though *Sprachmeister* does not introduce any new knowledge about either the Korean language or script, it is still of considerable value as it was the earliest work to reproduce substantial parts of Witsen's 1705 glossary. Unlike Witsen's work, which was exceedingly rare and whose content was therefore unavailable to most scholars, *Sprachmeister* was readily available and later even republished under a slightly different title.<sup>75</sup>

*Histoire moderne 1754, Universal History 1759, Gatterer 1764, Boysen 1771*

The 18th century saw a number of large-scale publications on history, East Asia being no exception here. Revised editions and translations soon appeared, again a useful indicator of the demand and spread of these works, some of which are treated briefly in the following.

In 1754 the first volume of *Histoire moderne des Chinois, des Japonnois, des Indiens, des Persans, des Turcs, des Russiens, &c.* (Modern History of the Chinese, Japanese, Indians, Persians, Turks, Russians, etc.) was published. In the the revised edition and its Korea section<sup>76</sup> we read:

La Langue Coréenne est différente de celle des Chinois, & s'écrit avec des caracteres qui lui sont particuliers. Le peuple & les femmes n'employent point d'autres lettres dans leurs écritures. Mais les Lettrés se servent des caracteres de la langue Chinoise, & l'étude de cette langue fait même une des principales occupations des Savans. Hamel distingue une troisième maniere d'écrire, que consiste en certains signes ou caracteres mysterieux, dont il prétend que les Ministres & les Mandarins se servent dans les affaires secretes.<sup>77</sup>

The sources are obvious and well known: Hamel and du Halde. Of more interest due to its original ideas, going beyond the two named works likewise employed here, is the appendix treating Korea (pp. 520–544) contained in volume VIII of *The modern part of an Universal History, from the Earliest Account of Time*.<sup>78</sup> The language of the Koreans, who are »allowed by most Europeans to be of Tartarian extract«,<sup>79</sup> is characterized as follows: »THEIR

74 Schultze, *Sprachmeister*, 204–205. Fraktur in the original is indicated by Italics.

75 *Orientalisch- und Occidentalisches A, B, C-Buch*. (Naumburg, Zeitz: Christian Friedrich Geßner, 1769). As already pointed out by Adlung, *Mithridates*, 1: 670, and Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 68, this is essentially the same work as that of 1748 (excluding however the second half, i.e. the collection of Lord's Prayers).

76 *Histoire moderne des Chinois...* (Paris: Desaint & Saillant, 1755), 445–486.

77 *Histoire moderne des Chinois*, 461.

78 *The modern part of an Universal History*, 44 vols., ed. by George Sale & al. (London: S. Richardson etc., 1759), 7: 520–544.

79 *The modern part of an Universal History*, 7: 529.

language is different from the *Chinese*, or rather is a mixture of that and the *Manchew Tartar*, but they use the *Chinese* characters in their writings and books.«<sup>80</sup>

The exact reasons for assuming so are not given anywhere, and needless to say the above statement is not easily reconcilable with the note in du Halde that Korean is different from both languages now considered its origin.

Approximately one decade later, Friedrich Eberhard Boysen (1720–1800) started to publish the *Alte Historie* section of his German adaptation of *Universal History* under the title *Die Allgemeine Weltbistorie*. A somewhat more elaborate account of the Korean language and script can be found therein:

Ihre Sprache ist von der chinesischen und tartarischen unterschieden. Daher sie, wenn sie nach China reisen, einen Dollmetscher mitnehmen. Man hält aber dafür, daß die eigentliche *koreanische* Sprache ein aus der chinesischen und aus der Sprache der *Man-tschebu* entstandener Dialekt sey. Sie bedienen sich einer dreyfachen Schrift. Mit der einen schreiben sie ihre eigene Sprache, und diese Buchstaben oder Zeichen sollen nichts mit den chinesischen gemein haben; die Gelehrten gebrauchen die chinesischen Charaktere, und dann sollen die Koreaner noch eine dritte Art zu schreiben besitzen, mit der sie geheime Sachen aufsetzen, und diese soll, wie leicht zu erachten ist, nur wenigen bekannt seyn.<sup>81</sup>

While the idea of a mixed language on a Chinese-Manchu basis is retained, better use is made here of the two aforementioned sources. Acting as an intermediary at this point is historian Johann Christoph Gatterer (1727–1799), who also contributed a long preface to the first volume of Boysen's *Alte Historie* section: On the one hand he had likewise been using *Universal History* for his *Handbuch der Universalhistorie nach ihrem gesamten Umfange* (Manual of Universal History in Its Entire Extent),<sup>82</sup> on the other it was also Gatterer—and undoubtedly his *Handbuch*, the relevant passage from which is quoted below—to which Boysen refers as a source on Korea and Tibet in his preface.

Die *Sprache* der Coreaner ist von der Chinesischen unterschieden. Nach einigen ist sie nichts anders, als eine aus der *Chinesischen* und der Sprache der *Man-tschebu* vermischte Sprache. Ihre *Schrift* ist dreyerley: denn sie schreiben erstlich ihre Sprache mit eigenen Zeichen, die von den Chinesischen ganz verschieden sind; sodann bedienen sich insonderheit ihre Gelehrte der Chinesischen Charaktere in ihren Schriften und Büchern, wie sie dann ein Hauptgeschäfte aus der Erlernung der Chinesischen Schrift machen: endlich sollen die Staatsbedienten bey geheimen Dingen noch eine dritte Art zu schreiben, die aus gewissen geheimnisvollen Zügen besteht, gebrauchen.<sup>83</sup>

Boysen's account is therefore clearly based on Gatterer's, but makes additional use of du Halde, or any other work repeating the latter's words.

80 *The modern part of an Universal History*, 7: 526.

81 Boysen, *Die Allgemeine Welt-Historie*, 50 vols., ed. By Johann S. Semler (Halle: Johann Justinus Gebauer, 1746–85), 9 («Alte Historie»): 554.

82 2 vols. (Göttingen: Verlag der Wittve Vandenhoeck, 1761–64).

83 Gatterer, *Handbuch*, 2: 401.

*Christian Wilhelm Büttner 1779*

Being the owner of a vast library and certainly one of the greatest collectors of his time when it came to sources on languages and writing systems, Christian Wilhelm Büttner (1716–1801) earned various appellations, of which »secretary to the archives of the Tower of Babel« is especially telling.<sup>84</sup> Mere fragments of the results of his comparative studies of the languages and writing systems of the world made it to the printing press, while the rest is either preserved in manuscript form or has been lost.

Writing in the 1770s, even Büttner had no access to a specimen of the Korean script. And in fact he deemed it unlikely that any script hitherto unknown could surface, apart from maybe some cases of »roher Bilderschrift«, or »crude pictorial script«.<sup>85</sup>

However, among the indirect publications of Büttner—i.e. those bits and pieces of his scholarship scattered throughout other scholar's works, often based on their correspondence with Büttner—we do find a far better informed view on the language of Korea. In treating various transgnetic languages, he thus notes the following concerning the consonant inventory and phonotactical characteristics of Chinese as opposed to Korean and other languages:

Unter diesen Sprachen ist die Sinesische die ärmste geblieben, weil sie nur ohngefähr aus 800 Sylben besteht, deren jede mit einem Consonanten anfängt, und einige von ihnen nur mit *n* und *ng* schließen; ihnen auch überdies *b*, *d*, *g* und *r* fehlen. Die übrigen Völker, als Coreaner, Tunkiner, Siamer, Peguaner und Tibetaner, fangen ihre einsylbigen Wörter nicht allein mit allen unsern, so wohl Vocalen als Consonanten, an; sondern schließen sie auch mit den selben, und die Maleyer haben eine zweysylbige Sprache.<sup>86</sup>

In some way or another, Witsen's glossary will have served as Büttner's source and indeed this would have been sufficient for his remarkable observation that Korean allows a far greater variety of closed syllables than the Mandarin of his or also our time.

While Büttner's linguistic manuscripts still await a detailed examination, it is beyond doubt that the Korean language plays at least a minor role here as well. Just like part of his library, these were moved to Weimar after his death, a burdensome enterprise undertaken by no-one other than Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832). Here, we meet among others the Orientalist Julius Klaproth (1783–1835), who naturally had an interest in this linguistic collection and even compiled a brief catalogue chiefly containing some of

84 »Geheimschreiber des babylonischen Thurm-Archives«; see p. 158 in: [Christoph Martin Wieland], »Ueber die Entstehung der Sprachen. (Auszug eines Briefes des verst. Hofrath Büttners in Jena.)« [On the Origin of Languages. (Extract from a Letter by Late Court Counsellor Büttner in Jena.)], *Der Neue Teutsche Merkur* 10 (1801), 158–160.

85 See his *Vergleichungs-Tafeln der Schriftarten verschiedener Völker, in denen vergangenen und gegenwärtigen Zeiten* [Comparative Tables of the Scripts of Various Peoples in Times Past and Present], 2 vols. (Göttingen & Gotha: Johann Christian Dieterich, 1771–1779), II: 8.

86 See pp. 32–33 in [Christoph Martin Wieland], »Etwas über die Sineser. Aus einem Aufsatz des Hrn. Hofrath B\*\*«, *Der Teutsche Merkur* NS vol. 7 (1784), 30–39.

its Chinese works.<sup>87</sup> In 1807 Goethe also welcomed Johann Severin Vater (1771–1826), who came to inspect the convolutes of manuscripts left by Büttner and who later published his results in 1821. Among the various materials Vater notes a number of comparative vocabularies, regrettably often fragmentary and unfinished. One of these is reported to start with no other language than »Coräsch«.<sup>88</sup>

*Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger 1782*

Johann Christian Christoph Rüdiger (1751–1822), known among other things for his study of the relationship between Romani and Hindustani, belongs without doubt to the more important language scholars of his time. His *Grundriß einer Geschichte der menschlichen Sprache nach allen bisher bekannten Mund- und Schriftarten mit Proben und Bücherkenntniß. Erster Theil. Von der Sprache* (Outline of the History of Human Language, Considering All Languages and Scripts, With Specimens and References. Part One: Of Language)<sup>89</sup> was honoured as »the hitherto best attempt at a universal glossary«,<sup>90</sup> and as far as Korean is concerned it deserves no less attention than the works of Hervás or Pallas treated below, even if only considered in isolation. Yet it is left unmentioned in studies on the knowledge of Korean in the West, which is all the more regrettable as Rüdiger's work turned out to be the missing link between Witsen and the dictionary initiated by Catherine the Great—an aspect we will get back to shortly.

As the entry on Korean is both little known and rather brief, it is quoted here in full. Its position in the chapter—it is preceded by Chinese and what are considered varieties thereof by Rüdiger (§198–§203) and followed by Formosan (§205)—does not indicate an attempt at genetic grouping.

§. 204. Die Halbinsel Korea hat eine eigene Stammsprache.

1. jagnir. 2. tourgy. 3. socsom. 4. docso. 5. caseto. 6. joseljone. 7. jeroptchil. 8. jaderpal.
9. ahopcon. 10. jorchip. 20. somer. 30. schierr. 100. hirpee. 1000. jyrctien.
- a. pontchaa. b. hanel. c. moet. d. moet. e. poel. f. hay. g. tael. h. saeram. p. taigwor. q. doen. s. koo. z. pael.

Die Vornehmen des Landes reden eine sehr abweichende Mundart.

87 See Martin Gimm, »Zu Klaproths erstem Katalog chinesischer Bücher, Weimar 1804—oder: Julius Klaproth als "studentische Hilfskraft" bei Goethe? —« [On Klaproth's First Catalogue of Chinese Books, Weimar 1804, or: Julius Klaproth as Goethe's »Student Assistant«?], in *Das andere China. Festschrift für Wolfgang Bauer zum 65. Geburtstag* [The Other China. Festschrift for Wolfgang Bauer on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday], ed. by Helwig Schmidt-Glintzer (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1995), 559–599.

88 See p. 94 in Johann Severin Vater, »Büttner's Handschriftliche Sprach-Sammlungen in Weimar« [Büttner's Manuscript Collections of Languages in Weimar], *Analekten der Sprachenkunde* 2,2 (1821), 85–101.

89 Leipzig: P. G. Kummer, 1782.

90 »Der beste bisherige Versuch eines Universalglossariums«; see p. 184 in Friedrich Gedike, »Plan und Ankündigung eines Universalglossariums der Rußischen Kaiserin« [Scheme and Announcement of an Universal Glossary by the Russian Empress], *Berlinische Monatsschrift* no 8 (Aug 1785) (1785), 181–191.

1. ana. 2. toue. 3. suy. 4. deuye. 5. tasset. 6. joset. 7. jirgop. 8. jadarp. 9. agop. 10. jaer.<sup>91</sup>

For each language treated in his *Grundriß*, Rüdiger seeks to provide a set of numerals (1–10, 11–13, 20, 30, 100, 1000) and as many words as possible from a set of basic vocabulary items numbered from »a« to »z«. The meanings of the latter are as follows:

a. god. b. heaven. c. earth. d. water. e. fire. f. sun. g. moon. h. man. i. father. k. mother. l. son. m. daughter. n. brother. o. sister. p. head. q. eye. r. ear. s. nose. t. tongue. u. hair. x. hand. z. foot.<sup>92</sup>

The fact that items i–o, r and t–x are missing for Korean is self-explanatory in view of Witsen’s glossary, which also lacks them. In general, the copying was carried out with considerable accuracy, so that the original spellings are all preserved. The only error is that both c and d are given as »moet« (d should read »moel«, cf. Witsen’s #70 *Moel* ‘t Water’).

*Samuel Friedrich Günther Wahl 1784, 1787–88*

In his *Allgemeine Geschichte der morgenländischen Sprachen und Litteratur* (General History of Oriental Languages and Literature)<sup>93</sup> Samuel Friedrich Günther Wahl (1760–1834) developed a classification scheme for all Oriental languages, separating them into four classes—prediluvial Cainitic, Japhetic, Hamitic and Semitic, which in turn are sub-divided into varying numbers of phyla. He apparently had some awareness of Korean, or in his wording »hoch und platt koreisch« (p. 22), or High and Low Korean, grouping it with the Manchu phylum of prediluvial languages, just as he does with Tibetan, Chinese, Japanese, Annamese and others. Wahl’s »hoch« and »platt« in the designation of the language will ultimately have its roots in Witsen’s above-mentioned way of differentiating between the ways of counting used among the »great men« as opposed to the »common«.

In his revised classification scheme as found in his *Versuch einer Allgemeinen Geschichte der Litteratur* (Attempt at a General History of Literature),<sup>94</sup> which among other things removes Chinese from the Manchu phylum and sets up a separate one for it, we still find Wahl mentioning High and Low Korean. However, its affiliation was changed to the phylum of Turko-Tatarian languages under the prediluvial class. Despite this, the reasons for Wahl’s change of mind appear to be purely nonlinguistic:

Nächst dem scheinen *japanische* Landessprache, *annamitisch* oder *tungkinische* Landessprache, samt den Mundarten davon in Caubang und Cochinsina, hoch und platt *koreisch*, zu dem tatarischen Stamm das meiste Recht, in Absicht des Volksursprungs, zu haben.<sup>95</sup>

91 Rüdiger, *Grundriß*, 98–99, §204.

92 Taken from the entry on English in Rüdiger, *Grundriß*, 58.

93 Leipzig: Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf, 1784.

94 2 vols. (Erfurt: Georg Adam Kayser, 1787–88).

95 Wahl, *Versuch*, 17.

*Lorenzo Hervás 1784/86*

The *Catalogo delle lingue conosciute e notizia della loro affinità, e diversità* (Catalogue of the Known Languages, and Remarks on Their Affinity and Diversity)<sup>96</sup> of Spanish ex-Jesuit Lorenzo Hervás (1735–1809) contains no data of Korean as such, but demonstrates what kind of picture one of the greatest language scholars of his time was able to draw from working with the meager sources available in the 1780s.

Generally, Hervás assumes a close relationship between Korea, its language and script with the Manchus—primarily out of historical reasons, as is apparent from the following:

Sebbene nella penisola della Corea in oggi d' alcune famiglie, o sia piccola nazione si parli un dialetto Cinese, pure è indubitabile, che il linguaggio propriamente Coreese, o Coreano à dialetto Tartaro, perchè, come si rileva dal testo degli Annali Cinesi da Lei citato, la Corea abitossi anticamente dalla Colonia Tartara *Kan-kiu-bi*, e nell' anno 1122. avanti all' Era Cristiana *On-vang* Fondatore della terza dinastia Imperiale vi diede a *Ki-tse* l' investitura di Re della Corea feudatario della Cina.<sup>97</sup>

Faced with an observation to the contrary in du Halde (cf. above), a solution is quickly found in assuming dialectal »corruption« and a seeming confirmation of the relationship likewise, namely in the appellation of the country:

I Coreani (secondo il P. Regis) non intendono il Tartaro, nè il Cinese: tuttavia è credibile, che essi parlino un dialetto assai corrotto del *Mancheü*. In *Mancheü Koron* significa regno, e probabilmente da *Koron* viene *Korea*, o *Corea*.<sup>98</sup>

Drawing upon Hamel, Hervás even manages to discover »linguistic evidence«:

L' Hamel Secretario della nave Olandese, che nel 1653. naufragò in un' isola de' Coreesi, e fra questi dimorò quasi tredici anni, dice, che nella lingua Coreese una stessa cosa si esprime con molte parole sinonime; e ciò succede ancora nella lingua *Mancheü*.<sup>99</sup>

The case of Manchu is illustrated by a variety of words for 'dog' (pp. 136–137, §214), while for Korean nothing but Hamel's statement was available. In any case, this scarce evidence was apparently sufficient for him to speak of »the Koreans, who likely speak the Manchu language« from then on.<sup>100</sup> The language being dealt with, he continues with the writing systems used in Korea:

Lo stesso Hamel dice, che in Corea si usano tre sorta di caratteri. cioè i Cinesi, i quali adoperansi ne' libri, e ne' pubblici affari. Ci sono altri alquanto simili agli Europei (ed in ciò ancora i Coreesi convengono co' *Mancheü*, come si vedra in appresso), e se ne servono i Grandi, i Nobili, ed i Governatori ne' loro interessi. La terza sorta, che è la più rozza, e facile, n' è propria delle donne, e del volgo.<sup>101</sup>

96 Cesena: Gregorio Biasini, 1784.

97 Hervás, *Catalogo*, 110–111. *Kan-kiu-bi* is an error for *Kau-kiu-li*, i.e. Gaojuli, that is Koguryō 高句麗; *On-vang*, i.e. *Wu wang* 武王; *Ki-tse*, i.e. Jizi, corresponds to Kija 箕子.

98 Hervás, *Catalogo*, 135. *Koron*, i.e. Manchu *gurun* 'country; ruling house'.

99 Hervás, *Catalogo*, 135.

100 »Coreesi, che probabilmente parlano la lingua *Mancheü*«, in Hervás, *Catalogo*, 141.

101 Hervás, *Catalogo*, 135–136. For *Mancheü* read *Mancheü*.

To this there also belongs a note on an earlier page:

La lingua Coreese scrivesi con caratteri particolari. I Letteratti Coreesi studiano la lingua Letterata Cinese, ed usano i caratteri Cinesi. Dicesi che nella Corea sia una scrittura Simbolica, e propria de' Ministri per gli affari politici: ma io credo, che sia la Scrittura Tartara alquanto sfigurata.<sup>102</sup>

Hervás thus had three entirely different scripts in mind: a native Korean one, Chinese writing and a »Tartar« one albeit in a somewhat distorted form—probably on the Mongolian-Manchu model.

Further linguistic studies by Hervás appeared over the following years, most of which contain little of relevance here.<sup>103</sup> A noteworthy exception is Hervás' *Aritmetica delle nazioni e divisione del tempo fra l' orientali* (Arithmetics of the nations and the division of time among the Orientals; Cesena: Gregorio Biasini, 1786), which was hitherto the only of his linguistic works to receive attention in the context of Korean. Nevertheless, certain aspects remain unsolved to the present day.

The relevant paragraphs are as follows, again in abbreviated form, as the remainder of the entries is found in the comparative tables under Pallas further below:

320. *Numerali di Borneo.*

1. ana. ¶	2. toue. toul. ¶	3. sevve. sui. ¶	[...]
8. joderp. jadarp. ¶	9. agop, ahob. ¶	10. jaer.	

321. *Della Corea Cinese*

1. jagner.	2. tougi. ¶	3. socsom. ¶	[...]
70000. tsiroock. ¶	80000. paerroock. ¶	100000. jirpooch.	

I numerali di Borneo, e della Corea Cinese sono chiaramente affini; poichè i nomi de' numeri 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 hanno le stesse lettere iniziali. Ne' numerate Coreesi il nome del numero 3. incomincia con *s* come ne' Cinesi del numero 302. e poi ne' numeri 300, 3000, e 30000 si scuopre la voce Cinese *san*. Ancora ne' numeri 400, 4000, 40000, si scuopre la lettera *s* iniziale del nome Cinese *se*. che significa quattro. Parimente ne' numeri 700, 7000, e 70000 si scuopre la lettera *t* iniziale del nome Cinese *tsi* sette, e ne' numeri 800, 8000, e 80000 si scuopre la sillaba *pa*, che in Cinese significa otto. ed ultimamente nel numero 900. si ha la lettera *ke*, che è iniziale del nome Cinese *kieu* nove.<sup>104</sup>

Hervás thus noticed the correspondences between the Chinese numerals and the Sino-Korean ones.<sup>105</sup> By far more striking, however, is the other affinity he discovered: that of the Sino-Korean ones with those of—out of all possible places in the world—Borneo!

102 Hervás, *Catalogo*, 111n(a).

103 They are: *Origine formazione, meccanismo, ed armonia degl' idiomi* [Origin, Formation, Mechanism and Harmony of Languages] (Cesena: Gregorio Biasini, 1785); *Vocabolario poligloto* [Polyglot Vocabulary] (Cesena: Gregorio Biasini, 1787); and *Saggio pratico delle lingue* [Practical Essay on Languages] (Cesena: Gregorio Biasini, 1787).

104 Hervás, *Aritmetica*, 148–149.

105 He uses the following set taken from du Halde (*Description*, 2: 238): *i* '1', *eul* '2', *san* '3', *ssë* '4', *oii* ~ *ii* '5', *loii* ~ *lii* '6', *tsi* '7', *pa* '8', *kieü* '9', *che* '10'. Cf. *Aritmetica*, p. 145, #302.

Unlike Ogura, Adami mentions Hervás' classification of one set as that of Borneo, but offers no explanation.<sup>106</sup> Before proposing a solution to this long-standing puzzle, it is however necessary to pinpoint the exact source Hervás was using. Ogura, Adami and Aalto all assume the numerals have been taken from Witsen,<sup>107</sup> but this is highly doubtful as under closer scrutiny his forms show a number of deviations from Witsen. Almost all of these can be easily explained, however, if an intermediate is assumed: Schultze's *Sprachmeister* of 1748.

Had Witsen been the actual source of the numerals in Set 1, one would expect »toek« instead of »touk«. Schultze on the other hand gives exactly this spelling. The remainder is hardly decisive. However, the case is more obvious with Set 2: Hervás skipped 9,000 and 90,000 for some reason, probably accidentally. His word for 80,000 was originally given as that for 90,000 in Witsen; but in fact Hervás' deviation is a correction here, as the words for 600,000, 800,000 and 900,000 (or 60,000, 80,000 and 90,000 according to Witsen) are mixed up. Furthermore, Hervás introduces a number of new mistakes: »tou[lg]i«, »dosco«, »mah[a]n«, »jirgum«, »jadam«, »haham[ ]ahan« and »soatcien«. However, certain indicators of his source are now cases like »jagner«, »paalpeik«, »tsi[el]rtcien«, »paerpoock« or »jirpoock«, which cannot but go back to Schultze rather than to Witsen as such. Everything considered, we have an obvious case of *Sprachmeister* acting as an intermediate here—which is unsurprising, as at no time was it as rare as the editions of Witsen's work.<sup>108</sup>

Coming back to the riddle posed by Borneo, *Sprachmeister* finally provides us with a solution: The set quoted as that of Borneo by Hervás is given here under the heading »Nach der Vornehmen Aussprache«, i.e. »Following the nobles' pronunciation«. However, this is just like the entire main text of Schultze's work in Fraktur. Capital <B> and <V> in Fraktur resemble each other to a considerable extent, with varying degrees depending on the exact font. If the two letters as found in *Sprachmeister* are given next to each other—as is done below—confusion is rather unlikely. Even if not so, the context usually provides enough hints as to which of the two is intended. All this does not necessarily apply, however, as soon as <V> appears in isolation, with no <B> in its proximity to contrast it with and in a word with which a non-native speaker might well have been unacquainted. In short: Hervás apparently misread »Vornehmen« as »Bornehmen«, interpreting this non-existing word as referring to (the people of) Borneo. As the heading contains nothing specifically referring to Korea it was thus misinterpreted as starting the entry of a new language, instead of marking the beginning of a sub-entry of the previous one.

106 Ogura, »Chösen goi«, 49, and *Gogakushi*, 69; Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 20 and 69.

107 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 20; Ogura, »Chösen goi«, 49; Aalto, »Proposals«, 19. Ogura, »Wakansho«, 76 even names Pallas as Hervás' source—as long as »Pallas« here is not merely an error for »Witsen«—but this is chronologically impossible.

108 Note also that Hervás refers to *Sprachmeister* explicitly in some of his other works but also in his *Aritmetica*, 134 and 138, thus supporting the above scenario.

»Nach der Vornehmen Aussprache«

»V« *versus* »B«

**Nach der Vornehmen Aussprache.**



Hervás' undoubtedly most interesting works on Korean date from the first years of the 19th century however, which will be treated in detail on another occasion (cf. the outlook below).

*Peter Simon Pallas 1786/87–89*

Hardly in need of an introduction is the comparative dictionary initiated by Catherine the Great (1729–1796) and published under the name of its involuntary editor, the German naturalist Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811): *Сравнительные словари всѣхъ языковъ и нарѣчій* (Comparative Vocabularies of All Languages and Dialects), perhaps better known under its Latin title *Linguarum Totius Orbis Vocabularia Comparativa* (Comparative Vocabularies of the Languages of the Entire World).<sup>109</sup>

Quantitatively speaking, linguistics plays a rather minor role in the work of Pallas, who even considered himself inapt for carrying out the orders received; therefore, there is no need to repeat the harsh criticism this work has received almost since the day of its publication. It defects are apparent at first sight and in any case, Pallas, who was working under considerable pressure, cannot be blamed for their entirety. In fact, the final product did not necessarily reflect his own ideas and preferences in its entirety anyway.<sup>110</sup>

Of relevance to us in *Vocabularia* are: (1) twelve words given under language #175 (Корейскіи). Apart from the last one—which is not actually Korean—all of these are in the first volume. (2) The appendix on numerals in volume II has two sets containing Korean: one properly labeled 'Korean' (#183: Корейскіи) and another one strangely referred to as 'Sinhalese' (#182: Сингалскіи), as already noted by Ogura and Adami.<sup>111</sup>

Regarding the non-numerals, most scholars so far have assumed that these were taken from Witsen. Thus, Ogura states that »almost all« are from Witsen but names not a single exception or possible source. Furthermore, while giving the total number of non-numerals as twelve, his list in fact includes only eleven—the single problematic case in volume II was disposed of in silence. Later, all items are claimed to be taken from Witsen. In more recent times, Aalto and others likewise refer to Witsen.<sup>112</sup>

109 2 vols. (St. Petersburg: Johannes Carolus Schnoor, 1786/87–89).

110 For this and other aspects of Pallas' *Vocabularia* see the discussion in Folkwart Wendland, *Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811). Materialien einer Biographie* [Peter Simon Pallas (1741–1811). Materials for a Biography], 2 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1992), 1: 491–504.

111 Ogura, »Chōsen goi«, 48–49; Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 17.

112 See Ogura, »Chōsen goi«, 48 (the list is found on pp. 66–91) and *Cogakushi*, 69; Aalto, »Proposals«, 19.

However, Adami's careful study of the words given as Korean in Pallas already demonstrated that this is doubtful: The single word found in volume II is neither found in Witsen nor Korean to begin with. Furthermore, the selection of Korean words—only eleven despite the much higher number provided by Witsen—is in need of an explanation.<sup>113</sup> Aalto similarly writes: »It remains unclear why Korean words are quoted only under Nos. 1, 2, 14, 16, 18, 20, 40, 75, 76, 98, 100 [sic], 112, 248.«<sup>114</sup>

Adami's assumption that Pallas did not work directly with Witsen's work but rather with some intermediary source can now be finally confirmed since Rüdiger 1782 has been reclaimed from oblivion. As we saw above, Rüdiger's specimen contains only *twelve* non-numerals, which match almost perfectly the selection in Pallas:

	<i>Pallas (vol. 1)</i>	<i>Rüdiger</i>	<i>Witsen</i>
'god'	ПОНТЬХАА (#1, 3)	pontchaa	Pontchaa
'heaven'	ГАНЕЛЬ (#2, 7)	hanel	Hanel
'man'	СЯРАМЪ (#14, 45)	sacram	Sacram
'head'	ТАИВОРЪ (#16, 51)	taigwor	Taigwor
'nose'	КО (#18, 58)	Koo	Koo
'eye'	ДОЕНЬ (#20, 64)	doen	Doen
'foot'	ПАЕЛЬ (#40, 126)	Pael	Pael
'sun'	ГАЙ (#75, 237)	Hay	Hay
'moon'	ТАЕЛЬ (#76, 240)	Tael	Tael
'water'	МОЕТЬ (#98, 309)	moet [sic!]	Moel
'earth'	—	moet	Moet
'fire'	ПОСЛЬ (#112, 354)	Poel	Poel
	<i>Pallas (vol. 2)</i>	<i>Rüdiger</i>	<i>Witsen</i>
'you'	ИТЕАНЬ (#248, 385)	—	—

As the words for 'water' and 'earth' are both written »moet« by Rüdiger, the second was apparently considered to be an error and therefore omitted. This is the only discrepancy between Rüdiger and Pallas, the remainder is entirely unproblematic and the case thus clear. This leaves us with the mysterious ИТЕАНЬ 'you' for which no corresponding word exists in Witsen. Unlike Ogura, Adami admits not having been able to verify its origin.<sup>115</sup> But where does the word come from? No entirely satisfactory answer can be given at this point, though the »donor language« is easily identified: Cora, a Uto-Aztecan language spoken in Mexico. Ultimately, it likely goes back to Jesuit Joseph de Ortega's *Vocabulario en lengua Castellana y Cora* (Dictionary in the Spanish and Cora Languages; Mexico 1732)

113 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 18.

114 Aalto, »Proposals«, 19. He thus also includes #100 in his list, but this must be an error. No word is given under Korean in this entry (cf. *Vocabularia*, I: 316).

115 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 18.

wherein *itean* is explained as a first (!) person plural (!) pronoun. As we are dealing with a pronoun in both cases and have a perfect match in form as well as a donor language going by a name not exactly dissimilar to the name of Korea, the only plausible explanation is a confusion of Cora with Korean at some point in the process of compilation (possibly via an abbreviated and thus ambiguous form such as »Kop«).

Secondly, regarding the numerals in volume II, the split of Korean into Korean proper and another entirely unrelated language is reminiscent of Hervás' »Borneo« and indeed the two sources do agree at least as to which set is Korean and which is foreign. However, while Hervás' »Borneo« can easily be explained, a cogent explanation is difficult to establish in the case of Pallas. Volume 2 does not contain a single word of Sinhalese in the main section, but the first one does, and indeed they are what their designation claims them to be.<sup>116</sup> Nothing here suggests a solution to the riddle.<sup>117</sup>

Be that as it may, it is possible to name the source for the numerals. Rüdiger is impossible this time: Where Pallas has two variants for the same numeral in Set 1, Witsen, Schultze and Hervás all provide both; Rüdiger on the contrary does not. While Туль '2' could hint at either Schultze or Hervás, Себѳѳ '3' must be taken from the latter, which retains <vv>. As Adami pointed out, the fact that <v> is interpreted as [b] and thus rewritten as <ō> here hints at a Spanish source<sup>118</sup>—or, as it turns out, rather a non-Spanish source authored by a Spaniard.

116 The Sinhalese words in vol. 1, with one exception copied from Rüdiger, *Grundriß*, 91, §186, are as follows: #1 Девііō (Rüdiger, *a: devijoo* 'god'), #2 Аҫаа (b: *abasa* 'heaven'), #3 Аппаа (f: *appa* 'father'), #5 Пурре (f: *putre* 'son'), #8 Садуларі (o: *sabondarii* 'sister'), #14 Миницá (h: *minibaa* 'man'), #16 Олува (p: *oluva* 'head'), #75 Ира (f: *ira* 'sun'), #76 Ганда (g: *banda* 'moon'), #97 Буми (c: *bumi* 'earth'). Finally, #40 Паé (z: *pae* 'foot') is not Sinhalese. It is likewise from Rüdiger, *Grundriß*, 90, §184 (»Balabandisch«), but here merely an erroneous repetition of the previous entry (#173, Балабандаски).

117 Suffice to say for the time being that the appendix on numerals also contains numerous other problems deserving closer study—even the double entry immediately following Korean accidentally mixes up the series of numerals originally given by Rüdiger and Hervás.

118 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 19.

## Numerals, Set 1

	<i>Pallas</i>	<i>Hervás</i>	<i>Rüdiger</i>	<i>Schultze</i>	<i>Witsen</i>
'1'	Ана (#274)	ana	ana	Ana	Ana
'2'	Туе Туль (#275)	toue, toul	toue	Toue, Toul	Toue, Toel
'3'	СеббѢ Сѹе (#276)	seyve, <sup>119</sup> suĭ	suy	Seve, Suy	Sevve, Suy
'4'	ДеуѢ (#277)	deuye	deuye	Deuye	Deiye
'5'	Тассеть (#278)	tasset	tasset	Tasset	Tasset
'6'	Юсеть (#279)	joset, jacet	joset	Joset, Jacet	Joset, jacet
'7'	Иргопь (#280)	jirgop	jirgop	Girgop, Jirgop	Girgop, jirgop
'8'	Юдарпъ (#281)	joderp, jadarp	jadarp	Joderp, jadarp	Joderp, jadarp
'9'	Агопъ (#282)	agop, ahob	agop	Agop, Ahob	Agop, ahob
'10'	Яерь (#283)	jaer	jaer	Jaer	laer

For the second set, even a cursory examination is sufficient to arrive at the same conclusion: The numerals cannot but be taken from Hervás. Ягнѣрь '1' could likewise hint at Schultze and his *Jagner*, but it is telling that Тути '2' fully coincides with Hervás' *tougi* with its dropped *r*, just as Доцко '4' shows the same inversion as Hervás' *doico*. Both deviations are not seen in the other sources.

119 A direct borrowing from Witsen seems most probable at first glance in the case of »sevve«, but this is unnecessary to assume: Hervás generally rewrites <w> as found in *Sprachmeister* as <vv>. Cf. the other numerals on page 149: »svvin«, »jesvvin« < *Sprachmeister* »Swin«, »Jeswyn« < Witsen »Swin«, »jeswyn«.

## Numerals, Set 2

	<i>Pallas</i>	<i>Hervás</i>	<i>Rüdiger</i>	<i>Schultze</i>	<i>Witsen</i>
'1'	Ягнерь (#274)	jagner	jagnir	Jagner	Jagnir
'2'	Туги (#275)	tougi [r > _]	tourgy	Tourgy	Tourgy
'3'	Сокеомь (#276) [read: Соқсомь]	socsom	socsom	Socsom	Socsom
'4'	Доско (#277)	dosco	docso	Docso	Docso
'5'	Казето (#278)	kaseto	caseto	Caseto	Caseto
'6'	Юсельюнь (#279)	joseljone	joseljone	Joseljone	Joseljone
'7'	Їропчилъ (#280)	jeroptchil	jeroptchil	Jeroptchil	Jeroptchil
'8'	Ядерпаль (#281)	jaderpal	jaderpal	Jaderpal	Jaderpal
'9'	Аһопконъ (#282)	ahopcon	ahopcon	Ahopcon	Ahopcon
'10'	Юркинь (#283)	jorchip	jorchip	Jorchip	Jorchip
'20'	—	somer	—	Somer	Somer
'30'	—	schierri, siergan	—	Schierri, Siergan	Schierri, Siergan
'40'	—	mahn [a > _]	—	Mahan	Mahan
'50'	—	svyin	—	Swin	Swin
'60'	—	jegu, jesvyin	—	Jegu, Jeswyn	Jegu, Jeswyn
'70'	—	hierigum, jirgun	—	Hierigum, Jirgun	Hierigum, Jirgun
'80'	—	jader, jadam	—	Jader, Jadarn	Jader, Jadarn
'90'	—	hahamahan [sic!]	—	Haham, Ahan	Haham, Ahan
'100'	Гирши Исшикъ (#284)	hirpee, jiszpeick	hirpee	Hirpee, Jiszpeick	Hirpee, Jyrpeick
'200'	—	jirpeick	—	Jirpeick	Jirpeyck
'300'	—	sampeick	—	Sampeick	Sampeyck
'400'	—	soopeick	—	Soopeick	Soopeyck
'500'	—	opeick	—	Opeick	Opeyck
'600'	—	joeckpeick	—	Joeckpeick	Joeckpeyck
'700'	—	tsirpeick [ʔ > _]	—	tʰsyrpeick	tʰsyrpeyck
'800'	—	paalpeick [c > _]	—	Paalpeick	Paelpeyck
'900'	—	koerpeick	—	Koerpeick	Koerpeyck
'1.000'	Ииртьчѣнь (#285)	jirtcien	jyrtcien	Jirtcien	Jyrtcien
'2.000'	—	jietcien	—	Jyetcien	Jijetcien
'3.000'	—	samtchien	—	Samtcien	Samtcien
'4.000'	—	soatcien	—	Sootcien	Sootcien
'5.000'	—	otcien	—	Otcien	Otcien

'6.000'	—	joeckcien	—	Joeckcien	Joecktcien
'7.000'	—	tsjrtcien [ʔ > _]	—	Tʔsyrtcien [e > _]	tʔSyertcien
'8.000'	—	paertcien	—	Paertcien	Paertcien
'9.000'	—	—	—	Koetcien	Koetcien
'10.000'	—	jūroock	—	Jyroock	Jyroock
'20.000'	—	jūoock	—	Jyoock	Jyoock
'30.000'	—	samoock	—	Samoock	Samoock
'40.000'	—	soeoock	—	Soeoock	Soeoock
'50.000'	—	ooock	—	Ooock	Ooock
'60.000'	—	Koeoock	—	Koeoock	Koeoock [900,000!]
'70.000'	—	tsjroock [ʔ > _]	—	Tʔsʔroock	tʔSiroock
'80.000'	—	Paerroock	—	Joeoock	Joeoock [600,000!]
'90.000'	—	—	—	Paerroock	Paeroock [800,000!]
'100,000'	—	jūrpooock	—	Jyrpooock	Jyooock

Adami already noticed that the way of re-rendering the original transcriptions in Latin script into the Cyrillic alphabet is different for the numerals and non-numerals.<sup>120</sup> Rüdiger does not indicate Witsen as his source and so nothing in *Grundriß* indicates that Dutch orthography is involved. If taken from a German source, it is only natural therefore that <oe> is not read as [u] as in Dutch but literally and thus simply written as <oe> in Cyrillic script.<sup>121</sup> The digraph <ch>, which is understood as [x] and therefore re-written as <x> if taken from Rüdiger following German usage (*pontchaa* > Понтъхаа), on the other hand could as well reflect Dutch usage. If taken from Hervás, however, this is interpreted as in Romance languages: In <chi> it is read as [k] like in Italian (*jonchij* > Юрѣиъ; cf. also the Italian-like treatment of <ci> in *jirtcien* > Ирѣѣиъ) or as [ʃ] like in French (*jeroptchil* > Ёропѣиль).<sup>122</sup> Needless to say, it is not actually the case that all transcriptions in Rüdiger's or Hervás' work follow the orthography of one specific language. However, how were their readers supposed to tell if the spellings were neither unified nor their sources indicated?

Finally, let us have a brief look at the chronology of the works of Hervás and Pallas. Adami concludes that Pallas cannot possibly have used Hervás' work as both were allegedly published at the same time. However, as he himself mentions, the first volume was only

120 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 19.

121 A reading as [o] or [œ] would likewise be possible, but is rather unlikely as Rüdiger generally writes <ö> (i.e. <ö>) in that case.

122 The switch from an Italian to a French reading might be induced by the preceding <pt>, as reading <ch> here as [k] would have resulted in the unlikely consonant cluster [ptk].

finished in 1787,<sup>123</sup> most likely in the very beginning of the year. Hervás' *Aritmetica* on the other hand was published almost exactly one year earlier.<sup>124</sup> Therefore, the two were certainly not published simultaneously. Note also that it was only for the Korean numerals in the *second* volume—published as late as 1789—that Hervás' *Aritmetica* was consulted, thus giving Pallas a fair amount of time. All speculations are rendered unnecessary, however, by a brief note by Pallas at the very end of volume 2, in which he refers to both Hervás' *Aritmetica* and Rüdiger's *Grundriß*.

Everything considered, we can conclude that Witsen was *not* directly consulted for the Korean words (and »Sinhalese« numerals) in the comparative dictionary, but rather the two intermediary sources just mentioned. In substance the materials here are thus anything but new and date from the beginning of the century and in effect from the 1650s and 1660s. The same holds true for the re-arranged edition published shortly after,<sup>125</sup> which does not seem to contain any additional Korean words but which rather retains the erroneous labeling of Итеань 'you' as Korean.<sup>126</sup>

Both editions of the dictionary contain Japanese words collected from castaways; in the new edition there is even a separate section on Japanese for which Daikokuya Kōdayū 大黒屋光太夫 (1751–1828) served as an informant. The latter in fact reports to have met Koreans at Irkutsk<sup>127</sup>—unfortunately however, these and other Koreans in reach were apparently not employed as informants.

To conclude our discussion of Pallas, it seems due to pay attention to Friedrich Adelong's (1768–1843) monograph on the comparative dictionary *Catherinens der Grossen Verdienste um die vergleichende Sprachkunde* (Catherine the Great's Contributions to Comparative Linguistics; St. Petersburg: Friedrich Drechsler, 1815). Adelong here quotes from a manuscript found among the Pallas' papers entitled »Languages and dialects of peoples and tribes deserving in part to be subdivided and in part to be studied and compared« and hitherto left unmentioned in this context.<sup>128</sup> In a list of Asian languages knowledge of which is either incomplete or missing entirely, we find, if only from among slightly more than ten others, an entry for »Die Sprache von *Corea*«. While nothing concrete can

123 Adami, »Koreaforschung«, 20, 17. Both versions of the preface are dated Dec 29, 1786, the year indicated on the title pages varies between 1786 (Latin) and 1787 (Russian).

124 In fact, copies of two different editions are extant: One gives the year 1786 on the title page (with Hervás being described as »Socio della Reale Accademia delle Scienze, ed Antichità di Dublino«) while the other has 1785 instead (here, the description continues: »... e dell' Etrusca di Cortona«). Apart from the title page the two editions appear to be identical, including their dedication, which carries the date of Dec 31st, 1785.

125 *Сравнительный словарь всѣхъ языковъ и нарѣчій, по азбучному порядку расположенный*. 4 vols. (St. Petersburg: s.n., 1790–91).

126 See Pallas, *Linguarium*..., 2: 251.

127 Thus stated in *Hyōmin goran-no ki* 漂民御覽之記 [Record of the *shōgun*'s Inspection of the Castaways], compiled by Katsuragawa Hoshū 桂川甫周 (1754–1809) after Kōdayū's return to Japan in 1792.

128 »Sprachen und Dialecte von Völkern und Stämmen, die theils verschieden, theils untersucht und verglichen zu werden verdienet« (Adelong, *Verdienste*, 104–106).

be reconstructed from this alone, this is at least sufficient to demonstrate Pallas' awareness of the incompleteness or imperfection of his sources—or rather his lack of satisfaction with the status quo. This is an interesting insight into Pallas' stance on the materials available on Korean.

*The Subsequent Decades: An Outlook*

The period that follows—namely from the closing years of the 18th century to the 1830s—is characterized by a wealth of new sources and therefore new data on the Korean language and script to become known in the West. As this will be reconsidered in detail on another occasion, only a rough outline is given in the following.

Firstly, regarding the script, in the second half of the 1790s Isaac Titsingh (1745–1812), the former *Opperhoofd* in Japan and Dutch ambassador to China, returned to Europe and brought with him collections he had acquired abroad. Among these was a copy of Hayashi Shihei's 林子平 (1738–1793) well-known *Sangoku tsūran zūsetsu* 三國通覽圖説 (Illustrated survey of the three countries surrounding Japan; Edo 1786), containing a specimen of *han'gŭl* in the form of a transcription of the *iroha* poem, as was not uncommon for such specimens in Edo period sources. Its publication under the name »Alphabet of Corea« in *The Oriental Collections for January, February, and March, 1799*, thanks to Joseph Hager (1757–1819), was long equated with the introduction of the script to the West.

As a by-product of the French missionaries to China, the year 1790, however, already saw the printing of a Korean version of the Lord's Prayer in Peking along with versions in Chinese and Manchu.<sup>129</sup> At the same time a syllable chart of *han'gŭl* was produced, both with the help of the later martyr Yun Yuil 尹有一 (1760–1795) and both were thereafter sent to Europe. Owing to the romanisations provided alongside the original script, these would soon become the foremost sources on the subject matter for Orientalist Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832), who after several postponements finally published his *Recherches sur les langues tartares* in 1820.

Entirely shrouded in oblivion in this context is one of Hervás' unpublished works that will be treated in extenso in the near future: his *Paleografía Universal*, known in the form of a manuscript dated 1805 (but apparently written over a span of more than a decade). His source on *han'gŭl* was a brief account of the Japanese script printed in Korea towards the end of the 18th century for the use of official interpreters of Japanese—a work which itself has gone largely unnoticed and is nowadays kept in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (shelfmark Borg.cin.400). In the 1830s further accounts of the script together with charts

129 In fact this is merely the Sino-Korean reading of the Lord's Prayer translated into Chinese (cf. already Adelung, *Mithridates*, 1: 533 on this point). The earliest actual translation into Korean to appear in a Western publication is likely the one given by Charles Dallet on a plate in his *Histoire de l'église de Corée* [History of the Church of Korea], 2 vols. (Paris: Victor Palmé, 1874).

were published by the missionaries Karl Gützlaff (1803–1851) and Walter Henry Medhurst (1796–1857), Julius Klaproth and last but not least Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866).

Second, regarding the language, the entirely rewritten and considerably expanded Spanish edition of Hervás' *Catálogo*<sup>130</sup> contains an updated account of Korean, including a brief and regrettably neglected reference to his *Paleografía*. Other large scale publications on languages followed, including *Geschichte der neuern Sprachenkunde*,<sup>131</sup> by Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752–1827) and especially the eminently important *Mithridates oder allgemeine Sprachenkunde*, started by Johann Christoph Adelung (1732–1806) and continued after his death by Johann Severin Vater, whose correspondence reveals an interest in Korean no lesser than Leibniz's.

Part of the desire of these and other scholars was satisfied by new glossaries that were published. At first, these were part of travelogues: The description of William Robert Broughton's (1762–1821) voyage of discovery during the years 1795 to 1798 was published in 1804, followed twelve years later by that of Basil Hall's (1788–1844) voyage in 1816–17. Approximately at the same time the activity of the aforementioned Klaproth as one of the most prolific early Orientalists reached its peak, culminating in no less than three glossaries of Korean. For the first time Chinese and Japanese sources on Korean were now put into use in Western publications, namely the glossaries found in *Jilin leishi* 鷄林類事 (1103) and *Wakan Sansai zue* 倭漢三才圖會 (1713).

*Kyoto University, Department of Linguistics*

130 Published as *Catálogo de las lenguas de las naciones conocidas, y numeracion, division, y clases de estas segun la diversidad de sus idiomas y dialectos* [Catalogue of the Languages of the Known Nations, Their Enumeration, Division and Classes According to the Diversity of Their Idioms and Dialects], 6 vols. (Madrid: Ranz, 1800–05).

131 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1807.