



Selected materials on Korean from the Siebold Archive in Bochum – Preceded by Some General Remarks Regarding Siebold's Study of Korean

Sven Osterkamp

The present paper introduces several manuscripts related to the Korean language and script from the Siebold Archive at Ruhr University Bochum which have hitherto gone largely unnoticed. After describing the exact nature and content of these materials, their Japanese sources are identified and their role in Siebold's opus magnum *Nippon* is discussed. This is preceded by a number of general remarks concerning Siebold's study of Korean as well as previous scholarship in this field.

While Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866) has an important place both in the history of Japanese–Western relations in general and the (pre-)history of Japanology in particular, it is not possible to do justice to the man and his work if only his contribution to Japanese studies is considered.* Besides the Ainu and the former kingdom of Ryūkyū, for instance, Siebold's interest and scholarship extended to Korea – in fact to such an astonishing degree that it is hard to believe that his work is still often seen in the context of Japan alone.

This is not to say, however, that Siebold's achievements regarding the Korean language and script went entirely unnoticed – important studies by William E. Griffis (1882), Ogura Shinpei (1927, 1929, 1940), Shinmura Izuru (1929, 1938), Hamada Atsushi (1977), Ko Yōnggūn (1978, 1981, 1989), Frits Vos (1983), Yi Kimun (2000), and Ken Vos (2003) all prove the opposite. Nevertheless a number of unsatisfactory aspects remain in the treatment of the relevant writings by both Siebold and Johann Joseph Hoffmann (1805–1878), who was responsible for a considerable part of the study and publication of the materials collected by Siebold after the latter's return to Europe. In the following we will concentrate on four central aspects in need of clarification.

1. Naturally, one is tempted to say, most attention is on the materials in Siebold's opus magnum *Nippon* (1832ff.), the scope of which is indicated by the full title of this work.¹ Likewise commonly recognised are those works that were for the most part contained in *Nippon* but were also published separately in the series *Bibliotheca Japonica*, namely *Tsián dsú wên* (i.e. *Qianziwen*, or *Ch'ōnjamun* 千字文; 1833, = vol. 3), complemented by Hoffmann's edition of 1840, and *Lui hō* (i.e. *Yuhap* 類合; 1838, = vol. 4).

* The author would like to thank the Siebold Archive at Ruhr University Bochum for granting permission to reproduce several manuscript pages from its holdings. Furthermore, the final touches to this paper were done at Kyōto University during a postdoctoral fellowship awarded by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science, to which he likewise extends his gratitude.

¹ It translates to *Nippon – Archive for the description of Japan and its adjacent and tributary territories: Ezo [or Hokkaidō] together with the Southern Kuriles, Karafuto [or Sakhalin], Korea and the Ryūkyūan Islands, according to Japanese and European writings and personal observations.*

The first major problem is that *Nippon* was originally published over an enormously long time span in numerous installments, so that the date(s) of publication for the section on Korea in part, or *Abtheilung*, VII is not apparent at first sight. Ko (1989: 4) and Yi (2000: 124) both assume a *single* date for the whole section, namely some time during the 1840s for the former and approximately the year 1850 for the latter. Both tentative datings are inaccurate, however, and have to be rejected. A careful reading of the section suggests that it was not all published at the same time, and this fact is confirmed by the tables of contents that came with each installment, or *Lieferung* (see Fujita 1977 and Miyazaki 2004, 2005): These clarify that the section on Korea was published in three steps, as part of installments 2, 7 and 8. Their contents and probable dates of publication are as follows:²

² The reasons for the proposed dates of publications are as follows: A detailed review of the first two fascicles, or *Hefte*, is found in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* for 21.4.1834 (1834.65: 641–647). Here 1833 is given as the year of publication, apparently for both (!). Now Körner (1967: 857, note 173) argues indeed that the first fascicle was not published until 1833, and not in 1832 as suggested by its title page and preface, as Siebold is called “Ritter [...] des K. Civilverdienstordens der Bayerischen Krone” in the former – which was only true since 30.11.1832. However, even if we accept 1833 as the actual year of publication, this does not necessarily mean it had not already been printed during the year 1832, with the exception of the title page at most. In a letter to Klaproth dated 22.8.1832 – or in fact an addition to a letter dated 19.8.1832 – Siebold writes: “Die erste Ablieferung des *Nippon* Archivs werde ich mit erster Gelegenheit an Sie absenden” (I will send you the first installment of *Nippon* at the earliest opportunity; Walravens 2002: 100). Somewhat later, in a letter dated 13.9.1832, he writes: “Die erste Lieferung meines *Nippon* werden Sie mittlerweile empfangen haben” (Meanwhile you will have received the first installment of my *Nippon*; Walravens 2002: 107f.). Accordingly, he must have dispatched the first fascicle in late August or early September. And indeed before long we find the following notice in *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* (10: 384) for October, which undoubtedly goes back to Klaproth: “Le premier cahier du *Nippon* de M. le docteur Von Siebold, dédié à M. le B^{on} Van der Cappellen, vient de paraître” (The first fascicle of doctor von Siebold’s *Nippon*, dedicated to Baron van der Capellen, has just appeared). Thus, we might assume that the main text of the first fascicle had been finished in 1832 and that the title page was added, or changed, very late in 1832 or during 1833. Cf. also *Nippon* (III: 17; part of installment 9), which states that the preceding section (pp. 3–16; from installment 1) was published in 1832.

For installment 2, i.e. the second fascicle, the year 1833 appears to be the only option. On the one hand, it cannot be earlier than the first, and on the other hand, Nees von Esenbeck had already received the first two fascicles together no later than 15.1.1834 (Körner 1967: 857, note 173).

Installment 7 contains a notice (Benachrichtigung) dated October 1839 and Hoffmann (1857: 2, note 2) gives the same year for his “Japan’s Bezüge mit der koraischen Halbinsel und mit Schina” (Japan’s relations with the Korean peninsula and China) in this installment. It cannot have been published much later than that, as it was used for the tenth installment of “Manners and Customs of the Japanese” printed shortly afterwards in the *Asiatic Journal* (32 [May–August, 1840]: 240–251).

Installment 8 contains Hoffmann’s German translation of the *Qianziwen*, which was published separately in 1840, and furthermore a map of Korea (plate XV) also bearing the year 1840. As installments 8 and 9 were apparently published together (see Miyazaki 2005: 61), they were probably both printed in 1840. This is confirmed by the entry “Ph. Fr. von Siebold, *Nippon*. [...] Heft 9–12. Leyden 1840. Fol.” among the additions to the Royal Library in Munich for the year 1841 listed in *Gelehrte Anzeigen* (1842.97 [17. May 1842]: 784).

year	installment	contents relating to section VII	
1833	2 (fasc. 2)	VII: 3–44 VII, app.: 1–8 plates I–XIV	[incl. “Sprache und Schrift” and “Wörterverzeichnis”] [“Wörterverzeichnis” and poems in original script] [incl. “Scriptura Cooraiana” (X)]
1839	7 (fasc. 7–8)	VII: 45–161 VII, app.: 9–18	[incl. “ <i>Lui hǒ</i> , eine schinesische Wörtersammlung ...”] [<i>Lui hǒ</i> in original script]
1840	8 (fasc. 9–10)	VII: 165–191 plate XV	[“Tsiän dsü wen oder Buch von tausend Wörtern, ...”] [“Karte von der kōraischen Halbinsel”]

Siebold’s account and glossary of Korean thus goes back to the year 1833. The exact chronology is of utmost importance for a variety of reasons: While the section on Korea is in the seventh and therefore last part of *Nippon*, the important first one-third of it belongs to the earliest parts of *Nippon* to be published – something that cannot be said about the sections on the Ainu and Ryūkyū. This, together with the early publication of the *Tsiän dsü wên* might serve as an indicator either of Siebold’s interest in Korea(n) or at least of the importance he assigned to these matters.

Dating the second installment to the year 1833 also raises another question, namely that of a possible mutual influence of Siebold’s account of Korean and the writings of Julius Klaproth (1783–1835). Within just a decade he published no less than three glossaries of Korean, making use of virtually all the sources available to him, European as well as East Asian ones.³ Of great significance here is the last one of these, for which Klaproth (1832a: 123) provides a detailed list of sources ending with the “Voculaires donnés par Witsen et par M. le docteur de Siebold” (vocabularies given by Witsen and doctor von Siebold). The former is self-explanatory (cf. Witsen 1692, II: 23; 1705, I: 42–63), but to what does the latter refer?

Ogura (1927: 84; 1929: 56; 1940: 70) quotes Klaproth several times and thus unavoidably mentions Siebold, but does not dwell further on the topic. On the contrary, he even states that there is no noteworthy difference in content between Klaproth’s glossaries of 1823 and 1832. According to Ko (1978: 29; 30, note 10), however, the “vocabulary given by doctor von Siebold” refers to *Nippon*, which he deemed possible in view of the relative chronology of the two works as derived from their prefaces: Siebold’s preface to *Nippon* is dated “Februar 1832” and is thus somewhat earlier than that of Klaproth 1832a, which says “12 mai 1832”. In fact, however, Siebold received a copy of Klaproth 1832a from the author himself and expresses his gratitude for it in a letter dated 19.8.1832 (see Walravens 2002: 98), i.e. before the publication even of the first installment, let alone the second one (cf. note 2 above)!

The answer is simple and leads directly to the second problem: the limitation of sources almost entirely to *Nippon*, *Tsiän dsü wên* and *Lui hǒ*. Siebold’s first account of Korean is not to be found in *Nippon*, but goes back as far as 1824, i.e. the year immediately following his arrival in Japan! The treatise in question was originally

³ Klaproth (1823: 333–343; 1829a: 42–48; 1832a: 123–144). The second glossary is rarely mentioned.

written in German and titled “Einige Worte über den Ursprung der Japanesen” (Some words on the origin of the Japanese; Siebold Archive Bochum, 1.145.001).⁴ It was published several times in various forms, apart from the original German also in Dutch, English and French. Körner (1967: 937) merely mentions the Dutch translation of 1832, as does the otherwise comprehensive Siebold bibliography compiled by Eschbach-Szabo (1997: 496, #90), which however also notes the manuscript in Bochum. A fuller, albeit possibly still incomplete list up to the 1897 edition of *Nippon* would at least have to include Klaproth 1829b, 1830 besides Siebold 1832, 1897 and a few anonymous reports published in 1829, 1830 and 1831. Furthermore a translation into Japanese by Kure Shūzō has been available since 1929.

Among these, Klaproth 1830 and Siebold 1832, 1897 are more than just bibliographical curiosities as they retain the comparative study of Japanese, Manchu, Ainu – and Korean. In fact, most of the account of Korean in the chapter “Sprache und Schrift” in *Nippon* is found here already. And as the treatise was sent to Paris for publication in 1826, where it fell to Klaproth to examine it, it is not surprising that he was in a position to make use of part of Siebold’s materials on Korean even before the first installment of *Nippon* appeared. Ko’s (1978: 33) assumption that the information on Korean found in Siebold 1897 is based on the first edition of *Nippon* combined with other materials published since by other scholars, or that it derives from Siebold’s sons (1989: 5), has to be rejected. As should be obvious from the above, it has to be attributed to Siebold himself and goes back to a time predating *Nippon*.

To demonstrate the validity of our claim let us compare the following entries from Klaproth 1832a and Siebold’s “Einige Worte”. Examples for the expansion of entries also found in Klaproth 1823/1829a are given in A, while B comprises entirely new ones. None of the underlined words is found in Klaproth 1823/1829a, or any of his sources.⁵

A	<p><i>piaer</i>, <i>piôr</i>, <i>piêr</i> ‘Étoile’ (star; Klaproth 1832a: 124) K130 (334): <i>pjoor</i>, <i>pjeer</i>; S32: <i>Pjoor</i>, <i>Pjeer</i>; S97: <i>Ljoor</i>, <i>Ljeer</i> W (52): <i>Piaer</i> cf. N (29): <i>piêl</i>, <i>piê</i></p>
	<p><i>kaksi</i>, <i>kaghip</i>, <i>kanahe</i>, <i>hiekhiep</i>, <i>kiôdzip</i> ‘Femme’ (woman; Klaproth 1832a: 131) K130 (336): <i>kjoodsjib</i>, <i>kjeedsjib</i>; S32: <i>Kjoodsjib</i>, <i>Kjeedsjib</i>; S97 (295): <i>Kjoodsjib</i>, <i>Kjeedsjib</i> W (52): <i>Kackxie</i>, <i>Hiechep</i>; Br (391): <i>Kageep</i>; WSZ (#61): かんなへ, 加牟奈閉 cf. N (36): <i>dsiê-dsip</i>, <i>kiê</i></p>

⁴ In the manuscript, “Japanesen” was later changed to “Japaner” throughout. The original wording is confirmed in Siebold’s “Epitome” (1826: 79, note 2), the preface of which is dated “Nov. 1824” and thus at the same time serves as an indicator of its early time of writing. For the original dating see also *Verhandelingen* (10, “Voorberigt”: VIII) and most importantly Siebold’s report on his activities in Japan for the year 1824 (Kurihara 2009: 63f., 100); for the late publication in Dutch see *Verhandelingen* (13, “Voorberigt”: [3]–[5]) as well as Siebold’s letter to Klaproth dated 5.9.1830 and edited in Walravens (2002: 93–95).

⁵ Br = Broughton 1804; K130 = Klaproth 1830; N = *Nippon* VII; S32/97 = Siebold 1832/1897, I; W = Witsen 1705, I; WSZ = *Wakan Sansai zue* 和漢三才圖會 (1712) XIII, “Chōsen kokugo” 朝鮮國語.

	<i>ater, ator, <u>namsa</u>, aikie</i> ‘Fils, garçon’ (son, boy; Klaproth 1832a: 132) K130 (336): <i>namssa</i> ; S32: <i>Namsa</i> ; S97 (295): <i>Namsa</i> W (52): <i>Ater, Aickie</i> ; WSZ (#67): あとる, 阿止留 cf. N (36): <i>nam-dsa</i>
B	<i>kogtsyoüg</i> ‘Air’ (air; Klaproth 1832a: 123) K130 (334): <i>kogtsjuug</i> ; S32: <i>Kogtsjüüg</i> ; S97 (294): <i>Koglsjung</i> cf. N (29): <i>küi</i>
	<i>kogou</i> ‘Tu (envers un supérieur)’ (you, towards superiors), <i>doui</i> ‘Tu (envers un inférieur)’ (you, towards inferiors; Klaproth 1832a: 133) K130 (338): <i>kogu, dui</i> ; S32: <i>Koga, Dui</i> ; S97 (297): <i>Koga, Dui</i> cf. N (43): <i>koku, tui</i>
	<i>salas’ta</i> ‘Vivre’ (to live; Klaproth 1832a: 135) K130 (337): <i>ssaras’ta</i> ; S32: <i>Savasta</i> ; S97 (297): <i>Sarasta</i> cf. N (40): <i>salasta</i>

The examples above show that 1) even if we ignore the problem of anachronism, *Nippon* (confined here to the earliest relevant installment) cannot have served as Klaproth’s source and 2) both Siebold 1832 and 1897 contain numerous clerical errors, whereas Klaproth 1830 is fairly reliable and true to the original manuscript (which has: *Pjoor, Pjeer; Kjoodsjib, Kjeedsjib; Namsa; Kogtsjuug; Hoogdsjoo; Kogu, Dui; Saras’ta*). As we shall see below, Siebold’s “Einige Worte” in its various incarnations is also indispensable for a proper understanding of his later writings on Korean.

There are further works by Siebold and Hoffmann that deserve consideration in regard to Korean, such as the former’s *Fauna Japonica* or the latter’s grammars of Japanese.⁶ Also, the early translations of *Nippon* deserve more attention. According to Ko (1989: 6), the section on Korea was first translated in the Russian version (1854) – but what about the French one, which predates it by more than a decade?⁷ Some parts (i.e. VII: 45–57) furthermore saw an early English translation (cf. note 2). The aforementioned are certainly the most significant among the printed ones however.

2. Related to this is the question when did Siebold become interested in Korea(n) and what sources did he have? The romanticized view that an encounter with several shipwrecked Koreans on 17.3.1828 (see *Nippon* VII: 6–9 or also Vos 1983) triggered his interest is not tenable, just as it is hardly the point when Ko (1978: 30; 1981: 2) suggests that his information on Korean came from those shipwrecked Koreans. In part this may well be so, but it is just one of several sources.

⁶ See e.g. the “Tableau synoptique et philologique des reptiles au Japon” (*Reptilia* [1838]: V–VII), which contains numerous Korean names as well, in *han’gül* and romanization. Hoffmann’s grammars (1857, 1867 &c.) all mention Korean transcriptions of Japanese as found in *Waeö yuhae*.

⁷ Two text volumes (I and V) were published, each in two installments. Volume V (1840) apparently contains everything on Korea except for “Tsiän dsü wen” (installment 8). Of great interest are the 55 plates at the end of Vb: while corresponding to pages 1–18 of the original appendix, they are not identical with these. Probably due to the smaller size of the French edition (14×23cm) the plates had to be redone, but Ko Tsching Dschang – i.e. Guo Chengzhang 郭成章, who had been responsible for the lithographical reproductions of East Asian texts in Siebold’s works – had already returned to Batavia in 1836. As a result, the new plates (excluding 19–24) look somewhat coarse, as if done by a European hand.

Likewise, there is no justification, if all sources are considered, for assuming, like Yi (2000: 124), that either Siebold based his account of the Korean script on Klaproth's, or the opposite, namely that Klaproth's *han'gŭl* chart is based on the one Siebold sent to Paris as early as 1824 – as suggested by Ko (1989: 12, note 37).⁸

Siebold's earliest informants were, besides occasional shipwrecked Koreans, Japanese interpreters of the language in the services of Tsushima. A careful reading of his *Nippon* reveals this,⁹ but it is also explicitly mentioned in the comparative table of Japanese, Manchu, Ainu and Korean in his rather early "Einige Worte", where we find the following note:

“Die Baustoffe zu dieser Tabelle sind genommen: [...] Die Koreische Sprache untersuchte ich mit Hülfe eines kundigen Beambten des Fürsten von Tsusima, der viele Jahre als Dolmetscher auf Korea gedient; auch unterhielt ich mich selbst mit Koreern hierüber. Die Japanischen und Jezo-worte sind getreu nach dem Schreib und Sprach-Gebrauche der Japaner, und die Koreischen Worte nach einem Schlüssel der Koreischen Schrift niedergeschrieben.”

(The materials for this table were taken from: [...] *The Korean language* I have examined with the help of a knowledgeable official of the lord of Tsushima who has served many years in Korea as an interpreter; I also talked to Koreans about this myself. The Japanese and Ainu words are written according to the conventions of the language and script of the Japanese, the Korean words according to a key of the Korean script.)

In Siebold's description of this "Schlüssel" in the list of references (1.145.001: 5a) the interpreters' role is likewise apparent:¹⁰

“13.) Schlüssel der Koreischen Schrift aus Korea erhalten und mit Beyhülfe Koreischer Dolmetscher <durch mich> so bearbeitet, daß man mit Hülfe derselben alle Koreischen Bücher im reine {m}/n\ Klange lesen kann. M.S.”

(13. *Key to the Korean script*: received from Korea and modified by me with the help of interpreters of Korean in such a way as to enable you to read all Korean books in their pure pronunciation. Manuscript.)

⁸ Klaproth published two almost entirely identical charts in 1832 (1832a: plate to page 19; 1832b: plate IV). Siebold's *han'gŭl* chart "Scriptura Cooraiana" was similarly published twice in the following year (*Nippon* VII: plate X = installment 2; also in *Tsián dsü wên*).

⁹ In the narrative of the encounter in 1828 we read that Siebold had been acquainted with several officials of Tsushima since earlier (VII: 7), and further: "Durch früheren Umgang mit Kooraiern, so wie durch die Bekanntschaft mit mehreren Japanern, welche in *Tsusima* und *Fusankai* gewesen, hatte ich mir über kooraische Sprache und Schrift [...] einige Kenntniss verschafft" (I had acquired some knowledge pertaining to the Korean language and script through my earlier contacts with Koreans as well as through my acquaintance with several Japanese who had been in Tsushima and Fusankai; VII: 9; on Fusankai cf. note 24 below).

¹⁰ Here and in the following quotes from manuscripts interlinear additions are enclosed by < >, portions deleted by strike-through given in { } and substitution by means of overwriting or deletion of part of a letter indicated by { }/\, with the substituted part or remaining letter in /\.

The influence of Japanese sources is also obvious from several passages in *Nippon* VII, either explicitly or at least under closer scrutiny (see below for examples). In conclusion we can see that as early as 1824 Siebold was working with both Japanese and Korean informants and written sources, both of which contributed to his writings on Korean. The encounter of 1828 might have been the basis for an entertaining anecdote – with valuable by-products for sure – but the beginning of his research predates this event by several years.¹¹

3. Then we must consider Siebold's role and significance in the history of Western studies of Korean – as well as the level of his understanding of Korean. If Siebold is counted, in ignorance of even the most obvious sources, among the “scholars [who] pursued their bookbound search for the language,” while “explorers and merchants were making direct contact with the Koreans themselves” as Pihl (1964: 10) for instance did, it is only natural to end up underestimating him and his work. An examination of his writings leads to a different evaluation: Shinmura (1938: 301f.) considered Siebold's account of Korean in itself as well as his comparative work on Korean and Japanese superficial, but still a pioneering effort with its use of both written sources and direct contact with native speakers. For his time and in view of his predecessors his material is to be seen as a step forward. He is furthermore credited by Griffis (1882: 446) and more recently by Ko (1981: 2) as the first Westerner to present specimens of Korean going beyond simple entries in glossaries which rarely contained more than a single word, and especially an account of Korean grammar, however rudimentary it may have been.

On the other hand, Siebold's role in the history of Western knowledge pertaining to Korean should not be overestimated. Such is certainly the case if he is considered, as he was, for instance, by Kure (1926 [1967–68, II: 287]), Henker et al. (1993: 44/158f., #78) or Chi (2007: 115, note 71) as the first person to introduce the Korean language and/or script to the West – despite the brief historical survey of earlier sources by Siebold himself (see *Nippon* VII: 10)! Neither is true, of course.

Also the amount of material on Korean which he contributed to Western scholarship is by no means a reliable indicator of his own grasp of the language. The following passage from his account of Korean in *Nippon* (VII: 11) may serve to illustrate this:

“Die Namfälle, die übrigens selten bezeichnet werden, kommen meistens als ein-silbige Partikeln am Ende der Wörter vor, als: Genitiv, *na*, *kal* (im Japanischen: *no*, *ka*), Dativ, *i* (im Jap. *he*, *ni*) Accus. *ru*, Abl. *isja*.

Der Genitiv sowie die Adjectiva stehen dem Hauptworte, zu dem sie gehören, vor; z. B. *hai nanta*, Sonnenstral; *sol-na mo*, Tannenbaum; *poto-na mo*, Weidenbaum. *Kun patang*, das grosse Meer, *kôu kiê*, die schöne Frau.

¹¹ Interestingly, Siebold is said to have met Jean-Pierre Abel-Rémusat (1788–1832) in Paris in 1822 (Siebold 1897, I: XIV; but see Körner 1967: 811), whose *Recherches sur les langues Tartares* – containing one of the earliest Western accounts of the Korean script ever – had finally been published two years earlier. Siebold shows no awareness of this work, so presumably Korean was not a matter of interest at the time.

Der Comparativ wird durch Anhängung einer Partikel an das Nenn- oder Fürwort, womit die Vergleichung Statt hat, ausgedrückt; es ist die Partikel *isja*, von, vor, in Hinsicht auf; z. B. *Ji sül-tsan ji tiûng-pal isja kunta*, diese Weinschale ist in Hinsicht auf diese Theeschale gross, d. i. grösser als die Theeschale. Der Superlativ wird durch eine Partikel, welche der Bedeutung von sehr entspricht und dem Adjectiv vorgesetzt wird, gebildet; z. B. *Ji moi idsiêil nopta*, dieser Berg ist sehr hoch.”

(The cases, which incidentally are rarely expressed, usually occur as monosyllabic particles at the end of words, such as: genitive *na*, *kal* [*no*, *ka* in Japanese], dative *i* [*he*, *ni* in Japanese], accusative *ru*, ablative *isja*.

The genitive as well as adjectives precede the corresponding substantives, as for instance: *hai nanta* ‘ray of sunlight’, *sol-na mo* ‘fir tree’, *poto-na mo* ‘willow tree’, *Kun patang* ‘the great sea’, *kôu kiê* ‘the beautiful woman’.

The comparative is expressed by means of suffixation of a particle to the noun or pronoun to which something is compared; it is the particle *isja* ‘from, before, in respect to’, as for instance: *Ji sül-tsan ji tiûng-pal isja kunta* ‘this wine cup is big in respect to this teacup, i.e. is bigger than the teacup’. The superlative is expressed by a particle which in meaning corresponds to ‘very’ and is put before the adjective, as for instance: *Ji moi idsiêil nopta* ‘this mountain is very high’.)

As Ko (1981: 3, note 3) has already pointed out, Siebold’s *kal* is merely a misinterpretation based on the traditional Korean name for the character 之, namely *kal ci*.¹² The Korean gloss *kal* corresponds to the meaning ‘to go’ however, not to the attributive or genitive one Siebold had in mind. The identity of the second “genitive marker” *na* is termed uncertain by Ko, there can be no doubt however that this one also stems from an error, as Hamada had already pointed out earlier (1977: 201) – and as becomes apparent in the following paragraph. Here the words *sol-na mo* and *poto-na mo* are mentioned, with *mo* being interpreted as ‘tree’ and *-na* as a genitive marker. Needless to say, this is erroneous, as both simply contain the word *namwo* ‘tree’ (modern *namu*).¹³

¹² Linguistic examples are given in Yale rather than McCune-Reischauer romanization.

¹³ Siebold’s forms, corresponding to modern *so(l)namu* and *petunamu*, are consistent throughout the section; cf. “Wörterverzeichnis” (VII: 33, #118, #119) and the corresponding entries in original script on page 2 of the appendix. Furthermore, the Sino-Korean reading of 木 ‘tree’ is given as “mo” (VII: 30, #61) and 木 (appendix: 1, #61) respectively. The expected reading would be *mok*, of course, but the misreading here demonstrates precisely what led Siebold to his erroneous segmentation of the tree names. A further possible source for Siebold’s misanalysis is the entry “Tree – Phang na moo” found in the list of “Words obtained from the inhabitants of the West coast of Corea” (Hall 1818: last page), which was of course known to him (cf. *Nippon* VII: 10).

In passing, it should be pointed out that *kôu kiê* for ‘the beautiful woman’ quoted above, is simply the clipped form “kiê” for “kiê-dsip” (cf. glossary; VII: 36, #182) preceded by a likewise clipped form for “kôun”; cf. modern *kowun kyeycip*. Hamada’s (1977: 201) rather far-fetched assumption involving the Sino-Japanese reading (*kôkyū*) of the word *haoqiu* 好逑 ‘good match’ found in the *Shijing* 詩經 is thus unnecessary. Interestingly “Einige Worte” gives the same expression as “Koon Keetsip” instead – especially the latter word’s orthography is reminiscent of Japanese transcriptions, as is most of the material in the tables, including even the Chinese character readings.

Concerning the ablative *isja*, Ko (ibidem) provides no definite explanation but assumes an underlying Chöllado dialect form corresponding to the modern comparative marker *-pota*. Unlike the previous examples, *isja* is certainly not another error, but is easily identified with the ablative particle *-eyse* in its older form *-eysye*. Morpheme segmentation is also problematic elsewhere, thus it is not surprising to find the initial vowel clipped off here. In fact, the same has obviously happened to the dative particle, as Siebold's *i* is simply the older, not yet monophthongized form of modern *-ey*, again without the initial vowel. Finally, there is the accusative *ru* which betrays its route of transmission at first glance: the epenthetic *-u* – the morpheme transcribed is of course *-(l)ul*, without the final *-u* – leaves no doubt that Siebold was working with a Japanese source here, as this is exactly what is found throughout in *kana* renderings of Korean. Finally, this may also explain the final *-a* in *isja*, which likewise has parallels in Japanese transcriptions.¹⁴

The word *idsiêil* to form the superlative of adjectives was correctly identified by Ko (1981: 3, note 4) with modern *ceyil* 第一. The initial *i-* is left unexplained however and instead of assuming a clerical error, a glimpse at “Einige Worte” offers another, more satisfactory, explanation. Here we find almost the same example: “Ji San idseeir nopta. Hic mons perquam altus.” Instead of *moi* (i.e. the now obsolete *mwoy*) the still current Sino-Korean word “San” is used here, and it was apparently only for his account in *Nippon* that Siebold replaced this loanword with its purely Korean counterpart.¹⁵ The earlier variant with “San” now demonstrates where the superfluous and hitherto unexplained *i-* comes from: “Ji San idseeir nopta” should read “Ji San()i dseeir nopta”. After the consonant-final “San” *-i* is to be expected as the nominative marker, so that a further mis-segmentation by Siebold is rendered transparent. Because “San” is substituted with *-y*-final *moi* in *Nippon* however, the error is less apparent, as no additional *-i* is to be expected here.¹⁶

The fact that Siebold's grasp of Korean was rather limited is evidenced by his own words in *Nippon* (VII: 16):

¹⁴ In *Zen'ichi dōjin* 全一道人 (1729) *-eysye* is frequently written イシヤ (see the facsimile in KBKKK 1964: 48.5, 53.6, 61.6f. &c.). The same is true for *Chōsengoyaku* 朝鮮語譯 (copied 1750, see Kishida 2009 for the bilingual text; cf. lines I/4b1, I/12a1, I/17a9 &c.). – The author would like to thank Professor Kishida Fumitaka of Ōsaka University for generously providing him with materials on this valuable work.

¹⁵ Siebold's preference for Korean proper rather than loanwords can also be gleaned from the following quote concerning his “Wörterverzeichnis” (*Nippon* VII: 14): “Das Rein-kooraïsche ist, so weit möglich, von dem Schinesisch-kooraïschen gesäubert” (Korean proper is, as far as possible, purged of Sino-Korean).

¹⁶ Note that we find almost entirely parallel example sentences for Japanese in the comparative table in “Einige Worte” just as in Siebold's roughly contemporary “Epitome”: “*Wutsukusiki onago* foemina pulchra” (beautiful woman; 1826: 103, §21), “*Kono ts'ja wanwa kono kopp' jori futoi* haec patera hoc vitro major” (this teacup/saucer is bigger than this glass; 103, §22), “*Fuzino jamaga ittsi takai* Fusi mons est altissimus” (Mount Fuji is very high; 104, §23) etc. This suggests that the Korean examples constitute translations elicited from (in all likelihood Japanese) informants.

“[D]as Liedchen könnte eher als eine Probe der kooraischen Schreibart dienen, wenn es gelänge, die einzelnen Redetheile desselben zu zergliedern; doch die Schreibweise des *On-mun*, in der es zu Papier gebracht ist, macht es dem der kooraischen Sprache zu wenig Kundigen schwierig, die zu jedem Worte gehörigen Silben zu bestimmen, und so die Worte selbst mit Zuverlässigkeit von einander zu trennen.”

(The song could better serve as a specimen of the Korean way of composition if only we succeeded in analyzing the parts of speech of the same. The notation in *ōnmun* in which it is written renders it difficult for those insufficiently acquainted with the Korean language to figure out the syllables belonging to each word, and thereby separate the words from each other with certainty.)

The song referred to here is the following “kooaische Liedchen” given in several versions: in original *han’gŭl*, in romanized Korean, in a Japanese translation, again romanized, and in a German translation (*Nippon* VII: 14f.; appendix: 6).

세양의알분거시거모밧괴다시업너제밧딤줄롤내야만경그물마자놋고곳보고
웃는나비를잡으라고

“*Siêi-siang ui jal mûn kô si kômo pas kui ta si ôp nai, dsôi mis tai dsûl lul nai ja man kiêng ku mul ma dsa nos ko kos po ko us nun na pui lal dsap u lia ko.*”

“*Sei-sjoo-ni itadsurana mono-ha kumo hoka-ni nai, sono mi-ga siri-kara ito-wo dasi-te, hiroi ami-wo hari, kake-te, hana-wo mi-te warafu tefu-wo kaki-joo-to suru.*”

“Es giebt auf der Welt nichts abscheulicheres als die Spinne, welche aus ihrem Hintern Fäden zieht, und ein breites Netz ausspannt, um den Schmetterling zu umgarnen, der fröhlich die Blumen besucht” (Nothing in this world is more disgusting than the spider, spinning threads from its rear and spanning a wide net to enmesh the butterfly, which lightheartedly comes to see the flowers.)

The comment quoted above together with the romanization of the Korean original, with spacing between almost all syllables, provide us with definite proof that Siebold was not able to segment the text and distinguish word boundaries.¹⁷ The German translation is without doubt based on the Japanese version, which is likely to be the work of one of the Tsushima interpreters.¹⁸

4. Finally, while a number of Korean-related manuscripts in Leiden were introduced, described and in part also reproduced by Shinmura (1929), Vos (1983) and Ko (1989), the relevant manuscripts in Germany have received relatively little attention. In the following, we will thus concentrate on some specimens from the latter category, all of them in the Siebold Archive at the Ruhr University Bochum today – and all without any apparent relation to what is found in *Nippon*. A comprehensive study

¹⁷ The only exceptions to this being *Siêi-siang* and *kômo* – that is, the first word, which is close to its Sino-Japanese counterpart, and the word for ‘spider’, the topic of the song.

¹⁸ Incidentally, later scholars such as Léon de Rosny (1837–1914) fared little better in tackling this song, despite having more sources at their disposal: While recognising 나비 as the word for ‘butterfly’ – his only improvement over Siebold’s analysis –, he mis-identified *Siêi-siang* as “le mot chinois 蜘蛛 *tchi-tchou*” and even introduced new errors in the Japanese version (1881: 591f.).

and edition of these and other relevant manuscripts, including “Einige Worte” as well as those now at Berlin State Library, for instance, are currently in process.

Manuscripts relating to the Korean script

Among the Sieboldiana in Bochum are several charts of the *iroha*¹⁹ transcribed in *han'gŭl*, all to be found under the call number 1.374.000 (see the plates at the end of this article). Even at first glance it is obvious that in terms of quality they are quite different from what is found in Siebold's published works or the materials in the Leiden collection as reproduced by Vos (1983) and Ko (1989) for instance.

Schmidt's description (1989: 281) of these items in her catalogue of the Siebold collection in Bochum is as follows:

“[Notizen zu Korea: 1.] Antwoorden over Corea [2. Erläuterungen zur koreanischen Schrift; 3. kanji mit koreanischer Umschrift und Lesung; 4. han'gŭl mit katakana-Lesung nach dem iroha geordnet; 5.] Deze letters zijn Corejasche iroha [han'gŭl mit Lesung in lateinischen Buchstaben.] (no. 3 trägt den Zusatz: ‘eigenhandig von einem Koraier geschrieben. vSiebold’.)”

([Notes regarding Korea: 1.] Answers about Korea, [2. explanations concerning the Korean script; 3. Chinese characters with transcription in Korean and reading; 4. *han'gŭl* with reading in *katakana*, arranged according to the *iroha*; 5.] These letters are the Korean *iroha* [*han'gŭl* with romanised readings.] [No. 3 carries the note: ‘personally written by a Korean. von Siebold’.]

Item #1 consists of brief answers in Japanese and Dutch translation to some of the ten Dutch questions and topics concerning Korea found on the appended sheet. “Korean letters” are mentioned here, followed by “Korean words”, nothing in this respect is found among the answers however. In all likelihood, the “answers” are thus those materials to be discussed presently.

Item #3 is a single sheet containing a specimen of Chinese and Korean, written by a Korean according to Siebold's comment. Next to the two large characters 天地 their Korean equivalents are given in *han'gŭl*: 하늘 as well as 하늘 and 땅 respectively. For 하늘 a romanized form is also given, reading from top to bottom “ha na l”.²⁰

In the following, we will concentrate on the remaining three items #2, #4 and #5.

¹⁹ I.e. the classical arrangement of the Japanese syllabary in a Buddhist poem of 47 syllables. It is a pangram dating from about the late 10th or early 11th century and contains each syllable distinguished in writing at the time of its creation exactly once.

²⁰ At least part of another manuscript appears to go back to the same encounter with Koreans as this item (see Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sammlung Darmstaedter, Asien 1823 (5), 7b).

Iroha #1: “Corea” (item #4)

Apart from the heading “Corea” in the upper right-hand corner the recto side of this sheet contains the *iroha* poem in Korean transcription, with the reading added in smaller size *katakana*. Whenever pre-modern Japanese works contained a specimen of the Korean script they did not usually include anything genuinely Korean but rather gave a transcription of the *iroha* poem in the script. No source or explanation of any kind is given here, but in view of the letter forms there is little doubt that this is a manuscript copy of the transcribed *iroha* found in Hayashi Shihei’s 林子平 (1738–1793) *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* 三國通覽圖説 printed in 1786.²¹ In fact, it is the same as the “Korean alphabet” published by Joseph Hager (1757–1819) in 1799.²²

Note especially the erroneous arrangement of the *han’gŭl* (but not the *katakana*) version: The poem is arranged in six lines of 7 and one line of 5 syllables, but the fourth and fifth of the 7-syllable lines are inverted. The same error occurs in Hayashi’s original (and likewise Hager 1799).

Iroha #2: “Corea” (item #2)

The next item requires more explanation, but is from the same source as item #4. Again, the letter forms leave no doubt that this version was also taken from *Sangoku*. This time however the transcribed *iroha* is embedded in a Dutch text, which starts on the preceding page. Based on the description of this item by Schmidt (1989: 281), namely “explanations concerning the Korean script”, one would expect the Dutch text to explain the nature of the script and/or the specimen given here. This is not the case however, apart from a few lines on the second page. The text reads as follows:

“[1] Tiosen ligt aan ’t noorder van Kúesúe [?], tússen 35 en 53²³ graad, en omtrent 48 mijlen ver van Jappan. Dit land is van ’t zúiden, tot noord 300 mijlen, van ’t oosten tot westen 90 mijlen, ’t digtste plaats van Jappan {ligt}/ge\`naamt vousankaij”²⁴ ligt 36 graad.

²¹ Note however the slight difference in the *han’gŭl* for Japanese *shi*.

²² Hager took his specimen from Isaac Titsingh’s (1745–1812) copy of *Sangoku*. He refers to *han’gŭl* as an “alphabet, which I have reason to believe is not yet known in Europe” (1799: 88) – but he was mistaken, as missionaries in Peking had already printed a (Sino-)Korean Lord’s Prayer in 1790, which they sent to Europe together with a *han’gŭl* chart. Both were the work of the later martyr Yun Yuil 尹有一 (1760–1795) (regarding their authorship see the letter from Raux to Bertin dated 14.11.1790 [Cordier 1913: 254–257] as well as British Library, Add. 14054) and became the main source on *han’gŭl* not only for Abel-Rémusat (1820) – via Louis-Mathieu Langlès in Paris, one of the original addressees –, but apparently also for Julius Klaproth (1832a; cf. his letter to Siebold dated 2.9.1832, Walravens 2002: 106). At about the same time as Hager Spanish Ex-Jesuit Lorenzo Hervás (1735–1809) was already working with a genuinely Korean source for an account of *han’gŭl* – which will be reclaimed from oblivion on another occasion in the near future.

²³ Probably an error for 43 (cf. *Sangoku* 4a).

²⁴ “vousankaij” = Fusankai 釜山浦. Vos (1983: 12, note 5) assumed that “-kai is probably 街 (Sino-Korean: *ka*), here used in the sense of ‘settlement’” and some early Japanese sources re-interpreted

Zijn hof ligt op 38 graad. aan 't westen van dit land leggen twee groot rivieren, door welke hij word bepaald, tussen dese Rivieren leggen twee hooge bergen, de eene word haktoozan en de andere Tiohakzan genaamd,²⁵ waar door men kan {niet} over land schijnt <naar China> niet te gaan maar dit land in de daad gemaenschap met China heeft.

't geheele land word in 8 provencien verdeeld, namentelijk, Kinkedoo. Kaandoo. Bahajdoo. Tiksakdoo. Terradoo. Keksiakdoo. Beandoo en Hamikiandoo²⁶

[2] daar is nog 't comptoirs van tsoesima, met soldaat bezet, zij zijn almaal <van> tsoesima.

de c[a]racters zijn de volgende

i	lo	ha	ni	ho	he	
to	ti	li	noe	roe	wa	ka
o	io	ta	le	tsoe	ne	na
ra		woe	i	no	o	koe
ia	ma	ke	voe	co	ij	te
a	sa	ki	jú	me	mi	si
		mo	ce	soe		

deze zijn gebrúikelijk bij de g[e]ringe personen dog de Fatsoen lijke man gebrúikt de chineesche ch[a]racters gelijke de Europeesche de Fransche taal.”

-*kai* as Sino-Japanese *kai* 海 ‘sea’. In fact however it is simply from Korean *kay* ‘bay’ prior to its monophthongization. *Fusankai* is amply attested in Japanese sources, including *Chōsen monogatari* (1750, see below) for instance, where it is encountered either in *kana* only (ふさんかい) or as reading aid next to the named characters (e.g. I/1a, II/5a, II/10a &c.). For further attestations of the Japanese form starting with the 15th century see Tsuji (2007: 74).

The underlying Korean form *Pusan-kay* – not fully Sino-Korean **Pusan-pho* – is not only attested as such, for instance in 1617 (Tsuji 2007: 74). It can also be deduced from the fact that the allomorph of the dative particle used with 釜山浦 in *Ch’ōphae sinō* 捷解新語 for instance, one of the Japanese–Korean textbooks used for the training of interpreters in Chosŏn period Korea, is *-yey* (which follows words ending in *-i* or *-y*, but not *-o* for instance; see e.g. its 1676 edition, pp. I/14a6 and I/17a1), as already pointed out by Tsuji (1997: 74, note 29).

Siebold was by far not the first Westerner to speak of “*Fusankai*”, as it is well attested in European sources at least from the 1590s onwards. An early and important printed work is the *Historia de las misiones* by Luis de Guzmán (1544–1605), which refers to “*Fusancay*” (502 &c.) and some other Korean place names in their Japanese forms. From here they found their way into the influential works by François Solier (1558–1628), Jean Crasset (1618–1692) and Pierre-François-Xavier de Charlevoix (1682–1761) for instance, among countless others.

²⁵ “*Tiohakzan*” = *Chōhakuzan* 長白山, i.e. Changbaishan or Paektusan 白頭山. “*haktoozan*” is based on *Hakutōzan* 白登山 as found in *Sangoku* (4b), but of unclear reference. The map of Korea accompanying *Sangoku* does not show any 白登山 – but considers 長白山 and 白頭山 to be two different mountains. It therefore appears plausible that 白登山 is merely an error for 白頭山 based on their homophony in Japanese (登 and 頭 can both be read *tō* in Sino-Japanese).

²⁶ I.e. *Kyōnggido*, *Kangwōndo*, *Hwanghaedo*, *Ch’ungch’ōngdo*, *Chōllado*, *Kyōngsangdo*, *P’yōngando* and *Hamgyōngdo*. Cf. *Sangoku* (4b–5b): ケンキタイ, カアンタイ, バハイ, チグシヤグ, テルラ, ケクシヤグ, ベアン and ハミキヤンタイ. Apart from replacing the incorrect *-tai* タイ with “-doo” throughout, there are thus only minor differences. “*Kinke*” for “*Kenki*” (ケンキ) is probably a mere slip of the pen. See also the discussion of the names in *Nippon* (VII: 20, note 2).

(Chōsen is located north of Kyūshū between [latitude] 35° [N] and 53° [N] and in a distance of about 48 miles from Japan. This land measures 300 miles from South to North, 90 miles from East to West. The place that is closest to Japan, called Fusankai, is on [latitude] 36° [N].

Its capital is located on [latitude] 38° [N]. To the West of this country are two great rivers, by which it is limited. In between these rivers are two high mountains, the one called Hakutōzan, the other Chōhakuzan, which is why it appears impossible to go to China by land although this country indeed holds commerce with China.

The whole country is divided into eight provinces, namely: [...].

There is also the trading post of Tsushima, where soldiers are stationed. They are all from Tsushima.

The letters are the following: [...]

These [letters] are in use among the lowborn, but the respectable man uses the Chinese characters, just as the European [uses] the French language.)

Little effort is required to identify most of the surrounding text – the closing lines on the use of *han'gūl* and Chinese characters is the only obvious exception – as the draft of a partial translation, or perhaps better: paraphrase, of the Korea section in *Sangoku* (4a–7b). The fact that Siebold brought a Dutch translation of *Sangoku* with him from Japan is revealed in his correspondence with Klaproth. In a letter to the same dated 19.8.1832 (edited in Walravens 2002: 97–100) Siebold writes:

“Von *San kokf tsu ran* &c. besitze ich ein japanisches MS., und was Ihre Arbeit vielleicht sehr erleichtert hätte, eine holländische Übersetzung, welche mir von einem sehr kundigen Japaner mitgetheilt wurde.”

(I am in the possession of a Japanese manuscript of *Sangoku tsūran zusetsu* and, what might have simplified your task [of translating this work] considerably, a Dutch translation presented to me by a very knowledgeable Japanese.)

This manuscript covers only a small portion of *Sangoku*, but it is likely related to the (full?) translation Siebold refers to here. Having clarified the nature of the surrounding text, which unfortunately does not contain much to justify the description “explanations concerning the Korean script”, let us come back to the *iroha* itself. This time no reading in *katakana* is provided but a somewhat problematic romanization in Dutch orthography is included: As far as the arrangement is concerned, “o” should precede “wa ka”; the three syllables *mu*, (*y*)*e* (< *we*) and *hi* are left blank, and *so* (after “ta le”) is simply omitted. The transcription of *r*- varies between *l*- (“lo”, “li”, “le”) and *r*- (“roe”, “ra”), the *ha*-row is written *h*- (“ha”, “ho”, “he”) with the exception of *fu* (“voe”). The most interesting characteristics of the transcription are, however, the rendering of *u* as “woe” and that of *ko(y)ete* as “co ij te”.²⁷

²⁷ For “woe” a number of parallel cases from European sources can be adduced, such as “wu” in Meister (1692: plate “Das Japansche A.B.C.”), “wou” in Müller/Bartsch (1694: “Syllabarium Japonicum geminum”), again “wu” in Schultze (1748: 135) or “woe” as in our manuscript in Overmeer Fisscher (1833: plate “Het Japansch Alphabet met zogenaamde Katakane letters”). It is likewise found in other writings of Siebold (e.g. 1826: 103, §21 [“Wutsukusiki” for *utsukushiki* ‘beautiful’]).

The *han'gŭl* version shows the same inversion as with “o” above, so that *wŏ* 우 follows *wa ka* 와가 instead of preceding it. The inversion of lines four and five in the original arrangement of *Sangoku* is taken over here as well. The romanization, however, ignores this inversion which demonstrates clearly that it was done on the basis of the *kana* glosses in *Sangoku*, not the *han'gŭl* which in any case is often hardly legible. This is confirmed by the fact that even when a given romanization and *han'gŭl* spelling refer to the same Japanese syllable, they do not necessarily match; thus, for instance *hwa* 화, originally standing for Japanese *fa* with the older bilabial fricative,²⁸ is glossed as *ha* (based on *Sangoku*'s ㄱ and its more recent pronunciation as *ha*).

Iroha #3: “Corea” (item #5)

This item bears the title “deze letters zijn Corejasche iroha” [“these letters are the Korean *iroha*”] and contains another *iroha* in *han'gŭl*, again with sound glosses in Latin script only. The orthography is again Dutch; of special interest here, apart from “Woe”, for which see note 27, are the two syllables “Kfoe” and “Zoe”.²⁹

i	Ro	Ha	Ni	Ho	He	To
Tsi	Ri	Noe	Roe	O	Wa	Ka
Jo	Ta	Re	So	Tsoe	Ne	Na
Ra	Moe	Woe	ji	No	Oo	Kfoe
Ja	Ma	Ke	Foe	Ko	E	Te
a	Sa	Ki	ú	Me	Mi	Si
e	Vi	Mo	Se	Zoe		

These transcriptions in Roman script are further reminiscent of the earliest alphabetical rendering of Japanese found in the textbook *Irop'a* 伊路波 of 1492. In the sound glosses to the *iroha* song the exceedingly rare *han'gŭl* combination of *wu* ㅜ is used. In light of the parallel transcriptions in Roman script the use of *wu* ㅜ instead of simple *u* 우 here is most likely not due to a difference in vowel quality between Japanese /u/ and Korean /u/ as earlier assumed by Yi (1965: 12). Instead it is an optional labial onglide *preceding* /u/ that is rendered here by means of *w* ㅜ.

²⁸ In the 1676 edition of *Ch'ŏphae sinŏ* (cf. note 24) for instance Japanese *fa* is generally glossed as *hwa* 화, whereas in its 18th century editions it is increasingly replaced by *ha* 하.

²⁹ An early remark concerning spellings like “Kfoe”, noting a fricative heard between velars and *u*, is found in Hoffmann (1857: 16f.). For sources contemporary with Siebold see for instance Overmeer Fisscher's syllabary (1833; cf. note 27), which also has “kfoe” and “gfoe”, or Medhurst's (1830: V and passim) English-based orthography with its “kfoo” and “gfoo”. Parallel spellings in Cyrillic script are likewise found since at least the former half of the 18th century (cf. among others Murayama 1965: 63, 176, 233, #198 etc.). <kf> as a rendering of fully devocalized word-final *-ku* can be traced back even further, and is already found in Engelbert Kaempfer's (1651–1716) writings for instance.

Reciting the *iroha* with voiced-initial *zu* at the end is attested over several centuries from Japanese and foreign sources alike. Overmeer Fisscher's syllabary even gives “zoe” only, without its voiceless initial counterpart (as he otherwise does throughout), but also see the aforementioned *Irop'a*, Rodriguez (1604–1608: 55b), Duret (1613: 915) &c.

At first sight one might be tempted to regard *Sangoku* as the source once more, but on closer inspection this is questionable. Where *Sangoku* has a \triangle -like shape for the circle used for the zero initial \circ and in *h* $\bar{\circ}$, the manuscript here has a closed triangle \triangle instead.³⁰ Where *Sangoku* has *a* $\circ\text{a}$ and *ua* ua (sic!; with \circ as \triangle) for Japanese *ya* and *wo*, the manuscript has the expected *ya* $\circ\text{a}$ and *wō* ua (with \circ as \triangle) – and so on.

As before, the romanizations do not refer to the *han'gūl* next to them but rather to the *kana* sound glosses that must have been in the source of this manuscript but are no longer present. Schmidt's description “*han'gūl* with romanised readings” is therefore somewhat misleading. This and the similarity to *Sangoku's* *iroha* hints at another Japanese source.

The characteristic triangle for the circle is known from several *iroha* versions found in dictionaries such as *Eitai setsuyō mujinzō* 永代節用無盡藏, *Eitai setsuyō taizen mujinzō* 永代節用大全無盡藏, *Kōdai setsuyō taizen mujinzō* 廣大節用大全無盡藏 as well as in *Senkin nanatsu iroha* 千金七ッいろは and Takai Ranzan's 高井蘭山 (1762–1838) *Onkun kanazukai* 音訓國字格 (1799) – although in the latter \triangle is retained for syllables with initial *h*.³¹ There are various slight differences in *han'gūl* shapes, which may help to identify the exact source of the manuscript. Taking the shapes found in the manuscript as the basis, the following table summarises the comparison of eight syllables whose representation differs from the manuscript in one or more of the above-named works.

title	<i>ni</i>	<i>wa</i>	<i>so</i>	<i>tsu</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ku</i>	<i>ya</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>mo</i>
廣大節用大全無盡藏	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
永代節用大全無盡藏	+	+(?)	+	+	+	+	–	+	–
永代節用無盡藏	+	–	+	+	+	+	–	+	+
千金七ッいろは	–	+	–	–	–	–	+	+	+
音訓國字格	+	–	–	+	+	+	+	–	+

Furthermore, *te* in all four works is rather close to ㄸ , i.e. the vertical line in the center is longer than in the manuscript at hand. If this minor difference is disregarded, the most probable source appears to be *Kōdai setsuyō taizen mujinzō* – or a comparable dictionary, as there are numerous other works of its kind not contained in the list of candidates given above.

None of the above manuscripts seems to have left any traces in Siebold's published work and the reasons are clear: The specimens of *han'gūl* given in the Japanese sources

³⁰ This is also true of *si* ㄸ and *no* ㄸ whose initial likewise became \triangle in *Sangoku*.

³¹ The relevant portions of all five works are reproduced in KBKKK (1965: 108, 110, 112, 114–120; also cf. pages 58–62 for a bibliographical outline). Incidentally, Rosny (1864: 290f., note 2) was aware of the transcribed *iroha* in *Eitai setsuyō mujinzō* and commented upon the faultiness of this one and the one in *Sangoku*.

are all severely distorted and thus next to useless for a proper understanding of the script. In 1799 Hager had no better source at hand than *Sangoku*, but Siebold's case is different. Through his association with both Koreans and Japanese interpreters from Tsushima he gained access to a variety of manuscripts and printed works dealing with or at least containing proper *han'gŭl*. The latter category includes the Korean edition of the *Qianziwen* which he brought back with him to Europe,³² and apparently also a copy of the late 18th century (Chinese–)Japanese–Korean dictionary *Waeŏ yuhae* 倭語類解 (henceforth: WY), to which he had access while still in Japan. Already in “Einige Worte” (1.145.001: 5a) and its list of references referred to above we find the following curious note regarding WY:

“12.) Wago-Ruige-Mokurok’.³³ – d: i: Ausführliches Wörterbuch der Koreischen Sprache in 2 Theile (in Korea gedruckt) davon bestehen in Japan nur 2 Exemplare.

³² The circumstances of its acquisition are not narrated in *Nippon* – unlike it is the case with *Yuhap* (for which see *Nippon* VII: 61) –, but Ko (1989: 24) makes the natural assumption that it was a present from one of the shipwrecked Koreans Siebold met. Corroborating evidence comes from a letter to Klaproth dated 19.8.1832: “Mehrals habe ich zu Nagasaki schiffbrüchige Kooraiere kennen gelernt, und diese haben mir unter andern einen in Koorai gedruckten Wortschatz mitgetheilt” (I have repeatedly met shipwrecked Koreans in Nagasaki, and they have presented to me among other things a vocabulary printed in Korea; Walravens 2002: 98). He probably had the same work in mind when he boasts two years prior to this, on 9.10.1830: “Ich besitze unter andern ein Chinesisch Koreisches Wörterbuch, in Korea gedruckt, eine herrliche Ausgabe!” (Among other things I am in the possession of a Chinese–Korean dictionary printed in Korea – a splendid edition!; Walravens 2002: 97). – Now there is no title mentioned here, but for one thing no other work known to Siebold fits the two descriptions and for another we find almost exactly the same wording elsewhere: Briefly after the publication of *Tsián dsú wên* (preface dated November 1833), in a letter to Nees von Esenbeck dated 2.4.1834, Siebold refers to this work as “ein schinesisches und Kooraisches Wörterbuch“ (a Chinese–Korean dictionary; Sammlung Darmstaedter, Asien 1823 (5), leaf 13b).

³³ Nowadays the title is usually given as *Wago ruikai*, but there seems to be nothing to suggest that this had already been the case in the early 19th century. As Siebold undoubtedly received word of this dictionary from one of his Japanese informants, it seems safe to trust him on this point and assume a then-current reading *Wago ruige*. Incidentally Siebold's manuscript diary already contains a brief reference to WY, probably dating from the time when he first learned about its existence. The title is likewise given here as “Wago-Rui-ge Moku-rok” (Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Sieboldiana 271, leaf 153b).

The addition of the word “Mokurok”, that is *mokuroku* 目録 ‘index’, is easily explained: As WY lacks a title page as such, both volumes start directly with an index instead – which naturally carries the heading “倭語類解目録”. While the actual title should have been obvious from the running title in the central fold of each page and the beginning of the main body of each volume, the characters 目録 here were misinterpreted as being part of the dictionary's title. This is confirmed by installment 2 of *Nippon* (1833), where “倭語類解目録” (VII, appendix: 6) is transcribed and translated as follows (VII: 44): “*Wa gjo* [!] *ruí tok* [!] *mok rok*, Verzeichniss japanischer Redensarten mit (koraischer) Uebersetzung” (Index of Japanese expressions with [Korean] translations). This rendering leaves no doubt that 目録 was indeed considered as part of the title by Siebold and/or his informants.

It is only several years later that we eventually find the title freed from the word for ‘index’, namely as “Wei jü luí kiài” (VII: 62 etc. = installment 7 in 1839), or without diacritics simply as “Wei jü

Ich habe Hoffnung eines zu erhalten” [note later added to the above; SO]

(12. *Wago ruige mokuroku*. I.e.: Extensive dictionary of the Korean language in two parts (printed in Korea). There exist only two copies of this work in Japan.

I am hoping to obtain a copy.)

Among his manuscript sources there were several *han ’gŭl* syllable charts,³⁴ some of which had been in Siebold’s possession from at least as early as 1824.³⁵ The above-mentioned chart entitled “*Scriptura Cooraiana*”, which was published twice in 1833, is based on two or more of these earlier manuscripts, judging from the variant letter shapes seen in it.

A manuscript vocabulary of Korean

The next item, call number 1.286.000, is described as follows (Schmidt 1989: 243): “*Einige Koreische Worte. [Koreanisch-japanisch-niederländisches Vokabelverzeichnis von einem Japaner geschrieben]*” (“Some Korean words”. Korean–Japanese–Dutch vocabulary written by a Japanese). Brief as it may be, this covers the central aspects of the manuscript, although the claim that it was written by a Japanese author is rather questionable as we shall see below. What we have here is a trilingual vocabulary, giving from top to bottom on each page Korean words in *katakana*, followed by their equivalents in Japanese and finally Dutch. The glossary spans 27 pages, containing eleven entries each (apart from the last page which ends after the ninth), giving 295 entries in total. Of these, 22 lack a Dutch equivalent, otherwise it is fully trilingual.

The fact that even the Korean portions of the glossary are written in *kana* only hints at a Japanese source, and indeed there is one perfect match among the various Edo period materials on Korean: *Chōsen monogatari* 朝鮮物語 of 1750 (henceforth: CM),³⁶ or

lui kiai” (VII: 166 = installment 8 in 1840), i.e. in its Chinese reading. Both passages were written by Hoffmann, not Siebold himself – and at a time *after* the publication of Walter Henry Medhurst’s (1796–1857) English translation of WY in 1835.

³⁴ Siebold mentions “fünf Originale(n) des Silbenentwurfs, welche mir von Kooraitern und japanischen Dolmetschern dieser Sprache mitgetheilt wurden” (five original syllable charts, presented to me by Koreans and Japanese interpreters of the language; *Nippon* VII: 13; cf. also VII: 64).

³⁵ Cf. *Nippon* (VII: 10, note 11): “Bereits im Jahre 1824 sandte ich von Japan aus ein ähnliches Syllabaire an die Niederländisch-Indische Regierung, mit dem Gesuche, dasselbe nebst einem Geleitsbriefe dem Königl. Institut zu Paris zukommen zu lassen” (As early as in 1824 I had already sent a similar syllabary from Japan to the Netherlands Indies government, with the request to forward it together with an accompanying letter to the Royal Institute in Paris). See also his “*Epitome*” (1826: 83, note 1), originally written in 1824, and the letter to Klaproth dated 19.8.1832 (Walravens 2002: 98f.). The year given in the latter is actually 1825, but in view of all other evidence, including a draft of the letter to Paris dated September 1824 – which likewise mentions *several* charts – (Sammlung Darmstaedter, *Asien* 1823 (5), leaves 50a–52b), this appears to be erroneous.

³⁶ This is not identical to the one translated and published in 1876 as “*Der Feldzug der Japaner gegen Corea im Jahre 1597*” (*Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-*

rather one section in it entitled “Chōsen-no kokugo” 朝鮮の國語 (V/8b–16a). Here a Japanese–Korean glossary of 298 entries is provided, and again, the Korean equivalents are rendered in *kana* only. As a thorough comparison of the two glossaries shows, there is not a single entry in the manuscript that is not also present in CM. (Conversely, the three entries #13, #14 and #54 are lacking altogether in the manuscript.)

Orthographically the glossary is characterised by its use of ー as a long vowel marker throughout, often going as far as mechanically replacing postvocalic *-u* regardless of the preceding vowel. Thus *fūchō* ふうてう (V/13a, #183), for instance, is rewritten as フーテー (#199), giving incorrect **fūtē*, or *kōhenmaru* かうへんまる (V/15b, #285) changed to **kāhenkiru* カーヘンキル (#282).³⁷ The same kind of error is also found in the Japanese portions of the glossary. Also revealing are the many misidentifications of cursive characters, which at the same time confirm the natural assumption that the Dutch translations are based on the Japanese, not the Korean expressions.³⁸

Considering this and the general appearance of the manuscript, it is certainly *not* to be attributed to a Japanese author, but rather to a foreigner with an imperfect understanding of the language and script.

Now the “Wörterverzeichnis” in *Nippon* (VII: 29–44) has repeatedly been claimed to have some relation to the glossary in CM and thus also possibly to the manuscript at hand. Shinmura (1929 [1972: 171]) claims that it is the material on Korean in CM that Siebold used, “among other things, for his comparative studies”. What exactly is meant by this is rather unclear, however, as the *overt* use of CM’s glossary is difficult to find in *Nippon* or elsewhere, including his “Eigene Worte” with its comparative tables. Later, Shinmura (1938 [1972: 301]) returns to this topic, saying that Siebold extracted the ca. 300 Korean words from CM. Again, there is nothing concrete – and it is highly unlikely that he was aware of the manuscript under discussion here.

Ogura (1927 [1975: 78f.]) briefly discusses the “Wörterverzeichniss” and draws attention to the titles of six Korean and Japanese works following the glossary in original script (*Nippon* VII, appendix: 6).³⁹ While CM is included in this list, Ogura concen-

historische Classe 24: 71–166, 25: 235–290). August Pfizmaier, its translator, used a work of the same title printed in Edo in 1849. He was aware of Hoffmann’s translation in *Nippon*, but appears to have had no first-hand knowledge of the original work (cf. page 71, note 4 therein).

³⁷ Cf. *hwochywo* [modern *hwuchwu*] ‘pepper’ and *kecunmal* [< *kecusmal*; modern *kecinmal* < *kecismal*] ‘lie’ (へ in CM is an error for つ).

³⁸ Such as “黒ヲ こむた” (V/10b, #87) turning into “コムタ 墨 ink” (ink; #108), “峯ヲ ぼぐ” (V/8b, #16) into “ボグ 岸 kúst” (coast; #116) or “日ヲ みる” (V/9a, #25) into “キル 同 eijland” (island; #125; the preceding entry is for ‘island’). The Dutch translations correspond to the wrong characters and thus contradict the Korean forms (cf. modern *kemta* ‘black’ and Sino-Korean *pong* 峯 and *il* 日).

³⁹ The romanized glossary is likewise followed by some titles, but here (*Nippon* VII: 44) there are only five – *Qianziwen* is missing – and the order does not coincide with that of the appendix either. Furthermore both lists comprise works which do not contain any Korean apart from a few place names at best. It is thus problematic from the beginning to regard it as some sort of bibliography of sources used to compile the glossary.

trates on *Qianziwen* and *Waeõ yuhae* as likely sources of the Korean words in the glossary. However, his assumption (1927 [1975: 79]) that entries like those for *kutabire* 草臥 ‘fatigue’, *rachi aku* 埒明 ‘to settle’ or *sayõ* 左様 ‘thus’ were taken from WY is incorrect, as no such entries are to be found anywhere in that dictionary.⁴⁰ In a somewhat later article Ogura (1929 [1975: 18f.]) again names WY as the likely source of some items, but this time he adds that quite a number of them were apparently taken from Witsen and Klaproth. Finally, Ko (1978: 31) regards the list of titles as a bibliography of consulted works with reference to Ogura 1929.

With over 560 entries, the glossary is almost twice as large as that in CM (298 entries).⁴¹ What does Siebold himself have to say about his sources?

“Dem grössten Theile nach sind die Wörter durch mich und meine japanischen Freunde aus dem Umgange mit Kooraiern gesammelt, welche dieselben in ihrer *Onmunschrift* mit beigefügter Erklärung durch die schinesischen Charaktere, schrieben. Einige Wörter und viele der schinesisch-kooraïschen sind aus dem erwähnten *Tsiân dsú-wên* genommen; die aus dem Vocabulaire des Herrn Klaproth füllten dabei eine grosse Lücke aus. Da wir sie jedoch, wie Herr Klaproth selbst bemerkt, weil ihre Aussprache sich auf eine Angabe in schinesischen Charakteren gründet, nicht durchgehends für richtig mögen gelten lassen, glaubten wir sie durch Cursivschrift von den übrigen unterscheiden zu müssen.”

(For the most part these words were collected by myself and my Japanese friends through our contact with the Koreans, who wrote them down in their *õnmun* script with explanations in Chinese characters added. A number of [purely Korean] words and many of the Sino-Korean ones are taken from the above-mentioned *Tsiân dsú-wên*; those taken from the glossary of Klaproth filled a large gap in this respect. As we cannot however consider them correct in their entirety, as their pronunciation is based on renderings in Chinese characters – as mentioned by Klaproth himself –, we found it necessary to distinguish them from the others by using italics.)

The above passage (*Nippon* VII: 14) together with an accompanying footnote which is omitted here provides us with two written sources: *Tsiân dsú wên*, published in the same year as installment 2, and the glossary in Klaproth 1832. Items from the latter are given in italics and are thus easily recognised, those from the former and the remainder are unmarked however. Now a closer comparison with Siebold’s *Tsiân dsú wên* indeed yields an explanation for a number of problematic items in “Wörterver-

⁴⁰ Only the word *kutabire* can be found here (I/21b). However, neither the Chinese head word nor its Korean translational equivalent matches what is given by Siebold.

⁴¹ The number of entries in the “Wörterverzeichnis” is usually given as 454 (Ogura 1940: 71) or 455 (Ko 1978: 31; 1989: 23). The discrepancy does not stem from different editions, as assumed by Ko: #455 is the last *numbered* entry in the romanized glossary, while Ogura probably actually counted the entries in original script as found in the appendix – which in fact number 454, as #393 is missing. In the romanized version #393 and #454 (contentwise included in #453 here) are missing, #169 is miswritten as #179 (its position is correct however, thus giving two entries numbered #179) and #174 is erroneously placed after #163; the actual total is thus 453. In any case, both ignored the 111 *unnumbered* entries that are present in the romanized version only (the one placed between #226 and #227 contains only Japanese however and no Korean).

zeichniss”, especially for the otherwise hard-to-explain clipped forms, such as: *piê* ‘star’ (#8, cf. *Tsián dsú wên* 8/6/4 [page/column/character]), *ka* ‘autumn’ (#23, 1/4/1), *kiê* ‘winter’ (#24, 1/4/3), *nu* ‘evening’ (#31, 13/6/3), *na* ‘country’ (#34, 2/5/2) &c.

A thorough comparison of the remainder with the glossary in CM rules out the option that they are unrelated: Almost all Japanese headwords in CM are found intact in Siebold’s glossary, and even the three entries mentioned by Ogura (1927 [1975: 79]) and quoted above are found here and not in WY (namely as #244, V/14b; #281, V/15b; #278, V/15b). The Korean equivalents are, however, not necessarily identical – and in any case they are given in *han’gŭl* and romanization, not in *kana* as in CM. Also, errors such as in #267 ‘to (get to) know’ (CM V/15a) with the Korean giving its antonym are retained (#313), while entries such as #102 ‘to sell’ and #103 ‘to buy’ in CM (V/11a), which have the Korean equivalents erroneously inversed, were corrected to match Siebold’s entries #338 and #339. We thus see clearly that CM served as a source here, but an *indirect* one: Siebold obviously used CM as a starting point to work with informants – judging from the influence of *kana* renderings of Korean in some cases these were not exclusively native speakers –, having them provide him with *han’gŭl* spellings and, at times, alternatives or corrections.

Blatant errors such as, for example, *sayō* 左様 ‘so, thus’ translated as “Linkisch” (left-like; #386), demonstrate again that the translations are based on the Japanese entries. Our manuscript has correct “zoo” (so, thus; #269) here instead. On the other hand “Wörterzeichniss” does not contain the misidentifications of Chinese characters noted above (see note 38) – in other words: the manuscript at hand does not seem to have played any role in the compilation of the glossary in *Nippon*, though they obviously share a common source.

If the items from Klaproth, *Tsián dsú wên* and CM are disregarded, only relatively few entries remain to be explained. A number of these, such as 404–413 are without doubt based on “Einige Worte”, or probably rather on the materials Siebold collected at the time of writing. Informants with a reliable knowledge of Korean were certainly not involved here, maybe these are rather attempts by Siebold (or Hoffmann) to restore the romanizations to their original forms in *han’gŭl*. For instance *koku* ‘Du (gegen Höhere)’ (you, towards superiors; #407), written ㄱㄱ in the appendix, makes little sense as such. The intended Korean form is *kong* 公, regularly giving コグ in *kana*, or simply コク, if diacritical marks were omitted, as was not uncommon at the time. Somebody with inadequate knowledge of the underlying Korean forms would naturally transliterate this as “koku” – and convert this into the meaningless ㄱㄱ seen in the appendix.

Shinmura was thus indeed right in assuming CM behind the “Wörterverzeichnis”, but matters are considerably more complicated, as we have seen. It was not the only and not a direct source for it, and in effect the manuscript at hand does not seem to have contributed in any significant way to the glossary as found in *Nippon*.⁴²

⁴² Interestingly, the examples named in a passage concerning Japanese transcriptions of Korean words – “ペル *per*’ für kor. *pjör*, Stern; デル *der*’ für *tsjör*, Tempel” (*per*’ for Korean *pjör* ‘star’,

At this point, and to conclude, a few words on CM and its role in the context of Siebold and his work seem due. A printed copy which Siebold brought back is preserved in Leiden up to the present day, and Shinmura (1929 [1972: 171]) reports to have seen a manuscript copy made by Ko Tsching Dschang.⁴³ The printed one is found in the *Catalogus* of Siebold's collection (1845: 11, #185) as well as in Serrurier's catalogue of the Japanese collection at the University of Leiden (1896: 50f., #188). Both mention that the chapter "Japan's Bezüge mit der koraischen Halbinsel und mit Schina" (*Nippon* VII: 87–152) is based on this work. Apart from this, there are also two longer passages in *Nippon* VII which were translated directly from CM,⁴⁴ as well as a number of further references throughout the text.

To appreciate the full meaning of CM for Siebold's account of things Korean, the above-mentioned manuscript draft of his "Einige Worte" is of considerable interest. In the list of sources used we read (1.145.001: 4a):⁴⁵

"3.) Tsjoosen-monogatare. Beschreibung von Korea von Kimura Riemon. Jedo 1750. 5 Theile. Ein äusserst gehaltreiches Werk über diess uns bis heute so wenig bekannte Land. Geschichte, Sprache, Geographie, Religion, Sitten und Gebräuche, Producte u: dg: m. sind hierinn vom Verfasser so auseinandergesetzt, dass es mir als Grundlage einer Beschreibung von Korea diene, die ich zu seiner Zeit bekannt zu machen gedenke. Uebersetzt im Jahre 1826 M.S." [note later added to the left of the above; SO]

(3. *Chōsen monogatari*. Description of Korea by Kimura Riemon. Edo 1750. 5 parts [here: volumes; SO]. A work exceedingly rich in content about this country, so little known to us up to the present day. Its history, language, geography, religion, customs and practices, products and so on are treated herein by the author in such a way as to have served me as the foundation for a description of Korea, which I am planning to publish in due course.

Translated in the year 1826, manuscript.)

Siebold thus assigned considerable value to CM, going as far as to acknowledge that it was the basis for his account of Korea. Interestingly, this roughly coincides with

der' for *tsjōr* 'temple'; *Nippon* VII: 64) – are taken *not* from CM but from entries #5 and #40 of the Korean glossary in *Wakan Sansai zue* (cf. note 5 above; CM [V/8b, #9; V/10a, #65] on the other hand has びよる and てらい respectively).

⁴³ According to Shinmura the manuscript is in *katakana* and Chinese characters, while the printed original mixes the latter with *hiragana*. Hamada (1970:7) therefore doubts Shinmura's words in this respect; if they turn out to be true, however, this might serve as an indicator of Ko's abilities.

⁴⁴ "Nachrichten über Koorai, von japanischen Seeleuten, welche an die Küsten der Tatarei verfielen, nach Peking geführt und von da über Koorai in ihre Heimat zurückgebracht wurden. Aus dem japanischen Werke *Tsjō sen mono gatari*" (VII: 45–57, corresponding to CM III–IV) as well as "Staatsverfassung, Staats- und Hofämter des kōraischen Reiches" (VII: 57–69, corresponding to CM V/5b–8b, chapter "Chōsen kanshoku kō" 朝鮮官職考).

⁴⁵ The list was also published in Klaproth 1829b, here however the entry merely gives the content of the work. In the various other translations of and reports on Siebold's study, including the Dutch one of 1832, the list was omitted altogether. The manuscript is thus unique in this respect.

the view earlier expressed by Yamamoto (1940: 9) that the greater part of Siebold's knowledge pertaining to Korea probably derives precisely from this work. In any case its importance must have become apparent to Siebold at a rather early date so that even as early as 1826 a translation had been prepared – in all likelihood one into Dutch carried out by a Japanese.

At this point it also seems worthwhile to come back to Siebold's 1833 *Tsián dsú wên* for a moment. His preface starts with the words “Historia Japonica refert” followed by a longish quote in Japanese which is reproduced here faithfully in its original cursive script. Needless to say, the passage was not chosen at random but rather was carefully selected to underline the importance of the *Qianziwen* and the role of Paekche in its early transmission to Japan – as is also evident from the appended translation into Latin:

“Anno imperatoris *Woozin* decimo quinto (p. C. n. 284.) legatus in Japoniam Atogi (Odschi khi) venit, regis, qui tunc tenebat imperium *Pědsĩ*, filius, librosque sinenses *Yking*, *Hiaò king*, *Lün yü* et *Schan hai king* imperatori Japoniae dono dedit. Odschikhi bene in literis versatus, in doctrinam recepit imperatoris filium principem, quo facto primum in Japonia opera impendi literis coepta est. Odschikhi aliquando ab imperatore rogatus, num esset, qui eum superaret doctrina, “*Wang shin*,” inquit, me doctior est. Imperator legatos igitur misit in *Pedsi*, a quibus arcessitus in Japoniam se contulit *Wang-shin*, librumque apportavit *Tsian dsü wen*.” (A. C. 285.)

(In the fifteenth year of emperor Ōjin (284 AD) ambassador Atogi [or Achiki; SO] (Ezhiqi), son of the king who then ruled the empire of Paekche, came to Japan and gave the Chinese books *Yijing*, *Xiaojing*, *Lunyu* and *Shanhaijing* to the emperor of Japan as a present. Being well versed in letters, Ezhiqi admitted the first son of the emperor to his instruction, whereby for the first time in Japan efforts were devoted to letters. Being once asked by the emperor, whether there be one who surpasses him in knowledge, Ezhiqi said: “Wangren [or Wani; SO] is more learned than I am.” The emperor therefore sent the ambassadors to Paekche. Wangren, having been called by them, went to Japan and brought with him the book *Qianziwen*. [AD 285.]

Now Siebold does not provide any further information as to the Japanese source quoted here, and “Historia Japonica” refers to Japanese history in general and not to a specific work whose title could be Latinized thus. Ko (1989: 24f.) correctly points out the relationship of the passage to *Nihon shoki*, but without naming a possible source.⁴⁶ In fact, however, this can easily be identified with certainty as CM, I/12b–13a.⁴⁷ The

⁴⁶ In fact, the account in CM goes in part beyond what is stated in *Nihon shoki* (X: 応神 15/VIII/丁卯) or also the somewhat earlier *Kojiki* for that matter. Compare also *Nippon* (VII: 111f.).

⁴⁷ The passage reads as follows (punctuation marks added): 同天皇の十五年に百濟國より王子阿直伎といふものをつかわして易經、孝經、論語、山海經ならびに良馬二疋を貢ず。ときにあとぎよく經典をよむ。皇太子これを師として經書をよむ。これ本朝にて書を讀のはじめなり。天皇阿直伎にとふての給はく、「なんじにまされるものあり

textual differences are minor and their motivations obvious.⁴⁸ Essentially the text remains intact and even the cursive character forms and *kana* correspond exactly.

“Until the present century the Korean language was like the scroll in Revelation, sealed with seven seals”, wrote Griffis (1882: 446), and the same applies to a considerable number of details concerning the Korean studies of Siebold – and likewise those of his predecessors and contemporaries – that are in need of clarification up to the present day. Similarly there are several more materials on Korea(n) besides the above-mentioned ones both in Bochum and elsewhere that have received little attention and in any case no comprehensive study so far. Future research will have to take into account a broader variety of sources than has hitherto been the case to help remedy this situation and give Siebold his proper place in the history of Western knowledge pertaining to the Korean language and script – as well as to Korea itself.

References

- Abel-Rémusat, Jean-Pierre (1820): *Recherches sur les langues Tartares, ou mémoires sur différens points de la grammaire et de la littérature des Mandchous, des Mongols, des Ouigours et des Tibetains. Tome I.^{er}*. Paris: Imprimerie Royale.
- Anonymous (1829): “The History of Japan”. In: *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British India and its Dependencies* 28: 401–406.
- (1830): “Ueber die Abstammung der Japanesen”. In: *Neue Allgemeine Geographische und Statistische Ephemeriden* 31.9: 276–282.
- (1831): “Dr. Siebold’s account of Japan”. In: *The Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register for British and foreign India, China, and Australasia* 4: 129.
- Broughton, William Robert (1804): *A voyage of discovery to the North Pacific Ocean &*. London: T. Cadell & W. Davies.
- Chi Myōngsuk (2007): “Repositioning Hamel: The linguistic significance of the first European cross-cultural account of Chosŏn”. In: Breuker, Remco E. (ed.): *Korea in the Middle. Korean Studies and Area Studies*. (CNWS publications; 153). Leiden: CNWS Publications, pp. 97–117.
- Cordier, Henri (1913): “Les correspondants de Bertin, Secrétaire d’État au XVIIIe siècle”. In: *T’oung Pao* 14: 227–257.
- Duret, Claude (1613): *Thresor de l’histoire des langves de cest vnivers &*. Cologny: Matth. Berjon.

や」。こたへていわく、「王仁わうにんといふものあり、われにまされり」。これによつてつかいはくさいを百濟はくさいにつかわして王仁わうにんをめす。をうにんせんじもん千字文せんじもんをもちて來朝らいてうす。



⁴⁸ 同 (天皇) ‘the same (emperor)’ in the original, the reference to which would be unclear without the lines preceding the quote, is replaced with 應神 (天皇) ‘(Emperor) Ōjin’ and the words ならびに良馬二疋 ‘as well as two fine horses’ are omitted together with all reading aids.

- Eschbach-Szabo, Viktoria (1997): “Siebold-Bibliographie. Schriften von Philipp Franz von Siebold”. In: Braun, Kim / Müller-Yokota, Wolfram / Schmidt, Vera: *Dokumente zur Siebold-Ausstellung 1935*. (Acta Sieboldiana; 6). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, pp. 451–502.
- Fujita Kiroku 藤田喜六 (1977): “*Nippon-no shoshigakuteki kentō*” NIPPON の書誌学的検討. In: KGK 1977: 9–29.
- Griffis, William Elliot (1882): *Corea, The Hermit Nation*. London: W.H. Allen & Co.
- Guzmán, Luis de (1601): *Historia de las misiones qve han hecho los religiosos de la Compañia de Iesvs, para predicar el Sancto Euangelio en la India Oriental, y en los Reynos de la China y Iapon*. 2 vols. Alcalá: Biuda de Iuan Gracian.
- Hager, Joseph (1799): “Alphabet of Corea – Extracted from a Japanese Book and Explained by Dr. Hager of Vienna”. In: *The Oriental Collections* 3: 88–93.
- Hall, Basil (1818): *Account of a voyage of discovery to the West coast of Corea, and the great Loo-choo Island &*. London: John Murray.
- Hamada Atsushi 浜田敦 (1970): “*Chōsen monogatari kaidai*” 朝鮮物語解題. In: KBKKK (1970): 1–7.
- (1977): “Kinrin shokoku-ni kansuru jōhō: Chōsen” 近隣諸国に関する情報——朝鮮. In: KGK 1977: 198–207.
- Henker, Michael et al. (1993): *Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796–1866). Ein Bayer als Mittler zwischen Japan und Europa*. (Veröffentlichungen zur Bayerischen Geschichte und Kultur; 25.93). München: Haus der Bayerischen Geschichte.
- Hoffmann, Johann Joseph (1840): *Das Tsiän dsü wen 千字文 oder Buch von tausend Wörtern, aus dem Schinesischen, mit Berücksichtigung der koraischen und japanischen Übersetzung, ins Deutsche übertragen*. Leiden.
- (ed.); Curtius, J. H. Donker (1857): *Proeve eener Japansche Spraakkunst*. Leiden: A.W. Sijthoff.
- (1867): *Japansche spraakleer*. Leiden: A. W. Sijthoff.
- KBKKK = Kyōto daigaku bungakubu kokugogaku kokubungaku kenkyūshitsu 京都大学文学部国語学国文学研究室 (ed.) (1964): *Zen'ichi dōjin-no kenkyū* 全一道人の研究. Kyōto: Kyōto daigaku kokubungakkai.
- (1965): *Kōji gonen Chōsen-ban Iroha* 弘治五年朝鮮板伊路波. Kyōto: Kyōto daigaku kokubungakkai.
- (1970): *Chōsen monogatari* 朝鮮物語. Kyōto: Kyōto daigaku kokubungakkai.
- (1974–1975): *Ogura Shinpei hakushi chosakushū* 小倉進平博士著作集. 4 vols. Kyōto: Kyōto daigaku kokubungakkai.
- KGK = Kōdansha gakujutsukyoku 講談社学術局; Rinsen shoten shuppanbu 臨川書店出版部 (eds.) (1977): *Shīboruto Nihon-no kenkyū-to kaisetsu* シーボルト「日本」の研究と解説. Tōkyō: Kōdansha.
- Kishida Fumitaka 岸田文隆 (2009): “Shiryō honji: Waseda daigaku Hattori bunko shozō *Chōsengoyaku taiwa-hen*” 資料翻字 早稲田大学服部文庫所蔵「朝鮮語訳」対話篇. In: Itō Chiyuki 伊藤智ゆき (ed.): *Chōsengoshi kenkyū* 朝鮮語史研究. Tōkyō: Tōkyō gaikokugo daigaku, Ajia Afurika gengo bunka kenkyūjo.
- Klaproth, Julius (1823): *Asia Polyglotta*. Paris: A. Schubart.

- (1829a): “Sur l’introduction et l’usage des Caractères chinois au Japon, et sur l’origine des différens Syllabaires japonais”. In: *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* 3: 19–48.
- (1829b): “Rapport sur un Mémoire relatif à l’origine des Japonais, par M. DE SIEBOLD”, “Notice de quelques Ouvrages japonais et coréens mentionnés par M. DE SIEBOLD”. In: *Nouveau Journal Asiatique* 3: 385–405, 405–408.
- (1830): “Klaproth’s Bericht über Hr. v. Siebold’s Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Japaner”. In: *Annalen der Erd-, Völker- und Staatenkunde* 2.3: 321–353.
- (1832a): *San Kokf Tsou Ran To Sets, ou aperçu général des trois royaumes*. Paris: J. Murray.
- (1832b): *Aperçu de l’origine des diverses écritures de l’ancien monde*. Paris: Librairie orientale de Dondey-Dupré père et fils.
- Ko Yōnggūn 高永根 (1978): “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. In: *Kwanak ōmun yōn’gu* 冠嶽語文研究 3: 27–40.
- (1981): “Ch’ogi sōyangin-ūi Han’gugō yōn’gu” 初期西洋人の韓國語研究. In: *Sōnch’ōng ōmun* 先清語文 11.1: 1–13.
- (1989): “Chibolt’ū-ūi Han’guk kirok yōn’gu” 지볼트 (Fr. von Siebold) 의 韓國記錄 研究. In: *Tongyanghak* 東洋學 19: 1–64.
- Körner, Hans (1967): *Die Würzburger Siebold. Eine Gelehrtenfamilie des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*. Leipzig: J.A. Barth.
- Kure Shūzō 呉秀三 (1926 [1967–68]): *Shīboruto sensei sono shōgai-to kōgyō* シーボルト先生其生涯及功業. Tōkyō: Tohōdō shoten. [Quoted from: idem (1967–68): *Shīboruto sensei sono shōgai oyobi kōgyō* シーボルト先生その生涯及び功業. 3 vols. (Tōyō bunko 東洋文庫; 103, 115, 117). Tōkyō: Heibonsha.]
- (trans.) (1929): *Shīboruto Nihon kōtsū bōekishi* シーボルト日本交通貿易史. (Ikoku sōsho 異国叢書). Tōkyō: Sunnansha.
- Kurihara Fukuya 栗原福也 (2009): *Shīboruto-no Nihon hōkoku* シーボルトの日本報告. (Tōyō bunko 東洋文庫; 784). Tōkyō: Heibonsha.
- Medhurst, Walter Henry (1830): *An English and Japanese and Japanese and English Vocabulary. Compiled from native works*. Batavia.
- (1835): *Translation of a Comparative Vocabulary of the Chinese, Corean, and Japanese Languages: to which is added the Thousand Character Classic, In Chinese and Corean*. Batavia: Parapattan Press.
- Meister, Georg (1692): *Der Orientalisch-Indianische Kunst- und Lust-Gärtner &*. Dresden: Johann Riedel.
- Miyazaki Katsunori 宮崎克則 (2004): “Shīboruto Nippon-no shoshigaku kenkyū: Nippon-no sukashi-to haihon jōkyō” シーボルト『NIPPON』の書誌学研究——『NIPPON』の透かしと配本状況. In: *Kyūshū daigaku sōgō kenkyū hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku* 九州大学総合研究博物館研究報告 2: 1–32.
- (2005): “Fukugen: Shīboruto Nippon-no haihon” 復元：シーボルト『NIPPON』の配本. In: *Kyūshū daigaku sōgō kenkyū hakubutsukan kenkyū hōkoku* 九州大学総合研究博物館研究報告 3: 23–105.

- Murayama Shichirō 村山七郎 (1965): *Hyōryūmin-no gengo: Roshia-e-no hyōryūmin-no hōgengakuteki kōken* 漂流民の言語 —— ロシアへの漂流民の方言学的貢献. Tōkyō: Yoshikawa kōbunkan.
- Müller, Andreas; Bartsch, Gottfried (ed.) (1694): *Alphabeta universi*. Königsberg.
- Ogura Shinpei 小倉進平 (1927 [1975]): “Ōbeijin-no Chōsengo 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. In: *Minzoku* 民族 3.1: 75–86. [Quoted from: KBKKK 1974–1975, IV: 489–500.]
- (1929 [1975]): “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. In: Tabohashi Kiyoshi 田保橋潔 (ed.): *Chōsen Shina bunka-no kenkyū* 朝鮮支那文化の研究. Tōkyō: Tōkō shoin, pp. 43–91. [Quoted from: KBKKK 1974–1975, II: 273–321.]
- (1940): *Zōtei Chōsengogakushi* 増訂朝鮮語学史. Tōkyō: Tōkō shoin.
- Overmeer Fisscher, J.F. van (1833): *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Japansche Rijk*. Amsterdam: J. Müller & Comp.
- Phil, Marshall R. (1964): “Westerners on Korean”. In: *Korea Journal* 4.12: 9–15.
- Rodriguez, João (1604–1608): *Arte da lingua de Iapam*. Nagasaki.
- Rosny, Léon de (1864): “Aperçu de la langue Coréenne”. In: *Journal Asiatique* 6.3: 287–325.
- (1881): “L’idiome vulgaire de la Corée”. In: *Congrès international des sciences ethnographiques, tenu à Paris du 15 au 17 juillet 1878*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, pp. 584–594.
- Schmidt, Vera (1989): *Die Sieboldiana-Sammlung der Ruhr-Universität Bochum*. (Acta Sieboldiana; 3). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schultze, Benjamin (1748): *Orientalisch- und Occidentalischer Sprachmeister & Leipzig*: Christian Friedrich Geßner.
- Serrurier, Lindor (1896): *Bibliothèque japonaise. Catalogue raisonné des livres et des manuscrits japonais enrégistrés à la bibliothèque de l’université de Leyde*. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Shinmura Izuru 新村出 (1929 [1972]): “Oranda Raiden daigaku hōshoshi: tokuni Nihon oyobi tōyōgogaku-no kosho” 和蘭ライデン大学訪書誌 —— 特に日本及東洋語学の古書. In: *Shomotsu raisan* 書物禮讚 9: 1–4, 7. [Quoted from: idem 1971–1973, IV: 168–172.]
- (1938 [1972]): “Gengogakushijō-ni okeru Shīboruto sensei” 言語学史上におけるシーボルト先生. In: Nichidoku bunka kyōkai 日独文化協会 (ed.) (1938): *Shīboruto kenkyū* シーボルト研究. Tōkyō: Iwanami shoten. [Quoted from idem 1971–1973, III: 293–303.]
- (1971–1973): *Shinmura Izuru zenshū* 新村出全集. 15 vols. Tōkyō: Chikuma shobō.
- Siebold, Philipp Franz von (1826): “Epitome linguae Japonicae”. In: *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 11: 63–136.
- (1832): “Verhandeling over de afkomst der Japanners”. In: *Verhandelingen van het Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen* 13: 185–275.
- (1832ff.): *Nippon. Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan und dessen Neben- und Schutzländern: Jezu mit den südlichen Kurilen, Krafto, Koorai und den Liukiu-*

- Inseln, nach japanischen und europäischen Schriften und eigenen Beobachtungen.* Leiden: Bei dem Verfasser.
- (1833): *Tsián dsú wên* 千字文 *sive mille literae ideographicae. Opus Sinicum origine cum interpretatione Kooraiana, in peninsula Koraï impressum.* Leiden: Ex officina lithographica editoris.
- (1838): *Lui hō* 類合, *sive vocabularium sinense in kōraianum conversum; Opus Sinicum origine in peninsula Kōraï impressum.* Leiden: Ex officina lithographica editoris.
- ; Hoffmann, Johann Joseph (1845): *Catalogus librorum et manuscriptorum Japonicorum a Ph. Fr. de Siebold collectorum, annexa enumeratione illorum, qui in Museo Regio Hagano servantur.* Leiden: Apud auctorem.
- (1897): “Über die Abstammung der Japaner”. In: Siebold, Alexander von; Siebold, Heinrich von (eds.) (1897): *Nippon. Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan.* 2 vols. Würzburg, Leipzig: Leo Woerl, vol. I, pp. 281–298.
- Tsuji Seiji 辻星児 (1997): *Chōsengoshi-ni okeru Shōkai shingo* 朝鮮語史における『捷解新語』. (Okayama daigaku bungakubu kenkyū sōsho 岡山大学文学部研究叢書; 16). Okayama: Okayama daigaku bungakubu.
- (2007): “Sonkai tokai nikki-ni shirusareta Chōsengo[-ni] tsuite” 「尊海渡海日記」に記された朝鮮語[に]について. In: *Bunka kyōseigaku kenkyū* 文化共生学研究 5.1: 71–84.
- Vos, Frits (1983): “A Meeting Between Dutchmen and Koreans in 1828”. In: *Korea Journal* 23.1: 4–12.
- Vos, Ken (2003): “P’illip P’ūrach’ū p’on Chibolt’ū: Kūktong Asia-ūi majimak t’am-hōmga” 필립 프란츠 폰 지볼트 — 극동 아시아의 마지막 탐험가. In: Kim Yōngwōn et al.: *Hanghae-wa p’yoryu-ūi yōksa* 항해와 표류의 역사. Sōul: Sol ch’ulp’ansa, pp. 334–340.
- Walravens, Hartmut (2002): *Julius Klaproth (1783–1835). Briefwechsel mit Gelehrten, größtenteils aus dem Akademiearchiv in St. Petersburg.* (Orientalistik Bibliographien und Dokumentationen; 18). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Witsen, Nicolaes (1692): *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondigh Ontwerp Van Eenige dier landen, en volken, zo als voormaels bekend zyn geweest. &c.* 2 vols. Amsterdam.
- (1705): *Noord en Oost Tartarye, Ofte Bondigh Ontwerp Van eenige dier landen en volken, Welke voormaels bekend zijn geweest. &c. Tweede Druk.* 2 vols. Amsterdam: François Halma.
- Yamamoto Haruki 山本春喜 (1940): “Shīboruto-no Chōsen kiji” シーボルトの朝鮮紀事. In: *Bunken hōkoku* 文獻報國 6.6: 7–10.
- Yi Kimun 李基文 (1965): “Sōngjong-p’an Irop’a-e taehayō” 成宗板<伊路波>에 대하여. In: *Tosō* 圖書 8: 3–36.
- (2000): “19 segi sōgu hakchadūr-ūi han’gūl yōn’gu” 十九世紀 西歐 學者들의 한글 研究. In: *Haksurwōn nonmunjip* (inmun, sahoe kwahak-p’yōn) 學術院論文集 (人文・社會科學篇) 39: 107–155.

 <p>Corea</p> <p>daar is inoght Crumptoren om te vinden met inlaas hetzef. by Kim, almar ^{stuy} ^{stuy} ma</p> <p>de practicus King de volgende.</p> <p>시^{si} 포^{po} 회^{hui} 가^{ga} 기^{gi} 호^{ho} 계^{gie} 세^{se}</p> <p>포^{po} 지^{ji} 지^{ji} 리^{li} 누^{nu} 루^{lu} 구^{ku} 호^{ho} 가^{ga}</p> <p>외^{oe} 쇼^{sho} 파^{pa} 회^{hui} 호^{ho} 조^{jo} 조^{jo} 나^{na}</p> <p>나^{na} 마^{ma} 후^{hu} 고^{go} 호^{ho} 기^{gi} 호^{ho}</p> <p>라^{la} 마^{ma} 호^{ho} 사^{sa} 호^{ho} 수^{su} 하^{ha} 무^{mu}</p> <p>사^{sa} 자^{ja} 지^{ji} 호^{ho} 마^{ma} 미^{mi} 미^{mi} 목^{mok}</p> <p>세^{se} 하^{ha} 모^{mo} 세^{se} 하^{ha} 구^{ku}</p> <p>Setra King gebruecht by de grange per sonen, Dief de Sinteren tyden gebruecht de Chinesege pbruekten gelijc de Europeers de Fransche taal</p>	 <p>Corea</p> <p>세^{se} 시^{si} 라^{ra} 사^{sa} 쇼^{sho} 지^{ji} 시^{si}</p> <p>히^{hi} 지^{ji} 목^{mok} 마^{ma} 파^{pa} 리^{li} 포^{po}</p> <p>모^{mo} 기^{gi} 후^{hu} 계^{gie} 회^{hui} 수^{su} 호^{ho}</p> <p>세^{se} 호^{ho} 시^{si} 후^{hu} 호^{ho} 루^{lu} 기^{gi}</p> <p>사^{sa} 마^{ma} 호^{ho} 고^{go} 호^{ho} 외^{oe} 호^{ho}</p> <p>시^{si} 하^{ha} 호^{ho} 세^{se} 지^{ji} 호^{ho} 세^{se}</p> <p>호^{ho} 무^{mu} 기^{gi} 가^{ga} 가^{ga} 포^{po}</p>	<p>Iroha #2: "Corea" (1.374.000, item #2, page 2)</p>
		<p>Iroha #1: "Corea" (1.374.000, item #4)</p>

a
116
172.

Seon (Khan) Sjoon Conyjsmae 170 ha

세 e	아 a	라 ja	야 ja	쇼 jo	지 je	디 i
히 ji	자 ja	목 mo	마 ma	파 pa	미 mi	포 po
모 mo	기 gi	우 u	계 je	계 je	누 nu	히 hi
히 je	웃 u	아 ja	후 hu	소 so	루 lu	기 gi
산 san	예 ye	소 so	고 go	즈 ju	외 oe	초 cho
시 si	위 wi	예 ye	예 ye	피 pi	외 oe	히 hi
수 su	부 bu	키 ki	키 ki	카 ka	가 ga	포 po

Iroha #3: "Corea" (1.374.000, item #5)

イロハニ	日本	yapan.	イロハニ	星	star.
キヨセニ	朝鮮	coria.	カニ	霞	mist.
ミヤギ	京都	miyagi.	ヒノウチ	雷	thunder.
カニニ	江戸	edo.	カヨニ	氷	ijs.
タニニ	大坂	osaka.	ハカイ	坂	trap.
ナウニ	天	land.	ハナニ	海	zee.
カニル	天	hemel.	カガク	川	river.
タグ	地	oord.	アガリ	水	water
バフ	風	wind.	アトル	火	brand
ビ	雨	regen.	アトル	子	voorde.
ベツ	曉	dagvaat.	トニ	木	hout

glossary "Einige Koreische Worte" (1.286.000, pages 1f.)