

“Ōtake Wasaburō's Dictionaries and the Japanese 'Colonization' of Brazil,” *Dictionaries: The Journal of the Dictionary Society of North America* 31 (2010): 46-68.

Errata found as of 23 February 2011:

63: The Nitobe essay is "Shokumin naru meiji ni tsukite (植民なる名辞に就きて) ." Note that the "m" in *meiji* is incorrectly capitalized in footnote 32.



Ōtake Wasaburō's Dictionaries and the Japanese “Colonization” of Brazil¹

Edward Mack

According to Kokei Uehara, a professor emeritus of hydraulic engineering at the University of São Paulo who immigrated in 1936, there were only two things that every migrant from Japan in Brazil possessed: a picture of the emperor and a copy of Ōtake Wasaburō's *Powa jiten* (Portuguese-Japanese dictionary, 1918).² The *Powa jiten* was heralded as the first of its kind, and became indispensable to the nearly 200,000 Japanese citizens who emigrated to Brazil prior to World War II. Though subsequently replaced by more extensive dictionaries, the *Powa jiten* is a dictionary of undeniable historic importance, facilitating the establishment of a community of persons of Japanese descent that is now the largest outside of Japan. This article will examine the circumstances of the dictionary's creation, the implications of its misleading claim of chronological primacy, and the development of the dictionary over time.

Introduction

Japan is not often considered as central to the history of imperial expansion or of mass migration, despite having been deeply involved with both. The Tokugawa Shogunate, which ruled Japan from 1603-1867 (also

¹ The author would like to thank Morita Sakyō and Wakisaka Katsunori, of the Centro de Estudos Nipo-Brasileiros, São Paulo, for their on-going support of my work, their long-term dedication to researching the life and work of Ōtake, and their friendship; and Kasumi Yamashita, Michael Shapiro, and Zev Handel, for their perceptive comments.

² Quoted in Horie 2008, 9.

known as the Edo period), fell to reformers bent on transforming Japan into a modern nation-state. In the decades that followed, the relative isolation of Japan during the Edo period was replaced by an atmosphere of profound interest in the outside world, driven by a government eager to join an international community of nations. The large-scale migration of Japanese citizens from the main Japanese islands began roughly simultaneously with the creation of the Greater Japanese Empire through the acquisition of Taiwan (1895) and the initiation of state-sponsored migration ("peaceful expansionism" in the parlance of the day) to other sovereign nations, beginning with Hawaii (which in 1885 was still a monarchy.)³ By 1899, the Japanese government was supervising emigration to the United States, Australia, Fiji, Guadeloupe, Canada, Mexico, and Peru. In the early years of the twentieth century, however, the United States, Australia, and Canada all began to curtail or forbid immigration from Japan altogether; the infamous "Gentlemen's Agreement" of 1907–08, for example, dramatically limited Japanese immigration into the United States. A concerted effort to identify a new destination for emigration caused the Japanese government to turn to Brazil. When the United States terminated immigration from Japan in 1924, Brazil became the primary destination of emigration outside of the Japanese Empire.

In addition to this push factor, there were also significant pull factors present in Brazil. In addition to the general desire of the Brazilian government to take greater advantage of interior lands they considered to be underutilized, a faction in the government that was concerned with a shortage of agricultural laborers on coffee plantations in São Paulo welcomed Japanese immigrants as a potential solution to that problem. At the close of the nineteenth century, the Italian government had called back its migrants (who had been the primary laborers on these plantations since the abolition of slavery in 1888) after it received word of their poor treatment. Although there was some resistance, particularly from groups who supported racialist "bleaching" (*branqueamento*) immigration policies, the labor needs of plantation owners won the day. In this way, the migration of Japanese to Brazil became seen as mutually beneficial for both countries, at least in the minds of certain key politicians, intellectuals, and military figures. Despite the ending of Japan's formal imperial project in 1945 and the dwindling of large-scale migration overseas that coincided with domestic economic growth in the postwar, this period of overseas expansion has led to sizable communities overseas, particularly in Brazil.

³ See Iriye 1972, Duus 1995, Azuma 2005.

Ōtake Wasaburō (1872-1944)

Ōtake's birth followed closely on the heels of the creation of the modern nation-state of Japan, and the story of his life that has been passed down reflects the new cosmopolitanism and expansionist sentiments that marked the Meiji period (1868-1912).⁴ Although he was born in Tokyo to a doctor of traditional Chinese medicine, Ōtake took a decidedly different route from his father's: by the time he was entering middle school, he was living with his family in the port city of Yokohama and studying English.⁵ His proximity to the ships in port gave Ōtake plentiful occasions to develop his language skills, as he was in the habit of visiting them in order to practice his English, and was sometimes employed as an interpreter despite his youth. It was in this capacity that Ōtake went aboard a Brazilian warship, the *Almirante Barroso*, which came into port in July 1889.

This was not just any ship. In addition to the captain of the ship, Rear-Admiral Custódio José de Melo (1840-1902), the crew also included a very special seaman: Prince Augusto Leopoldo (1867-1922), the grandson of Don Pedro II, the second and final ruler of the Empire of Brazil.⁶ During the ship's stay in Yokohama, the prince and seven other men were granted an audience with the emperor, making it the first (and last) meeting between the Brazilian and Japanese imperial families. The prince, who was a contemporary of Ōtake, took a liking to the interpreter, and suggested that he return to Brazil with them. Ōtake made the extraordinary decision to return to Brazil, and on 4 August 1889 he left Japan aboard the ship.

Brazil was on the verge of important changes as well, a fact that became very clear shortly thereafter. While in port in Aceh (Sumatra), the ship received word of the proclamation of the Republic of Brazil and the fall of Emperor Don Pedro II.⁷ The prince was granted leave and allowed to disembark in Colombo (Sri Lanka), from which he traveled to Europe to join his grandfather in exile. Though Ōtake had lost his pri-

⁴ I have followed Sakurai 1974, Horie 2008, and Paurisuta Shinbunsha 1996 in stating that Ōtake lived from 1872-1944. The *Nihon jinmei daijiten*, however, lists his birth as 1868 and death as 1947. The modern nation-state of Japan came into existence in 1868.

⁵ The following history comes from Sakurai 1974 and Horie 2008.

⁶ Don Pedro reigned from 1831-1889, and nominally from 1889-1891.

⁷ The Proclamação da República Brasileira, which brought an end to the Empire of Brazil and declared the birth of the Republic, occurred on 15 November 1889.

mary sponsor, the captain remained a supporter and allowed him to remain aboard. After the ship reached Rio de Janeiro nearly a year later, on 29 July 1890, the Brazilian Navy met it with a naval band, having heard that the first Japanese was arriving on Brazil shores, and proceeded to perform what it mistakenly believed to be the Japanese national anthem: "Harusame," a song that the delegation had heard playing in Yokohama.

This was not the last time that Ōtake would be present for an important event in Brazilian history. After arriving in Brazil, Ōtake entered the preparatory course of the engineering department at the Academia da Marinha (Naval Academy) in Rio de Janeiro with de Melo as his sponsor. Just prior to his completion of the program, on 6 September 1893, there was an uprising led by a group of naval officers, including now-Admiral de Melo, who was Minister of the Navy at the time. The revolt, in which the admirals and many cadets from the academy took warships into Guanabara Bay and threatened to bombard the capital, was only put down by an intervention by warships from the United States, Britain, France, Italy, and Portugal. Unable to overcome this defense of the capital, the leaders of the revolt took asylum aboard Portuguese ships.⁸ As a result of his involvement in the failed revolt, Admiral de Melo was forced to seek political asylum in Argentina (Smith 2000, 134n52). Despite his proximity to the revolt (and to de Melo), Ōtake suffered no direct repercussions, completing the preparatory course and advancing on to the main course in 1894. Ōtake began to feel alienated at the school, however, and withdrew before graduating.⁹

Ōtake's remaining years in Brazil were spent in more mundane activities in less illustrious company. He originally took a position as a mechanical engineer at a textile factory in Rio de Janeiro, but soon moved to an American agricultural company in São Paulo. After some time working at this company, Ōtake received word of the Sino-Japanese War and decided to return to Japan. He arrived there in 1896, seven years after he left the port of Yokohama. Here his fate was once again influenced by the intervention of a powerful patron. Thanks to a recommendation from the statesman Ōkuma Shigenobu, whom he had happened to meet, Ōtake was employed by the Brazilian Legation, which opened in Tokyo in 1897. He worked as an official interpreter at the Legation until 1942, when political relations between Brazil and Japan were severed as a result of the war.

⁸ For this and other information on the two naval revolts, see Burns 1993, 239-244. According to the standard narrative of Ōtake's life, he even took up arms alongside de Melo in the revolt, as had many students at the Naval Academy.

This is a wonderful story; unfortunately, much of it is nearly impossible to corroborate. Much of the narrative is drawn from the writings of the author and early immigrant to Brazil, Suzuki Teijirō, now deceased, who knew Ōtake personally.¹⁰ Two independent scholars in Brazil, Morita Sakyō and Wakisaka Katsunori, have attempted to verify the details of this narrative and have met with little success.¹¹ No records of Ōtake's life written by the man himself still exist. There is no record of Ōtake at the Naval Academy (or of his stay in Brazil as a whole, for that matter), and individuals there stressed the improbability of a non-citizen enrolling as a normal student. At the same time, however, the Ōtake family does possess an official document, signed by Almirante Custódio José de Melo, who was Minister of the Navy at the time (24 April 1893), making Ōtake an engineer, fourth grade (Horie 2008, 28).

When it comes to Ōtake's greatest contribution to lexicography and the history of Japanese emigration to Brazil, however, the specific veracity of these events is perhaps not so important. What is relevant is the fact that Ōtake spent seven years in complete immersion in the Portuguese language, developing a level of linguistic competency that allowed him to take on an impressive endeavor: the composition of the first modern Portuguese-Japanese dictionary.¹²

Precedents for Japanese-Portuguese Lexicography

Despite Ōtake's own claim, in his introduction to the first edition of the dictionary, that his is "in fact the first Portuguese-Japanese dictionary (*jitsu ni Powa jiten no kōshi tari*)," this claim is only true in the narrowest sense (that Ōtake's is the first printed dictionary providing Japanese equiv-

⁹ An earlier article, from the 12 January 1937 *Nippaku shinbun*, says that he was forced to withdraw as a result of his involvement in the uprising. Reproduced in Konno and Fujisaki 1994, 163-64.

¹⁰ Horie 2008 cites Suzuki Teijirō's *Umoreiku takujin no sokuseki* as a primary source of this narrative.

¹¹ Morita and Wakisaka's years-long research was the basis for Horie's book.

¹² It must be noted that Ōtake did not compile the dictionary single-handedly. In addition to his workplace, the Legation, which would have had the one of the greatest concentrations (albeit still only a handful) of native Portuguese speakers in the city of Tokyo, he also makes reference to a group called the Hakugo Kenkyūkai (Brazilian-Japanese Research Group), the members of which he thanks in the preface to the first edition. This author has not been able to find anything more about this group.

alences and definitions of Portuguese terms, rather than simply being a multilingual wordlist). In fact, the history of lexicographical attempts to establish equivalences between the Japanese and Portuguese languages is a long one, stretching back to the end of the sixteenth century.

Without a doubt, the most famous dictionary to establish equivalences between Japanese and Portuguese was the *Nippo jisho* (*Vocabulario da Lingoa de Iapam com adequação em Portugues*), printed in 1603-04.¹³ Even this, however, was not the first such attempt; non-printed vocabularies pre-existed this volume, dating back as early as 1563-64.¹⁴ These early attempts at Japanese-Portuguese lexicography were the work of Catholic missionaries, who arrived in Japan beginning in 1549. The *Nippo jisho* was the greatest of these undertakings. With almost 33,000 entries, the dictionary remains an extremely valuable source for information about contemporary Japanese usages. The *Nippo jisho*'s influence through history has not, however, been continuous; instead, there was a marked break, one which coincided with Ôtake's efforts.

The first period of the *Nippo jisho*'s influence was, of course, contemporary with its production. Beyond its utility to the proselytizing efforts of the Jesuit missionaries (which only continued for a short time after the dictionary's completion), the *Nippo jisho* was also pivotal in the ongoing process to develop dictionaries of other Romance languages during the Edo period. The *Nippo jisho* became the source text for the first Japanese-Spanish dictionary (the 1630 *Nissei jisho*, or *Vocabulario de Japón declarado primero en portugués por los Padres de la Compañía de Jesús de aquél Reyno, y agora en castellano, en el Colegio de Santo Thomás, en Manila*) and Léon Pagès's French-Japanese dictionary, the *Nichifutsu jisho* (*Dictionnaire japonais-français*), which was published in Paris in 1868.¹⁵

This sequence of dictionary production based on the *Nippo jisho* occurred against a background of extensive multilingual lexicography. Despite its explicit policy of seclusion, the Tokugawa Shogunate was the central engine behind these efforts. The government's translation efforts were originally focused on Dutch, which the government tolerated because of the lack of interest among Dutch traders in proselytizing. As a

¹³ Among printed dictionaries, it should be noted that the *Nippo jisho* was preceded by the trilingual vocabulary, the *Dictionarium Latino-Lusitanicum ac Iaponicum* (Amakusa, 1595); this vocabulary seems to have been largely rendered obsolescent by the more comprehensive *Nippo jisho*. The *Dictionarium* is still extant in both printed and handwritten copies; see Laures 1957, 50-51.

¹⁴ See Moran 1993, 156.

¹⁵ Sakakura 1971, 504. Cooper 1976, 417-18n2. Iwao 2002, 2059.

result, the Shogunate received most of its information about the rest of the world through Dutch; by the middle of the Edo period, this information was being provided in regular, formal reports known as *Oranda fūset-sugaki* (Dutch news reports) (Huffman 1997, 15-26). These government-led translation efforts were further formalized in 1811, with the establishment of the Bansho Wakai Goyōkakari (Bureau for the Comprehension of Foreign Writings).¹⁶ It was the Spanish-language program at one of the successors to this institution that produced the translators and interpreters that facilitated the initial emigration of Japanese to Brazil at the start of the twentieth century.¹⁷

At the end of the Edo period, however, we see the direct influence of the missionaries' *Nippo jisho* diminish dramatically. Although the text seems to have been held in the government's archives — James Curtis Hepburn was apparently able to reference it when he compiled his Japanese-English dictionary in 1867 — it was not readily available (Sakakura 1974, 522). According to Laures, only four printed copies and one handwritten copy have survived to the present day, and these are all held in libraries outside Japan (Laures 1957, 69; Cooper 1980, 512-13). As for availability at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries, one might consider the accessibility of the Jesuit's grammar of Japanese, the *Arte da Lingoa de Iapam* (1604-08), at that time. In an article from 1888, Basil Hall Chamberlain makes passing reference to the availability of Rodriguez's Japanese Grammar, including one original manuscript which had been held by a British nobleman (until at least 1865) and one copy that had been in the possession of Léon Pagès in the 1860s; it was this copy that Chamberlain was able to see (Chamberlain 1888, 10). Though far from conclusive, this anecdotal and circumstantial evidence suggests that the text had become effectively inaccessible until re-publication after World War II, when the dictionary entered its second period of influence, acting as a singular source for information about contemporary Japanese usage at the close of the sixteenth century.

¹⁶ This institution became the Yōgakusho (Institute for Western Learning) in 1855, the Bansho Shirabesho (Institute for the Investigation of Foreign Books) in 1856, and a series of other names until 1873, when it split into the Kaisei Gakkō (School for Intellectual and Industrial Development, which went on to become Tokyo University) and the Tōkyō Gaikokugo Gakkō (Tokyo School of Foreign Languages, later the Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.)

¹⁷ The study of Spanish in Japan, for example, had outpaced that of Portuguese in the nineteenth century. In 1897, the Tōkyō Gaikokugo Gakkō began teaching Spanish; a Portuguese department was not added until 1916.

Ōtake Wasaburō compiled his dictionary during this gap in the *Nippo jisho*'s influence. All evidence suggests that Ōtake did not have access to the text and that he may not have even been aware of its existence.¹⁸ Even had he had access to it, however, the *Nippo jisho* might have been of little use to him, if for no other reason than the changes in the language that had occurred in response to changes in the world; consider the *Nippo jisho*'s entry for a word as common as "neck (*kubi*)":

Cubi. Pescocoço. ¶ Cubi: o toru. Tomar
cabeças na guerra. ¶ Cub: uo cucuru, l,
cubiru. Enforca se. ¶ Cubiuo qiru,
vtçu, cacu, l, fanuru, l, vchi fanasu, l,
vo.oiú. Cortar a cabeça. ¶ Cubiuo ca
quru. Dependurar a cabeça, ou polta em
alto. ¶ Irm, Culiuo caçuru. A-
pislar pendo a cabeça.

Cubi. Neck. *Cubiuo toru*, to take a head in war. *Cubiuo cucuru, l, cubiru*, to hang (someone to death). *Cubiuo qiru, vtçu, cacu, l, fanuru, l, vchi fanasu, l, votosu*, to cut off a head. *Cubiuo caquru*, to hang a person from, or place a head in, a high spot. *Cubiuo caçuru*, to risk one's neck.

Figure 1. NIPPO JISHO.

The differences in Ōtake's twentieth-century world are clear from his definition for the same word in his 1925 *Wapo jiten* (Japanese-Portuguese dictionary):

Kubi 頸, 首, s. Pescocoço (頸) || Ca-
 beça (首) || Gargalo; collo (徳利等の)
 || —ni suru, Demittir (um em-
 pregado). {plício).

Kubi. Head, neck. n., *Pescoço* (neck). *Cabeça* (head). *Gargalo; collo* (neck of a bottle, etc.). — *ni suru, Demittir (um empregado)* (dismiss [an employee]).

Figure 2. WAPO JITEN.

As one would expect, the entries differ in correspondence with their intended purpose: the entry from the encoding dictionary (the latter, from the 1925 *Wapo jiten*) shows a variety of Portuguese terms that approximate the Japanese term's semantic range, whereas the decoding

¹⁸ Wakisaka Katsunori and Morita Sakyō explored this question and found no evidence that Ōtake had access to the *Nippo jisho*.

dictionary (the former, from the 1603-1604 *Nippo jisho*) focuses on idioms in the target language.¹⁹ Both the 17th-century *Nippo jisho* and the 20th-century *Powa jiten*, therefore, were attempts at decoding the linguistically incomprehensible world in which their respective users found themselves, rather than encoding in articulate expression their own thoughts in the target language. The worlds they were attempting to capture, however, were markedly different.

At the beginning of the twentieth century, as Japanese began emigrating, few tools existed to aid them in understanding the world they were entering in Brazil. At the time Kanazawa Ichirō's *Porutogaru (Bura-jiru)-go kaiwa* [*Conversação Portguez-Japoneza*] (1908), a thin volume of only 115 pages (in its first edition) was one of the few — if not the only — guides available.²⁰ Given the speed with which emigration to Brazil expanded, there is little doubt that high demand for a Portuguese-Japanese dictionary existed in 1918.

Ōtake's *Powa jiten*

Ōtake's *Powa jiten* met this demand.²¹ Its roughly 35,000 entries dwarfed Kanazawa's introductory text. Ōtake subsequently set upon composing the *Wapo jiten*, which appeared in 1925. After new spelling rules

¹⁹ The primary users of the *Nippo jisho* would have been native Portuguese speakers who were operating in a Japanese-language environment, making the dictionary a decoding dictionary; the primary users of the *Wapo jiten* would have been native Japanese speakers who were operating in a Portuguese-language environment, making that dictionary an encoding dictionary from their perspective.

²⁰ Sakurai 1974, 88. Kanazawa, a professor of Spanish at the Tōkyō Gaikokugo Gakkō, likely developed this text from his Spanish-language conversation manual, *Supeingo kaiwa-hen (Manual de la Conversacion y Vocabulario)*, 1905). The Portuguese volume was first printed on 15 April 1908 and the Spanish volume on 13 January 1905. A later version of the Spanish guide, his *Nissei kaiwa* (Japanese-Spanish conversation, 1908), was clearly designed in conjunction with the Portuguese volume.

²¹ Ōtake must have thought a market existed; the dictionary was likely financed by Ōtake himself. Nakagawa and Kodama 2000, 132 and 150. I qualify the claim because of the different descriptions given on these two pages. The first describes it unequivocally as self-published, while the second describes both the Portuguese-Japanese and Japanese-Portuguese first editions as having been “both published in a manner close to self-publication.” The description on page 132 claims that the revised *Powa shinjiten* was also self-funded. The 12 January 1937 article cited earlier states that Ōtake invested 10,000 yen of his money.

were promulgated through a joint decision by Brazil and Portugal in 1931, Ōtake set about revising and expanding the total number of entries to roughly 75,000.²² This resulted in the *Powa shinjiten* (*Novo Dicionario Portuguez-Japonez*), which appeared in 1937. As a result of Ōtake's death in 1944, the dictionary was not subsequently revised to reflect the new spelling rules adopted in 1943; nonetheless, it continued to be published into the postwar period. In addition, Ōtake also composed a grammar, his *Powa bunpō kaisetsu* (1921), and a conversation guide, his *Nippaku kaiwa* (1918).

Physically, the original *Powa jiten* (1918) is small, at 105mm x 143mm, and contains 644 pages of entries. One extant copy, from the 1926 fifth printing, has a durable binding, a rugged cloth cover, and a riveted outer box. The paper is relatively heavy weight. The price (5 yen for the 1926 fourth printing) was by no means inexpensive, especially when compared to the 1-yen books (*enpon*) that flooded the publishing world later that same year and to Kanazawa's inexpensive conversation manual (0.35 yen in 1908). The price was comparable to that for Muraoka Gen's 820-page *Seiwa jiten* [Spanish-Japanese dictionary] (1927), which sold for 6 yen 50 *sen*.²³ All indications suggest that the dictionary was designed to be carried and used extensively, in less-than-ideal conditions, and that the resulting high retail price did not dissuade buyers. The *Wapo jiten* (1925), with 648 pages of entries, is identical in size and construction (though it has a green cover, rather than a blue one.) The price (4.5 yen for the 1935 sixth printing) was also comparable. For the revised and expanded *Powa shinjiten* (1937), a larger page format was selected. At 118mm x 162mm with 1126 pages of entries, the book used slightly lighter-weight paper. An extant copy from the 1937 first printing cost 7 yen and is similarly designed for both portability and for heavy usage. The expanded page size allowed the much more extensive dictionary to be an only slightly thicker book: from 30mm for the first version to 35mm for the revised.

It should also be noted that the *Powa jiten* was revised while the *Wapo jiten* was not. Though this might simply be due to Ōtake's passing,

²² This was an agreement between the Academia das Ciências de Lisboa and the Academia Brasileira de Letras. See Williams 1942, 189-93. Ōtake had already had an expanded version in mind. The preface to his first-edition *Powa jiten* had mentioned the possibility of a new and expanded edition and called upon readers to help him in that effort.

²³ Nakagawa and Kodama 2000,133. The dictionary was initially offered at a specially reduced rate of 5 yen 50 *sen*.

it might also be due to the different demand among Japanese (the primary market for these dictionaries) for encoding and decoding dictionaries. For native-Japanese-speaking individuals attempting to create new lives in a Portuguese-speaking environment, the decoding *Powa jiten* would have been the essential tool for survival, whereas the encoding *Wapo jiten* might have been perceived as a more dispensable luxury. One can usually find ways to communicate one's thoughts, particularly in daily life, using a rudimentary vocabulary; when one encounters a foreign language, however, one has no such control over the vocabulary.

Comparison of the original and revised Portuguese-Japanese dictionaries

The original dictionary begins with a preface explaining the history of the Portuguese language, in which it is explained that the goal of this dictionary is the explication of its usage Brazil, which contains many differences from the language as it is used in Portugal. It notes that it focuses on the Brazilian variant because of the increasing demand arising from Japan's interactions with Brazil in recent years. The revised edition begins with a statement in Portuguese by the then Ambassador to Japan from Brazil, Paulo Leão Veloso, which is followed by a new preface by the author. In that, he begins by mentioning the ever-increasing activities of his countrymen (Japanese) in Brazil, whose expansion of Japanese-Brazilian commerce is accelerating. Acquisition of Portuguese, he argues, is essential for this undertaking. He says that if this revised dictionary contributes to the friendly economic relations of the two countries by assisting in the Portuguese language studies of his countrymen in Brazil, then he will consider his decade of hard work to have been worthwhile. As this change in the introductory material reflects, the primary intended audience of the text (particularly the revised text) was Japanese-language speakers in Brazil and their (primarily economic) endeavors there, which linked the two countries through trade.

Following the introductions, both editions included guides to grammar abbreviations and to subject and stylistic abbreviations. Although both grammar abbreviation lists contained 19 items, they are different both in content and in nature. In content, *impessoal* (impersonal) and *invariavel* (invariable) are removed for the revised edition, while *artigo* (article) and *pronomo pessoal* (personal pronoun) are added. In nature, while both use abbreviations derived from the Portuguese, the first edition presents the full term in Portuguese as well, while the revised edi-

tion provides the Japanese translation of the grammatical term. As for subject and stylistic abbreviations, the original edition contains 32 and the revised 47. The revised edition adds 23 abbreviations (including those for soil-related, agriculture-related, and mineral-related terms), drops one (logic), and modifies one significantly ("religion" becomes "religion, primarily Roman Catholicism.") It also expands three (English, French, and Dialect) into a separate chart, which identifies words and senses that either are borrowed from one of a number of languages (Latin, English, Italian, German, Spanish, and French) or are specific to certain dialects. Although abbreviations are only provided for Brazil (neologisms, words taken from indigenous Brazilian languages, and idioms), southern Brazil, northern Brazil, São Paulo, and Minas Gerais, within the dictionary one finds references to words and senses specific to other regions.²⁴

As an example of the format and changing detail of the two Portuguese-Japanese dictionaries, we can examine the entries for a common noun, *banco*.

Banco, m. 腰掛, 縁臺 || 大工又ハ鍛冶屋
等ノ使用スル作業臺 || 銀行 || Banco de
areia, 沙洲 || Banco de gelo, 氷山 ||
Banco do hospital, 病院ノ診察室.

Powa jiten

banco, m. 腰掛, 縁臺, 共同椅子 || 大工鍛冶屋等の
使用する作業臺 || 銀行 || 石坑に於る石床 || 淺瀬,
洲 || 漕手の座 || — de areia, 沙洲 || — de rocha,
暗礁 || — de gelo, 氷山, 流氷 || — do hospital,
病院の診察所 || — de pinchar, 城壁破壊用の古
代の武器; [紋] 凭掛のない腰掛の圖.

Powa shinjiten

Figure 3. *POWA JITEN AND POWA SHINJITEN*.

As we can see, the main entries are followed by their functional label, in this case "m." for *substantivo masculino* (masculine substantive). We are then given equivalences, with rough synonyms for a single sense separated by commas and two vertical lines functioning as sense dividers.²⁵ In the entry from the 1918 *Powa jiten*, then, we are given "seat

²⁴ Consider the entry for *bargado*, in which usages specific to Ceará and Bahia are noted.

(*koshikake*), bench (*endai*)” as roughly synonymous equivalences for the first sense of the word, followed by a definition for the second sense: “A worktable used by carpenters, smiths, and the like (*daiku mata wa kajiya nado no shiyō suru sagyōdai*).” This is followed by a third sense, for which we are given a single equivalent: “bank (*ginkō*).” Finally, we are given run-on entries made up of common phrases containing the entry word: “*Banco de areia*,” which is defined as a sand bar (*sasu*), “*Banco de gelo*,” which is defined as an iceberg (*hyōzan*), and “*Banco de hospital*,” which is defined as a hospital examination room (*byōin no shinsatsushitsu*).

The revised edition uses approximately the same format, but the definition is expanded as follows (Portuguese is in bold, English translations come from the Japanese, which follows in parentheses):

Banco, m. Seat (*koshikake*), bench (*endai*), multi-person chair (*kyōdō isu*). A worktable used by carpenters, smiths, and the like (*daiku mata wa kajiya nado no shiyō suru sagyō dai*). Bank (*ginkō*). The floor of a tunnel carved into rock (*sekkō ni okeru ishidoko*). Shoal (*asase*), sandbank (*su*). An oarsman’s seat (*kogite no za*). **Banco de areia**, sand bar (*sasu*). — **de rocha**, a concealed reef (*ansho*). **Banco de gelo**, iceberg (*hyōzan*). — **de hospital**, hospital examination room (*byōin no shinsatsushitsu*). — **de pinchar**, an ancient weapon used to destroy castle walls (*jōheki hakai-yō no kodai no buki*); (Heraldry) An image of a backless chair (*yorikakari no nai koshikake no zu*).

Figure 4. *POWA JITEN*.

In addition to addressing more senses of the term with a larger number of equivalences, the definition has also become more academic, adding classical military terms and information regarding heraldic symbols.

The entries for *banco* also raise another question, one that I am unfortunately not able to answer. Roughly simultaneous to the composition of these dictionaries, the word *banco* (in the sense of “bench”) was beginning to appear in literary works by high-profile authors publishing in conspicuous venues: the second-edition *Nihon kokugo daijiten* gives a 1928-29 usage (from Hayashi Fumiko’s *Hōrōki*) as its sole example, but Kitahara Hakushū used it (in Roman letters) in 1911 (*Suigō Yanagawa*) with the gloss *endai* (bench), and Yumeno Kyūsaku used it in 1935 (*Dogura magura*). It

²⁵ The guide to the revised edition informs us that homographs with unrelated etymologies will be treated as separate lexical items with their own entries, which will be numbered.

should be noted that *Suigō Yanagawa* is set in Fukuoka, and *Dogura magura* contains a comment that the term was from Kyūshū dialect, and was an old borrowing from Europe. Hayashi also had a close connection to Kyūshū, in southwestern Japan. The proximity of these locations to Nagasaki, the central site of the Catholic missions, and Yumeno's reference to it being an old borrowing raises the question of the moment of its entrance into Japanese, whether it dates back to the sixteenth century, or was introduced by returning migrants. Either because he was unaware of the term's entrance into Japanese, or because he felt that it would not function as an enlightening equivalent for the original Portuguese term, the Japanese borrowing is absent from both of Ōtake's dictionaries.

In many cases, the revised edition expanded definitions in ways that Japanese migrants to Brazil would have found extremely helpful. Consider the following entries for the term *alqueire*.

Alqueire, m. 穀物及び液体ノ容積度量
(地方ニヨリ一定セズ).

Powa jiten

alqueire, m. 往時の穀物及び液体の度量(13.800 リットルに當る) || 一アルケリーの種を蒔くに適する面積 || 註—— 現在はメートル法を採用し居るも未だ舊慣を脱せず面積を測るにもアルケリーを使用する所あり而しそれも地方により一定せず, サンパウロでは 24.200 平方米突又ミナスでは其二倍大の 48.400 平方米突である.

Powa shinjiten

Figure 5. *POWA JITEN AND POWA SHINJITEN*.

The original edition's distinctly unhelpful definition for the unit of measurement is "a measure of volume for liquids and grains (not uniform across regions)." Fortunately, this is greatly improved in the revised edition: "an old measurement of grain or liquid volume (equal to 13.8 liters); the area of land appropriate for planting one *alqueire* of seed; note: today, certain areas have adopted the metric system while other areas continue to use the term to measure area, having not yet abandoned the old convention. Nor is this old usage uniform across regions: in São Paulo this is equivalent to 24,200 square meters, while in Minas Gerais this is equivalent to 48,400 square meters." Such specifics would have made this revised entry far more useful for Japanese immigrants, most of whom resided in the state of São Paulo.

The changes in the definitions for the term *camarada* reflect similar improvements:

Camarada, f. 同僚, 仲間, 相棒.
Powa jiten
camarada, f. 同僚, 同輩, 同窓, 仲間, 相役 || 戦友 ||
 従卒 || (B.) 農場の日傭人 || (B. N.) 馬子 || 同棲者.
Powa shinjiten

Figure 6. *POWA JITEN AND POWA SHINJITEN.*

The first edition translates the term as merely “co-worker (*dōryō*), friend (*nakama*), buddy (*aibo*),” whereas the revised edition gives a larger number of equivalences for this primary sense of the word. More importantly, the revised edition adds one sense identified as being specific to Brazil (“an agricultural day-laborer”) and two more identified as specific to northern Brazil (“a pack-horse driver [*magō*]; cohabitant [*dōseisha*]”). It is the first of these regionally specific senses that Handa Tomoo (1906-96), a scholar of Japanese migration to Brazil and himself an immigrant (in 1917), identified as the most common use of the term among Japanese immigrants.²⁶ Given this fact, the inclusion of the alternate, regionally specific senses of the term reinforces the notion that the revised edition was attempting to achieve a high degree of thoroughness.

In the case of another term, *caboclo*, one sees a greater understanding of the racial imageries at play in Brazil reflected in the definitions of the term.

Caboclo, a. 銅色ノ || —, *m.* 伯國土
 人ノ一種族.
Powa jiten
caboclo, a. 銅色の || —, *m.* ブラジル土人の總稱
 || 土人と白人の混血兒. 「雷報」
Powa shinjiten

Figure 7. *POWA JITEN AND POWA SHINJITEN.*

The definition in the first edition, “(Adj.) Copper-colored. (N.) One of Brazil’s indigenous ethnic groups,” was expanded in the revised edition: “(Adj.) Copper-colored. (N.) A generic name for Brazil’s indige-

²⁶ Handa 1981, 789.

nous peoples. The mixed-blood child of an indigenous person and a white." As Nishi Masahiko has written, the term *caboclo* became, for many of the early Japanese immigrants, a term that connoted backwardness, in contrast to the civilization that they perceived as having seized for themselves as a people through the long labors of the Meiji period.²⁷ There was apparently great fear among Japanese migrants of becoming *caboclo* themselves, surrendering that hard-won civilization, in their new homes, particularly through miscegenation. The freighting of the term described by Nishi, in which the signifiers "indigenous peoples (*dojin*)" and "whites (*hakujin*)" would have conjured a clear binary of civilized/uncivilized, is not explicit in either edition of the dictionary. Implicitly, however, the logic of hypodescent is suggested in the revised definition: unions of "indigenous persons" and "whites" are presumed to result in *caboclo*, not white, children.

The final items to be examined are *colonia* and its cognate, *colono*:

Colon, *m.* [解 | 結腸. 「留民.
 Colonia, *f.* 殖民地 || 殖民, 移住民 || 居
 Colonial, *a.* 殖民地ノ, 殖民ノ. 「業.
 Colonização, *f.* 殖民スルコト, 殖民事
 Colonizado, *a.* 殖民セル. 「勵者.
 Colonizador, *a.m.* 殖民經營者, 殖民業
 Colonizar, *va.* 殖民スル, 拓殖スル.
 Colonizavel, *a.* 拓殖ニ適スル, 殖民可
 能ナル.
 Colono, *m.* 殖民, 殖民地ノ住人 || 農夫.
Powa jiten

Figure 8. POWA JITEN.

In the first edition, the terms are defined as follows:

Colonia, *f.* A colony (殖民地 *shokuminchi*); colonist (殖民 *shokumin*), migrant (*ijūmin*); settler (*kyoryūmin*).

Colono, *m.* A colonist (殖民, *shokumin*), a person living in a colony (殖民地 *shokuminchi no jūnin*). A farmer (*nōfu*).

The diversity of this definition reveals the problematic nature of the terms and their history in the source language (Portuguese), the target language (Japanese), and even the etymological origin languages (Latin and, by extension, Greek); at the same time, much of the com-

²⁷ For more on this term, see Nishi 2007, 69-89.

plexity has arisen as a result of translation itself, as the terms have been “carried across” from one language to another and from one socioeconomic chronotope to another. It thus poses complex problems for bilingual lexicographers, particularly one in the throes of multinational labor migration and informal expansionism, as Ōtake was.

The Latin term *colonia*, which is the root of the terms *colony* in English and *colônia* in Portuguese, and is the term for which the calque *shokumin* was developed in Japanese, has been linked to multiple Greek terms, including *apoikia*, *emporion*, and *klerouchia*, which in theory defined different forms of colonies with varying degrees of interconnectedness to their mother cities, but which were not always used with absolute precision.²⁸ In Latin, the term *colonia* was used for two distinct forms of colonies, one that acted as a formal extension of the Roman Empire and one that was an independent community of emigrants abroad. In English, the most important (though not first) source from which Japanese would have drawn the term, the use of the term “colony” has historically been broad, particularly since the late nineteenth century, when the term was borrowed into Japanese.²⁹ Prior to that time, a “colony” was seen as “a plantation of men, a place to which men emigrated and settled”; moreover, that colony remained a dependency, thus differentiating this form of human transplantation from emigration.³⁰ Subsequently, however, the term came to be used for communities with a wide variety of relationships with the colonists’ home of origin, making the distinction between emigration and colonization — or colonization as opposed to colonialism — less clear, at least in popular usage. Eventually the term even came to be used to refer to the structural relationship of one community to another, regardless of the presence or absence of a displaced population. Thus one sees such uses as the declaration in the British Parliament in 1846 that free trade made foreign nations “valuable colonies to us, without imposing on us the responsibility of governing them.”³¹ Ōtake’s definition does not go this far, but it does include the terminology used in describing Japan’s formal colonies alongside more generic terminology concern-

²⁸ Smith 1870, 313-17; Whitley 2001, 124-26; Worthington 2000, 235.

²⁹ Originally, the Japanese term *shokumin* appears to have been used in 1801 to calque the Dutch term *Volkplanting*, which itself appeared in print as early as 1772 in Motoki Yoshinaga’s *Oranda chikyū zuzetsu*, in which the settlement of the New World by Europeans after the arrival of Columbus is given as the prime example. As early as 1867 *shokumin* was used as a translation for the English term “colony.”

³⁰ Finley 1976, 167-188.

³¹ As cited in Semmel 1970, 8.

ing the movement and settlement of individuals. It thus resists a trend that existed in certain circles to clarify the use of the terms. For example, in a 1911 essay entitled, "*Shokumin naru meishi ni tsukite* [On the translation of the noun *shokumin*]," Nitobe Inazō, the first professor of colonial policy at Tokyo Imperial University, argued that the use of the term had been vague to that time and that henceforth *shokuminchi* should be used to describe formal colonial holdings, such as Korea, Taiwan, or Karafuto.³²

The linguistic ambiguity between the formal colonies and informal settlements reflected a political ambiguity: it is a matter of debate how the actual historical processes of emigration and formal colonization interrelated during Japan's imperial period. Peter Duus has argued that the distinction was seen in the last two decades of the Meiji period as follows:

Emigration was thought of as a movement of the poor and the weak, primarily an economic act with little political meaning since the main beneficiary was not the state but the migrant, who might find a better livelihood. Colonization, by contrast, was invariably linked with national purpose, national power, and national interests. It implied the controlled movement of people, often under official auspices or with official protection and encouragement, from the home country to a less developed society where they would establish prosperous and independent communities.³³

Duus argues persuasively that a number of thinkers considered emigration to Hawaii, North America, and Australia to be unproductive from the perspective of the state, citing the scholar and politician Tōgō Minoru (1881-1959)'s comment, "The expansion of a nationality is not necessarily the same as the development of a state" (Duus 1995, 300).

By contrast, Akira Iriye stresses the important continuum between the formal colonial projects of the Japanese state and its sponsorship of broad emigration, arguing that during the early years of Japanese expansion the distinction between emigration and formal colonization was often ambiguous (Iriye 1972, 131). As Akira Iriye writes, "'Peaceful expansionism' did not simply mean the passive emigration of individual Japanese, but could imply a government-sponsored, active program of

³² Alexis Dudden discusses Nitobe Inazō's 1911 essay, "On the Term 'Colony'" ("*Shokumin naru Meiji ni tsukite*"), in which Nitobe addresses the slippage between terms. Dudden 2006, 136-38.

³³ As quoted in Duus 1995, 295.

overseas settlement and positive activities to tie distant lands closer to Japan” (Iriye 1972, 131). Whether the expansion of a nationality is efficacious in the development of a state may be a matter of debate, but there is little doubt that some of the powers-that-be thought it could be, and the actual individuals involved often saw a relation between their conditions and those of their countrymen in the formal colonies.

The use of the term *shokuminchi* in Brazil is even more complicated; this fact explains Ôtake’s odd final equivalent given in the original edition: farmer. The Spanish and Portuguese cognates of the Latin *colonia* that are used in South America signify very different things from the corresponding cognates in English. According to T. Lynn Smith, the difference is particularly dramatic in Brazil:

In Brazil... the meanings given to the Portuguese equivalents of colonist, colony, and colonization are quite different; they vary considerably from one part of the immense country to another, and a number of other terms must be taken into account. For example, in the states of Rio Grande do Sul, Santa Catarina, and Paraná, where millions of the inhabitants are the descendants of immigrant small farmers from Germany, Italy, Poland, and other European countries, who were settled in various colonies on the land during the period from about 1870 to 1914, the *zona colonial* signifies the area given over to small farms and the *colono* is the owner-operator of a small farm. In the great industrial and agricultural state of São Paulo, which bounds Paraná on the north, however, the *colono* is an agricultural laborer who is assigned the care of a specified number of coffee trees for the period of one year, and who is assigned the use of one of the dwellings in the workers’ village, or *colonia*, near the mansion of the proprietor, the mill for processing the coffee cherries, and the grounds on which the coffee beans are spread to dry.³⁴

This explains Ôtake’s inclusion of “farmer” as an equivalent, an obscure regional usage when the words *colonia/shokuminchi* are considered against the backdrop of Japanese calques for the terms’ predominant global cognates, but in fact an equivalent much closer to its dominant sense in the Brazilian context.

This is made clearer in the revised edition, when the definitions are expanded as follows:

³⁴ Smith 1969, 95.

colônia, *f.* 植民地 || (集会的)植民, 移住民, 在留民, 居留民 || (B.) 小作人住居の部落.
colônias, *a.* 植民地の, 植民に関する || 植民地時代の (ブラジル國の).
colônico, *a.* (B.) 植民の, 植民地の.
colonista, *m.* (B.) 植民地問題の研究者, 拓殖業者.
colonização, *f.* 植民すること, 植民事業, 拓殖.
colonizado, *a.* 植民された, 拓殖された.
colonizador, *a. e m.* 植民經營者, 植民奨勵者.
colonizar, *v. t.* に植民地を設ける, に植民する, に拓殖する. [する.]
colonizável, *a.* 植民することの出来る, 拓殖に適し
colono, *m.* 植民 || 植民地の住民 || 耕作人 || (B. S.) 請負耕作人, 小作人.

Powa shinjiten

Colônia, *f.* A colony (植民地 *shokuminchi*); (collectively) colonists (植民 *shokumin*), migrants (*ijūmin*), residents (*zairyūmin*), settlers (*kyoryūmin*); (B.) A village of tenant farmer residences (*kosakunin jūkyo no buraku*).

Colono, *m.* A colonist (植民 *shokumin*), a person living in a colony (植民地 *shokuminchi no jūmin*). A farmer (*kōsakujin*). (B.S.) A contract farmer (*ukeoi kōsakujin*), a tenant farmer (*kosakunin*).

Figure 9. POWA SHINJITEN.

Certain key changes should be noted from the first definition to the second. First, the character used for *shoku* shifts, thus subtly changing the implication from “planting people” to “increasing the people” (Dudden 2006, 137-38). Second, we once again see an increased recognition of the specific usage of the term in the regions to which Japanese are migrating that is made explicit through the new dialectical rubrics. Third, the addition of the notation “collectively (*shūgōteki*)” perhaps reflects an attempt to clarify ambiguity, making clear to users of the dictionaries that the numberless Japanese noun could not be used to refer to singular individuals. At the same time, though, it implies the collective nature of the migration (and its resulting communities) that the term signifies. Fourth, the shift from the generic *nōfu* (farmer) to the specific *ukeoi kōsakujin* (contract farmer) and *kosakunin* (tenant farmer) reveals a greater sensitivity to the specific economic arrangements (and restrictions to agency) that the term had come to imply. Finally, however, the inclusion

of yet another general term, *zairyūmin* (a person/people who live/s in a foreign country), also seems to reflect a greater agency enjoyed by immigrants, as the term does not connote legal, geographical limitations to habitation, as *kyoryūmin* (people who live in a settlement or concession) does. In short, the specificities of the terms' usages in Brazil, which are only hinted at in the original definition, are brought out in some detail in the revised edition. It comes as little surprise that Ōtake has to provide such a complex definition for something that was in the process of being defined, a process the dictionary not only recorded, but also facilitated.

Conclusion

The Spanish humanist Antonio de Nebrija wrote in 1492 that, "language was always the companion of empire; therefore it follows that together they begin, grow, and flourish, and together they fall."³⁵ It is a truism that the need for bilingual dictionaries arises when disparate groups come into contact; it comes as no surprise, then, that the first two attempts at establishing equivalences between Portuguese and Japanese arose at moments of global expansion: the seventeenth-century *Nippo jisho* was the result of an ideological expansionism (religious proselytizing) that attended, sometimes justified, and sometimes contributed to political and economic expansion.³⁶ Similarly, Ōtake's dictionary was composed at a moment of significant expansion for the Japanese empire: the twentieth-century *Powa jiten* was a product of both economic and geopolitical expansion. While it would be misguided and reductive to suggest that either the missionaries or Ōtake Wasaburō invested such effort into the compilation of these dictionaries with the primary goal of geopolitical or economic expansion, in both cases the creation of the dictionaries was undergirded by economic expansion, whether it was the trade of the early European empires or the more complicated integration and search for advantage by a twentieth-century economy.

The difference between the two events, which is also visible in the physical appearance of the two dictionaries, was the new large-scale flows of populations, as labor. One wonders if the missionaries in Na-

³⁵ As quoted in Rafael 1988, 23.

³⁶ Dauril Alden summed it up concisely: "The heads of state supported, tolerated, and/or encouraged the activities of the Society because they perceived it was in their own interests to do so." Alden 1996, 656.

gasaki could have imagined a scenario in which such exchange between Japanese and Portuguese would be necessary. Ōtake, for his part, composed his first dictionary just as large-scale migration was beginning to accelerate, and revised it when it seemed clear that a large community — or colony — of Japanese would likely remain in a spot that is literally the most distant point on the globe from Japan. Thanks in part to Ōtake's lexicographical achievement, this mass migration resulted in the largest population of individuals of Japanese descent outside of Japan. While it may not have been the first attempt at establishing Japanese-Portuguese equivalences, the *Powa jiten*'s contribution to the establishment of a population that is now 1.5 million strong warrants its continued study.

References

- Alden, Dauril, 1996. *The Making of an Enterprise: The Society of Jesus in Portugal, Its Empire, and Beyond, 1540-1750*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Azuma, Eiichiro, 2005. *Between Two Empires: Race, History, and Transnationalism in Japanese America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Burns, E. Bradford, 1993. *A History of Brazil*, third edition. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Chamberlain, Basil Hall, 1888. Rodriguez' System of Transliteration. *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan*, Volume XVI Part I:10-16.
- Cooper, Michael, 1976. Review: The Nippo Jisho. *Monumenta Nipponica* 31.4: 417-30.
- Cooper, Michael, 1980. Review: Hōyaku Nippo jisho. *Monumenta Nipponica* 35.4: 512-13.
- Dudden, Alexis, 2006. *Japan's Colonization of Korea: Discourse and Power*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Duus, Peter, 1995. *The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895-1910*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Finley, M. I., 1976. Colonies: An Attempt at a Typology. *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th Series, Volume 26*: 167-88.
- Handa Tomoo, 1981. *Imin no seikatsu no rekishi: Burajiru Nikkeijin no ayunda michi*. São Paulo, Brazil: Centro de Estudos Nipo Brasileiros.
- Horie Yoshifumi, 2008. *Nippaku yūkō no ishizue, Ōtake Wasaburō: jisho hensan to sūki na shōgai*. São Paulo: Centro de Estudos Nipo-Brasileiros.
- Huffman, James L., 1997. *Creating a Public: People and Press in Meiji Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Iriye, Akira, 1972. *Pacific Estrangement: Japanese and American Expansion, 1897-1911*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Iwao, Seiichi, et al., 2002. *Dictionnaire historique du Japon*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Konno Toshihiko and Fujisaki Yasuo, ed. 1994. *Iminshi I: Nanbei-hen*. Tokyo: Shinsensha.

- Laures, Johannes, SJ, 1957. *Kirishitan Bunko: A Manual of Books and Documents on the Early Christian Mission in Japan*, third edition. Tokyo: Sophia University.
- Moran, J. F., 1993. *The Japanese and the Jesuits: Alessandro Valignano in sixteenth-century Japan*. London: Routledge.
- Nakagawa Kiyoshi and Etsuko Kodama, 2000. Seiwa jiten no shūhen. *Keiai Daigaku Kokusai Kenkyū* 6: 127-52.
- Nippo jisho: Vocabulário da Língua de Iapam com declaração em Portugues*, 1603-4. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1960.
- Nishi Masahiko, 2007. Burajiru Nihonjin bungaku to 'kabokuro' mondai. In *Ima o yomikaeru: 'kono jidai' no owari*, edited by Ikeda Hiroshi, 69-89. Tokyo: Inpakuto Shuppankai.
- Ōtake Wasaburō, 1918. *Powa jiten: Dicionário Português-Japonez*. Tokyo: Kaigai Kōgyō Kabushiki Kaisha.
- , 1925. *Wapo jiten: Dicionário Japonez-Portuguez*. Tokyo: Kaigai Kōgyō Kabushiki Kaisha.
- , 1937. *Powa shin jiten: Novo dicionário Português-Japonez*. Tokyo: Kaigai Kōgyō Kabushiki Kaisha.
- Paurisuta Shinbunsha, ed. 1996. *Nihon/Burajiru kōryū jinmei jiten*. Tokyo: Satsuki Shobō.
- Rafael, Vicente L., 1988. *Contracting Colonialism: Translation and Christian Conversion in Tagalog Society under Early Spanish Rule*. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press.
- Sakakura Atsuyoshi, ed. 1971. *Kōza kokugo-shi, volume 3: Goi-shi*. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten.
- Sakurai Ryōhei, 1974. Aru shisei no gogakusha: Porutogaru-go no Ōtake Wasaburō. *Gengo seikatsu* 277: 85-89.
- Semmel, Bernard, 1970. *The Rise of Free Trade Imperialism: Classical Political Economy, the Empire of Free Trade, and Imperialism, 1750-1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Joseph, 2000. Brazilian Diplomacy and Foreign Intervention in the Brazilian Naval Revolt, 1893-94. *Revista Complutense de Historia de América* 26: 117-34.
- Smith, T. Lynn, 1969. Studies of Colonization and Settlement. *Latin American Research Review* 4.1: 93-123.
- Smith, William ed. 1870. *Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company.
- Suzuki Teijirō, 1941. *Umōreku takujin no sokuseki*. São Paulo: Suzuki Nanju.
- Whitley, James, 2001. *The Archaeology of Ancient Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williams, Edwin B., 1942. Portuguese and Brazilian Spelling. *Hispania* 25.2: 189-93.
- Worthington, Ian, 2000. Demosthenes, *Philippic* 2.20 and Potidaea the *Apoikia*. *Hermes* 128.2: 235-36.