

Alice Crowther

**A Manuscript Russian-Chinese-Manchu Dictionary
(from before 1737) in T.S. Bayer's Papers
in Glasgow University Library.
Part II: Notes on the Manchu and Chinese Lexica
and the Transcription of Manchu¹**

DOI: 10.55512/wmo114834

Abstract: This article is the second part of a two-part presentation of an anonymous Russian-Chinese-Manchu manuscript dictionary from before 1737 held in the papers of T.S. Bayer (1694–1738) in Glasgow University Library. It examines the annotations found on sixty of the dictionary's 217 pages. These annotations use a mixture of Cyrillic and Latin script to give the pronunciation of the Chinese and Manchu entries. The article also discusses otherwise unattested Chinese and Manchu lexical entries found in the dictionary, and the use of popular variant character forms in the Chinese entries.

Key words: Manuscript dictionary, Manchu, T.S. Bayer, transcription, popular variant character forms

Introduction

Glasgow University Library's Special Collections holds a collection of the papers of Theophilus Siegfried Bayer (1694–1738), member of the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences from 1726 to 1738. These include an anonymous Russian-Chinese-Manchu manuscript dictionary (from before

© Alice Crowther, École Pratique des Hautes Études–Paris Sciences Lettres / Centre de recherche sur les civilisations de l'Asie orientale, Paris, France alice.crowther@me.com

¹ I sincerely thank David Weston, former director of Glasgow University Library's Special Collections, for having taken the time to speak with me when I visited the library in August 2016, and for allowing me to consult a draft version of his catalogue of the Bayer collection before its publication. I would like to thank Pierre Marsone and Mårten Söderblom Saarela for their comments on the draft of this article.

1737). The dictionary is bound into two volumes (19.3×21.8 cm, first volume 114 ff., second volume 103 ff.) and contains 2,328 Russian headwords, with Chinese and Manchu definitions. As well as the dictionary entries, which are written in black ink, the Bayer collection dictionary contains two layers of annotations. Firstly, for sixty pages (a total of 321 entries) a transcription of the Chinese and Manchu entries into a mixture of Latin and Cyrillic letters is written in black ink above the original entries in a smaller size and with a much finer-tipped writing instrument. The colour of the black ink is not discernibly different from that of the original entries. Secondly Latin, and sometimes German, translations or notes are added, in Bayer's hand and in an ink which now appears brownish, to most of the Russian head-entries in the first volume and to the first two pages of the second volume.

The first part of this article presented the provenance of this dictionary and the possible candidates for its authorship, concluding that it was produced in the context of the first Russian Ecclesiastical Mission to Peking but that it was not possible to identify the author. Since, Greg Afinogenov has told me of a report by Lorents Lange (dated as received on 19th Feb 1734) in which Lange says that he has instructed Luka Voeikov to compose, with the help of the Jesuits, as complete a Latin-Russian-Chinese dictionary as possible, giving him as incentive that when he completed this work he would be allowed to return to Russia.² This raises the possibility that Voeikov would have had good reason to work on a dictionary, and an instruction to compile a Latin-Russian-Chinese dictionary might well have evolved into a Russian-Chinese-Manchu project. The Jesuit Dominique Parrenin does mention Voeikov in a letter to Bayer dated 13th July 1734, but this is in connection with Parrenin's Latin-Chinese lexicon (Ms Hunter 392 (V.2.12) which is unrelated to the Bayer collection Russian-Chinese-Manchu dictionary³; at the time Parrenin wrote this letter Voeikov was already dead, from illness. It is however not impossible that he would have had the time to produce the dictionary between Lange's instruction and his death; although if he did he seems to have worked independently of the Jesuits. This does not definitively resolve the question of authorship, but adds some weight to Voeikov as a candidate.

² RGIA (Russian State Historical Archives) f. 796, op. 11, d. 23, 133–134. Reference from Greg Afinogenov, email of 24/07/2022, in which he kindly shared his transcription of this passage from his work in the archives.

³ See the references in Part I of this article: 70, n. 41 and n. 42.

This second and concluding part of the article presents a more detailed study of the dictionaries' Manchu and Chinese lexica and of the system of transcription found in the annotations giving the pronunciation of the Manchu and Chinese entries.

The Manchu and Chinese Lexica of the Dictionary

The Chinese definitions often use colloquial language — e.g. 不是我的事; 扎猛子; 起頭兜⁴; 說那一個人 — and are sometimes more explanations than equivalents (e.g. 有錯處; 燒⁵酒之鍋⁶; 沙土地長松柏處). Popular variant forms in current usage in the late imperial period are often found, e.g. 寫 for 寫; 處 for 處; 夢 for 夢; 恨 for 恨; 疾 written with the component part 失 rather than 矢; alternation between use of 國 and its popular variant 国. Some forms not attested in any variant dictionaries are also found, e.g. *nüe* 瘡, with the tiger component 虍 replaced by the rain component 雨.⁷ This, combined with the general fluency of the brushstrokes, suggests a native writer habituated to writing characters, but perhaps not with a scholar's training, and not a Western student. Sometimes the Manchu definitions — which are also written in a fluent, practiced hand — seem to be translations, often word for word, of the Chinese definition, rather than of the Russian headword. For example, the Manchu equivalent given next to 國子監 [Directorate of Education] is *gurun-i jusei yamun*, a literal translation (“office of the nation's sons”) but not the official name, which was *gurun-i juse be hūwašabure yamun* (“office where the nation's sons are

⁴ Popular variant form of 兒. Images of variant characters are taken from the online character variant dictionary *Yitizi zidian* 異體字字典/ *Dictionary of Chinese Character Variants* (JIAOYUBU 教育部/Ministry of Education: 2017).

⁵ Popular variant form of 燒.

⁶ Popular variant form of 鍋.

⁷ Note also the use of an iteration marker frequently found in late imperial manuscript texts (not currently included in Unicode so here transcribed by the character 乚 which it resembles in form although it is in fact written much smaller than the rest of the text), e.g. at v. 1, f. 67v: Ru. грохощы or хохочу, Ma. *gigi gaga seme injembi*, Ch. 哈哈嘻乚 ‘to laugh *haha heehee*’



reared”). However, this is by no means always the case e.g. три звезды is rendered in Chinese as 三星 but by the Manchu *ilmahū usiha* (star of the [Weaver’s] shuttle); and Архиевнухъ glossed by Bayer as “Archieunuchus” is simply 首領 (“chief-, head-“) in Chinese but elaborated to *seo ling taigiyan* (e.g. a Manchu transcription of the Chinese words *shouling taijian* 首領太監 “head eunuch”) in Manchu. It is not possible to say with certitude if the Chinese and Manchu definitions were written by the same person, but this seems very possible. A Manchu could have written both, as by the eighteenth century a literate Manchu living in Peking would also have had knowledge of spoken and written Chinese since childhood. It is also possible that a Chinese wrote the Chinese definitions, and a Manchu the Manchu definitions. As very few Chinese had any opportunity to study Manchu, it seems possible to dismiss the hypothesis that a Chinese scribe could have written both the fluent Manchu definitions and the Chinese definitions with their frequent use of popular and non-standard character forms.

The manuscript dictionary seems to have been produced through a process of collaboration between a Russian-speaker, who probably explained orally in Chinese the Russian headwords he had written down, and one or more collaborators fluent in Chinese and Manchu (either native Chinese or Manchu, or members of the Russian company), who wrote down Chinese, and then Manchu, equivalents. An illustration of how the definitions were produced through description is seen in the entry for the month of August, which is translated in Chinese and in Manchu as ‘the seventh month’ (七月/ *nadan biyai* [*sic*]) rather than the ‘eighth month’; the seventh month fits better with where the month of August normally falls in the Chinese lunar calendar. Similarly December is translated as ‘the eleventh month’ (十一月/ *omšon biya*). In a like manner architect (архитекторъ, Bayer: *Architectus*) is rendered as ‘a building-works master craftsman’ (工程巧匠/ *weilere arara mangga faksi*). A similar process of transposition can be seen for the word “godless” (без’бож’ны, annotated by Bayer as *impius, das Gottloße*) which is rendered in both Chinese and Manchu as ‘not knowing the deities or Buddha’ (不知神佛/ *enduri Fucihi be sarkū*). However, it is worth noting that the word for God (Богъ, glossed by Bayer as *Gott, Deus*) seems to have been regarded as untransposable and is simply not translated into either Chinese or Manchu. A shift or loss of meaning in the course of the translation process is seen in блудникъ ѿли блудунъ ‘whoremonger’ which becomes ‘fond of sodomy’ in the Manchu and Chinese glosses

(Ch. 好男風, Ma. *fajuhūlaran de amuran*). However immediately below блудница или блыдь ‘prostitute’ is rendered with exactitude as Ch. 妓, Ma. *gise hehe*.

Most of the Manchu entries in the manuscript dictionary are also found, with the same orthography, in other contemporary Manchu dictionaries. There are some scribal errors: the dot of an e or u forgotten (*uncahen* for *uncehen* ‘tail’), or š written in place of s (*šile* for *sile* ‘soup’); and some variant forms (far less frequent than the use of popular character variants in the Chinese entries): an i in place of an e (e.g. *jerin* for *jeren* ‘Mongolian gazelle’; *niyeksimbi* for *niyeksembi* ‘to thaw’); an i in place of an a (*micambi* for *macambi* ‘to patch’; *yasa hirimbi* for *yasa hirambi* ‘to gaze at’); u for e (*selfun* for *selfen* ‘slit [in clothing]’); e for u (*tufen* for *tufun* ‘stirrup’); u for i (*hūjuri ba* for *hūjiri ba* ‘salt flats’); a for o (*yacambi* for *yocambi* ‘to itch, to be bitten by bugs’); a for i (*beceme dangsambi* for *beceme dangsimbi* ‘to reproach, to censure’); a dropped vowel (*umdu* for *umudu* ‘orphan’); a doubled consonant (*illembi* for *ilembi* ‘to lick’); g for k (*maigan* for *maikan* ‘tent’; *gaga gigi injembi* for *kaka kiki injembi* ‘laughing *haha heehee*’); t for d (*turgiya usiha* for *durgiya usiha* ‘the morning star’; *cira aktun* for *cira akdun* ‘firm, hard’; *fotoho* for *fodoho* ‘willow’); r in place of l (*burdun* for *buldun/buldu* ‘uncastrated male pig’) *gocike* for *kuwecihe* ‘pigeon’; *mayahambi* for *mayambi* (‘to go down, to subside’); *sencike* for *sencehe* ‘chin’,⁸ and *sencihelaku* for *senceheleku* ‘bridle ornament’. The verb for to sleep is also a slight variant: *amugambi* (e.g. *eleme amugahanakū*/未睡醒) or *amuhambi* (e.g. *amuhame muterakū*/睡不著) rather than *amgambi*.

A handful of Manchu words seem to be unattested elsewhere:

boksu for calf/lower-leg (Russian икры, Chinese 腿肚子). (v. 1, f. 112r.)

hiyeri in ‘*hiyeri tuwambi*’ for ‘to look wildly at’ (дико смотреть) (Chinese 橫眼瞧 ‘to look askance at’ (v. 1, f. 75v.)

jora for bridle bit (Russian удила, Chinese 嚼子). (v. 2, f. 79r.)

selmin wehe for diamond (Russian адамант, glossed by Bayer as *Adamas*, Chinese 金剛鑽) (v. 1, f. 1v.). *Selmin* designates a crossbow used

⁸ The same variant form *sencike* is found in the *Nišan saman-i bithe* manuscript published by M.P. Volkova in 1961. The manuscript was written down at the request of A.V. Grebeščikov in Vladivostok by a Manchu named Dekdengge in 1913. Cf. VOLKOVA 1961: 23: “*sencike tukiyeceme yasa hadanaha ergen yadafi*” (“his chin tilted upwards and his eyes became fixed. After his breathing had stopped [...]”). Stephen Durrant’s translation, taken from NOWAK & DURRANT 1977: 43).

in traps set for animals, and *wehe* “stone”. *Selmin* must derive from *sele* “iron”, with the noun/adjective suffix –*min* (or –*miyen*). *Wehe selmin* exists as “a stone drill; a crossbow for shooting stones”. In other contemporary dictionaries diamond is given in Manchu as *palta/palta wehe* or *paltari/paltari wehe*. A manuscript Latin-Chinese-Manchu dictionary held by the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Mandchou 281, vol. I, f. 52r) defines diamond (entry: “*adamas antis*”) as *paltari wehe* or (with what again seems more an explanation than an equivalent) as *der seme šeyen gu wehe* “a very white snow-white precious stone”.

šoolambi for ‘to heat’ (Russian жаръ, Chinese 燒), and *šoolahangge* ‘that which is cooked, heated’ (Russian жарены, Chinese 燒的). (v. 2, f. 89v). A verb constructed from the Chinese *shao* 燒: *šoo* [from *shao*; *oo* is the fixed Manchu transcription for Chinese *ao*] + *la* [verbalizing element] + *mbi* [infinitive/present verbal ending]. On the opposite page (f. 90r) 燒, Russian жгу ('burn'), is translated by Manchu *deijimbi* ‘to burn’, so *šoolambi* seems definitely to be used to convey a precise nuance of meaning.

Also not found in other contemporary dictionaries is a Manchu transcription of the word balsam (балсамъ, glossed as *Balsamus* by Bayer's annotation) as *bar seme hiyan* [incense called bar] (Ch. 八拉薩母香 [*ba-la-sa-mu* incense]). However, although not incorporated into any dictionaries, balsam had in fact already been rendered, slightly differently and in a form closer to the Latin orthography, into Manchu: it appears in the compound *balsamun weite* (probably for *balsamum vitae*) in Jean-François Gerbillon, S.J. (1654–1707) and Joachim Bouvet, S.J. (1656–1730)'s 1693 *Si yang ni okto-i bithe* (*Treatise on Western Drugs*).⁹ It seems the author of the Manchu and Chinese definitions was unaware of both this and of earlier Chinese words for balsam (e.g. *abo shen* 阿勃參).¹⁰

⁹ Tsai Ming-che, email communication, 1st Aug 2022. I owe this reference to Mårten Söderblom Saarela, who kindly put me in touch with Tsai Ming-che. The identification of *balsamun weite* with *balsamum vitae* was suggested to Tsai by Saarela. For further discussion of the *Si yang ni okto-i bithe*, see TSAI 2011, 2015a, 2015b. Tsai Ming-che adds that in the Qing Palace archives an oil used on wounds called, in Chinese, *ba-er-sa-mu you* 巴爾撒木油, is mentioned. Its effects as described are different from those given for the *balsamun weite* medicine found in the *Si yang ni okto-i bithe*. For further discussion of the references to balsam found in the Chinese-language Imperial Palace archives, see GUAN 2016.

¹⁰ For a survey of knowledge of “Old World balsam” or “balm of Gilead” (bot. *Commiphora gileadensis*) as both an aromatic and a medicine in China, where it was known from Tang times onward, see SCHOTTENHAMMER 2020, an article which outlines the Jesuit

One of the most interesting of the dictionary's lexical items, and a usage not found in any other published or manuscript dictionary or source that I have been able to consult, are the translations of the names of continents. The dictionary does not give the words for countries (no Russia or China), but does include the names of three continents: Africa, Asia, and America, which it translates by giving the Chinese names of three of the continents of Buddhist cosmography:

Asia [азиа] (annotated by Bayer: Asia) is 南瞻部州 [pinyin *nan dan bu zhou*] [manuscript transcription: nan, dzan, boe dzooe], and in Manchu script *nan jan bu jeo* [manuscript transcription: nan, dzan, boe, dzo, oe].

America [америка] (annotated by Bayer: America) is 東聖神州 [pinyin *dong sheng shen zhou*] [manuscript transcription: doenk, ши^н, ши^н, dzo, oe] and in Manchu script *deng šeng šen jeo* [manuscript transcription: doenk, shenk, ши^н, dzo, oe].

Africa [африка] (annotated by Bayer: Aphrica) is 西牛賀州 [pinyin *xi niu he zhou*] [no manuscript transcription], and in Manchu script *si nio he jeo*.

In Buddhist sacred geography, Mount Meru is said to stand at the centre of the universe, surrounded by a sea containing four continents. Jambudvīpa, land of the *jambū*, a black plum tree, is positioned to the south. It traditionally designated India and the lands adjacent to it; also the land where mankind lived, as opposed to lands inhabited by fabulous creatures or deities. In Chinese it was transcribed as Nanshanbuzhou 南瞻部洲 (Southern *Shanbu* Continent). In the manuscript dictionary, rather than *shan* 瞻, the character written is the rare *dan* 瞻, which is then transcribed in Manchu as *jan* and annotated in a mixture of Latin and Cyrillic script as *dyan*: here it seems that the scribe was thinking of the character *zhan* 瞻, and miswrote the radical. This also suggests that in the milieu where he had heard of Jambudvīpa, Nanshanbuzhou 南瞻部洲 was being commonly read as Nanzhanbuzhou (which is in fact closer to the Sanskrit pronunciation, so perhaps evidence of some knowledge of Sanskrit leading to this (mis-) reading). Another small fault is that the manuscript dictionary systematically writes *zhou* 州 without the water radical, rather than the 洲 found in the standard Chinese terms. The Eastern continent is Pūrvavideha. In Chinese

introduction of 'Peruvian balsam' (bot. *Myroxylon balsamum*) into sixteenth-century China. As the balsam referred to in the Bayer collection dictionary is described as an incense or perfume (Ch. *xiang* 香), it seems it is referring to "Old World balsam".

popular culture it was known as the birthplace of the Monkey King, Sun Wukong 孫悟空.¹¹ The standard Chinese translations are 東勝身洲 (Eastern Continent of the Incorporeal-Bodied¹²) or *Dongshengshenzhou* 東勝神州 (Eastern Continent of the Triumphant Spirits). The homophonous 東聖神州 (Eastern Holy Spirits Continent), with the common character *sheng* 聖 “holy, sacred/sage” is understandable as a *glissement* of transcription for someone who knew the word orally but was not accustomed to seeing it written down, or for someone who had forgotten which character was used for *sheng*. The Western continent is the continent of bountiful cattle, Aparagodānīya, in Chinese *Xiniuhozhou* 西牛貨洲 “Western Cattle-Exchanging Continent” (or *Xiniuhezhou* 西牛賀洲 as found in the manuscript dictionary which in this case (apart from its substitution of 州) is employing a well-attested variant form), where cattle were said to be used as means of barter.¹³ The fourth northern continent, not used in the dictionary’s geography, was Uttarakuru (in Chinese rendered Beijuluzhou 北俱盧洲, Northern *julu* Continent). As the polar opposite of the human-inhabited Jambudvopa, it was perhaps the most utopic of the sacred continents (*Rāmāyaṇa*, canto 39 and 42: “...there is neither cold nor heat, nor decrepitude, nor disease, nor grief, nor fear, nor rain, nor sun [...] There are lakes there, whose waters are covered with golden lotuses [...] Pearls and gems of great prices and masses of blue flowers possessing golden stamens...”¹⁴). It seems that rather than being able — or choosing — to refer

¹¹ Wu Cheng’en 吳承恩. *Xiyouji* 西遊記, ch. 8: “Those living on the East Pūrvavideha revere Heaven and Earth, and they are straightforward and peaceful”. (東勝身洲者, 敬天禮地, 心爽氣平). (Anthony C. Yu’s translation. See YU 2012: vol. 1, 204).

¹² Literally ‘of those who have conquered the body’. From the Sanskrit *videha* (MACDONELL 1929 [1924]: 283 gives: *vi-deha* “bodiless, deceased”; 279 *vi* “as a vbl. preposition and w. nouns expresses separation, privation, dispersion (asunder, apart, off, away, without, etc.)”).

¹³ A similar identification of the Buddhist continents was made by two Russian scholars in the twentieth century: cf. GUMILEV & KUZNETSOV 1970: 565–579, which discusses a highly symbolic Tibetan map (unfortunately only identified as a “published” “Indo-Tibetan map of the world”), and hypothesizes that its traditional representation of the Eastern continent Videha as “three semi-circles whose straight sides face West” is how the Americas would have appeared to Indians crossing the Pacific Ocean; similarly they interpret the representation of the Western continent of Godānīya as three circles as an image of North Africa (largest central circle), Europe (upper circle), and southern Africa (lower circle). By contrast when, in the nineteenth century, the Japanese Tendai monk Entsu 円通 (1755–1834) elaborated a reconciliation of Buddhist and European cosmology, he took Jambudvīpa as being jointly formed by the three continents Asia, Europe, and Africa (MOERMAN 2021: 336).

¹⁴ SHASTRI 1976: 284–285. Cited in BATTACHARYA 2000: 191–201.

to a map to explain the geographical location of Africa, Europe, and Asia, the dictionary's European author must have given descriptions of these continents, and his collaborator then interpreted them through his own Buddhist cosmographical knowledge; the translation of Asia, where China and both the authors were, as Jambudvīpa, is evident; the other two choices must have resulted from the combination of the geographical (of America and Africa) and cosmographical (of Videha and Godānīya) knowledge that the collaborators possessed.

The author of the Manchu entries uses Manchu transcriptions of the Chinese names, and not the translations fixed for use in the Manchu Buddhist canon, which were:¹⁵

Jambudvīpa: *julergi tsambu tib*¹⁶ (Southern *Tsambu* Continent)

Videha: *dergi ambalinggū beyengge tib* (Eastern Great-Bodied Continent)

Godānīya: *wargi ihan baitalara tib* (Western Cow-Using Continent)

And, for the northern continent, Uttarukuru: *amargi ehe jilgangga tib* (Northern Inauspicious-Sounding Continent).

In contrast to this manuscript dictionary's conceptual transpositions to define the continents, from the late sixteenth century Jesuit geographical works and maps — Matteo Ricci's (1552–1610) *Kunyu wanguo quantu* 坤輿萬國全圖 (*Complete Map of the World's Ten Thousand Countries*)

¹⁵ Cf. The pentaglot Sanskrit (in Tibetan script)-Tibetan-Manchu-Mongolian-Chinese Buddhist glossary *Man-Han-Xifan jiyao* 滿漢西番集要, *juan xia* 下, ff. 23–24. Undated court imprint from the Qianlong (r. 1734–1796) era (cf. BINGENHEIMER 2013: 212–213). The BnF holds a copy which is now available on Gallica.fr: Sanscrit 1757 (formerly Mandchou 228). A facsimile (not of the BnF copy; no other provenance given) was published by Raghu Vira in New Delhi: VIRA 1961. A transcription of Raghu Vira's publication is provided by the Dharma Drum Buddhist College/Fagu Fojiao xueyuan 法鼓佛教學院: <http://buddhisticinformatics.dila.edu.tw/manchu/glossary.php>, as well as a catalogue list for the Manchu Buddhist Canon: <http://buddhisticinformatics.dila.edu.tw/manchu/catalog.php> (Dharma Drum Buddhist College, 2007–2011).

¹⁶ On the use of *tib* for continent: KHABTAGAEVA 2009: 154 cites the rendering of “Jambudvīpa” in pre-classical Mongolian as *ǰambu tib* (Khalkha *ǰambatiw*, Buryat *zambi tübi*, Kalmuck *zamba-tib*), which she thinks derives from a reconstructed Turkic **ǰambudvip* (citing Old Uighur *ǰambudvip/ǰmbudvip/ǰmbudivp*), itself from the Sanskrit Jambudvīpa. In the Mongolian version of the Buddhist canon, Jambudvīpa is similarly rendered *zambu tib*. However, Videha is *doron-a ülemǰi bey-e-tü*, Godānīya is *örün-e üker edlegči*, and the northern continent is *umar-a mayu dayutu*. In the Qing Buddhist canon, Chinese 洲 is systematically translated in Manchu as *tib*, whereas much more variation is found in the Mongolian terms used.

(1602),¹⁷ Giulio Aleni's (1578–1645) *Zhifang waiji* 職方外記 (*Record of Foreign Lands by an Imperial Geographer*) (1623), Ferdinand Verbiest's (1623–1688) *Kunyu quantu* 坤輿全圖 (*Complete Map of the World*) (1674) — had adopted the convention of using phonetic transcriptions for the names of the continents: Yaxiya 亞細亞 (Asia), Ouluoba 歐邏巴 (Europe), Liweiya 利未亞 (Africa [Libya]), Nan Yamolijia 南亞墨利加 (South America), and Bei Yamolijia 北亞墨利加 (North America). This difference provides further evidence of the dictionary's composition outside of Jesuit circles.

The Transcription of Manchu in the Annotations to the Dictionary

Tables I and II below show the different Latin and Cyrillic letters used to transcribe Manchu vowels and consonants in the annotations to the dictionary. The Möllendorf system of transliteration into Latin script is used as the base for comparison, with Zakhárov's transliteration¹⁸ into Cyrillic given between square brackets. Front and back k, g, and h are distinguished as k₁, k₂, etc. The next four tables show the different Manchu and Chinese¹⁹ sounds that could be represented by specific Latin (Tables III and IV) and Cyrillic (Tables V and VI) letters and letter combinations. In these tables only letters and letter combinations that occur in the transcription of Manchu are shown, and not those used by the dictionary solely to transcribe

¹⁷ First published under this title in Peking in 1602, but Ricci had printed a world map in 1584 while he was in Guangdong Province. He printed a second version as the *Yudi shanhai quantu* 輿地山海全圖 (*Complete Geographical Map of the Mountains and Seas*) in Nanjing in 1600. Both these versions are no longer extant but known from adaptations published by contemporary Chinese literati. The 1584 edition seems to have included transcriptions of the names of the continents Africa, Asia, North America, and South America; Europe (*Oluoba*) was added in the 1600 version. On the history of the various editions of Ricci's maps, see D'ELIA 1961: 82–164 (p. 89 on the inclusion of continent names).

¹⁸ As given in ZAKHÁROV 2010 [1879].

¹⁹ These tables are based on my transcriptions of the dictionary's annotations. On the Chinese transcriptions, see also DUNN 1992: 16–18 which gives a list in pinyin of all the Chinese syllables transcribed in the dictionary and the different transcriptions used for each. Of particular note in the transcription of Chinese is the borrowing of *el* from Polish orthography to represent pinyin *-er* 兒 e.g. 起頭兒 [*qi tour* “beginning”] = khi, tho, oe, *el*; 沒趣兒 [*mei qur* “boring”] = moe chú *el*. The dictionary's transcription of Chinese does not indicate tones.

Chinese.²⁰ Ø indicates that the sound was not transcribed by the annotator. In tables I and II numbers of occurrences of a transcription given between brackets () are only indications of the general range of frequency: because of the inadequate quality of certain photos taken during my research visit to Glasgow in August 2016, fifty-three entries from six different pages of the transcription are not included in this analysis. Where only one transcription is used in Latin or in Cyrillic, numbers of occurrences are not indicated. For the transcriptions that are not the normal choice of the annotator, the words in which they occur are given in a note. For the annotator's most commonly used transcriptions, which can be considered his default choice to represent a given sound, the words in which they occur are not given. When a sound occurs only a handful of times and is transcribed differently on almost each occasion: all the variants are listed, but no examples are given. In this case the variation most probably arises from the fact that the sound was uncommon and therefore the annotator had not fixed a way of noting it, and not from any differences in the pronunciation of specific words. Where English definitions are given in notes they are taken from NORMAN 2013. < > indicates letters added above line by the annotator.

Table I.
Table of the transcription of Manchu vowels and vowel combinations in the dictionary

| Transcription in Möllendorf system [and Zakhárov] | Transcriptions used in Bayer dictionary (number of occurrences in brackets) | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| | Roman alphabet | Cyrillic alphabet |
| a [a] | a (217) e (2 ²¹) aa (1 ²²) Ø (1 ²³) | a (53) |

²⁰ Because one vowel letter in pinyin can represent several very different sounds depending on a syllable's coda and onset, in Table III and Table IV which give vowel equivalences, the pronunciation in the International Phonetic Alphabet of all the cases where a letter is used to transcribe Chinese in the Bayer dictionary annotations is also specified. I.P.A. is given according to the equivalences between Peking dialect and pinyin laid out in NORMAN 2002 [1988]: 141.

²¹ fajan = fa,dʒen. congkišambi = chonkiɯɯbi.

²² aigan = aijgaan.

²³ hasaha = gasga.

| | | |
|-------|--|--|
| е [э] | е (133) и (10 ²⁴) о (7 ²⁵) ое (3 ²⁶) а (2 ²⁷) ее (1 ²⁸) é (1 ²⁹) | е (22) и (2 ³⁰) о (1 ³¹) |
| и [и] | и (160) ни (4 ³²) је (1 ³³) ји (1 ³⁴) ї (1 ³⁵) а (1 ³⁶) Ø (1 ³⁷) | и (38) |
| о [о] | о (59) ое (6 ³⁸) а (1 ³⁹) | о (24) о (4 ⁴⁰) |

²⁴ emu fen = Emoe, fīn. semken = semkin. kuren = khoerin. kengse lasha = khink se, lasga. beri uhukēn = beri oegoekhin. biya genggiyan = ba kink, in. uhukēn = oegoekhin. erken terken = erkhin therkhin. abkai enduri = abgaj in doe.ri.

²⁵ fekšun = foksoen. eniye = One, i. nimecuke = nimochoekhe. indehen nimeku = indegoen, nimokhoe. ferten = for, then. efēhen = ofogén.

²⁶ indehen nimeku = indegoen, nimokhoe. nimenggi = nimoenki. feng gin = foenk khin.

²⁷ ajige jui = адчика, чү. dare mohombi = dara mogombi. [But note that the standard form of the word written here in Manchu script as ‘dare’ would in fact be ‘dara’ (“waist, lower back”), as transcribed].

²⁸ lefu = leefoe.

²⁹ efēhen = ofogén.

³⁰ muheren = мѳхеринь. šen = ши=и.

³¹ we = во.

³² kiyamun-i morin = kjameon, ni, morin. emu hacin-i giranggi = emoe, hacin, ni kirank [-end of word illegible]. honin-i deberen = gonin, ni, deberen. aisin-i suje = айши=и, ni, soedче.

³³ ajirgan indahūn = adčirgan, jendagoen.

³⁴ illembi = jillembi. [Standard Manchu script form ilembi and not illembi.]

³⁵ enduringge-i efen = endoerink, e, ĩ, efēn.

³⁶ manggiyanihambi = mankkjanagabi.

³⁷ arkan seme isika = arkhan, seme, iskha.

³⁸ soison = soeioen. gala monjimbi = кала Моендчимби. konggoro = khoenkoro. homhon = gomgoen. holtoko = gol, tho, koe. dong = doenk.

³⁹ hūnto = goenta.

⁴⁰ nioboro boco = юѳбѳрѳ боцо. šoyoho = шююхѳ. obumbi = обѳмби.

| | | |
|-----------|--|---|
| u [y] | oe (118) e (2 ⁴¹) eo (1 ⁴²) woe (1 ⁴³) noe (1 ⁴⁴) | ʘ (20) |
| ū [ȳ] | oe | ʘ |
| ai [ай] | aij (14) aje (2 ⁴⁵) a, e (1 ⁴⁶) | / |
| ei [эй] | eij (5) ij (2 ⁴⁷) ei (1 ⁴⁸) eja (1 ⁴⁹) e, e (1 ⁵⁰) | / |
| io [ю/iō] | ú | юʘ |
| iya [я] | ja (4 ⁵¹) ia (4 ⁵²) ea (3 ⁵³) a' (2 ⁵⁴) e (1 ⁵⁵) ie (1 ⁵⁶) ija (1 ⁵⁷) ie (1 ⁵⁸) | a (4 ⁵⁹) я (2 ⁶⁰) ea (1 ⁶¹) |

⁴¹ deribun = deriben. uju nimembi = oed̄che nimembi.

⁴² kiyamun-i morin = k̄jameon, ni, morin.

⁴³ ungḡa jalan = woenka, d̄chalan.

⁴⁴ unumbi = noenoembi.

⁴⁵ baimbi = bajembi (twice).

⁴⁶ baimbi = ba, embi.

⁴⁷ wej̄jun = wij̄d̄choen. hehei gurun = gegij̄ koeroen.

⁴⁸ weihu = weigoe.

⁴⁹ neimbi = nejamb̄i.

⁵⁰ neimbi = ne, embi.

⁵¹ hiyang = sjank. kiyamun = k̄jameon. biya arga = bja, arga. manggiyanihambi = mankk̄janagabi.

⁵² kiyangkiyan = khiank, khen. niyalma = nialma. biyadari = biadari. giyarimbi = kiaximbi.

⁵³ niyalma = nealma (three times).

⁵⁴ saniya = sana'. huwaliyasun [standard form 'hūwaliyasun'] = gwala'soen.

⁵⁵ kiyangkiyan = khiank, khen.

⁵⁶ talkiyan = talkhien.

⁵⁷ aliyambi = alijamb̄i.

⁵⁸ siyang = sienk.

⁵⁹ miyaliyambi = маламби. biya = ба (twice).

⁶⁰ šanggiyan = ша^нянь (twice).

⁶¹ ice niyalma = иче неалма.

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| k ₁ (a, o, ū) [к] | kh (27) k (6 ⁷⁰) g (6 ⁷¹) kg (1 ⁷²) k kh (1 ⁷³) | к (3) |
| k ₂ (e, u, i) [к/к̄ ⁷⁴] | kh (19) k (4 ⁷⁵) g (1 ⁷⁶) | к (2) |
| k (before a consonant) [къ] | k (12) | к (2) |
| k (final) [къ] | k | / |
| g ₁ (a, o, ū) [г] | k (9) g (3 ⁷⁷) | к (1) г (1 ⁷⁸) х (1 ⁷⁹) |
| g ₂ (e, u, i) [г/г̄ ⁸⁰] | k (14) g (1 ⁸¹) | к (6) х (1 ⁸²) |
| h ₁ (a, o, ū) [х] | g (49) h (2 ⁸³) kh (1 ⁸⁴) k (1 ⁸⁵) gh (2 ⁸⁶) | х (14) |

⁷⁰ kocike = kocike. fuhali herserakū = foegali gerserakoe. gūnin baharakū = koenin bagharakoe. yoktakū = Joktakoe. [NB: but elsewhere the negative verbal form –akū appears as –akhoe]. holtoko = gol, tho, koe. yadarko = jatarkoe.

⁷¹ abka = abga (3 times). abkai = abgaij. jabdurakū = dzabdoeragoe. gisun gairakū = kisoen kaijragoe.

⁷² jakade = дчакгаде.

⁷³ dorakū = dorak khoe.

⁷⁴ Before u.

⁷⁵ semken = semkin. kiyamun-i morin = kjameon, ni, morin, muke = moeke. kiyoo = kio.

⁷⁶ urukebi = oe, roe, ge, bi.

⁷⁷ arga = arga. aigan = aijgaan. umgan = oemgan.

⁷⁸ gala = гала.

⁷⁹ asigan = ашихань.

⁸⁰ Before u.

⁸¹ ebergi = ebergi.

⁸² umgan gidambi = Ѵмхань китамби.

⁸³ hacin = hacin. eniyehen honin = Enegen, honin.

⁸⁴ jafaha = дчакфакха.

⁸⁵ bojuha yali = boedчоекка Ya'nli.

⁸⁶ gūnin baharakū = koenin bagharakoe. kataha yali = khatagha Yenli.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| h ₂ (e, u, i) [x/x ⁻⁸⁷] | g (37) s (1 ⁸⁸) kh (1 ⁸⁹) | x (8) |
| b [б] | b p (2 ⁹⁰) | б |
| p [п] | ph | / |
| s [с] | s | с Ø (1 ⁹¹) |
| š [ш] | s (2 ⁹²) | ш с (1 ⁹³) |
| si [си] | si (5 ⁹⁴) s (1 ⁹⁵) | ши си (2 ⁹⁶) жи (2 ⁹⁷) |
| t [т] | th (33) t (16) | т (4) |
| d [д] | d (45) t (8) th (1) | д (7) т (1) |
| l [л] | l | л |
| m [м] | m | м |
| с [ч/ц] | ch (8 ⁹⁸) с (4 ⁹⁹) | ц (6 ¹⁰⁰) ч (2 ¹⁰¹) |

⁸⁷ Before u.

⁸⁸ hiyang = sjank.

⁸⁹ lakderehebi = lakderekhebi.

⁹⁰ debtelin = deptelin. dubin = toepin.

⁹¹ fusheku = ф^ʋхек^ʋ.

⁹² šeng = sen. feksun = feksoen.

⁹³ pahūraka = сax^ʋ, пака.

⁹⁴ siyang = sienk. sirame = sirame. siltan = silthan. singkeri = sinkkeri. ferhe singgeri = ferge, Sinkeri.

⁹⁵ isika = iskha.

⁹⁶ ebsi = ебси. sike = сике.

⁹⁷ fisin yali = фижи^ʎ я^ʎли. huwesi = хожи.

⁹⁸ sonchoho = sonchogo. congkišambi = chonkišbi. cabin = chibin. nimecuke = nimochoekhe. girucun = kiroechoen. jibca = dčibcha. cihangga = chiganka. mucin = moechin.

⁹⁹ kocike = kocike. fucihi = foecigi. hacin = hacin. baitalaci = baijthalaci.

¹⁰⁰ boco = боцо. соко = цоко (twice). dacun = дац^ʋнь. cohogo = цохоро. bucehengge = б^ʋцехе^ʎЕ.

¹⁰¹ yokcin akū = Јокчин akhoe. ice = иче. [On alternance of ц and ч, see DUNN 1992:20, which notes the annotator's apparent occasional confusion between ц and ч in his transcription of Chinese (e.g. pinyin *chi* transcribed чи) as evidence that he was not a native Russian speaker].

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| j [чж] | dч (40) d (1 ¹⁰²) j (1 ¹⁰³) | дж (2 ¹⁰⁴) ч (1 ¹⁰⁵) |
| y [* ¹⁰⁶] | j (9) y (2 ¹⁰⁷) | я (3 ¹⁰⁸) (transcribing y+a) |
| r [р] | r x (2 ¹⁰⁹) | р |
| f [ф] | f | ф |
| w [в] | w | в б (1 ¹¹⁰) |
| ng (in final position) [нъ] | nk (4) | / |
| ngg [нг] | nk (16) n (2 ¹¹¹) nkk (2 ¹¹²) nk.k (1 ¹¹³) nk, (4 ¹¹⁴) | = ^H (3 ¹¹⁵) |
| ngk [нк] | nk, kh (1) ¹¹⁶ | / |
| h [ж] | / | дж |

¹⁰² jurgangga = doerkana.

¹⁰³ ja = ja (for Chinese 易 [pinyin *yì*, transcribed in this dictionary as “Ji”]).

¹⁰⁴ ju žu muke = джѳ жѳ Мѳке. joo = джѳ. [The standard imperative form of jimbi “to come” is *jio*, but here written *joo* in Manchu script].

¹⁰⁵ ajige jui = адчика, чу.

¹⁰⁶ Only appears as part of combinations y + vowel in Zakhárov’s transliteration.

¹⁰⁷ yali = Ya’nli. yali = Yenli.

¹⁰⁸ šanggiyan = ша=^Hянь. yali = я^Hли (twice).

¹⁰⁹ giyarimbi = kiximbi. arsalan = axsalan.

¹¹⁰ wehe = бехз. [Annotator’s confusion of the Cyrillic letters б and в].

¹¹¹ falanggū = falanoe. jurgangga = doerkana.

¹¹² singgeri = sinkkeri. [singgeri also transcribed elsewhere as sinkeri]. manggiyanihambi = mankkjanagabi.

¹¹³ defelinggu = tefelink.koe.

¹¹⁴ tangгы = thank, oe. jalingga = dčalink, a. weilengge = weijlenk, e. enduringge = endoerink, e.

¹¹⁵ šanggiyan = ша^Hянь. bucehengge = бѳцехе=^HE.

¹¹⁶ kiyangkiyan = khiank, khen.

Table III.

Table of the different Manchu and Chinese vowels and vowel combinations represented by a given letter (or combination of letters) of the Latin alphabet in the dictionary

| Transcription | Manchu (Möllendorf) | Mandarin Chinese (pinyin) + {IPA ¹¹⁷ } |
|---------------|------------------------|--|
| a | a e | a {[a] [ɑ] [ɛ] [ʌ]} |
| e | e u iye | e {[ə] [ʌ] [a] [e] [ɛ] [ʌ]} ia {[iʌ] [iɑ]} ie {[iɛ<]} ue {[yɛ<]} i {[i]} |
| o | o e | uo {[uo]} o {[uo]} e {[ʌ] [ʌ]} ao {[ɑo]} |
| i | i e | i {[i] [ɪ]} e {[ə]} |
| oe | u ū o | ou {[ou]} u {[y] [u] [ue] [ʊ] [ou]} o {[ʊ] [uo]} e {[ʌ]} |
| o, oe | eo | ou {[ou]} ao {[ɑo]} iao {[iao]} u {[u]} o {[uo]} |
| aij | ai | ai {[ae]} |
| eij | ei | ei {[ei]} i {[eɪ]} |
| oij | oi | ui {[ueɪ]} |
| ij | ei | i {[eɪ]} |

¹¹⁷ Given according to the table of equivalences between Peking dialect and pinyin found in NORMAN 2002 [1988]: 141.

| | | |
|------|-----|--|
| je | i | ia {[iɑ] [iɛ]} ua {[ya]} ya {[ja]} yue {[jyɛ]} ye {[jie<]} yi {[ji]} i {[i]} |
| ja | iya | ya {[ja] [jʌ]} a {[ɑ]} ia {[iʌ] [iɑ] [iɛ]} |
| ie | iya | ue {[yɛ<]} ia {[iɛ]} i {[i]} e {[ɣʌ]} |
| e, i | iye | / |

Table IV.
Table of the different Manchu and Chinese vowels and vowel combinations represented by a given letter (or combination of letters) of the Cyrillic alphabet in the dictionary

| Transcription | Manchu (Möllendorf) | Chinese (pinyin) |
|---------------|---------------------|--|
| a | a | a {[ɑ] [a] [ʌ]} |
| e | e | e {[ɣʌ] [iɛ<]} ia {[iɛ]} |
| и | i | e {[ɣʌ] [ə] [ʌ]} i {[i] [ɨ] [ei] [e]} yi {[ji]} y {[j]} |
| o | e | o {[o] [uo]} a {[ɑ]} uo {[uo]} e {[ɣʌ]} |

| | | |
|-----|-------------|---|
| ᡠ | u ū o | u {[u] [o] [y]} ᡤ {[y]} ou {[ou]} o {[o]} e {[ʌ]} |
| ᡤᡠ | io o | yo {[jo]} u {[ʊ]} |
| ᡤᡠᡵ | iya | ia {[iɛ] [ia] [iʌ]} |
| ᡠᡶ | eo | ao {[ao]} ou {[ou]} |
| ᡤᡠᡶ | io | you {[joʊ]} ou {[ou]} |
| ᡠᡵᡠ | ūwa | ua {[ua] [uʌ]} |

Table V.

Table of the different Manchu and Chinese consonants and consonant combinations represented by a given letter (or combination of letters) of the Latin alphabet in the dictionary

| Transcription | Manchu (Möllendorf) | Chinese (pinyin) |
|---------------|---|------------------|
| n | n | n ng |
| k | g ₁ g ₂ k ₁ k ₂ k (before a consonant) final k h ₁ | k g j q |
| g | h ₁ h ₂ g ₁ g ₂ k ₁ k ₂ | h |

| | | |
|----|--|--------------|
| gh | h ₁ | / |
| kg | k ₁ | / |
| kh | k ₁ k ₂ h ₁ h ₂ | k j q |
| nk | ng | ng |
| p | b | b |
| b | b | b |
| s | s | sh s x |
| t | t d | / |
| th | t | t |
| d | d | d |
| l | l | / |
| m | m | m |
| ch | c | ch q c |
| dz | j | j zh z |
| j | j | y i |
| r | r | / |
| f | f | f |
| w | w | w |

Table VI.

Table of the different Manchu and Chinese consonants and consonant combinations represented by a given letter (or combination of letters) of the Cyrillic alphabet in the dictionary

| Transcription | Manchu (Möllendorf) | Chinese (pinyin) |
|-----------------|--|------------------|
| б | b w | b |
| В | w | u l |
| Г | g ₁ | / |
| Д | d | d |
| Ж | s | r sh |
| ДЖ | j ž | / |
| К | k ₁ k ₂ k (before a consonant) g ₁ g ₂ | j |
| Л | l | l |
| М | m | m |
| Н | n (initial, medial) | n (initial) |
| НЪ | n (final) | n (final) |
| == ^н | n (final) ng | eng |
| ^н | ng | n (final) en |
| р | r | / |
| с | s š x | s sh |
| Т | t d | t d |

| | | |
|---|--|----|
| ф | f | f |
| х | h ₁ h ₂ g ₁ g ₂ | h |
| ц | c | c |
| ш | š s (before i) | sh |

A few preliminary notes:

- Most words are transcribed in either the Latin alphabet or the Cyrillic alphabet, and those words where the two alphabets are combined for the transcription are rarer. The cases where sounds are combined most often occur in words containing a sound systematically transcribed in one alphabet, such as š (as well as *s-* before an *i*) which is always transcribed ш (e.g. *faksi* ‘craftsman’ transcribed *fakши*)¹¹⁸.
- The genitive case marker is almost always transcribed as *ni* after a final *-n*, even when the author of the Manchu script has written *-i*.
- Möllendorf *k* (a voiceless aspirated stop¹¹⁹) is most often transcribed as *kh* before a vowel, and *k* before a consonant or in final position; Möllendorf *g* (a voiceless unaspirated stop initially, and a voiced aspirated stop between voiced segments¹²⁰) is transcribed as *k*¹²¹; and Möllendorf *h* (a voiceless fricative¹²²) is transcribed *g*¹²³ or, in Cyrillic, *х*.¹²⁴
- With the exception that all four transcribed occurrences of the words *abka* “sky” and its genitive form *abkai* use a *g* (*abga*, *abgaij*).

¹¹⁸ In the transcription of Chinese pinyin ‘sh’ is also consistently transcribed with ш. See DUNN 1992: 19.

¹¹⁹ NORMAN 2013: xviii.

¹²⁰ NORMAN 2013: xvi.

¹²¹ In the transcription of Chinese, *k* is used for pinyin *g*. See DUNN 1992: 21.

¹²² NORMAN 2013: xvii.

¹²³ For the transcription of Möllendorf *h* with the Roman letter *g*, see also, e.g. BELL 1763: v. 1, 277 where *aliha da* (an abbreviation of *aliha bithei da* ‘Grand Secretary’) is represented as “the Allegada, or prime minister”.

¹²⁴ In the transcription of Chinese, *g* is also used (although not exclusively) for pinyin *h*, and also occasionally for pinyin *x*. See DUNN 1992: 22.

- There is no noticeable difference between the consonants used to transcribe k_1 and k_2 , g_1 and g_2 , or h_1 and h_2 , implying that although they were written with different letter-forms their pronunciation was not differentiated. Lie Hiu¹²⁵ noted the same absence of differentiation in early Qing-period Korean transcriptions of Manchu, and suggested that the different letter forms had been borrowed from Mongolian in spite of the fact that in Manchu there was no need to differentiate between the pronunciation of these consonants. Norman¹²⁶ describes a differentiation into a series of uvulars (k_1 , g_1 , h_1) and velars (k_2 , g_2 , h_2); the evidence from this dictionary’s transcription goes against the existence of this distinction.
- b and p seem to be distinguished by aspiration (of p): $b = b$, \bar{b} , or, rarely, p ; $p = ph$.¹²⁷
- d and t seem to be differentiated by both voice and aspiration¹²⁸: $d = d$ (voiced, without aspiration), $t = th$ (voiceless, with aspiration).
- The pronunciation of \bar{u} is not distinguished from that of u . Both are most commonly rendered as *oe* in the Latin alphabet or У in Cyrillic.
- Very occasional syncope of vowels, e.g. *isika* (“almost”) = *iskha*, *hasaha* (“scissors”) = *gasga*.
- One example of a prothetic n , a phenomenon noted by Zikmundová in contemporary Sibe¹²⁹: *unumbi* “to carry (on one’s back), to shoulder, to put (the hands) behind one’s back”¹³⁰, transcribed as *noenoembi*. Zikmundová also notes the substitution of an initial $[n]$ with a prothetic $[y]$, possibly seen here in *nioboro* (“deep green”) transcribed as юУ6УpУ .
- Möllendorf r [NORMAN 2013: xix “a voiced alveolar flap”] is normally transcribed by r , but also on occasion by x .¹³¹

¹²⁵ LIE 1972: 64 (cited by ROTH LI 2004: 16).

¹²⁶ NORMAN 2013: xvi–xviii and 2000.

¹²⁷ DUNN 1992: 21–22, 24 also notes the annotator’s use of [consonant] + h to indicate aspiration in the transcription of Chinese.

¹²⁸ SAARELA 2015: 220 notes that while the Möllendorf transcription implies a difference between a voiced d and a voiceless t , earlier transcriptions (e.g. Amiot) implied that the difference between these two letters was one of the presence or absence of aspiration.

¹²⁹ ZIKMUNDOVÁ 2013: 27.

¹³⁰ But on another occasion *unumbi* transcribed *oenoeembi*.

¹³¹ In the transcription of Chinese, pinyin r (NORMAN 2002 [1988]: 139: a voiced retroflex continuant) is almost always transcribed ж . See DUNN 1992: 19.

-
- The transcription of the same word can vary across different parts of the dictionary (e.g. *niyalma* “person” can be rendered as *nialma*, *nealma*, or *неалма*).
 - The word *yali* (“meat”) is transcribed quite particularly each time it appears, with the first syllable ending in *-n*, or with what seems to be a perhaps a hiatus (or glottal stop?) and/or nasalization: *Ja’nli*, *Ya’nli*, *Yenli*, *Jenli*, *я^hли*.
 - In the transcription words are often separated by commas. However, occasionally punctuation marks appear within a word. Sometimes these are commas, and merely mark the boundaries between syllables (e.g. *holtoko* (“deceived”) = *gol, tho, koe*; *tašarame* (“erring”) = *tha, ша, rame* “erring”; *enduri* (“spirit”) = *in, doe, ri*. At other times, however commas, full stops, or apostrophes seem perhaps to be being used to indicate a hiatus in pronunciation, e.g. *huwaliyasun* [*sic*] (= *hūwaliyasun* “harmony”) = *gwala’soen*; *weilengge* (“a criminal”) = *weijlenk, e*; *enduringge* (“holy”) = *endoerink, e*; *baimbi* (“to seek”) = *ba, embi*; *neimbi* (“to open”) = *ne, embi*. The purpose is even less easy to ascertain when punctuation marks appear in disyllabic words e.g. *okto* (“medicine”) = *ok. tho*; or in monosyllabic words, e.g. *suwan* (“cormorant”) = *soe, an*; *kiyoo* (“bridge”) = *kheje, oe*.
 - To draw any more precise conclusions on the phonetic evidence of the transcriptions, it will be necessary to first reach a more definite conclusion as to the identity of the annotator, or at least the languages (in particularly those written in the Latin alphabet) known and used by him.

It seems probable that the second layer of annotation was also a collaborative work, with the author noting down the pronunciation of a native speaker of Manchu and Chinese (or of a native Chinese speaker, and a native Manchu speaker). The annotator seems not to have planned beforehand how he would transcribe individual sounds and to have noted words down as he heard them, changing his mind during the work on the best way to record different sounds. Because of the collaborative process involved, it again seems probable that the annotation also took place in Peking, although as only a portion of the pages are annotated it could also be possible that the dictionary was annotated during the caravan journey that must have carried it to St. Petersburg. The difference in the handwriting of the annotations and the head entries, and the fact that the layout of the

dictionary had not foreseen columns to add transcriptions suggests that the annotator and the author of the head entries were not the same person, and further perhaps that the original author was no longer involved with the dictionary at the moment when these annotations were added. As regards the identity of the annotator, Dunn hypothesizes that he was not Russian,¹³² and that he may have been a Dutch speaker on the basis of the use in the transcription of the Chinese of the Latin letter ‘g’ (in Dutch [r] or, in final position [x]) for fricatives (pinyin h and x); of ‘oe’ for a back, high, rounded vowel; of ‘ú’ for a front, high, rounded vowel; and of ‘-ij’ in some complex finals. However, as Dunn notes, other aspects of the transcription, e.g. the marking of aspirated consonants by [consonant] + h, or the use of the letter i are not derived from Dutch orthography.¹³³ To try to identify the scribe, Dunn also compared a sample of Ilarion Rossokhin’s (1716–1761) handwriting to the head-entries and annotations of the dictionary and concluded that he was not the author of the head-entries, but that the possibility that he was the author of the annotations remained open.¹³⁴

There is another, possible, record of an eighteenth century use of a mixture of the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets to transcribe Manchu. One of the charges made against the Emperor Yongzheng’s brother Yuntang 允禩 (1683–1726) in 1726 was that during his exile in Xining 西寧 he had used “Western characters” (*xiyangzi* 西洋字) to represent (*fangbi* 仿比) Manchu and to create a code (*chuangzao mimazi* 創造密碼字) which he employed in secret letters exchanged with his son. In the record of the interrogation of the Portuguese Jesuit João Mourão (1681–1726), charged with conspiring with Yuntang, one of the accusations is that as the only foreigner to have been in contact with Yuntang he must have taught him the “Western characters” used in this code. Mourão replies by contending that Yuntang was acquainted with the Cyrillic alphabet — and that his knowledge of the Cyrillic alphabet came from a source other than Mourão. Looking at a book (perhaps in Greek) of natural philosophy (*gewu qiongli de shu* 格物窮理的書) which belonged to Mourão, Yuntang had declared that it “rather resembled the Russian characters” (*you xie xiang eluosuzi* 有些像俄羅素字). He had explained that he had come into possession of a Russian alphabet (*de guo eluosu de zitour* 得過俄羅素的字頭兒) and had

¹³² Occasional confusion of б and в in the transcription of Manchu (see n. 108) also support the conclusion that the annotator was not a native speaker of Russian.

¹³³ DUNN 1992: 24.

¹³⁴ DUNN 1987: 20.

asked Mourão if, as this script also possessed the a, e, i sounds, he thought it would be possible to “make use of it for additions and changes” (*tiangai yong* 添改用), which possibility Mourão allowed.¹³⁵ This has led to speculation that Yuntang may have developed a system for transcribing Manchu that combined the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets.¹³⁶ However, in a recent study based on newly discovered archival documents, including a table of the code (unfortunately not reproduced in facsimile) and some of the encoded letters, Wang Miansen has concluded that the code is in fact entirely based on the Latin alphabet and Yuntang’s own modifications of it, and does not incorporate any Cyrillic letters.¹³⁷ If Yuntang had some knowledge of Cyrillic, this suggests the intriguing possibility that he may have had contacts with the Russian Ecclesiastical Mission as well as with the Jesuits — although his knowledge could also have come through written material in circulation at the time.

Conclusion

Paschke undoubtedly presented this manuscript to Bayer because he knew of his interest in the study of Chinese and Manchu, as well as in dictionaries: Bayer notably compiled an unpublished twelve-volume Chinese-Latin dictionary.¹³⁸ Bayer’s great curiosity and his cultivation of a network of friends and acquaintances who brought items of interest to him allowed him to assemble the invaluable material now held in his papers in Glasgow. The variety of this material underlines the inventiveness of Bayer’s approach to learning the languages of distant countries for which there were no

¹³⁵ “Yuntang Yunsi an” 允禔允禩案 (Case of Yuntang and Yunsi), 1st June 1726: GUGONG BOWUYUAN 1964 [1931]: vol. I, 3. For a contemporary Latin translation of Mourão’s deposition, carried out by a Chinese priest named Stefano Siu, and enclosed in a letter from Salvator Rasini, crsp (1690–1736) to the Cardinal Sacripanti (1642–1727) dated 19th December 1726, cf. D’ELIA 1963: 441–449. The relevant passage (D’ELIA 1963: 445): *Habebam unum librum philosophiae quem videns ipse dixit: «Sunt aliqua in illo libro quae assimilantur litteris Moscovitarum; his litteris aliqua addi possunt et mutari». Non cogitabam illum postea iis addisse et mutasse aliqua ad scribendas epistolas in domum suam. Quidquid sit de hoc, nihil scio.*

¹³⁶ LAAMANN 2000: 87; ZHANG 2012.

¹³⁷ WANG 2021: 35–45.

¹³⁸ DUNN 1987: 22, n. 8 gives its call number as AAN (Arkhiv Akademii Nauk), *fonds* 784, *opis*’ 1, no. 1.

standard paths of study at the time. As well as beginning a correspondence with the Jesuits, he sought out possible sources of knowledge wherever he could, and above all from travellers who passed through Saint Petersburg for one reason or another. His papers include scrapbook-style volumes where, as well as the vocabulary lists or grammars he copied out from published books or borrowed and consulted manuscripts, he has glued advertisements in Chinese for ink, cloth, or incense (e.g. Ms Hunter 221 (U.2.12), *Miscella Sinica*). There are also the small manuscript pamphlets he composed to record his conversations with Japanese (Ms Hunter B/E 10, *Sermo cum duobus Japonensibus*), Mongolian (Ms Hunter B/E 12, *Sermo cum Bordone legato Calmucorum*), or Manchu visitors.¹³⁹

In Ms Hunter B/E 11 (*Sermo cum Mangjuro*),¹⁴⁰ he records his conversation (on 31st August 1735) with a Manchu called “Dgjauga”, brought to see him by Pacunin, a secretary in the College of Foreign Affairs (“*Pacunin Secretarius in Collegio Extraneorum Negotiorum*”) (Vasilii Mikhailovich Bakunin?, 1700–1761, author of a description of the Torghuts published in 1761¹⁴¹). Bayer showed Dgjauga a “Chinese rosary” he possessed and, probably responding to a prompt from Bayer, Dgjauga informed him that the Manchus did not use rosaries although the Chinese and the Mongols did.¹⁴² He then showed Bayer how to pray with it. Bayer notes down in detail that would not be astray in an anthropological field report the physical movements and the reasons that motivated them: “He showed me the way of praying in a circle of 18 beads. When someone dies, rather than going over the middle knot these circles move backwards. However, when prayers are performed each single bead rests on top of the index finger and is pressed [forward] by the thumb”.¹⁴³ At every bead the Tibetans recite “*om ma ni bad ma chum*” (which Bayer here copies out in Tibetan script as well as giving the transcription) which he explains as “these six sounds are the names of the six infernal torments, which [the Tibetans] constantly turn in their thoughts so as to avoid sinning through fear of

¹³⁹ See the summaries and notes given in WESTON 2018: 65–69, 148–153.

¹⁴⁰ WESTON 2018: 151–152.

¹⁴¹ On Vasilii Bakunin and the other members of his immediate family’s service in the College of Foreign Affairs, see RANDOLPH 2007: 26–27. For an edition of Vasilii Bakunin’s description of the Kalmyk and the Torghut, see BAKUNIN 1995.

¹⁴² *Ostendebam ei rosarium Sinicum. Negabat Mangjuros eo uti: at Mungalos et Sinos.*

¹⁴³ *Demonstrabat mihi modum precandi in orbem per 18 globulos, quem orbem ubi quis obierit, non transilit medium nodum, sed retrogradus incedit. Globulus autem unusquisque, dum preces peraguntur supra indicem digitum recumbit et pollice premitur.*

Hell”.¹⁴⁴ Dgjauga said that the images on Bayer’s rosary, which must have consisted of engraved beads, were not Buddhas but Tibetan priests, and added that “Confucius was neither a Buddha, nor was he worshipped”.¹⁴⁵

Finally, Bayer sums up his encounter with Dgjauga thus: “in short, this noble Manchu was an excellent and most learned man.”¹⁴⁶ Dgjauga also sang to him, first in Chinese, then in Manchu, and finally in Mongolian: “Then he sang again in Manchu. This song was stirring, grave, and truly military, so that it seemed, like the din of war-trumpets and drums, most fitting for rousing spirits. [...] And finally he sang in Mongolian. The sound of this music was exactly that of the Circassian or Cossack [music] which we often hear here, full of melancholy and calm”.¹⁴⁷

Bayer’s “Dgjauga” must in fact be Russia’s first teacher of Manchu and Chinese, recorded in other sources as Zhou Ge.¹⁴⁸ According to Russian sources¹⁴⁹ he had been sent by the Qing on a reconnaissance mission to the court of the Torghut khan Tseren Donduk (r. 1724–1735), son of Ayuki Khan. However the Torghuts captured him, and then handed him over to the Russians in 1733, originally with the intention that he be sent back to the Qing. He accompanied Leontii Ugrimov, who was returning from a mission to the Zunghars, as far as Tobolsk. In Tobolsk there was a change of plan and, because it was feared he might possess intelligence that Russia did not want the Qing to obtain, he was instead sent to Moscow, which he reached in 1734. From there — to avoid contact with the Torghuts who had accompanied the 1732 Qing embassy and were still in Moscow, as his captured status now risked becoming an embarrassment — he continued on to Saint Petersburg. In 1737 he was baptized as Fedor Petrov and married the daughter of an Orthodox Kalmyk. A year later he applied to return to China, but was instead sent to Moscow to teach two students, Aleksei Leont’ev

¹⁴⁴ *Hae Sex voces sunt nomina Sex cruciatuum infernalium, quos animo constanter versant, ut metu gehennae non peccent.*

¹⁴⁵ *Confucium dicebat neque Burchanum esse, neque adorari.*

¹⁴⁶ *Denique homo erat hic nobilis Mangjurenensis plane optimus et politissimus.*

¹⁴⁷ *Tum idem canebat Mangjurice. Hic cantus erat citatus, gravis et revera militaris ut lituorum bellicorum et tympanorum ad incitandos animos strepitui accommodatissimus videretur. [...] Ad postremum Mungalice canebat. Sonus huius musicae ipsissimus erat, qui Tscherkas'kiensis et Cosakiensis est, quam hic saepe audivimus, plenam melancholiae et quietis.*

¹⁴⁸ PANG 1991: 125. WIDMER 1976: 158–159 (written Chou Ko, as he is using the Wade-Giles transliteration system).

¹⁴⁹ WIDMER 1976: 158–159, which summarizes SKAČKOV 1960: 198–201.

(d. 1786) and Andrei Kanaev (d. 1773). They were sent to Peking in 1741, Dgjauga saying that as a soldier he was not very literate and could teach them nothing more. He was then assigned to Arkhangelsk as an ensign. He died on March 9th (Julian calendar) 1751 never having been able to return to his home in the Qing Empire.

In the Bayer papers, inside Bayer's account of his conversation with Dgjauga, is a scrap of paper on which, along with 天下太平 ("Peace to All Under Heaven") several times, the mantra *om maṇi padme hūm* in Tibetan script and Bayer's transcription (*om ma ni bad mae chum*), and Manchu words for brick tea (*juwan cai*), silk (*juse*), and thread (*donggire* [a variant of *tonggo?*], transcribed by Bayer as "tonghora" which he translates as *filum sericum* "silk thread"), Dgjauga has written his own name in Manchu and in Chinese: in Chinese it is Zhaoge¹⁵⁰ and he writes it with two variant characters: 𠤎¹⁵¹ and 𠤎.¹⁵² In Manchu it is Jooge¹⁵³, and in front of his Manchu name he has also added "gulu fulgiyan-i" "of the Plain Red [Banner]". This small scrap of paper thus adds further clues to the story of the first Manchu teacher in Russia, confirming that he was a member of the Eight Banners and, given his name, Manchu rather than Chinese. As he writes his own name with variant characters, he could not have had a long classical education, but he possessed a different sort of literacy, similar to that of the unknown collaborator(s) who wrote the Chinese and Manchu entries in the Bayer collection dictionary.

¹⁵⁰ In his account Bayer comments on the difference in his pronunciation from that he had learned in books, and that in the first syllable of Dgjauga's name, whose character he transcribes as *chao*, the *ao* was pronounced as an *au*. Note that in his account Bayer transcribes the Manchu initial *j-* as *Dgj*, e.g. *juwan cai* is transcribed as *Dgjuan tschai*.

¹⁵¹ The *Jiyun* 集韻 (*Collected Rhymes*, 1037) places its together with the character 𠤎, with their pronunciation given as *zhao* in the *qieyin* system (*zhi xiao qie* 之笑切) and the gloss "the *Shuowen* defines it as to plough [land] by digging down deep and unearthing the black under-soil; or, cultivating fallow fields; or, an embankment" (*Shuowen: geng yi cha jun chu xialu tu, yi yue geng xiutian ye, yi yue ti ye* 說文耕以耒浚出下盧土, 一曰耕休田也, 一曰隄也.) DING 1986 [1037]: *juan* 8: 13a.

¹⁵² For *ge* 哥.

¹⁵³ For Jooge as a Manchu name, see STARY 2000: 232, where eight different occurrences in the genealogies of the Eight Banners are listed.

References

Publications on the Bayer collection dictionary

- CLEMINSON, Ralph 1988: *A Union Catalogue of Cyrillic Manuscripts in British and Irish Collections*. London: School of Slavonic and East European Studies, University of London ‘The Anne Pennington Catalogue’: 54–55.
- DUNN, J.A. 1987: “An early eighteenth-century Russian-Chinese-Manchu dictionary”. *Scottish Slavonic Review* 9: 7–25.
- DUNN, J.A. 1992: “The transliteration of Chinese characters in an early eighteenth-century Russian-Chinese-Manchu dictionary”. In: *The Wider Europe: Essays on Slavonic languages and cultures in honour of Professor Peter Henry on the occasion of his retirement*, J.A. Dunn (ed.). Nottingham: Astra: 15–27.
- DUNN, J.A. 1996: “Russian and Church Slavonic in an Eighteenth-century Manuscript Dictionary”. In: *Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies (Harrogate – July 1990): Language and Linguistics, Papers in Slavonic Linguistics*, occasional series vol. III, J.I. Press and F.E. Knowles (eds.). London: QMW: 54–72.
- WESTON, David 2018: *The Bayer Collection. A preliminary catalogue of the manuscripts and books of Professor Theophilus Siegfried Bayer, acquired and augmented by the Reverend Dr Heinrich Walther Gerdes, now preserved in the Hunterian Library of the University of Glasgow*. Glasgow: University of Glasgow, online publication: https://www.gla.ac.uk/media/media_586405_en.pdf: 141–143.

Other works cited

- BAKUNIN, V.M. 1995: *Opisanie kalmytskikh narodov, a osoblivo iz nikh torgoutskogo, i postupkov ikh khanov i vladel'tsev: Soch. 1761 g.* [Description of the Kalmyk peoples, in particular of the Torghuts and the actions of their khans and leaders, composed in 1761]. Elista: Kalmytskoe.
- BATTACHARYA, Ramkrishna 2000: “Uttarakuru: The (E)Utopia of Ancient India”. *Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute* 81: 191–201.
- BAYARMA Khabtagaeva 2009: *Mongolic Elements in Tuvan*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Turcologica 81.
- BELL, John 1763: *A Journey from St. Petersburg in Russia to Ispahan in Persia, with an Embassy from His Imperial Majesty Peter the First, to the Sophy of Persia, Shach Hussein, Anno MDCCXV*. Glasgow: Robert and Andrew Foulis, 2 vol.
- BINGENHEIMER, Marcus 2013: “History of the Manchu Buddhist Canon and First Steps towards its Digitization”. *Central Asiatic Journal* 56: 203–217.
- CHUNHUA 春花 2008. *Qingdai Man-Mengwen cidian yanjiu* 清代滿蒙文辭典研究 [Research on Qing-era Manchu and Mongolian Dictionaries]. Shenyang: Liaoning minzu.
- CLARK, Larry V. 2006: “A Bibliography of Manchu-Tungus Dictionaries” (revised by Hartmut Walravens). In: *Bibliographies of Mongolian, Manchu-Tungus, and Tibetan Dictionaries*. Hartmut Walravens (ed.). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz: 113–172.
- D’ELIA, Pasquale 1963: *Il lontano confino e la tragica morte del P. João Mourão S.I., missionario in Cina (1681–1726) nella storia e nella leggenda, secondo documenti in gran parte inediti*. Lisbon: Agência-Geral do Ultramar.

- D'ELIA, Pasquale 1961: "Recent discoveries and new studies (1938–1960) on the world map in Chinese of Father Matteo Ricci, S.J." *Monumenta Serica* 20: 82–164.
- DING Du 丁度 1986 [1037]: *Jiyun* 集韻 [Collected Rhymes]. Reprinted in: *Wenyuange Siku quanshu – Jingbu – Xiaoxuelei*. 文淵閣四庫全書 – 經部 – 小學類 [The Wenyuange Four Treasuries of Extant Works. Classics Division. Philology Section]. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan.
- GUAN Xueling 關雪玲 2016: "Qinggong *ba-er-sa-mu* xiang yanjiu — jianlun bifeng *ba-er-sa-mu* xiang" 清宮巴爾撒木香研究 — 兼論避風巴爾撒木香 [Research on the balm balsam in the Imperial Palace — and a discussion of antipyretic balsam balm]. *Ming-Qing luncong* 1: 492–504.
- GUGONG BOWUYUAN 故宮博物院 1964 [1931]: *Wenxian congbian* 文獻叢編 [Documentary Anthology]. Taipei: Guofeng.
- GUMILEV, L.N & KUZNETSOV, B.I. 1970: "Two Traditions of Ancient Tibetan Cartography". *Soviet Geography* 11(7): 565–579.
- JIAOYUBU 教育部/MINISTRY OF EDUCATION 2017: *Yitizi zidian* 異體字字典/*Dictionary of Chinese Character Variants*. Taipei: <https://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/variants/> (last accessed 05.08.2021).
- LAAMANN, Lars 2000: *The Inculturation of Christianity in Late Imperial China, 1724–1840*. PhD thesis, SOAS, University of London: 402 pp.
- LIE Hiu 1972: *Die Mandschu-Sprachkunde in Korea*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- MACDONELL, Arthur Anthony 1929 [1924]. *A practical Sanskrit dictionary with transliteration, accentuation and etymological analysis throughout*. London: Oxford University.
- MOERMAN, Max 2021: "The Epistemology of Vision: Buddhist versus Japanese Cosmology in Early Modern Japan". In: *Interactions Between Rivals: The Christian Mission and Buddhist Sects in Japan (c. 1549–1647)*. Alexandra Curvelo and Angelo Cattaneo (eds.). Berlin: Peter Lang: 319–357.
- NORMAN, Jerry 2013: *A Comprehensive Manchu-English Dictionary*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- NORMAN, Jerry 2002 [1988]: *Chinese*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- NOWAK, Margaret (introduction and interpretation) & DURRANT, Stephen (transcription and translation) 1977: *The Tale of the Nišan Shamaness. A Manchu Folk-Epic*. Seattle–London: University of Washington.
- PANG, Tatiana A. 2001: *Descriptive Catalogue of Manchu Manuscripts and Blockprints in the St. Petersburg Branch of the Institute of Oriental Studies Russian Academy of Sciences. Issue 2*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, Aetas Manjurica 9.
- PANG, Tatiana A. 1999: "The 'Russian Company' in the Manchu Banner Organization". *Central Asiatic Journal* 43(1): 132–139.
- PANG, Tatiana A. 1991: "A Historical Sketch of the Study and Teaching of the Manchu Language in Russia (First Part: Up to 1920)". *Central Asiatic Journal* 35(1–2): 123–137.
- RANDOLPH, John 2007: *The House in the Garden: The Bakunin Family and the Romance of Russian Idealism*. Ithaca–London: Cornell University.
- ROTH LI, Gertraude 2004: *Manchu. A textbook for reading documents. Second edition*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii.
- SAARELA, Märten Söderblom 2015: *Manchu and the Study of Language in Qing China (1607–1911)*. PhD thesis, Princeton University: 607 + xvii pp.

- SKAČKOV, P.E. 1960: “Pervyj prepodavatel’ kitajskogo i man’čžurskogo jazykov v Rossii [Dzou Ge]”. In: *Problemy vostokovedeniia* [Problems of Oriental Studies] 3: 198–201.
- SCHOTTENHAMMER, Angela 2020: “‘Peruvian balsam’: an example of transoceanic transfer of medical knowledge”. *Journal of Ethnobiology and Ethnomedicine* 16: 69.
- SHASTRI, Hari Prasad (transl.) 1976. *The Ramayana of Valmiki*. London: Shanti Sadan.
- STARY, Giovanni 2000: *A Dictionary of Manchu Names. A Name Index to the Manchu Version of the “Complete Genealogies of the Manchu Clans and Families of the Eight Banners”*. *Jakun gūsai Manjusai mukun hala be uheri ejehe bithe. Baqi Manzhou shizu tongpu* 八旗滿洲氏族通譜. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- STARY, Giovanni 1999: “A Manchu Document concerning Russian Teachers of the Manchu Banners’ ‘Russian Company’”. *Central Asiatic Journal* 43(1): 140–146.
- TSAI Ming-che 蔡名哲 2015a: “Manwen *Xiyang yaoshu* di er zhi di liu yaofang ji xiangguan wenti” 滿文《西洋藥書》第二至第六藥方及相關問題 [On the second to sixth recipes in the Manchu *Treatise on Western Drugs* and related questions]. *Jilin shifan daxue xuebao – renwen shehui kexue ban* [Journal of Jilin Normal University — Humanities and Social Sciences Issue] 43(4): 14–17.
- TSAI Ming-che 蔡名哲 2015b: “Manwen *Xiyang yaoshu* di er zhi di liu yaofang yizhu” 滿文《西洋藥書》第二至第六藥方譯註 [Annotated translation of the second to sixth recipes in the Manchu *Treatise on Western Drugs*]. *Zhongguo bianzheng* [Chinese Frontier Administration] 197: 161–175.
- TSAI Ming-che 蔡名哲 2011: “*Xiyang yaoshu* ‘qudu yaoyou’ yizhu” 《西洋藥書》〈祛毒藥油〉譯註 [Annotated translation of the *Treatise on Western Drugs*’ ‘Antidote balm’]. *Zhongguo bianzheng* [Chinese Frontier Administration] 187: 69–78.
- VIRA, Raghu 1961: *Pentaglot Dictionary of Buddhist Terms in Sanskrit, Tibetan, Manchurian, Mongolian and Chinese*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture.
- VOLKOVA, M.P. 1961: *Nishan’ samani bitkhe’ = Predanie o Nishanskoi shamanke*. [Nišan saman-i bithe = The Legend of the Nišan Shaman]. Moscow: Nauka.
- WANG Miansen 王冕森 2021: “Yuntang xiyang mizi dang’an chutan” 允禩西洋密字檔案初探 [Preliminary Archival Research on Yuntang’s European Code]. *Qingshi yanjiu* [Journal of Qing History] 5: 35–45.
- WIDMER, Eric 1976: *The Russian Ecclesiastical Mission in Peking During the 18th Century*. Cambridge: Harvard University East Asian Research Center.
- YU, Anthony C. (ed. and transl.) 2012: *The Journey to the West. Revised edition*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- ZHANG Huake 張華克 2012: “Yuntang, Mu Jingyuan de manwen shijiu zitou jiedu” 允禩穆景遠的滿文十九字頭解讀 [Deciphering Yuntang and João Mourão’s Manchu Nineteen Heads]. *Zhongguo bianzheng* [Chinese Frontier Administration] 192: 89–124.
- ZAKHÁROV, I.I. 2010 [1879]: *A Grammar of Manchu*. With an introduction by: Alexander Vovin. Kent: Global Oriental.
- ZIKMUNDOVÁ, Veronika 2013: *Spoken Sibe. Morphology of the Inflected Parts of Speech*. Prague: Charles University in Prague–Karlovinum.