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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.
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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
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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 Suarela for their comments on the draft of this article.
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 dictionary\(^3\); 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; 說那一個人 — and are sometimes more explanations than equivalents (e.g. 有錯露; 燒酒之鍋; 沙土地長柏蕨). Popular variant forms in current usage in the late imperial period are often found, e.g. 寫 for 寫; 麗 for 處; 夢 for 夢; 恨 for 很; 疾 written with the component部分 rather than 矢; alternation between use of 國 and its popular variant 國. Some forms not attested in any variant dictionaries are also found, e.g. 呱, with the tiger component 虎 replaced by the rain component雨. 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 嶐. Images of variant characters are taken from the online character variant dictionary *Yiti zi zidian* 單體字字典/ 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匕 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. грохощу or хохочу, Ma. gigi gaga seme injembi, Ch. 哈匕嘻匕 ‘to laugh hahaha’
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 taigovan (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 ёли блыдунъ ‘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 блыдъ ‘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 (becemambi 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’; senciheleku 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 смотрь) (Chinese 横眼瞧 ‘to look askance at’) (v. 1, f. 75v.)
- **jora** for bridle bit (Russian удила, Chinese 饗子). (v. 2, f. 79r.)
- **selmin wehe** for diamond (Russian ада́манть, glossed by Bayer as Adamas, Chinese 金刚鑽) (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. Volkoa in 1961. The manuscript was written down at the request of A.V. Grebeščikov in Vladivostok by a Manchu named Dekdengge in 1913. Cf. VOKOVA 1961: 23: “sencike tukiweceme 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 *paltai/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 seyen 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: šōo [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 жгы (‘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). 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).

---

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* 巴爾撤木油, 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 [азия] (annotated by Bayer: Asia) is 南贍部州 [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, шин, шин, dzo, oe] and in Manchu script deng šeng šen jeo [manuscript transcription: doenk, shenk, шин, 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 南贍部洲 (Southern Shanbu Continent). In the manuscript dictionary, rather than shan 贍, the character written is the rare dan 聿, which is then transcribed in Manchu as jan and annotated in a mixture of Latin and Cyrillic script as дчан: 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 南贍部洲 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. The standard Chinese translations are 東勝身洲 (Eastern Continent of the Incorporeal-Bodied) or Dongshengshenzhou 東勝神洲 (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 Xīniúhuozhou 西牛貨洲 “Western Cattle-Exchanging Continent” (or Xīniúhezhou 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. The fourth northern continent, not used in the dictionary’s geography, was Uttarukuru (in Chinese rendered Beijuluzhou 北俱盧洲, Northern julu Continent). As the polar opposite of the human-inhabited Jambudvīpa, 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…”). It seems that rather than being able — or choosing — to refer

---


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 Entsū 圓通 (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).

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: jel ergi tsambu tib16 (Southern Tsambu Continent)
Videha: dergi ambalinggū beyengge tib (Eastern Great-Bodied Continent)
Godānīya: wargi ihan bai talara tib (Western Cow-Using Continent)
And, for the northern continent, Uttarakuru: 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 (Complete Map of the World’s Ten Thousand Countries)


16 On the use of tib for continent: KHABTAGAEVA 2009: 154 cites the rendering of “Jambudvīpa” in pre-classical Mongolian as jambu tib (Khalkhia jambatū, Buryat zambi tūbi, Kalmuck zamba-tib), which she thinks derives from a reconstructed Turkic *cambudvip (citing Old Uighur čambudvipi/cmbudvipi/cmbudvip), itself from the Sanskrit Jambudvīpa. In the Mongolian version of the Buddhist canon, Jambudvīpa is similarly rendered zambu tib. However, Videha is doron-a ülemji bey-e-tū, Godānīya is őrűn-e üker edledgei, and the northern continent is umar-a maya darștu. In the Qing Buddhist canon, Chinese 州 is systematically translated in Manchu as tib, whereas much more variation is found in the Mongolian terms used.
 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 transliteration 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 Chinese 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 见 e.g. 起頭 *qi tour “beginning”* = khi, tho, oe, el; 没趣 *mei qur “boring”* = moe čú 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription in Möllendorf system [and Zakhárov]</th>
<th>Transcriptions used in Bayer dictionary (number of occurrences in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roman alphabet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a [a]</td>
<td>a (217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e (2$^{21}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aa (1$^{22}$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ø (1$^{23}$)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^{20}$ 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,dwen. congkišambi = chonkiš<em>bì.

$^{22}$ aigan = aigaan.

$^{23}$ hasaha = gasga.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>e [э]</th>
<th>e (133)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i (10^{24})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o (7^{25})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe (3^{26})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (2^{27})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ee (1^{28})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>é (1^{29})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и (2^{30})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o (1^{31})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>i [и]</th>
<th>i (160)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni (4^{32})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je (1^{33})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ji (1^{34})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i (1^{35})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (1^{36})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø (1^{37})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>и (38)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>o [о]</th>
<th>o (59)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oe (6^{38})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a (1^{40})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o (24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[4^{40}]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

24 emu fen = Emoe, fin. semken = semkin. kuren = khoerin. kengse lasha = khink se, lasga.
beri uhuken = beri oegeokhin. biya genggiyan = ba kink, in. uhuken = oegeokhin. erken terken = erkhin therkhin. abbai enduri = abgaig in doe.ri.
25 fekšun = foksoen. eniye = One, i. nimecuke = nimochoekhe. indehen nimeku = indegoen, nimokhoe. ferten = for, then. efehen = ofogén.
26 indehen nimeku = indegoen, nimokhoe. nimegen = nimoenki. feng gin = foenk khin.
27 ajige jui = advika, ŋu. 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 = leeofe.
29 efehen = ofogén.
30 muheren = мъхеренъ. šen = шинь.
31 we = no.
32 kiyanun-i morin = kjamcon, ni, morin. emu hacin-i giranggi = emoe, hacin, ni kirank [-end of word illegible]. honin-i deberen = gonin, ni, deberen. aisin-i suje = aijинь, ni, soe.чe.
33 ajirgan indahun = adviran, jendagoen.
34 illembi = jillembi. [Standard Manchu script form illembi and not illembi.]
35 endurgingge-i efen = endoerink, e, i, efen.
36 manggiyanihambi = mankkjanagabi.
37 arkan seme isika = arkhon, seme, iskha.
38 soison = soesioen. gala monjimbi = xana Moendчimbi. konggoro = khoenkoro. homhon = gomgoen. holtoko = gol, tho, koe. dong = donek.
39 hunton = goenta.
40 nioboro boco = эоэоэоэоэо. bozo. šoyoho = шоох. obumbi = ооооbbи.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>oe (118)</th>
<th>e (21)</th>
<th>oe (142)</th>
<th>noe (144)</th>
<th>(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{U}}) (20)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\ddot{u})</td>
<td>oe</td>
<td>(\mathcal{U})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai [ай]</td>
<td>aij (14)</td>
<td>aje (24)</td>
<td>a, e (146)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei [эй]</td>
<td>eij (5)</td>
<td>ij (24)</td>
<td>ei (148)</td>
<td>eja (150)</td>
<td>e, e (150)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>io [ю/іо]</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="" /></td>
<td>(\mathcal{U})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iya [я]</td>
<td>ja (451)</td>
<td>ia (452)</td>
<td>ea (353)</td>
<td>a (254)</td>
<td>e (155)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41 deribun = deriben. uju nimemb = өөдөө nimemb.
42 kiyamun-i morin = kjameon, ni, morin.
43 unggga jalan = woenka, dukan.
44 unumbi = noenoemb.
45 painmi = bajembi (twice).
46 painmi = ba, embi.
47 weijun = wijndsoen. hehei gurun = gegij koeroen.
48 weiwo = weigoe.
49 neimbi = nejambi.
50 neimbi = ne, embi.
51 hiyang = sjank. kiyamun = kjameon. biya arga = ba, arga. manggiyanihambi = mankkjanagabi.
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 = alijambi.
58 siyang = sienk.
59 miyaliyambi = маламби. biya = ба (twice).
60 шанянъ (twice).
61 ice niyalma = иче неалма.
Table II.
Table of the transcription of Manchu consonants in the dictionary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription in Möllendorf system [and Zakhárov]</th>
<th>Transcriptions used in Bayer dictionary (number of occurrences in brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman alphabet</td>
<td>Cyrillic alphabet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n (initial) [н]</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n (medial) [н]</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n (final) [нь]</strong></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

62 fiyele [standard form ‘fiyelen’] = fele. eniyehen honin = Enegen, honin.
63 eniye = One, i.
64 muheliyen = moegolin.
65 kiyoo = kio. kiyoo = khio.
66 kiyoo = kheje, oe.
67 nioboro = ю =р =р =р .
68 fisin yali = физин ялы. siden = шид =н .
69 aisin = айшин =н. sen = шин =а.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>k₁ (a, o, ü) [к]</th>
<th>kh (27)</th>
<th>k (6⁷⁸)</th>
<th>g (6⁷¹)</th>
<th>kg (1⁷²)</th>
<th>k kh (1⁷³)</th>
<th>k (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₂ (e, u, i) [к/к̄ 7⁴]</td>
<td>kh (19)</td>
<td>k (4⁷⁵)</td>
<td>g (1⁷⁶)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (before a consonant) [къ]</td>
<td>k (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (final) [къ]</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g₁ (a, o, ü) [г]</td>
<td>k (9)</td>
<td>g (3⁷⁷)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g (1²⁸)</td>
<td>r (1²⁸)</td>
<td>x (1²⁹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>g₂ (e, u, i) [г/г 8⁰]</td>
<td>k (1⁴)</td>
<td>g (1⁸¹)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>k (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x (1⁸²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h₁ (a, o, ü) [х]</td>
<td>g (4⁹)</td>
<td>h (2⁸³)</td>
<td>kh (1⁸⁴)</td>
<td>k (1⁸⁵)</td>
<td>gh (2⁸⁶)</td>
<td>x (1⁴)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

70 kocike = kocike. fuhali herserakū = foegali gerserakoe. günin baharakū = koenin bagharakoe. yoktakū = Joktakoe. [NB: but elsewhere the negative verbal form –akū appears as –akhoe]. holtoko = gol, tho, koe. yadarku = jatarkoe.
71 abka = abga (3 times). abkai = abgaij. jabdurakū = dzabdoeragoe. gisun gairakū = kisoen kajrjagoe.
72 jakade = духовый.
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 = gala.
79 asigan = ашыхань.
80 Before u.
81 ebergi = ebergi.
82 umgan gidambi = γключь китамби.
83 hacin = hacin. eniyehen honin = Enegen, honin.
84 jafaha = джафаха.
85 bojuha yali = boedчоека Ya’nli.
86 günin baharakū = koenin bagharakoe. kataha yali = khatagh Yenli.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>h₂ (e, u, i) [χ/χʰ⁸⁷]</th>
<th>g (37) s (1³⁸) kh (1³⁹)</th>
<th>х (8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b [ɓ]</td>
<td>b p (2⁹⁶)</td>
<td>б</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p [п]</td>
<td>ph</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s [с]</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>с</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŝ [ш]</td>
<td>s (2⁵²)</td>
<td>ш</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si [си]</td>
<td>si (5⁹⁴) s (1³⁵)</td>
<td>ши си (2⁹⁶) жи (2⁹⁷)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t [т]</td>
<td>th (3³) t (1⁶)</td>
<td>т (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d [л]</td>
<td>d (4⁵) t (8) th (1)</td>
<td>л (7) т (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l [л]</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>л</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m [м]</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>м</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c [ч/ц]</td>
<td>ch (8⁹⁶) c (4⁹⁶)</td>
<td>ц (6¹⁰⁰) ч (2¹⁰¹)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁸⁷ Before u.
⁸⁸ hiyang = sjank.
⁸⁹ lakderehebi = lakderekhebi.
⁹⁰ debtelin = deptelin. dubin = toepin.
⁹¹ fushku = φ'χέκ'γ'.
⁹² seng = sen. fekšun = feksoen.
⁹³ pahuraka = сах'γ', пака.
⁹⁴ siyang = senk. sirame = sirame. siltan = silthan. singkeri = sinkkeri. ferhe singgeri = ferge, Sinkeri.
⁹⁵ isika = iskha.
⁹⁶ ebsi = ебси. sike = сике.
⁹⁷ fisin yali = фицин'γ'εк'γ'. huwesi = хожи.
⁹⁸ soncho = sonchogo. congkišambi = chonkiš<em>b</em>i. cabin = chibin. nimecuke = nimochekke. giracun = kirechoen. jibca = dźibca. cihangga = chipanka. mucin = mœčin.
⁹⁹ kocike = kokič. fucibi = fociči. hacin = hacin. baijthalaci = bajjalaci.
¹⁰⁰ boso = боцо. coko = цоко (twice). dacun = дац'γ'εк'γ'. cohoro = цохоро. bucheñenge = б'γ'εк'εнге'γ'е.
¹⁰¹ yokcin akū = Jokvin akhoe. icе = иче. [On alternation 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].
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dч (40)</th>
<th>d (102)</th>
<th>dж (2104)</th>
<th>ч (1105)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j (40)</td>
<td>j (102)</td>
<td>j (1103)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>j (9)</td>
<td>y (2107)</td>
<td>я (3108)</td>
<td>(transcribing у+a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>x (2109)</td>
<td></td>
<td>р</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td>ф</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>в (1110)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>nk (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngg</td>
<td>nk (16)</td>
<td>n (2111)</td>
<td>nk (2112)</td>
<td>nk.k (1113)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngk</td>
<td>nk, kh (110)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>nk, kх (1116)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ngg</th>
<th>nk (16)</th>
<th>n (2111)</th>
<th>nk (2112)</th>
<th>nk.k (1113)</th>
<th>nk. (4114)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>=Н (3115)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

102 jurgangga = doerkana.
103 ja = жа (for Chinese 晋, transcribed in this dictionary as “Ji”).
104 ju = жу muke = джжж жжж Мъжжжке. joo = джжж. [The standard imperative form of jimbi “to come” is jio, but here written joo in Manchu script].
105 ajige jui = advika, чү.
106 Only appears as part of combinations y + vowel in Zakhárov’s transliteration.
107 yali = Ya’нli. yali = Yenli.
108 šanggiyan = ша=Hянъ. yali = шнли (twice).
109 giyarimbi = kiaximbi. arsalan = axsalan.
110 wehe = бехз. [Annotator’s confusion of the Cyrillic letters б and в].
111 falanggū = falanoe. jurgangγa = doerkana.
112 singgeri = sinkkeri. [singgeri also transcribed elsewhere as sinkeri]. manggiyanihambi = manakkjanagabi.
113 defelinggu = tefelink.koe.
114 tangγa = thank, oe. jalingγa = двалин, a. weilengγa = weijlenk, е. enduringγ = endoorink, е.
115 šanggiyan = ша=Hянъ. buchengγe = бшнγxe=чE.
116 kiyangkiyan = kханк, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Manchu (Möllendorf)</th>
<th>Mandarin Chinese (pinyin) + {IPA}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a {[a] [α] [ɛ] [ʌ]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e {[ə] [ɤʌ] [a] [e] [ɛ] [ʌ]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ia {[iʌ] [ia]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iye</td>
<td>ie {[iɛ&lt;]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ue {[yɛ&lt;]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i {i}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>uo {[uo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>o {[uo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e {[α] [yα]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ao {[ao]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i {[i] [ɹ̩]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e {[α]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oe</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>ou {[oo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ü</td>
<td>u {[y] [u] [ue] [o] [oo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o {[o] [uo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e {[α]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o, oe</td>
<td>eo</td>
<td>ou {[oo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ao {[ao]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iao {[iao]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>u {[u]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o {[uo]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aij</td>
<td>ai</td>
<td>ai {[ae]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eij</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ei {[ei]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i {[ei]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oij</td>
<td>oi</td>
<td>ui {[uei]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ij</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>i {[ei]}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

117 Given according to the table of equivalences between Peking dialect and pinyin found in Norman 2002 (1988): 141.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Manchu (Möllendorf)</th>
<th>Chinese (pinyin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a {[a] [a] [A]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e {[xא] [ie&lt;]}  ia {[ie]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>e {[xא] [o] [א]}  i {[i] [א] [e]}  yi {[ji]}  y {[j]}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e {[o] [uo]}  a {[a]}  uо {[uo]}  e {[xא]}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Manchu (Möllendorf)</th>
<th>Chinese (pinyin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ng</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>g₁, g₂, k₁, k₂</td>
<td>k, g, j, q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k (before a consonant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>final k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h₁</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>h₁, h₂, g₁, g₂</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₁, k₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gh</td>
<td>h₁</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>k₁</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kh</td>
<td>k₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h₁</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>h₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nk</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>ng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>ch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dz</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transcription</th>
<th>Manchu (Möllendorf)</th>
<th>Chinese (pinyin)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>б</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>в</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>у, l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>г</td>
<td>g₁</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>д</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ж</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>r, sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>дж</td>
<td>j, ž</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>к</td>
<td>k₁, k₂</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н</td>
<td>n (initial, medial)</td>
<td>n (initial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>нъ</td>
<td>n (final)</td>
<td>n (final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>н”</td>
<td>n (final)</td>
<td>eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>”</td>
<td>ng</td>
<td>n (final)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>р</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>с</td>
<td>s, š, x</td>
<td>s, sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>т</td>
<td>t, d</td>
<td>t, d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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)\(^\text{118}\).

— 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 stop\(^\text{119}\)) 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 segments\(^\text{120}\)) is transcribed as k\(^\text{121}\); and Möllendorf h (a voiceless fricative\(^\text{122}\)) is transcribed g\(^\text{123}\) or, in Cyrillic, х.\(^\text{124}\)

— 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 Hiu\(^{125}\) 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. Norman\(^{126}\) 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 aspiration\(^{128}\): \( d = d \) (voiced, without aspiration), \( t = th \) (voiceless, with aspiration).

— The pronunciation of \( \ddot{u} \) is not distinguished from that of \( u \). Both are most commonly rendered as oe in the Latin alphabet or \( \breve{u} \) 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 Sibe\(^{129}\): \( unumbi \) “to carry (on one’s back), to shoulder, to put (the hands) behind one’s back”\(^{130}\), transcribed as noenombi. Zikmundová also notes the substitution of an initial \( [n] \) with a prothetic \( [y] \), possibly seen here in \( nioboro \) (“deep green”) transcribed as \( j\breve{n}\breve{h}\breve{o}\breve{b}o\breve{r} \).

— 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).
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 oenombi.
131 In the transcription of Chinese, pinyin \( r \) (Norman 2002 [1988]: 139: a voiced retroflex continuant) is almost always transcribed \( \breve{z} \). 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 *нёалма*).

— 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”лн.

— 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*, *ма*, *rame “erring”; *enduri* (“spirit”) = *in*, *doe*, *ри*. 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, 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. 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.

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 in 1726 was that during his exile in Xining 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 得過俄羅索的字頭兒) and had

---

132 Occasional confusion of 6 and n in the transcription of Manchu (see n. 108) also support the conclusion that the annotator was not a native speaker of Russian.


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. This has led to speculation that Yuntang may have developed a system for transcribing Manchu that combined the Latin and Cyrillic alphabets. 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. 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. 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


137 WANG 2021: 35–45.

138 DUNN 1987: 22, n. 8 gives its call number as AAN (Arkhiw 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), Miscellae Sinica). There are also the small manuscript pamphlets he composed to record his conversations with Japanese (Ms Hunter B/E 10, Sermo cum duobus Japanensiibus), 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

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.
143 Demonstrabrat 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”. 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”.

Finally, Bayer sums up his encounter with Dgjauga thus: “in short, this noble Manchu was an excellent and most learned man. 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”.

Bayer’s “Dgjauga” must in fact be Russia’s first teacher of Manchu and Chinese, recorded in other sources as Zhou Ge. According to Russian sources 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 Mangjurensis 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 videtur. […] Ad postremum Mungalice canebat. Somus huius musicae ipsissimae erat, qui Tscherkas’iensis 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).*

(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 mani padme hum 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 Zhaoge and he writes it with two variant characters: 150 and . In Manchu it is Jooge, 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 (Collected Rhymes, 1037) places its together with the character , with their pronunciation given as zhao in the qieyin system (chi xiao qie 之笑切) and the gloss “the Shuowen defines it as to plough [land] by digging down deep and unearth ing the black undersoil; or, cultivating fallow fields; or, an embankment” (Shuowen: geng yi cha jun chu xialu tu, yi yue geng xiutian ye, yi yue ti ye 説文耕以臿浚出下盧土, 一曰耕休田也, 一曰隄也). Ding 1986 [1037]: juan 8: 13a.
152 For ge 言.
153 For Jooge as a Manchu name, see Stary 2000: 232, where eight different occurrences in the genealogies of the Eight Banners are listed.
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Abstract: The present work deals with the four previously unpublished fragments of the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra kept in the Serindia Collection in the subcollection of N.F. Petrovsky under the call numbers SI 2098 (2 fragments), SI 3693, SI 3694. These fragments have some points in common considering the information about the codicological and paleographical features. The fragments present a remarkable similarity to each other in terms of material, type of script and ductus of the writing. It is estimated that the original complete folios of the manuscripts had 7 lines and the same presumable dimensions. On these grounds it is very probable that the four fragments belong to one and the same manuscript. Apart from this, the analysis of text makes it clear that the two fragments under the call number SI 2098 are the two almost conjoining parts of one and the same folio. The article includes transliteration and English translation of the fragments, their comparison with the corresponding text from the Kashgar manuscript of N.F. Petrovsky and with the text of the Kern & Nanjio edition. As a result of comparing the text of the fragments with the texts representing two currently known Sanskrit versions of the Lotus Sūtra (the Gilgit-Nepalese and the Central Asian) it becomes possible to assume that our fragments are closer to the Central Asian version. Fragments containing the texts of this version are of particular interest and utmost importance for the textual history of the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra, because such texts represent the earlier stage of textual development of the Sūtra than the Sanskrit texts from Nepal and Gilgit that show more modern and remodeled variant.

Key words: Serindia Collection, Sanskrit manuscripts, Lotus Sūtra, Khotan, Nikolai F. Petrovsky

The Serindia Collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM, RAS) has preserved a significant number of folios and fragments of the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra. Among the

© Artiom Vladimirovich Mesheznikov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (mesheznikoff@yandex.ru)
manuscripts of the Sanskrit part of the Serindia Collection the Lotus Sūtra texts take the first place in terms of the number of copies and the volume of the manuscripts. The Serindia Collection includes 30 Sanskrit manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra among which some folios and fragments still remain unpublished. After they had been identified, it became possible to publish the next seven fragments and thereby to make significant progress in introducing into scientific circulation the manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra stored in the Serindia Collection.

The Sanskrit manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra kept in the Serindia Collection were compiled mainly in the 8–9th cc. All the manuscripts were written on paper in pothi format in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī script. Both Sanskrit versions of the Sūtra (Gilgit-Nepalese and Central Asian) are presented in the Serindia Collection, but it is necessary to note that the manuscripts related to the Central Asian version greatly predominate. It is suffice to point out that the Sanskrit part of the Serindia Collection contains the largest existing Central Asian manuscript of the Lotus Sūtra which is well-known as the so-called Kashgar manuscript kept in the subcollection of N.F. Petrovsky. Since this manuscript has been preserved almost entirely (including over 400 folios and fragments), it serves the basis for investigating the Central Asian version, which is considered as the earliest version containing an older text being very close to the original variant of the Lotus Sūtra. Studies of the text of the Kashgar manuscript showed that initially it consisted of about 500 folios, of which 399 folios and fragments are stored now in the Serindia Collection in the subcollection of N.F. Petrovsky (under the call number SI 1925/27). Most of the other Sanskrit

1 SI 2098 (2 fragments), SI 3000 (2 fragments) and 3 fragments for the call numbers SI 3631, SI 3693 and SI 3694.
2 According to the data of paleography it can be assumed that several fragments were recorded in the 5–7th cc.
3 In the preface to the Kern and Nanjio’s edition of the Lotus Sūtra H. Kern suggested that the Kashgar version was older and closer to the original composition of the Lotus Sūtra than the other texts, since the grammatically correct Sanskrit of the Nepalese manuscripts was the outcome of subsequent innovations made by the authoritative revisers (KERN & NANJIO 1908–1912: IX).
4 Apart from a larger part of the text preserved in the Serindia Collection and those 12 folios which are considered to be missing some parts of the Kashgar manuscript are kept in the following places in the world: 40 folios are held in the Stein collection in the British Library and 4 folios are in the Hoernle collection in the India Office Library; 9 folios are in the Trinkler collection in the State Library of the Stiftung Preussischer Kulturbesitz formerly in Marburg and now in Berlin; 6 fragments are now in the Otani collection in the Peking Library; one fragment is in the Ellsworth Huntington papers in the Sterling Library of Yale University (TODA 1981: XII).
manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra from the Serindia Collection show similarities or even verbatim matches with the text of the Kashgar manuscript and thus stand closer to the Central Asian version. When compared with the Sanskrit texts of Nepalese and Gilgit manuscripts, almost all Central Asian folios and fragments represent a quite different recension of the textual tradition of the Lotus Sūtra. The Gilgit-Nepalese version of the Lotus Sūtra is formed by Sanskrit manuscripts on palm leaf and paper from Nepal and Tibet, as well as Sanskrit manuscripts on birch bark discovered in 1931 in a stūpa site north of Gilgit in Kashmir. Only three Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in the Serindia Collection under the call numbers SI 1941, SI 3332/3 and SI 4645 are close to the Gilgit-Nepalese version of the Lotus Sūtra.

The paleographic and linguistic analysis of the manuscripts showed that during the second half of the 1st millennium AD the Lotus Sūtra was circulating in the Southern oases of the Tarim Basin, mainly in Khotan. This is confirmed by some happily survived Khotanese colophons to several manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra in which the Khotanese donators transfer the merits to their dead relatives. The widespread circulation of the Lotus Sūtra in Khotan also could be confirmed by the type of script. As has already been noted, Sanskrit manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra from the Serindia Collection were written in Southern Turkestan Brāhmī script developed and used for copying texts in the southern rim of the Tarim. Comparison of Sanskrit manuscripts from the Serindia Collection with the Sanskrit texts in Northern Turkestan Brāhmī from the German Turfan Collection revealed that Hīnayāna texts were more popular in the Northern oases while Mahāyāna texts predominated in the Southern. The Lotus Sūtra and other Mahāyāna texts are represented in the Turfan Collection by only a small number of manuscripts, while these texts perform the main part within ‘Sanskrit division’ of the Serindia Collection. In this respect, being probably one of the most popular Sanskrit texts in Khotan, the Lotus Sūtra may well have been one of the school-forming Sūtras in the Southern oases of Tarim Basin.

5 Undoubtedly the Sanskrit texts found in the Gilgit manuscripts agree very closely with the Sanskrit texts of the Nepalese manuscripts and thus both groups of texts form single Gilgit-Nepalese version.
8 See: MESHEZNIKOV 2021.
9 For example, the Kashgar manuscript of N.F. Petrovsky has such a colophon on the f. 459b (TODA 1981: 225).
It is noteworthy that the name “Kashgar manuscript” is conditional and should be associated with the place where this manuscript was acquired by the Russian Consul General in Kashgar N.F. Petrovsky from a local collector aqsaqal Badruddin Khan, who had discovered it near Khotan (most probably in the Domako region, in the ancient Buddhist site at Khādalik, where excavations were carried out at the beginning of the 20th c., and where many other manuscripts of the Serindia Collection were found).\(^{10}\) Judging the presumptive provenance, the Kashgar manuscript of N.F. Petrovsky strictly scientific should be called the Khotan manuscript.

Manuscripts from Central Asia contain the original Sanskrit Hīnayāna and Mahāyāna texts and represent the early versions of the sūtras, which had already been replaced in India by the newer ones. The same applies to the Sanskrit variants of the Lotus Sūtra. The study of Chinese translations shed light on the chronology of the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra texts. Comparison of available Sanskrit manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra with the Chinese Buddhist texts allowed to determine which Sanskrit version had served the basis for a certain Chinese translation of the Sūtra. The exact dates of the Chinese translations gave grounds for making assumptions about the textual history of the Sanskrit versions. On one hand, it was discovered that the Gilgit-Nepalese version had appeared in India presumably around the fourth century AD and it was this version which had been chosen for the Chinese translation of Kumārajīva in 406. On the other hand, the earlier version of the Sūtra, which at present we know as the Central Asian one, most likely penetrated oases of Tarim Basin in the first centuries AD and was translated into Chinese at as early a date as the third century AD by Dharmarakṣa.

In this regard Prof. Heinz Bechert attempted to research the textual history of the Sanskrit text of the Lotus Sūtra checking its Chinese translations and all currently known Sanskrit manuscripts in Nepalese, Devanāgarī and Brāhmī scripts. Having studied the chronological relationship between Indian and Central Asian texts, H. Bechert tried to explain the appearance of several versions of the Sūtra. According to him, the Gilgit-Nepalese version which underlies Kumārajīva’s translation and must be dated earlier than 406 AD was neither of Nepalese, nor of Kashmirian origin.\(^{11}\) Initially, the earliest text of the Sūtra was recorded in the first centuries AD and brought from India to Central Asia. Subsequently in India this text was remodeled by unknown scholars, and as a result appeared the so-called Gilgit-Nepalese

\(^{10}\) VOROBIeva-DESIATOVSKAIA 2011: 245.
\(^{11}\) Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra 1977: 6.
version. The hybrid language\textsuperscript{12} of the original text of the Sūtra was changed by scholars applying the rules of classical Sanskrit grammar. The new form of the text was widely accepted in the Buddhist tradition of North India and replaced the earlier variant, because the upgraded version fitted much better the taste of time of the so-called Sanskrit renaissance.\textsuperscript{13} During that period the Buddhist literary tradition, which had been functioning for a long time in the large variety of Middle Indian dialects, was transferred to a single classical Sanskrit. The original text of the Lotus Sūtra was restructured, its variations from classical Sanskrit in orthography, phonology, syntax, and morphology were removed or unified in accordance with standard Sanskrit grammar. The more modern version of the Lotus Sūtra began to spread throughout North India, while in oases of Tarim Basin the earlier so-called Central Asian recension had been already generally accepted and widely transmitted. Thus, the Central Asian manuscripts represent the early stage of textual development of the Lotus Sūtra. Such manuscripts were in circulation especially in Khotan and the unpublished fragments to which the present article is devoted are among them.

The present work deals with the four previously unpublished fragments of the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra kept in the Serindia Collection in the subcollection of N.F. Petrovsky under the call numbers SI 2098 (2 fragments), SI 3693, SI 3694. We introduce transliteration of the fragments, their English translation and facsimile.

\textsuperscript{12} Franklin Edgerton in his seminal work Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary proposed a description of Buddhist Sanskrit texts based on the assumption that the originally used Prakrit languages had been undergoing the process of a progressive Sanskritization during which middle Indic forms were gradually purged. Presumably, Sanskritization was increasing exponentially in the course of a gradual oral transformation, Sanskrit elements were penetrating more and more into texts in Middle Indic languages, and as a result this process formed an array of texts, characterized by a different ratio of Sanskritisms and Prakritisms in them. Speaking about the manuscripts of the Lotus Sūtra presented in the Serindia Collection, they contain the texts which underwent changes in the direction of greater Sanskritization, their prose passages were composed in almost regular Sanskrit comparatively free from recognizable Middle Indic influence, but many archaic hybrid language forms also retained especially in the verses.

\textsuperscript{13} Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra 1977: 6.
Description of the fragments

**SI 2098.** According to the text fragment 1 (in size 13.9×13.1 cm) and fragment 2 (13.7×10.6 cm) are almost connected. A large decorative circle has been preserved (diameter: 10.1 cm). It was supposed to contain a colored miniature. Such circles can also be found in the Kashgar manuscript, usually at the beginning or the end of chapters. (Pl. 1, 2, 3, 4)

**SI 3693.** The fragment measures 14×20.1 cm, only the left part of the pothi folio is extant. Fragment preserves a left margin (2 cm) and a small decorative circle (diameter: 3.1 cm) for marking a binding hole. The number of the page (225) is preserved on the left side-recto. (Pl. 5, 6)

**SI 3694.** The manuscript, which measures 7.5×18.6 cm, belongs to the left half of the folio and preserves part of a small decorative circle (diameter: ≈ 3 cm). It consists of three fragments, two of which are very tiny and preserve only illegible fragments of aksaras. On the basis of the Kashgar manuscript we estimate that a complete folio SI 3694 bore 7 lines of writing on each side as with the fragments SI 2098 and SI 3693. Comparison with the Kashgar manuscript shows that the recto side of the fragment SI 3694 might include the lines from 5 to 7 and the verso side continues with the excerpts of the next four lines. (Pl. 7, 8)

From an evaluation of the available information about the external features of the fragments (material, type of script and ductus, number of lines, etc.) it is possible to assume that they were parts of one manuscript copied in Khotan. Moreover, two fragments kept under the call number SI 2098 form parts of one and the same folio of this manuscript. Our fragments are written in the ornamental formal Southern Turkestan Brāhmī script, the forms of the aksaras look very similar, and, judging by the paleography, the manuscript dates back to the 8–9th cc. AD. The text is put down in black ink on light brown paper. The complete pothi folio contains 7 lines on each side, the dimension between the lines is 1.8 cm. The upper and lower edges are partially preserved in some of our fragments and measure 1 to 1.5 cm, the size of left and right margins according to the fragments is 1.5 to 2 cm.

As mentioned above, the Sanskrit Lotus Sūtra texts in the manuscripts of the Serindia Collection often coincide almost verbatim with the text contained in the Kashgar manuscript. Aside from those few fragments that turned out to be closer to the Gilgit-Nepalese version, the rest manuscript
fragments clearly follow the text of the Kashgar manuscript, and rare discrepancies found among them can be considered equivalent in terms of both content and grammatical form. With the help of the text of the Kashgar manuscript it is possible to calculate that there would originally have been 25–30 aksaras to the line of the entire folio of the manuscript to which our fragments belong. From the facts mentioned above, the size of the entire pothi folio may be calculated as having originally been roughly 15×50 cm.

Contents of fragments

The fragments contain text from two chapters of the Lotus Sūtra. The text of SI 3693 belongs to the 18th chapter of the Lotus Sūtra (“The Chapter Describing the Religious Merit [Obtained through] Joyful Participation [in Dharma]”, ‘Anumodanāpunyanirdeśaparivartaḥ’). The fragments SI 2098 and SI 3694 are the excerpts from the 19th chapter (“Benefits of a Dharma Preacher”, ‘Dharmabhāṇakānṛśaṃsa-parivartaḥ’).

The excerpt of fragment SI 3693 belongs to the end of the 18th chapter, which, as the name of the chapter implies, outlines a description of religious benefits obtained from the joyful acceptance of Dharma. The content of the chapter may be summarized as follows. Bodhisattva Maitreya asks Buddha what achieves a person who listens to the Lotus Sūtra and follows it with joy. According to Buddha, accepting the teachings of the Lotus Sūtra will bring incalculable religious merit to an adept and lead to a better rebirth. The key term for this chapter is anumodanā (acceptance, (expression of) thanks, gratification or approval).14 In the context of the Lotus Sutra this term may be understood as a joyful participation in knowledge. Through listening to the Lotus Sūtra, a person experiences a joyful participation in the truth inherent in it, which Buddha comprehended, and which the listener of the Sūtra comprehends.15 The chapter emphasizes that concerning accumulation of religious merit anumodanā gained through listening to the Sūtra surpasses other methods of spiritual development, namely the practice for the laity (offering gifts) and yogic practice. Our fragment tells that if a person of a good family16

14 MONIER-WILLIAMS 1899: 37; EDGERTON 1953: 32.
16 Both the 18th and 19th chapters speak about sons and daughters of a good family. They may be understood as sentient beings who have awakened to the realization of their Buddha-nature, of their innate potential for enlightenment, and the spiritual tendencies of these beings are directed towards attaining Buddhahood through the path of a bodhisattva.
hears the Dharma of the Lotus Sūtra, were it even just one line for a single moment, and, as mentioned before, if that person joyfully receives it, feeling participation in knowledge it contains, the religious benefits of that person will be incalculable and incomparable. Namely those who hold joy in their mind while hearing the Dharma (and also persuading other beings to listen to it) will be reborn into the body which will acquire marvelous carts, palanquins, vehicles etc., obtain seats of Indra, Brahma, a Cakravartin’s royal lion-throne, gain birth in the same place as the bodhisattvas acquired dhāraṇī-powers.

The text of fragments SI 2098 represents the very beginning of the 19th chapter of the Lotus Sūtra, which speaks about those who spread the Dharma. This chapter focuses not only on the transformative power of the text of Sūtra itself, but also on the exalted status of its preacher. It tells about the good qualities acquired by sentient beings through the reading, explaining, propagating the Lotus Sūtra to others. According to the text, a person who keeps the Lotus Sūtra, takes care of it, recites its Dharma, explains difficult passages, rewrites and propagates the text of the Sūtra, is called Dharmabhāṇaka or a Dharma-preacher. The passage from SI 2098 enumerates the merits obtained by Dharmabhāṇaka in terms of rewards for the six senses. The number of good qualities that a Dharma-preacher will receive is indicated for each of six sense faculties (the five sensory organs and the mental organ — the mind), and it is either 800 or 1200. One of the interpretations of these numbers was offered by Kumarajiva’s student Tao-shen (360–434) in his Commentary on the Sūtra. The 10 precepts of Buddhism (10 kinds of goodness) correspond to 10 virtues or good qualities. Every good quality can be combined with the 10 good qualities, thus their number should be multiplied by itself, resulting in 100. Good qualities are inherent in the four proper deeds (self-practice, teaching the Dharma, praising the Dharma and following it with joy) and thus 400 good qualities result from it. Good qualities have three grades. Everything can be characterized as the lowest, the middle and the highest. The middle level includes the lowest, and the highest level includes both the lowest and the middle. If the lowest level has 400 good qualities, then the middle and highest levels have 800 and 1200 respectively. According to the 19th chapter three organs — ears, tongue and mind — can be described as the highest, and they get 1200 good qualities, the other three — eyes, nose and body — are of the middle grade, so they have 800 good qualities. Further the text

\[\text{See: Young-Ho Kim 1985.}\]
specifies how pure and perfect will be Dharmabhāṇaka’s faculties of seeing, hearing, perceiving etc. In particular fragment SI 3694 presents the excerpt which deals with the Dharmabhāṇaka’s body.

Transliteration, correspondences and English translation

The fragments presented here under the call numbers SI 2098 and SI 3693 correspond to the text from the folios of the Kashgar manuscript preserved in the Stein collection of the British Library. The fragments SI 2098 follow the text of the folios 340–341 kept under the call numbers Or.9613–14 and Or.9613–15. The fragment SI 3693 corresponds to the text of the folios 336–337 (Or.9613–10, 11). Speaking about the fragment SI 3694 it overlaps with the folio No. 357 of the manuscript SI 1925 kept in the N.F. Petrovsky subcollection of the Serindia Collection. The text of the Central Asian version of the Lotus Sūtra, contained in the Kashgar manuscript is most fully presented in the edition of H. Toda. Also, the facsimile edition of L. Chandra was used when comparing the text of our fragments with the Kashgar manuscript.

Apart from the comparison with the Kashgar Manuscript our fragments may be also compared with the corresponding text of the well-known Kern and Nanjio edition of the Lotus Sūtra which is based mostly on the texts of the Nepalese manuscripts and thus differs textually from the Central Asian version. The comparison of our fragments and texts of the Kashgar manuscript with the version known from the late Sanskrit Nepalese manuscripts shows that more modern rearranged version in some parts overlaps with the Central Asian, but also has many differences due to later alterations.

18 See: TODA 1981.
20 See: KERN & NANJIO 1908–1912.
21 The manuscripts used by H. Kern and B. Nanjio are all much newer than the Central Asian manuscripts. Nepalese palm leaf texts preserving comparatively older readings may be dated to the 11–12th cc., and more modern Nepalese paper manuscripts have been copied since the 17th c.
Symbols used in the transliteration

( ) — restored akṣara(s)
[ ] — akṣara(s) whose reading(s) is(are) uncertain
< > — omitted (part of) akṣara(s) without gap in the manuscript
{ } — superfluous akṣara(s) or a daṇḍa
+ — one lost akṣara
.. — one illegible akṣara
. — illegible part of an akṣara
/// — beginning or end of a fragment when broken
| — daṇḍa
|| — double daṇḍa
* — virāma
• — punctuation mark
: — visarga used as punctuation
‘ — avagraha
◯ — decorative circle
ḥ — jihvāmūlīya

SI 2098 (fragment 1 + fragment 2 (in italic))

Recto

1. /// ◯ .. + kha(l)[u] +++ [n] sa ..
2. /// ◯ ti sma [•] [y]at kaśc(i)t sa[t].
3. /// ◯ vā [i]m dharmapa-
4. /// ◯ vā[c](a)vyati de-
5. /// ◯ [ś][a][y][i]syati • svādhyā-
6. /// [r]gu ◯ na[ś](a) + (n)[i] • pratilapsya-
7. /// .. • aṣṭau ghrāṇaguṇ[ña](a) + (t)[ā]ni pra(t)[i]-

Verso

1. /// • aṣṭau kāya[ṇ]a .. (t)[ā]ni [p]ra +
2. /// .[y][a]ti • yebhīr guṇe + s [t]asya kulaputra-
Kashgar manuscript 340b(4)–341b(2):

atha khalu bhagavān satatasamitābhiyuktantaḥ nāma bodhisatvam  
+++/tvam 23 āmantrayati sma • yaḥ kaścit satatasamitābhiyau /// — ///24 tā25  
vā imaṃ dharmaparyāyam udghṛtasyati /// — ///26 samprakāśayiṣyantaḥ •  
svādhyāyiṣyantaḥ /// — /// lapsyati27 • dvādaśa śrotaguṇaśatāni prati /// —  
// psyati28 • dvādaśa jihvāguṇaśatāni pratilapsyati • a(ṣ)ṭ /// — /// lapsyati29 •  
dvādaśa managunaśatāni pratilapsyati28 • yebhir guṇebhis tasya  
(k)ula[pl]utrasya bahubhir guṇaśatebhī śārīre śaḍendriyāgraṃ sa[ddhaṃpa]  
risuddhaṃ bhaviṣyati • supariṣuddhaṃ bhaviṣyati sa kulaputra  
eva pariṣuddhaṃ ca[ksurindriyaṃ prati]lapsyati ye ca[ksurindriyena  
pratilabdhenā prākṛtitena māṃsacākṣuṣā mātāpitṛsambhavan[sa]rvam  
ṛśaḥhasram mahābhāhaḥsaḥ lokadhātuḥ draksyati sāntarabhir[duḥ]am  
asumerumo sa[ccakrravāt]aṃ mahā[ccakrravat]aṃ muci[llendramahāmucilendraṃ  
sasarabhaṭakaṃ heṣṭīmena yāvad avīcī mahānara[kaṃ dr]aksyati •  

22 Kashgar manuscript: scribal error for “bhāṭakaṃ”.
23 (mahāsa)tvaṃ (TODA 1981: 169). Hereinafter restoration of some parts of the missing  
text of the Kashgar manuscript is given in accordance with the edition of H. Toda.  
24 The symbol /// — /// indicates those parts of the folios in the Kashgar manuscript which  
are missing due to fire.
25 (kta .. kuladuhitā).
26 (dhārayiṣyati vācayiṣyati deśayiṣyati paryāpuniṣyati).
27 (likhiṣyati .. prati)lapsyati.
28 prati(lapsyati .. prati)lapsyati.
29 a(ṣ)§(au .. prati)lapsyati.
Pl. 1.
A fragment of Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS. SI 2098, fragment 1 *recto*

Pl. 2:
A fragment of Saddharmapundarīka-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS. SI 2098, fragment 1 *verso*
Pl. 3:
A fragment of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS. SI 2098, fragment 2 recto

Pl. 4:
A fragment of Saddharmapundarika-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS. SI 2098, fragment 2 verso
Thereupon Bhagavan addressed Bodhisattva Mahāsattva Satatasamitābhiyukta (‘Forever Diligent’): “If a young man of a good family preserves, recites, teaches, writes this Dharmaparyāya, that person will attain eight hundred good qualities of the eye, twelve hundred qualities of the ear, eight hundred qualities of the nose, twelve hundred qualities of the tongue, eight hundred qualities of the body, and twelve hundred qualities of the mind. By these many hundred good qualities the six sense faculties of that person will become completely pure and perfect. That person will gain pure vision. By means of the natural, bodily eyes given by his parents he will see the whole universe consisting of triple thousand great thousand worlds, within and beyond, with its great mountains Sumeru, Cakravāla, Mucilinda, mountain ranges, forests, clouds, seashores, all the existence from the lowest hell Avīci and up to the highest summit of the universe.

30 Cakravāṭa/Cakravāḍa/Cakkavāla — n. of a mountain or rather mountain-range, supposed to surround the earth.
1. rmaparyāyaṃ śṛṇu[yā](t*) u ///
2. saṃskāreṇa kṛtenopaci ///
3. lābhe gorathā[n](āṁ) lā[bhi] ///
4. yānānāṃ sarṣa○pa(y) ///
5. bhī bhaviṣyati • sa[ce]t pu[n]a ///
6. rmaparyāyaṃ [śṛ]ṇuyāt* para[s] ///
7. rasya sa[tva] ++ tena [pa]ra ///

Verso

1. kuśalābhisaṃ++reṇa lābhī [bh] ///
2. sanānāṃ siṃ(hā)sanānāṃ lābhī ///
3. aparasya puruṣasyaivaṃ + ///
4. traṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ ○ śṛṇu ///
5. yadi muhūrt[a]∪[t]∪[r]∪[a][m] ///
6. saṃskāreṇa pa[ra]ṃ prautsā+ ///
7. labdhebhir bodhisatvebhiḥ sārdhaṃ ///

Kashgar manuscript, 336b(1)–337b(1):

tatra vihāre muhūrtamātram api imaṃ dharmaparyāyaṃ śṛṇuyāt* utthito vā • niṣṭhāno vā sa ajita kulastrup tie mātrakena puṇyābhisaṃskāreṇa kṛtenopacite vagy jātivītivṛtte dvitiye ātmabhavaprayutinābh gorathānāṃ lābhī bhaviṣyaty aṣvarathāna hastira○thānāṃ śivikayānāṃ nāvayānānāṃ sarṣapayānānāṃ sukhayānānāṃ divyānāṃ ca vimāna(y)ā /// — /// iṣyati31 •

sacet punas tatra dharmārāve muehūrtamātram api /// — /// ryāya32 śṛṇuyā para satvam vā niṣīdā /// — /// sya33 satvasya sa tena

31 (nānāṃ lābhī bhav)iṣyati (TODA 1981: 166).
32 (…dharmāra)ryāya.
33 niṣīdā(ayed… apara)sya.
paramāsana /// — /// skāreṇa

kuṇḍalābhisaṃskāreṇa lābhī bhaviṣya(ta)

(kara)kṛrabhavārjāsanānāṃ sīṃhasañānāṃ lābhī bhav /// — ///

ajita tatra kaścid eva puruṣaḥ aparasya ○ puruṣasyaivaṃ vaded āgacche tāva(ta)

tvaṃ bhoho puruṣa sādhibhāvapiṇḍarikaṃ nāma sūtraṃ dharma-pāramāpāyaṃ

śṛṇusya sa ca puruṣaḥ tasya puruṣasya taṃ protsāhanam āgamyā āgatvā yadi

muhūrtamātram api imāṃ dharma-pāramāpāyaṃ śṛṇuyāti* tasya satvyasyānena

puṇyābhisaṃskāreṇa paraṃ protsāhanakuśalamūlenabhisamkṛtena puruṣaḥ

sādāhāranipratilabdhheḥ bhodhisattvaḥ • sārdham samavadhānāṃ

pratilabhath •

Kern & Nanjio, 349(9)–350(4):

sa ca gattvā tasminnīnāṃ dharma-pāryāyaṃ muhūrtakamapi śṛṇuyātsthito

vā niṣāṇo vā sa sattvasthāngatrena puṇyābhisaṃskāreṇa kṛtenopacitena

jātīviniyāto dvitiye samacchraye dvitiye ātmabhāvapatralambhe gorathānāṃ

lābhī bhaviṣyatayāsvarathānāṃ hastirathānāṃ sivikānāṃ
goyānāṃmṛṣabhayānāṃ divyānāṃ ca vimānānāṃ lābhī bhaviṣyatī|
sacētpunastatra dharmaśravane muhūrtamātramapi niśadyemaṃ
dharma-pāryāyaṃ śṛṇuyātparaṃ vā niśādayedāsanamvibhāgaṃ vā
kuryādaparasya sattvasya tena sa puṇyābhisaṃskāreṇa lābhī bhaviṣyati

sākṣaṣaṇānāṃ brahmāsānānāṃ cakravartiśīṃhasañānāṃ| sacētpunarañjita

kaścid eva kula-puroorro vā kula-dhuḥhitā vāparaṃ puṣāmevaṃ vadedāgacchā
tvaṃ bhoho puruṣa sādhibhāvapiṇḍdarīkaṃ nāma dharma-pāryāyaṃ

śṛṇusya sa ca puṇyābhisaṃskāreṇa tāṃ protsāhanāṃ āgamyā yadi

muhūrtamātramapi śṛṇuyātī sattvastena protsāhena

kuṇḍalābhisaṃskāreṇa dhāraṇī pratilabdhhair-bhodhisattvaiḥ sārdham

samavadhānāṃ pratilabhath āṃ
Pl. 5:
A fragment of Saddharmapundarika-sutra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3693 recto

Pl. 6:
A fragment of Saddharmapundarika-sutra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3693 verso
Translation

...if a man of a good family approaches a monastery and there hears this Dharmaparyāya for even a single moment, either standing or sitting. Then, O Ajita! Through the store of merit attained from this action that person after the end of his present life, at the time of his second existence will become a possessor of carts yoked with oxes, horses and elephants, palanquins, ships, light and beautiful carriages, heavenly vehicles, aerial cars. If that person sits down at a place where the Dharma is taught, even for a moment to hear this Dharmaparyāya, or invites another person to sit and listen or shares with him his own seat, by the merit of goodness attained through that action he will gain seats of Indra, of Brahma, thrones of a Cakravartin. O Ajita! If that same person says to another person: “Come and listen to the Dharmaparyāya called the Lotus Sūtra of the True Law”, — and if due to his exertion that other person comes to listen to it even for a single moment, then by the merit of the root of goodness attained through this exertion the first person will obtain co-existence with Bodhisattvas having acquired dhāraṇīs.

SI 3694

Transliteration

Recto

5. /// ya[th]aiva vai[dū][rya]ma[yi] ///
6. /// dhāreti idaṃ hy udā ++ ///
7. /// thā 's[ya] [dr](śya)te • sau [t](u) [s](va)yaṃ [pa] ///

Verso

2. /// iṣu prat[i]binba drśyaṃ[ti] [hi] [t] ///
3. /// cakravādā : hi[ma]vā[n] su+ ///
4. /// [thai]+ ○ [4] ++++ sau pa[s] ///
Pl. 7:
A fragment of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3694 recto

Pl. 8:
A fragment of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection. The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3694 verso
Kashgar manuscript, 357a(7)–357b(6):

pariśuddha tasya bhavate ‘tmabhāvo yatheva vaiḍūryamayī sunirmalaḥ priyadarśana bhoti ca sarvapṛṣṭhināṃ : ya sūtra dhāreti ēndanḥ hy udāraṃm36 ādārśa mṛṛaṣṭe yatha bimba drṣyate loka ‘sya kāyasmī tathā ‘sya drṣyate • sau tu svaṃ paśyati no ca anye pariśuddhakāyasy iyam evarūpaṃ* 2 ye lokadḥātuyā iḥāsti satvā manusya-deva-viśuddhaḥ ca • nanarēṣu vā pre○ tiraścayoniṣu pratiṃba drṣyanṭi hi tasya kāye 3 devavimānās ca bhavāgra yāva(ca)chaila /// — /// ā • himavān sumeruḥ ca mahāṃś ca meruh kaya(sm)i /// — /// śyant37 ātmabhāve saśrāvakā bu[d](dha) /// — /// ā38 gaṇe ca ye dharma prakāṣa39 ///

Kern & Nanjio, 370(10)–371(6):

pariśuddha tasya bhavetmabhāvo yathāpi vaiḍūryamayo viśuddhaḥ| sattvāna nityaṃ priyadarśanaśca yaḥ sūtra dhāreti ēndanḥ udāram ||61|| ādārśapiṃba yathā bimba paśyet loko ‘sya kāyē ayu drṣyate tathā| svayaṃbhur so paśyati nänyasattvāṃnariśuddhi kāyasyiyamevarūpā ||62|| ye lokadḥātāu hi iḥāsti sattvā manusya-deva-viśuddhaḥ ca • nanarēṣu preteṣu tiraścayonīṣu pratiṃbaṃ saṃdrṣyati tatra kāye||63|| vimāna deva-viśuddhaḥ yāvacchailaṃ pṛcā parvata cakravāḍaṃ himavān sumeruṣca mahāṃśca meruh kāyē drṣyanṭi sarvathaiva ||64|| buddhāṃ pṛcā paśyati ātmabhāve saśrāvakāṃbhuddhasutāṃṣtathānyān| ye bodhisattvā viharantī caikakā gaṇe ca ye dharma prakāṣayanti ||65||

37 (= 6... paśyani.
38 buddha(sutāms... caikak)ā.
39 prakāṣ(ayanti 5...).
Translation

His body becomes entirely pure, perfectly clear and excellent, as if made of a cat’s-eye gem; he who preserves this Sūtra is always an utterly pleasant sight for all sentient beings.

Since everything reflects on the surface of a mirror, so the world’s image is seen in his body. He alone sees it, while no other beings do, such is the perfection of his body.

All sentient beings of the world, humans, gods, demons, spirits, hell’s inhabitants, hungry ghosts, animals are reflected on that body.

The aerial chariots of the gods which reach as high as the extremity of the universe, the mountains Cakravāḍa, Meru, Mahāmeru are reflected on that body.

He sees the Buddhas in his body, likewise the Śrāvakas and other sons of Buddha, the Bodhisattvas who lead a solitary life, and those who teach the Dharma to the assembly.
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Provenience

The German Turfan Collection in Berlin preserves nearly forty fragments of an unusual Sanskrit manuscript originally found at Toyoq in the Turfan oasis. Although it is written on paper, the usual material of the manuscripts found in Central Asia, the script, a distinct variety of the so-called Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II in the terminology of Lore Sander,¹ rather points to northern India as its origin. There, paper is rarely used; the standard material is either palm leaf or birch bark. Among the thousands of folios preserved in

© Safarali Haibulloevich Shomakhmadov, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (safaralihshom@mail.ru)
© Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Institute of Indology and Tibetology, Ludwig Maximilians University of Munich (juhartmann@lmu.de)

¹ Sander 1968.
the famous Gilgit find in Northern Pakistan, there is only one birch-bark manuscript that contains also a number of paper folios. The combination of script and material makes the manuscript from Toyooq something special—and, as will be shown below, it greatly facilitates the attribution of further fragments! The surviving folios could be assigned to three famous works representing three different literary genres of Buddhist ornate poetry, Mātṛceta’s *Varṇāravarnā* (a hymn on the Buddha), Āryaśūra’s *Jātakamālā* (a collection of birth stories) and Kumāralāta’s *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā Drśtānapaṇkti* (a collection of tales). In the German collection, the manuscript carries the modern number SHT 638, and it is described in the first of the catalogue volumes (SHT I: 286). According to this description, there are three fragments of the *Varṇāravarnā* (VAV), fourteen of the *Jātakamālā* (Jm) and thirteen of the *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* (KalpM). Once it must have been a very large manuscript; for the VAV the folio numbers 13 and 26 are preserved, for the Jm the number 120, and for the KalpM the numbers 294, 297, 421 and 422. Eight very small fragments had remained unidentified, but later three of them (2–4) could be shown to also belong to the VAV. Since folio 13 contains the verses 16–31 of the second chapter of the VAV and folio 26 already verses 9–23 of chapter 8, it is obvious that at least one more text must have preceded the VAV. All the fragments are edited (cf. SHT I: 286 for the details); Weller’s edition of the Jm folios and Lüders’ of the KalpM are accompanied by facsimiles, and for the VAV Schlingloff published a separate facsimile edition.

This was the state of affairs when in May 2021 a fragment of the VAV was found in the Serindia Collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IOM, RAS). After a close examination, two facts became quickly clear. First, Shin’ichirō Hori had already identified the fragment in 2011, but not edited, and second, it clearly belonged to the same manuscript as the fragments of SHT 638. As mentioned above, the script is very distinct and combined with material, number of lines, number of akṣaras per line and presumable size of the folios it leaves no doubt that the fragments come from one and the same manuscript. This

2 HARTMANN 2017 (Fs. HÖLLMANN): 290, note 3.
4 WELLER 1955, Tafel I–III (only the verso sides); LÜDERS 1926, Tafel I–XII; SCHLINGLOFF 1968, no. 227–232. Very good colour photographs of all fragments are nowadays available online (http://turfan.bhaw.de/idp-berlin/).
5 HORI 2011: 6 (SUP 152 1 = SI 3695).
was a surprise, but that was not yet all: The Petrovsky Collection also contains a fragment of the Jātakamālā and the Petrovsky and Krotkov Collection one each of the KalpM. Hori had not only identified the latter two (SI 2Kr/9 (4) = SI 2041/5 and SI 3695 = SI P/152 2), but also edited them. The Jātakamālā’s fragment (Kṣāntivādi-jātaka) (SI 2998) was published in 2022.

How is this distribution over three collections to be explained? The fragments now kept in Berlin were collected by the members of the second so-called Prussian Turfan expedition that visited the Turfan oasis from November 1904 until November 1905. It was headed by Albert von Le Coq, and it is known that on several occasions Le Coq gave manuscript fragments as a gift to researchers and officials from other countries. Therefore it is quite plausible that the fragments now in Russia were originally also found by Le Coq and his team and on fitting occasions handed over to the Russian consul in Ghulja Nikolay Krotkov and the Russian consul in Kashgar Nikolay Petrovsky.

Mātṛceṭa and his works

As mentioned above, fragment SI 3695/1 is an excerpt from the work of the famous Buddhist thinker and poet Mātṛceṭa, the Varnār̥havarna, “The Praise of the Praiseworthy” (another name is Caturśatakā since it consists of nearly 400 verses). A late version of his biography says that, being a brahmin, Mātṛceṭa came to the Nālandā monastery and won a philosophical debate over many learned monks. Nāgārjuna sent Āryadeva to dispute with Mātṛceṭa, who was able to defeat the brahmin. The defeated Mātṛceṭa converted to Buddhism. Information on Mātṛceṭa’s biography is very fragmentary and is contained in Chinese and Tibetan texts. The most complete description of the life of Mātṛceṭa is presented in the “History of Buddhism in India” by Tāranātha (1575–634). Apparently, Tāranātha brought together several scattered traditions about the life of Mātṛceṭa.
So, according to one of the legends, Mātṛceṭa lived during the time of Vindusāra Maurya (3rd c. BC), the son of Candragupta Maurya, the dynasty founder and the father of Emperor Aśoka. Mātṛceṭa lived in the city of Kusumapura in the monastery of Kusuma-laṃkāra, where he preached the teachings of both the Mahāyāna and the Hīnayāna. Subsequently, Mātṛceṭa erected a temple dedicated to Avalokiteśvara, where a thousand monks — followers of the Mahāyāna — lived.

Particularly, “The History of Buddhism in India” mentions names associated with Mātṛceṭa. According to Tāranātha, Mātṛceṭa is also known by the following names: brāhmaṇa Durdharṣakāla, (Ārya)Śūra, Aśvaghoṣa, Mātṛceṭa, Pitṛceṭa, Durdharṣa, Dhārmika Subhūti. Maticitra, etc.

A number of facts speak against the assertion that Aśvaghoṣa and Mātṛceṭa are one person. First of all, from the analysis of the works of both authors, it becomes obvious that the audience for both authors was different. Aśvaghoṣa’s writings were addressed to the educated elites of Indian society, not necessarily Buddhist. Mātṛceṭa’s poems were exclusively for Buddhist followers. Therefore, the sources of creativity of both poets differed: Aśvaghoṣa relied on various written monuments, of both Buddhist and non-Buddhist content. The basis of Mātṛceṭa’s works were exclusively Buddhist texts.  

According to another version of the biography recorded in Tāranātha’s text, Mātṛceṭa was born into a brāhmaṇa family called Saṃghaguhya, and his maternal grandfather was a lay Buddhist. Having received the name Kāla at birth, the young Mātṛceṭa perfectly studied the Vedas, mantras, tantra and the art of debate. According to legend, the god Mahādeva was his mentor. For his devotion to his parents, he received the name ‘Dedicated to mother’ — Mātṛ- or Pitṛceṭa.

So, the Brahmin Mātṛceṭa defeated many Buddhist thinkers in the art of debate, turning them away from the Dharma and making them Non-Buddhists (tīrthika). However, Mātṛceṭa’s mother, wishing to guide her son on the Dharma Path, told him that victory cannot be considered absolute until the Magadha Buddhists are defeated. And Mātṛceṭa went to Nālandā. His meeting with Āryadeva was mentioned earlier. After converting to Buddhism, according to the legend, Mātṛceṭa saw the bodhisattva Tārā, who ordered him, in atonement for sins, when he was a brahmin, to create many stotras praising the Buddha.

So, among the works attributed to Mātṛceṭa, the following are known:

And, of course, “Praise for the Praiseworthy”. The Chinese monk Yijing (635–713) who went as a pilgrim to India highly appreciated the artistic and religious qualities of VAV.¹²

Varṇārhavarṇa’s structure

The text of VAV consists of 12 chapters:
1. Asakyaśtava (“The Praise to the Incomparable (He who is above all praises)”). The chapter is an introduction to the whole work, especially the introduction to the Second chapter. This chapter raises the important question of the futility of expressing aspects of the Buddha in the ‘conventional (common) language’.
2. Mūrdhābhiseka (“The Head Sprinkling”, i.e. “Consecration”). Although of the previous chapter about the impossibility of describing the qualities of the Buddha through human language, in this chapter Mātṛceṭa praises the individual qualities of the Bhagavān through such epithets as śramaṇa, brāhmaṇa, lokācārya, snātaka, nṛṣimha, mahānāga.
3. Sarvajñātāsiddhi (“The Fullness of Omniscience”). The chapter is devoted to describing both the bodily appearance of the Buddha and aspects of gaining Omniscience.
4. Balavaiśaradādyastava (“The Praise to the Powers and the Confidences (Fearlessness)”). The chapter characterizes the ten Powers of the Tathāgata (daśa tathāgatabalāni) and four ‘fearlessnesses’ (vaiśāradya) as factors in the Omniscience manifestation.
5. Vāgniṣuddhi (“The Speech Purification”). The chapter describes the properties of Buddha’s speech, the concept of two truths — the relative truth (saṃvrtisatyā) and the absolute one (paramārthasatyā), as well as idea of the Single Utterance (ekasvāra).

6. **Avivādastava** ("The Praise to the Indisputability [of the Teaching]"). The chapter substantiates the indisputability and truth of the Dharma; the topic of conducting a public dispute (vivāda) is touched upon.

7. **Brahmānuvāda** ("The Explanation of Brahma"). In this chapter, the Buddhist teaching is explained through the Brahmanical terms. Thus, the Buddha is described as Brahma and the Dharma — as Brahman.

8. **Upakārastava** ("The Praise of the [Buddha’s] Blessings"). The chapter describes the benefits that the Buddha’s Teaching brings to people — liberation from afflictions (kleśas), the achievement of Nirvāṇa, the practice of arhat, pratyekabuddha, bodhisattva, ‘four analytical knowledge’ (catvāri pratisamvidāḥ).

9. **Apratikārastava** ("The Praise of the impossibility of repaying [the Buddha for his beneficence]"). The chapter says that it is impossible to thank the Buddha for his immeasurable deeds aimed at saving all sentient beings.

10. **Śarīraikadeśastava** ("The Praise of the parts of the [Buddha’s] Body"). The chapter describes the iconic marks (special characteristics of the body’s parts) of the Great Person (Mahāpuruṣa).

11. **Prabhūtastava** ("The Praise of the Great [Buddha’s tongue]"). The chapter describes the Buddha’s tongue; epithets for beautiful women are actively used. At the end of the chapter, a comparison is made with the goddess Sarasvati.

12. **Bhavodvejaka** ("The Creation of Fear of Existence"). The chapter says that, despite the impeccability of the Buddha’s teaching, after his Parinirvāṇa, the world is gradually moving towards the "Age of the Dharma’s End".

The fragment we are studying contains the end of the 7th chapter (Brahmānuvāda) — stanzas 17–22, its colophon, and the beginning of the 8th chapter (Upakārastava) — stanzas 1–7.

### The manuscript description

Description of the German fragments: SHT I: 286 (and SHT VI: 218 with the identification of the fragments 2–4 as belonging to one folio and covering the verses VAV 6.25–40); the manuscript contains VAV, Jm, KalpM.13

---

13 For a survey of fragments in the German collection written in Proto-Śārada cf. HARTMANN 2017: 79–82.
Facsimiles: folio 421 (= dd) of the KalpM as plate 37 in SHT I.\(^{14}\)

Although the folio number is lost, our fragment must belong to folio 25, since the text immediately precedes the verses preserved in SHT 638 b. This is a fragment from the left part of the folio, where the folio number 26 is preserved.\(^{15}\)

Since the edition of VAV, one fragment has been published which confirms text reconstructed in 7.17c. This is Or.15007/189 (published by Klaus Wille in BLSF III: 59) which adds two vowels: recto d /// .ā .e ++ /// for (sugat)ā(v)e(n)/i]kaivaisā. Together with SI 3696/1 r2 the gap is closed.

Symbols used in the transliteration

+ — a lost glyph(s)
[ ] — glyph(s) whose reading(s) is (are) uncertain
. — one illegible glyph
.. — illegible part of a glyph
/// — beginning or end of a fragment when damaged
|| — the double daṇḍa — punctuation mark

Transliteration of the fragment

SI 3695/1 recto: VAV 7.17b–colophon

1 /// + + .. + + + + .. + + + + + + ///
2 /// nāt* suga[t]. vėni .. .. + + + ///
3 /// [kt]. vi◯ghasāśinaḥ || ito [bā] + ///
4 /// sya◯ti taṃ tasmiṃ pūrvāpa + + ///
5 /// + ni yah śraddadhyāt tanmayāṇīti sa bā[h].e ///
6 /// + + s[t]i sambhavaḥ || brahmāṇ[u].ā[d]o + + ///

\(^{14}\) Folios 13, 26 and 31 (all VAV) in SCHLINGLOFF 1968: no. 227–232; facsimiles of all fragments available on http://turfan.bbaw.de/idp-berlin/.

\(^{15}\) See: SCHLINGLOFF 1968: no. 230.
r2: cf. VAV 7.17b–c sarvam tat tava śāsanā | sugatāvenikaivaisā;
r3: cf. VAV 7.18d–19a tvatsūktavaśīśaśīnaḥ || 18 ito bāhyesu yat sūktaṃ;
r4: cf. VAV 7.20a–b kāh śraddhāsyati tat tasmin pūrvāparāparāhatam ||;
r5: cf. VAV 7.21b–d sahaśārāphalāni yāḥ | śraddhayāt tanmayāṇīti sa bāhyesu subhāṣītam ||;
r6: cf. VAV 7.22d–colophon tvadanyatāsti saṁbhavaḥ || 22 varṇārharvare buddhastotre brahmānuvādo nāma saptamaḥ paricchedaḥ 7 ||; in this manuscript the colophon is abbreviated to the chapter title.

SI 3695/1 verso: VAV 8.1d–8c

v1: cf. VAV 8.1d–2a svayambhuvaḥ || 1 pranāsapathabāhulīyāt;
v2: cf. VAV 8.3a–c mahānāgam īva svairam api kṣuṇṇaḥ kumārakaḥ | strījanenāpi;
v3: cf. VAV 8.4c–d deśanāprātiḥāryasya vyuṣṭīr vyuṣṭimatāṃ vara ||;
v4: cf. VAV 8.5d–6a -pratipakṣāgadākaraḥ || 5 kāmarāgādidagdāhānāṃ;
-āgatā- against the well-attested -āgadā- must be a scribal error;
v5: cf. VAV 8.7a–b bruvaṭā mārgasāṁbhārānm dharman kuśalasāśrayān ||
here (mārga-) and in the next line (saṁtarjano-) the manuscript shows gemination, a rather typical phenomenon in later manuscripts from the northwest of the subcontinent.
v6: cf. VAV 8.8b–c sāmānyākārataḍāṭitāḥ | saṁtarjanolmukānīva.
Pl. 1.
A fragment of Varṇārhaṇa from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection.
The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3695/1 recto

Pl. 2.
A fragment of Varṇārhaṇa from the Serindia Collection, Petrovsky Sub-Collection.
The Institute of Oriental Manuscripts RAS.
SI 3695/1 verso
Translation

7. Brahmānavaṇḍa

17. Everything that is beautifully spoken in the world is said in your Teaching: [ability to] speak beautifully is Sugata’s exceptional ability.

18. But all the Dharma scholars who, apart from you, are seen in an impeccable practice of speech, are devourers of the remnants of what [you] said beautifully.

19. The ‘beautiful speech’ of those who are outside [Dharma] is also [similar to the Buddha’s words], as are the footprints of the woodworm [similar to] writing: their nature is unequal, as are gold and iron.

20. How can one believe this ['beautiful speech'] of that [non-Buddhist teaching], contradictory before and after? [This is also ridiculous] as if the Gośīrṣa sandalwood tree was growing in the Castor-oil plant.16

21. Whoever believes that ‘beautiful speech’ can come from external [teachings] is [like] those who believe that ripe mango fruits grow on the Neem tree.17

22. There is no other ‘birth place’ for the pearls of ‘beautiful speech’ except for you. As well as for sandalwood, there is no other place of growth than the Malaya Mountains.18

8. Upakārastava

1. [The Path] by which ‘Rhinoceroses’19 sometimes walk at some point in a mighty, silent, carefree, self-arising step,

---

16 Gośīrṣa Sandalwood has a great value in the Indian religious tradition. Castor-oil (Ricinus) is poisonous to living beings.
17 Fruits of Neem tree is bitter and its leaves are chewed at funeral ceremonies.
18 The Malaya Mountains are a range of mountains, mentioned in Indian sacred texts.
19 Here the one of two types of Pratyekabuddhas are meant. According to Vasubandhu, the author of Abhidharmakośa (5 c.), Pratyekabuddhas are of two kinds: ‘those who live in communities’ (varga-cāriniḥ), and ‘rhinoceros-like’ ones (khadgavisāṇa-kalpaḥ), i.e. living alone, not needing others (AKB: 181–183). According to Yaśomitra, the author of Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavākyāh, the varga-cāriniḥ are the first śravakas to attain arhatship on their own as early as the Buddha’s time (SAKV: 337). According to another point of view, ‘Those who live in communities’ cannot be included in the category of the first śravakas. These are ‘ordinary people’ (prthāja-jana) who in previous births realized the dharmas leading to the four stages of the ‘deep penetration’ (nirvedhabhāgīya), and in the present birth, following their own path, have reached Awakening. The status of ‘Those who are like a rhinoceros’ is acquired within one hundred Great Kalpas through the special practice of achieving the conditions of Awakening (bodhisambhāra). The conditions are as follows: moral behavior (śīla), the practice of concentration of consciousness (samādhi), wisdom (prajñā). Just like
2. this path to Nirvāṇa, which is so extremely difficult to achieve because of the many paths [leading] to the loss of [achieved progress in the religious practice], you turned into the Great Royal Path.

3. [The path is so easy] that the ‘crown princes’-kumārakāḥ walk leisurely along it like the ‘Great Nāgas’, even women whose strength and insight are two fingers wider;

4. it results from the miracle of your Teaching, which has immeasurable power (and) belongs only to the Buddha, the best of those who have beauty.

5. For those bitten by various venomous vipers, you are the source of specific and general antidotes.

6. For those who are burned by the passion of desire, etc., you offer a cure for this disease by proclaiming the dharmas that begin with the meditation on impurity.

real rhinos live alone, the Khadgavisāṇa-kalpaḥ avoid other people, do not preach the Dharma, because they are afraid to be distracted from the state of deep concentration of mind.

20 According to Vasubandhu, it is necessary to distinguish three kinds of falling away: the loss of what was gained; the loss of the unacquired and the loss of the object of pleasure. The first type of loss occurs when an arhat falls away from previously gained spiritual or good qualities. The second is if he does not gain any of those good qualities that should be gained. The third, losing the object of pleasure — if the arhat can no longer realize the previously gained qualities (AKB: 345–346).

21 Kumāra(ka) (‘crown prince’) is the bodhisattva who will become a Buddha because of the Buddha is the Dharmarāja (‘King of Dharma’).

22 ‘Great Nāgas’ (mahānāgāḥ) is the epithet of great śravakas (MV: 82), i.e. arhats.

23 Navaśūnyavāda—‘nine realizations of the abominable’. This practice of yogic concentration is necessary for ascetics, whose main opponent is their own passionate attraction to color, form, touch, vanity. So, someone who is seduced by color should contemplate figuratively or, in reality (in a cemetery, in places of cremation, blue or blackened corpses; those who are attracted by the form should meditate on a corpse whose integrity is broken — cut into pieces, gnawed by animals, etc.; those subject to a passion for pleasant tactile sensations should observe corpses at various stages of decomposition — infested with worms, overflowing with pus, etc. The contemplation of any corpse contributes to getting rid of vanity. With figurative (only in one’s own mind) contemplation of repulsive objects, one should subject to mental ‘corpse decomposition’ first a part of one’s body, then the whole body; after that, the ‘procedure’ should be repeated on third-party objects, expanding the area of contemplation to the ‘sea of skeletons’. There are three stages of cultivation in this practice: ‘beginner’, ‘having mastered the skill’, ‘having outstanding mental concentration’ (AKB: 337; Mppu: 1314–1316, 1320–1326).

The Mahāyāna ‘innovation’ consists in the observation that, unlike the śravakas, whom, according to Mahāprajāpāramitā-upadeśa (Mppu), the practice of contemplation of repulsive objects should turn away from color, form, etc. and bring them closer to attaining Nirvāṇa, bodhisattvas comprehend this type of concentration in order to teach it to other people. In addition, the concept of sūnyavāda prescribes to treat the type of decaying corpses
7. **By speaking of the good and (at the same time) impure dharmas**\(^{24}\) that make up the **Path**, you have created an inner and mutual distinction of things.

**Abbreviations**


**References**


neutrally, without a feeling of disgust and the color of a decaying corpse (a blue-colored corpse, yellow, decaying sludge, red blood and muscles, white bones of the skeleton) to contemplate only as colors — blue, yellow, red, white (Mppu: 1327–1328).

\(^{24}\) It means good dharmas but ‘with afflictions’ (sāśrava) and ‘causal’ (saṃskṛta), for example, the dharma of the ‘Truth of Path’ (mārgasatya) (AKB: 3).
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Introduction

The Dravidian manuscripts are part of the Indian Collection (shelf number Ms.Ind) of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (hereafter, IOM, RAS). In addition to manuscripts in numerous Indian languages, the collection includes manuscripts from the neighboring countries of South and Southeast Asia: Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia, and Indonesia. The collection currently comprises 666 encrypted

© Elena V. Tanonova, Cand. Sci. (Philology), Research Fellow, Scientific Secretary of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences (St. Petersburg, Russian Federation) (etanona@yandex.ru)

1 Acknowledgements to: Pang Tatiana A., Shkarina Oxana V., Volkova Irina O., Bogdanov Kirill M.; to colleagues Smirnitskaya Anna A., Gordiychuk Nikolay V.
and identified items. Among them 41 manuscripts were previously identified as Dravidian: 8 manuscripts in Telugu, 2 in Malayalam, 31 in Tamil, and 1 in Telugu and Tamil.

The subject of this article is the description of Dravidian manuscripts. Some of them which were previously classified as Dravidian manuscripts turned out to be written in Sanskrit in Dravidian script. A short description of several manuscripts can be found in the catalogue by T.K. Posova and K.L. Chizhikova.2 An inventory and identification of a part of the Indian collection, which has not been previously described, was made in 2021–2022. It became necessary to present all the available Dravidian manuscripts in a single publication and in a single list. It also made sense to collect in one place all the information about the provenance of these manuscripts and the history of their processing and study. It is not the purpose of this article to give a complete description of the manuscripts, this is a matter of the near future.

Dravidian Languages and Dravidology

Dravidology does not belong to well-developed fields of Oriental Studies in Russia, and it would be sufficient to say some words about the Dravidian languages and the history of Dravidology in Russia. There are about 25 languages in the Dravidian language family. These languages are spread throughout India (except Bragui, which belongs to the languages of Pakistan). There are four major written languages with the developed history and literary tradition: Telugu, Tamil, Malayalam and Kannada. Telugu is the largest of them in terms of number of speakers (82 million), followed by Tamil (75 million). All major Dravidian languages belong to 22 official languages of India and are state languages (Telengana — Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Karnataka). Tamil is the oldest language among the Dravidian languages (even rivaling with Sanskrit) with the most developed and original literary tradition.

The year 1915 can be considered to be the beginning of the development of Dravidology in Russia, when a scientific expedition of the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography (Kunstkamera) of A.M. Mervart (1884–

2 See POSOVA & CHIZHIKOVA 1999.
1932) and L.A. Mervart (1888–1965) arrived in South India. The Mervart spouses studied the Tamil, Malayalam and Sinhala languages, made translations of some famous literary works. In 1929 they published in Russian the first grammar of the Tamil spoken language.³ After A.M. Mervart was repressed and then died in Ukhtpechlag in 1932, the study of Dravidian languages in Russia was interrupted. It was resumed only in the 50-ies and early 60-ies when a few researchers-indologists independently mastered Dravidian languages. These researchers formed the basis for the development of the Dravidian language studies, among them were S.G. Rudin (1929–1973) and N.V. Gurov (1935–2009) in Leningrad; A.M. Piatigorskii (1929–2009), M.S. Andronov (1931–2009), Yu. Glazov (1929–1998), Z.N. Petrunicheva and A.M. Dubianskii (1941–2020) in Moscow.⁴ All contemporary Russian Dravidologists are the students of these pathfinders. There was a kind of “division of labor” between Leningrad and Moscow: the Telugu language was studied in Leningrad (N.V. Gurov) and Tamil — in Moscow (A.M. Dubianskii).⁵ The Kannada and Malayalam literatures were almost out of the interest of Russian scholars.

Provenance of Dravidian Manuscripts

The formation of the Indian Collection mainly took place during the first 100 years of the existence of the Asiatic Museum, the predecessor of the IOM, RAS. The collection was based on some Indian manuscripts, among which were the Tamil manuscripts. The work of I. Bakmeister mentions that in 1776 the library of the Academy of Sciences held several Tamil manuscripts⁶. These manuscripts were probably given to the Asiatic Museum, which was organized in 1818. G.Z. Bayer (1694–1738) was one of the first academicians of the Academy of Sciences founded by Peter the Great. Already in the 30s of the 18th c. he was involved in the studies of Oriental languages. In one of his articles, for the first time in Russia, he gave examples of the Sanskrit alphabet (“Devanagari” as he called it), as well as a brief information about the Dravidian languages (“Tamul” and Telugu).

³ See MERVART 1929.
⁴ More about the history of Dravidian studies in Russia see DUBIANSKII 2002.
⁵ More about the history of Russian Tamil studies see VECHERINA 2020.
⁶ BAKMEISTER 1779: 87.
In addition to Bayer, around the same time D.G. Messerschmidt (1685–1735), who was interested in Punjabi and Tamil, also studied the alphabets of the “Devanagari” and Dravidian languages.

The collection began to grow significantly from the early 1930-ies, and the details on the history of the Indian collection can be found in the articles by G.A. Zograf\(^7\) and V.S. Vorobiov-Desiatovskii.\(^8\)

The first recorded acquisition of the manuscripts in the Dravidian languages dates back to 1913. Most probably, they were not the first Dravidian manuscripts of the collection, given the fact that the abovementioned information on the availability of Tamil manuscripts dates to the 18th c. While preparing the present article, the author has studies materials of the Archives of Oriental Studies of the IOM, RAS and the entire bulk of documents related to the arrival of manuscripts into the Asiatic Museum. Indeed, no mentions of the Dravidian manuscripts earlier than 1913 could be found. It is noteworthy, that the Chinese, Manchu, Mongolian, Tibetan, Arabic, Turkish, and Persian languages were well known at that time and came across frequently. The rest of the collection is designated as “other languages”. Given the already mentioned late history of the development of Dravidology in Russia, it is very likely that the Dravidian languages were not registered separately since they were unknown at that time.

There is a record in the Inventory of Asiatic Museum dated by October 1913 which fixed the acquisition from M.S. Andreev of 16 Tamil manuscripts from Pondicherry. A more detailed record of the receipt of manuscripts was found in the records of F.152 of the Archives of Orientalists of IOM, RAS:

Excerpt from the Protocol of 9.11.1913, p.439 of the Department of History and Philology\(^9\):

\(^7\) PUTEVODITEL 2018: 293–300.
\(^8\) VOROBIOV-DESIATOVSKII 1954.
\(^9\) The original Russian text:

В Азиатский Музей
Михаил Степанович Андреев (Индия, Pondicherry) при письме от 19 сентября/2 октября с.г. пришёл на имя Отделения, 16 рукописей, написанных на тамульском языке, с предоставлением Академии располагать рукописями по своему усмотрению. Положено благодарить М.С. Андреева, а рукописи передать в Азиатский Музей. 16 рукописей при сем препровождаются.

Непременный секретарь, ординарный академик Сергей Ольденбург.
Надпись на листе: “рукописи находятся в Азиатском Музее”.
To Asiatic Museum

Mikhail Stepanovich Andreev (India, Pondicherry) with the letter dated 19 September/2 October this year, has sent to the Department 16 manuscripts written in Tamul, leaving the Academy to dispose them in its own way.

It is decided to thank M.S. Andreev, and to give the manuscripts to the Asiatic Museum.

Sixteen manuscripts are enclosed herewith.

Permanent Secretary, Ordinary Academician Sergei Oldenburg.

Inscription on the sheet: “manuscripts are in the Asiatic Museum”\textsuperscript{10}

M.S. Andreev (1873–1948) was an outstanding ethnographer and linguist, born and lived all his life in the East, self-taught orientalist who became a corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences. M.S. Andreev was a traveler, a tireless organizer and participant of expeditions to Central Asia\textsuperscript{11}. From 1905 to 1914 he served in India as a diplomat, he was a private secretary and interpreter of the Russian Consul General in Bombay A.A. Polovtsov (1867–1944) and carried the duties of the Russian Consul in the French colonies in India and Indochina. In addition to his official responsibilities, M.S. Andreev realized the demands of the Russian Academy of Sciences and collected ethnographic materials and manuscripts. The result of this work were 2 collections: the already mentioned manuscript collection donated in 1913 to the Asiatic Museum, and a huge collection of more than a thousand various items that was delivered in 1914 to the Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography and the State Hermitage Museum.\textsuperscript{12}

The next significant addition of South Indian manuscripts to the Asiatic Museum dates by 1917. The Inventory of 1917, dated October 23, has “A list of eight Sanskrit manuscripts donated to the Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, Academy of Sciences, from the Adyar

\textsuperscript{10} Archive of Orientalists of IOM, RAS. Fund 152, inv.1, unit 54: 115.

\textsuperscript{11} M.S. Andreev lived a bright, eventful life, working for the good of the country. During the World War II, at the age of 70, he regreted that he could not join the Red Army but hoped that he could benefit his country in the field of science, developing topics related to the Tajik Afghan frontiers. His death was as memorable as his life: as a bright person and charismatic lecturer, he had attracted the attention of an unstable lady who one day came to his house and, in a fit of jealousy, struck him dead with an axe (More about M.S. Andreev see Shermatov 2021).

\textsuperscript{12} Borochina 1989: 130.
Library, Madras, S. India, through A.A. Kamenskaya, chairwoman of the Russian Theosophical Society”. This receipt, formally unrelated to the Dravidian manuscripts, caused a mix-up in some of the inventory records of the Indian collection, which then was revealed in the Catalogue of 1999.

Some of the acquired manuscripts were compiled in Sanskrit, but written in Telugu, Malayali and Grantha scripts. When these manuscripts were listed in the 1960-ies, it was mistakenly assumed that some of them, written in the Malayalam or Telugu script, are in the Telugu or Malayalam languages (shelf numbers V, 119; VII, 62; V, 115 and V, 118). This information was repeated in the “Brief Catalogue of Indian Manuscripts” of 1999, from which it follows that the Indian collection of the IOM, RAS has more manuscripts in Telugu and Malayalam than in reality. These incorrectly attributed Sanskrit manuscripts in Dravidian are not considered in this article, based on the subject matter of the article.

Further on, only few mentions of Dravidian manuscript arrivals could be found. In the Inventory Book of the Serindia(!) collection there is an entry dated by May 1954 about the purchase of two Tamil manuscripts on palm leaf from Andreev’s inheritors. In the list given in this article below these are no. 29 & 33. One manuscript was bought at Akademkniga in 1964 for 250 rubles (see: list no. 12). One Telugu manuscript was brought from India by a Soviet delegation in the 1960s (see: list no. 01).

Actually, no other information on the receipt of Dravidian manuscripts in the collections of the IOM, RAS is available.

Cataloguing of the Dravidian collection

The description of the Dravidian part of the collection is difficult to separate from the general cataloguing of the Indian collection.

As the collection was gradually growing, the catalogues were compiled. The separate parts of the collection were described by R.H. Lenz and

---

13 Sanskrit was used throughout the Indian subcontinent but did not have a writing system of its own; local scripts (most commonly Devanagari, Bengali, Telugu) were usually used to transmit Sanskrit, with the exception of Tamil, where grantha script was used.

14 Grantha is a South Indian script based on Tamil alphabet, specially created for writing Sanskrit texts. Compared to classical Tamil script grantha has special graphemes for rendering of specific Sanskrit consonants which don’t exist in Tamil.

15 Lenz 1833.
Later in 1846, a list by O. Böthlingk was published which, in fact, became the first inventory of the collection (the numbers in this list correspond to the code number of the oldest part of the collection with the index \textit{Ind.}, covering acquisitions from the first half of the 19th c.). Following the instructions of the director of the Asiatic Museum K.G. Zalemann (1850–1916), N.D. Mironov (1880–1936) had been engaged in complete cataloguing of the collection for over 10 years. As a result, the first issue of his catalogue was published in 1914. This issue included most of the manuscripts in Sanskrit and Pali.

In the preface to the publication N.D. Mironov wrote:

“The extraordinary circumstances of the times have delayed the publication of this catalogue, on which we have been working for many years. It is unlikely to be completed soon. Therefore, we had to publish the present first issue of the catalogue by the order of its editor, Director of the Asiatic Museum, Academician K.G. Zaleman. This issue contains a description of the most important part of the collection of the Museum, manuscripts in Sanskrit and Pali. The second edition will contain a description of manuscripts in the New Indian languages, both Indo-Aryan, as well as Dravidian, Indo-Chinese, etc., and an addition on some Sanskrit manuscripts which, for various reasons, were not included in the 1st edition. In the second edition — we hope that the interval between the two will not be too long — the reader will find indexes, a table of old and new numbers, etc., the absence of which makes the use of the catalogue very difficult”.

Thus, the first mention of a description of the Dravidian manuscripts appears in the preface to Mironov's catalogue, but the second edition was never published. This fact made all Mironov's work on the cataloguing of the collection incomplete. In addition to cutting off part of the collection, the issue lacked contents, indexes, and lists of shelf numbers' correspondences, which made it extremely difficult to work with. The fact that the second edition was in preparation is proved by five corrected proof sheets with the

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item[16] PETROV 1836.
\item[17] BÖTHLINGK 1846.
\item[18] More about N.D. Mironov and his work on catalogues, see OSTROVSKAYA 2015, TANONOVA 2015.
\item[19] MIRONOV 1914.
\item[20] MIRONOV 1914: 01.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
descriptions of No. 506–525 preserved in the Manuscripts and Documents Department of the IOM, RAS. These sheets contain primary definitions of manuscripts in Newar, Sinhalese, Burmese, Khmer, and Thai scripts made by Mironov.\textsuperscript{21}

These descriptions were used by V.S. Vorobiov-Desiatovskii (1927–1956), who turned to the collection almost 40 years later. He re-examined it and compiled a list of 102 manuscripts not included in Mironov's catalogue. This work remained in manuscript\textsuperscript{22}.

In 1956–1957 G.A. Zograf (1928–1993) compiled descriptions of Hindi and Punjabi manuscripts which were not included in Mironov's catalogue.\textsuperscript{23} The description of manuscripts in Dravidian languages has so far been a task for the future.

In 1975–1977 the work on the catalogue was resumed by T.K. Posova. Later, K.L. Chizhikova (1933–2020) joined that work, which in 1999 finally resulted in the publication of the “Brief Catalogue of Indian Manuscripts”.\textsuperscript{24} Actually, it was a title-list with brief information about the described manuscripts. Partly this can be explained by the tasks faced by the publishers of the catalogue: the complexity of the Indian collection required specialists not only in Indian languages, both Indo-Aryan and Dravidian, but also in the languages of neighboring countries of South and Southeast Asia. It was hardly possible.

It turned out that the Tamil manuscripts were described (at the request of G.A. Zograf), by N.V. Gurov, the head of the Indian Philology Department of the Saint Petersburg University, who specialized mainly in the Telugu language. There is evidence in the manuscript repository that N.V. Gurov invited to work with Tamil manuscripts a well-known specialist in Dravidology, Prof. D.D. Shulman from the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, who happened to be in St. Petersburg at the time. The sheets with handwritten notes by N.V. Gurov revealed joint research with Prof. Shulman on the identification of manuscripts. The notes dated from 1999, the year in which the “Brief Catalogue” was published. It is likely that clarification of the information on the Tamil manuscripts was done to include them into the catalogue under preparation. The manuscripts that were inspected by two Dravidologists were not included into the catalogue.

\textsuperscript{21} TANONOVA 2015: 135.
\textsuperscript{22} PUTEVODITEL 2018:
\textsuperscript{23} ZOGRAF 1960.
\textsuperscript{24} POSOVA, CHUZHIKOVA 1999.
Nevertheless, the Catalogue of 1999 contained all acquisitions of Dravidian manuscripts after 1913: the entire Tamil collection from Andreev and the manuscripts that entered in the 1950-ies and 1960-ies.

As mentioned above, the entry in the 1913 Inventory concerning the receipt of the Andreev’s collection fixes 16 Tamil manuscripts on palm leaf. Only in 1956 the shelf numbers were given to these manuscripts (altogether 17 items). For some reason, they were assigned temporary shelf numbers: ПА / sequence number (from 1 to 17). It is logical to assume that the abbreviation “ПА” means “Pondicherry. Andreev”. The entries in the Inventory Book include a brief description of the manuscripts: title of the work, author (if known), size of the manuscripts, language, number of leaves. The entries in the Inventory Book of 1956 were made by an unknown hand of a specialist who knew Tamil and could read the manuscript.25

Manuscripts from Andreev collection carrying temporary shelf numbers were included into the Catalogue of 1999. All the manuscripts (except one) were given a description number in the Catalogue under the letter a. This may indicate that the compilers acknowledged their temporary shelf numbers, but did not have the time or opportunity to re-inventory them. The manuscripts in this collection were not permanently registered until 2022.

All later arrivals of Dravidian manuscripts immediately acquired permanent shelf numbers in the collection.

In addition to the listed manuscripts which were included in the 1999 Catalogue, in the repository there were 2 boxes of manuscripts (20 pcs.) presumably in Tamil. These were the ones which were examined in 1999 by N.V. Gurov and D.D. Shulman. In late 2021 — early 2022 these manuscripts were again analyzed, inventoried, and described. They are marked by shelf numbers from X, 7 to X, 19 (see: list no. 05–16).

It appeared that two manuscripts from the boxes with old indexes Indica 132 and Indica 136 are probably not Tamil. The Indica 132 was identified as Telugu (new shelf number X, 7; no.). Whereas Indica 136 appears to be Thai (X, 19). There is a red stamp referred to Asiatic Museum and old no. (Ind.?) 134 on the cover of X, 18 (see: list no. 16). The old numbers (Indica) of

25 It would seem that such a specialist might be V.S. Vorobiov-Desyatovskii, a renowned polyglot, who knew Tamil, but the records are dated by August 1956, and Vorobiov-Desyatovskii died suddenly in July of that year. This is only a suggestion that the notes could have been taken by a Tamil tutor at Leningrad University, S.G. Rudin; but the first intake of Tamilist students at the University was not made until 1960, so it is unlikely that the writer was a student.
these manuscripts refer to O. Böthlingk's list and indicate that they are probably the oldest part of the collection which arrived in the first half of the 19th c.

All the manuscripts (except X, 10, list no. 08) are written on palm leaves, the pothi type, and have one or two holes for a cord. Most have original wooden covers. In general, their condition is satisfactory, but some of them are very fragile, the leaves are folded into rolls and are extremely difficult to unroll. These manuscripts (after restoration measures) need to be carefully copied to avoid the sheets breaking.

Dravidian Manuscripts’ Description

This article gives a brief description of all the Dravidian manuscripts in the collection. The list is made according to the following characteristics:
Sequence Number. Shelf number/Old Shelf number (if any)
Title; Author; Provenance; Size; Folia; Script; Language; Collection; Remarks.

In the list below, in case of convolute each text is described separately under the same number with the letters a, b, c…

01. Ms.Ind. VII, 83
Title: Bhagavatā
Author: Bammera Pōtana (Potaratzu)
Provenance: brought by a Soviet delegation in 1960-ies
Size: 45 cm × 3 cm
Folia: 138 ff.
Script: Telugu
Language: Telugu

02. Ms.Ind. V, 122
Title: Sitaramānjasaneyasamvada
Author: Lingamurti
03. Ms.Ind. II, 160
Title: Bible (fragment)
Size: 24.5 cm × 3 cm
Folia: 1f.
Script: Telugu
Language: Telugu
Remarks: conserved in glass

04. Ms.Ind. VII, 76
Title: A Note
Author: Unidentified
Size: 44 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 1 f. + 2 ff. empty
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: Bretshneider

05. Ms.Ind. X, 7 / Indica № 132
Title: Notes
Author: Unidentified
Size: 53.7 cm × 2.8(1.8) cm
Folia: 4 double ff.
Script: Telugu
Language: Telugu
Remarks: Domestic notes

06. Ms.Ind. X, 8
Title: History of Madhavan
Author: Unidentified
Size: 49 cm × 2.7 cm  
Folia: 44 ff.  
Script: Tamil  
Language: Tamil  
Remarks: Collection of land leases

07. Ms.Ind. X, 9
Title: Unidentified  
Author: Unidentified  
Provenance: 1913, № 2967 (incorrectly)  
Size: 44.4 cm × 2 cm  
Folia: 148 ff., empty last f.  
Script: Tamil  
Language: Tamil  
Collection: by Andreev ???  
Remarks: Medical Treatise. Incorrect reference to the catalogue entry is given. The correct reference is 1913, no. 2669. Because of its separate location, it is doubtful that the manuscript belonged to the Andreev’s collection. All manuscripts received from Andreev were listed in 1956.

08. Ms.Ind. X, 10
Title: Unidentified  
Author: Unidentified  
Size: 31.5 cm × 20.5 cm  
Folia: 176 ff.  
Script: Tamil  
Language: Tamil  
Remarks: Codex. The only manuscript written on paper (vergé).

09. Ms.Ind. X, 11
Title: Unidentified  
Author: Unidentified  
Size: 39.3 cm × 3.1 cm  
Folia: 113 ff.  
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Remarks: Historical poem in the genre of *ammanai*

10. Ms.Ind. X, 12
Title: Unidentified
Author: Sattei Muni
Size: 26 cm × 3 cm
Folia: 33 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Remarks: Medical Treatise

11. Ms.Ind. X, 13
Title: Unidentified
Author: Unidentified
Size: 36.4 cm × 3 cm
Folia: 254 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Remarks: Anthology of stories in prose

12. Ms.Ind. X, 14
Title: Bhāgavata-purāṇa
Provenance: Stamp: bought in Academkniga [book store] for 250 rub. 20.08.196(?)4
Size: 41.1 cm × 3.5 cm
Folia: 343 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Remarks: Prose

13. Ms.Ind. X, 15
Title: Unidentified
Author: Unidentified
Size: 26 cm × 3 cm  
Folia: 1 f.  
Script: Malayalam  
Language: Malayalam  
Remarks: Seal of Sealing wax with inscription “Śrī Mallari prasanna”

14. Ms.Ind. X, 16  
Title: Unidentified  
Author: Unidentified  
Size: 78 cm × 1.7 cm; 87 cm × 2.2 cm; 111 cm × 2.1 cm; 52 cm × 2 cm  
Folia: 4 ff.  
Script: Tamil  
Language: Tamil  
Remarks: Bundle of tightly scrolled palm leaves which seems to be impossible to unwind

15. Ms.Ind. X, 17  
Title: Bilingual note  
Author: Unidentified  
Size: 33 cm × 2.4 cm  
Folia: 1 f. of three parts  
Script: Tamil and Telugu  
Language: Tamil and Telugu  

16. Ms.Ind. X, 18  
Title: Business correspondence of a person named Cinthattinar  
Author: Cinthattinar  
Provenance:  
Size: 61 cm × 2.1 cm  
Folia: 8 ff.  
Script: Tamil  
Language: Tamil  
Collection:
Remarks: Bundle of scrolled palm leaves; cardboard cover with Asiatic Museum red stamp and [old shelf number??] (Ind.) № 134

17. Ms.Ind. X, 33 / ПА/14
Title: Āruṇagiripurāṇa (Āruṇacalapuraṇa)
Author: Āruṇagiriyoga
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 18 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 32 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev

18. Ms.Ind. X, 26 / ПА/7
Title: Kantaranupūti (Skandānubhuti)
Author: Āruṇagirinātha
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India.
Size: 23.5 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 57 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev

19a. Ms.Ind. X, 20 / ПА/1
Title: Kūrmānandaśastra
Author: Kūrmānanda
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 25 cm × 2 cm
Folia: 13 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
19b. Ms.Ind. X, 20 / ПА/1
**Title:** Yoga
**Author:** Ramadeva
**Provenance:** 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
**Size:** 25 cm × 2 cm
**Folia:** 43 ff.
**Script:** Tamil
**Language:** Tamil
**Collection:** by Andreev

19c. Ms.Ind. X, 20 / ПА/1
**Title:** Yoga
**Author:** Tirumular
**Provenance:** 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
**Size:** 25 cm × 2 cm
**Folia:** 22 ff.
**Script:** Tamil
**Language:** Tamil
**Collection:** by Andreev

19d. Ms.Ind. X, 20 / ПА/1
**Title:** Vāta
**Author:** Agastyar
**Provenance:** 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
**Size:** 25 cm × 2 cm
**Folia:** 13 ff.
**Script:** Tamil
**Language:** Tamil
**Collection:** by Andreev
**Remarks:** Medical Treatise

20. Ms.Ind. X, 29 / ПА/10
**Title:** Kaivalyanavanīta
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 34 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 113 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Philosophical poem

21a. Ms.Ind. X, 31 / ПА/12
Title: Kaumantinūl
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 24 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 115 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Medical Treatise

21b. Ms.Ind. X, 31 / ПА/12
Title: Māntrika
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 24 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 115 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Treatise on Magic

22a. Ms.Ind. X, 21 / ПА/2
Title: Jñānasūtra
Author: Darmandriare (Dhanvamtari)

Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India

Size: 26 cm × 2.5 cm

Folia: 14 ff.

Script: Tamil

Language: Tamil

Collection: by Andreev

---

22b. Ms.Ind. X, 21 / IIА/2

Title: Vaitiyyam

Author: Darmandriare (Dhanvamtari)

Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India

Size: 26 cm × 2.5 cm

Folia: 20 ff.

Script: Tamil

Language: Tamil

Collection: by Andreev

Remarks: Medical Treatise

---

23. Ms.Ind. X, 34 / IIА/15

Title: Tiruvāśakam

Author: Manivashagar

Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India

Size: 16.5 cm × 3 cm

Folia: 161 ff.+ 1 f. ill. + 26 empty ff.

Script: Tamil

Language: Tamil

Collection: by Andreev

Remarks: Anthology of Shaivite lyric poems

---

24a. Ms.Ind. X, 25 / IIА/6

Title: Nakṣatrabala
24b. Ms.Ind. X, 25 / ПА/6
Title: Rāśibala
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 30 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 6 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Astrological Treatise

25. Ms.Ind. X, 27 / ПА/8
Title: Navagrahacintāmaṇi
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 22 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 118 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Astrological Treatise

26. Ms.Ind. X, 32 / ПА/13
Title: Nāḍinidāna
90

Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 31.5 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 34 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Medical Treatise on pulse

27a. Ms.Ind. X, 23 / ПА/4
Title: Palavākatam
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 №2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 18 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 46 ff. + 9 empty ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Medical Treatise on child diseases

27b. Ms.Ind. X, 23 / ПА/4
Title: Vaittiyam
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 18 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 39 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Medical Treatise

28. Ms.Ind. X, 28 / ПА/9
Title: Mantirikkattalṭerūṭṭu
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 15 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 64 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Tantric Treatise

29. Ms.Ind. V,134
Title: Rāmanāṭakakirtanai
Author: Arunachalakavi
Provenance: May, 1954 — purchased from Andreev’s inheritors
Size: 39.5 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 460 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil

30. Ms.Ind. X, 22 / ПА/3
Title: Vaittiyam
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 26(20) cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 42 ff. + 5 ff. of another size
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Medical Treatise

31. Ms.Ind. X, 36 / ПА/17
Title: Vaittiyam
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
32. Ms.Ind. X, 24 / ПА/5
Title: Unidentified
Author: Romaṛṣi
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 33 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 131 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil
Collection: by Andreev
Remarks: Three Medical Treatises

33. Ms.Ind. II, 170
Title: Unidentified
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: May, 1954 — purchased from Andreev’s inheritors
Size: 25 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 196 ff.
Script: Tamil
Language: Tamil

34. Ms.Ind. X, 35 / ПА/16
Title: Unidentified
Author: Unidentified
Provenance: 1913 № 2669. Collection of Tamil manuscript obtained in Pondicherry, South India
Size: 33.5 cm × 2.5 cm
Folia: 16 ff.
Conclusion

As a result of the work done, some mistakes made in the description of the Dravidian manuscripts have been corrected. It was revealed that three manuscripts in Telugu and one in Malayalam were compiled in Sanskrit but written down in Telugu and Malayalam scripts. Thus, the number of Dravidian manuscripts in the IOM, RAS has been reduced by four.

As the result, the Indian collection of IOM, RAS contains 35 manuscripts in Dravidian languages, they all have shelf-marks. Of them, 4 manuscripts are in Telugu, 1 in Malayalam, 1 in Tamil and Telugu, and 31 in Tamil.

The 35 manuscripts described in this article contain 37 works and 12 collections of practical nature (business correspondence, letters, notebooks). Among the works are 13 medical treatises, 13 literary works of various character, 3 treatises on astrology, 2 magic and tantra, and 2 philosophical treatises. It is noteworthy that one work, a medical treatise Vaittiyam (Medicine), is represented in four(!) manuscripts from the Andreev's collection (see: list no. 22b, 27b, 30, 31). It is interesting to note that 11 manuscripts in Andreyev's collection contain works on traditional
Tamil Siddha medicine, and additionally there are treatises on astrology, magic, and tantra. It can be assumed that these manuscripts belonged to a Tamil traditional medicine doctor. Many of the manuscripts require further investigation to identify the works and authors. This is a matter for future research.
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Nikolay Karamzin’s Dedication to the Emperor Alexander I as a Preamble to the “History of Russian State” in Manchu and Chinese Translation by Zakhar Leontievsky

Abstract: The first official history of the Russian state “Istoriia gosudarstva Rossijskogo” (“History of Russian State”) was compiled by Nikolay Karamzin in 12 volumes (published in 1816–1828). The first eight volumes were printed in 1816–1818 and were most probably taken to Beijing by the members of the 10th Ecclesiastic mission (1820–1830). Among the students of that mission was Zakhar Leontievsky (1799–1874), who had spent ten years in Beijing and had perfectly mastered the Chinese and Manchu languages. During his stay in China, Leontievsky has translated into Chinese three volumes of Karamzin’s “History of Russian state”. Nowadays, the manuscript copies of this translation are kept in the Oriental collections in St. Petersburg, Russia. The Russian original by Karamzin begins with the Dedication to the Russian tzar Alexander I. Only the manuscript from the Oriental department of the Scientific library of the St. Petersburg state university has the Dedication translated into two languages — Manchu and Chinese. The comparison of the Russian original with the Manchu and Chinese versions shows that the translations turn to be Leontievsky’s interpretations of the original text written according to the rules of Chinese addresses to the throne. Additional translator’s comments were added to explain some episodes from the Russian history to the Chinese reader. Zakhar Leontievsky’s translation of the “History of Russian state” was the first introduction of Russian history to China.
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The first official history of the Russian state was compiled by Nikolay M. Karamzin (1766–1826) and is titled “Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo”. It covers the period of the Russian history from ancient times until Ivan the Terrible (1530–1584) and the disturbance period of Smutnoe vremia
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This grand project was initiated by N. Karamzin in 1790s when he became interested in the studies of the Russian historical documents and thought of a literary description of the events. In 1803, he asked the Russian Emperor Alexander I for a paid position of an official historiographer with an access to the historical archives. Karamzin was granted this position and started writing the “History of Russian state” based on the original historical sources. The main idea of Karamzin’s “History” is glorification of a strong monarchy guided by a wise ruler. It was clearly expressed in the author’s dedication of the “History” to his patron Alexander I. The 19th c. editions begin with the “Dedication to the Monarch Emperor Alexander Pavlovich, the autocrat of All Russia”. It was not included in the later editions. This is why the early editions and the text of the dedication are bibliographic rarities.

The Russian text of Karamzin’s dedication is as follows:1

ПОСВЯЩЕНИЕ

ВСЕМИЛОСТИВѢЙШѢЙ ГОСУДАРѢ!

Съ благоговѣніемъ представляю ВАШЕМУ ИМПЕРАТОРСКОМУ ВЕЛИЧЕСТВУ плодъ усердныхъ, двѣнадцати-лѣтнихъ трудовъ. Не хвалюся ревностію и постоянствомъ: ободренный ВАМИ, могъ ли я не имѣть ихъ?

Въ 1811 году, въ счастливѣйшія, незабвенныя минуты жизни моей, читаль я ВАМѢ, Государь, нѣкоторыя главы сей Исторіи — объ ужасахъ Батыева нашествія; о подвигѣ Героя, Димитрия Донскаго — вѣ в то время, когда густая туча бѣдствій висѣла надъ Европою, угрожая и нашему любезному отечеству, ВЫ слушали съ восхитительнымъ для меня вниманіемъ; сравнивали давно-минувшее съ настоящимъ, и не завидовали славнымъ опасностямъ Димитрия, ибо предвидѣли для Себя еще славнѣйшія. Великодушное предчувствіе исполнилось: туча грянула надъ Россіею — но мы спасены, прославлены; врагъ истребленъ, Европа свободна, и глава АЛЕКСАНДРОВА сіяетъ въ лучезарномъ вѣнцѣ безсмертія. Государь! Если счастіе ВАШЕГО добродѣтельнаго сердца равно ВАШЕЙ славѣ, то ВЫ счастливѣе всѣхъ земнородныхъ.

1 KARAMZIN 1816: 1–4.
Новая эпоха наступила. Будущее извѣстно единому Богу; но мы, судя по вѣроимо-стямъ разума, ожидаемъ мира твердаго, столь вождѣ-лѣннаго для народовъ и Вѣщеносцевъ, которые хотятъ властвовать для пользы людей, для успѣховъ нравственности, добродѣтели, Науку, Искусствъ гражданскихъ, благосостояния государственного и частнаго. Побѣдою устранивъ препятствія въ семь истинно Царскомъ дѣлѣ, даровавь златую тишину намъ и Европѣ, чего ВЫ, Государь, не совершите въ крѣпости мужества, въ теченіе жизни долговременной, общаемой ВАМЪ и закономь Природы и теплою молитвою под-данныхъ!

Бодрствуѣте, Монархъ возлюбленный! Сердцевѣдцу читаешь мысли, Исторія предаетъ дѣянія великодушныхъ Царей, и въ самое отдаленное потомство вселяетъ любовь къ ихъ священной памяти. Примите милостиво книгу, служащую тому доказательствомъ. Исторія народа принадлежить Царю.

ВАШЕГО ИМПЕРАТОРСКАГО ВЕЛИЧЕСТВА,
вѣрноподданный
Николай Карамзинъ.

Translation from Russian

Most grateful Your Majesty,

With reverence I present to Your Imperial Majesty the result of my twelve years diligent labor. Not boasting of being ardent and constant, encouraged by You, how could I have done it?

In 1811, in the happiest and unforgettable moments of my life, when I read to You, Your Majesty, some chapters of this History — about the horror of Batyi’s invasion, about the great deeds of the hero Dmitry Donskoy — at the times when a dark cloud of distress was hanging over Europe threatening our beloved fatherland, You listened to me with admirable attention, comparing the remote past with our days, without envy to the dangers of Dmitry, since You had predicted even greater for Yourself. Majesty’s premonition realized: the cloud burst over Russia — but we are saved, glorified, the enemy is destroyed, Europe is free, and the head of Alexander shines with the wreath of Majesty’s eternity! If the happiness of Your
virtuous heart is equal to Your glory, then You are the happiest of all creature.

A new era has arrived. Only God knows the future, but we according to the capabilities of the mind expect solid peace which is so wished by the peoples and monarchs who want to govern for the sake of people, virtue, Science, civil Arts, prosperity of state and individual. Victoriously destroying all the obstacles to this real Tzar’s deeds, granting golden peace to us and Europe, what would not You, Your Majesty, accomplish in courage during Your long life, which is promised to You by the law of Nature and warm pray of subjects?

Keep awake, beloved Monarch! Clairvoyant reads thoughts, History tells about the deeds of generous Tzars and inspires love of the far descendants to their holly memory. Graciously accept this book as a proof that History of the people belongs to the Tzar.

Your Imperial Majesty’s
Loyal subject
Nikolay Karamzin

Although Nikolay Karamzin officially started working on the “History” in 1803 when he became a court historiographer, the dedication mentions the year of 1811. That year, upon the request of Ekaterina Pavlovna, a sister of Alexander I, Karamzin compiled “A note on ancient and new Russia in its political and civil state” and delivered it to the Emperor. This note was a short program of the “History of Russian state”, and from that date Karamzin started his work on the compilation of his great masterpiece. In his dedication Karamzin compares Alexander I battles against Napoleon with the Duke Dmitry Donskoy war against the Tatar-Mongols: both invasions were stopped by brave and wise leadership of Russian rulers.

The first eight volumes of the “History of Russian state” were printed in 1816–1818. The last volume number twelve was published in 1828 after Karamzin’s death. The work was so popular that the first three thousand copies of the first edition were sold out in twenty-five days, and the second edition of the first eight volumes was published in 1818–1819.

Most likely, this edition of the “History of Russian state” was taken to Beijing in 1820 by the members of the Tenth Ecclesiastic Mission (1820–
1830). Among the students of that Mission was Zakhar Fedorovich Leontievsky (1799–1874), who had spent ten years in Beijing and had perfectly mastered the Chinese and Manchu languages. His knowledge of these languages is proved by numerous Russian translations of Chinese and Manchu historical and literary texts that were published in St. Petersburg after his return to Russia. 

During his stay in Beijing, Leontievsky has translated into Chinese three volumes of Karamzin’s “History of Russian state”. Nowadays, the manuscript copies of this translation are kept in St. Petersburg: one copy at the Russian National library, three at the Oriental department of the Scientific library of the St. Petersburg state university, four copies at the Institute of Oriental manuscripts, RAS. 

The manuscripts are written on Chinese paper, the fascicles in yellow cover are put into a cardboard cover/tao with yellow silk cover. The information on the attached labels tells that Zakhar Leontievsky has presented four fair copies of his translation to four St. Petersburg centers of Oriental studies: Imperial library (now — Russian National library), Asiatic department of the Ministry of Foreign affairs and Asiatic Museum (now both collections are kept at the Institute of Oriental manuscripts, RAS) and Petersburg university (now — Scientific library of the St. Petersburg state university). Draft copies are also kept in IOM, RAS and Russian National Library. According to the studies of Sergei Peshtich and Isolda Ciperovich, the fair copy from IOM, RAS (M-30) was most probably aimed for the Chinese Emperor, since it is of big format, bound in golden silk and has a red label with golden printed title. Two draft copies of the “History of Russian state” were possibly acquired by the Petersburg university library from the private collection of Zakhar Leontievsky (Xyl. 1062 и Xyl. 2565). According to the studies of the manuscripts, the fair and draft copies were definitely done by Chinese scribe, while corrections in draft copies were made by a foreign hand. The corrections mainly concern style, as well as transcription of geographic and personal names. Characterizing the Chinese translation of the “History”, the scholars write that “the translator left behind four chapters (from the 4th to the 7th) of the third volume; the translation

4 PESHTICH & CIPEROVICH 1968: 126.
does not include Karamzin’s “Commentaries”, <…> as well as chapters where Karamzin lists the sources for his multivolume “History”. All this indicates a popular character of the Chinese translation”.5

All existing copies of the Chinese translation of the “History of Russian state” are almost identical, but only two manuscripts begin with Karamzins’ Dedication to the Russian Emperor Alexander I: The first fascicle of the Russian National library manuscript has the text in Chinese, the copy of the University library begins with the Dedication in Chinese and Manchu (Xyl. F-60). It is the only sample with Manchu language translation of the Dedication. The Manchu text is written in black ink from left to right (ff. 1a–5a), after it goes the Chinese translation, but written from right to left (ff. 1a–3a). The Manchu text bares corrections in red ink done by another hand. The main corrections concern the style of the language: the Manchu aha ‘slave’ is regularly changed to amban ‘official’ that also corresponds to the Chinese version of the text. The translator did not understand the Chinese sentence 波及大西洋 (‘[this] also influenced Europe’) and translated it as amba si yang ni niyalma de isitala (‘reached the people of great Si-yang’) not recognizing the word ‘Europe’. These small hints lead to a conclusion that the Chinese version was done first and then translated into Manchu. Dedications in Manchu and Chinese languages are not direct translations of the Russian original, but have more detailed references to the Russian history and sometimes need comments for the foreign reader.

5 PESHTICH & CIPEROVICH 1968: 126.
Dedication in Manchu

Pl. 1. ИБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 1а
Pl. 2. НБ СПБГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 1b
Рл. 3. НБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 2а
Пл. 4. НБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, ф. 2б
Pl. 7. НБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 4а
Пл. 9. НБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 5a
Transliteration

[f. 1a] amban Nikolai gingguleme / wesimburengge / hese be dahafi (changed to: dahame) gurun-i suduri be banjibume / arara de (changed to: jalin) amban mini hûlii mentuhun be / akûmbume. geren be yarume kimcime baicafi. juwan / funcere aniyai sidende (changed to: aniya ototo). teni longkîyabume arame mutehebehi. / gingguleme durun-i debtelin arafî / ibebuhe. bairenqge / enduringge ejen-i // [f. 1b] genggiyen-i bulukušefi jorišame tacibureo. hujufi günici aha (changed to: amban) / dubei jeri dushun mentuhun. muten sarasu micihiyan / albatu.ejen-i isibuha kesi ambula ijen. huwekiyebuhengge jacî / dabanahabi. ede joboro suilara be (changed to: de) sengguwenderakû inenggi / dobori akû banjibuhai. ududu mudan hallûn. beikuwen / halafi. juwan juwe aniyi de isitala teni iooni / bithe muwašame wajime mutehe. Iesu-i ebunjime banjiha-i / ibebuhe. bairengge / enduringge ejen-i // [f. 2a] forgon (changed to: emunci aniyai) ci. ahaı (changed to: amban mini) jalan de banjiha (changed to: banjirarin) de isibume / yaya ahaı (changed to: amban mini) hûlaha donjiha (changed to: donjihale) bisirele (cancelled) baitai (changed to: baiťa) bithe be / amba muru be şosofî / ejen-i juleri (changed to: de) tucibume wesimbuki. ere bitheı deribure sekiyen / dacı Batiya han musèi gurun de necinjime (changed to: biyalume) dosikan / fonde doksin-i horon dembei algika bithe. musèi / nenehe han Dona Dimitri hûwangdi dorgi (changed to: ferguvecuke) bodogon melebuhe ba akû / enduringgei mujilen ci emhun lashalafi. / beye silin dacun-i cooha be gaifî. damu enduri gesê // [f. 2b] baturu de akdambî (changed to: akdafi). tere ehe facuhûn-i bata be / gidafî. ferguvecuke gungge be ilime (changed to: ilibume) mutebuhe. tere fonde / Rossiya gurun-i gubci inu ambula gelme olhome hungkereme / dahahabi./ ejen tetele donjiha de urunkû amcame buyeršeme jendu (changed to: dorgideri) / acanarakûngge akû. ne-ı (i — cancelled) ucaraha etenggi bata nenehe / baiťa ci ele nelehe (changed to: dabinaha) bime. / Dimitri han-i mujakû ichihiyara de mangga baiťa be (inserted: te de) ereńi (cancelled, two other corrections are also cancelled: teđe, te-i fonde) / dubuleleme (changed to: dubuleci) ichihiyara de ele mangga ohobi. uttu de // [f. 3a] fafuršame hûkure dailame afara de urunakû / beye nikenefi yabuci teni sain acara be tuwame wara jafara /oci teni mohobume sihai wachihiyame mukiyebuci ombi. tereci / enduringge arga baturu (changed to: žengge bodonggo) horonggo (added: linge) hacingga tumen-i eljeme / afanduhai emgeri etere
bodogon be toktofì tuttu amba / gungge ilibuha yala / enduringge ejen tumen halai ırgese de (changed to: ırgese-i jalin) ebdereku (added: be) geterembufi / dergi abkai gosire kesi be alime mutefi. gurun-i gubci geren / ırgese de isitala iooni tukveme henduhenge muse (changed to: meni beyese) // [f. 3b] amba hûwangdi-i deserengge kesi be alihangge. urunakû tumen / aniya otolo ferguwen elden tutabuci ojoro yargiyan-i / dele-i gosin şengin (changed to: jurgan)-i amba hûturi. inu / ejen-i gosin algın ambarame badarambure adali (added: seme maktame hendure) oči (changed to na: ohoře) abkai / fejergi-i nialma. gemu kesi fulahun (added: be) de baimbikai (changed to: alimbikai). aha (changed to: amban) / uthai te-i forgon-i ejeme araci acara bai ta / tesulebuhede. dici dubede songkole hacin dendeme narzü shame / fakalafi isamjame banjibumbi (changed to: banjibume). jai aha (changed to: amban) jalan-i bai ta be / tuwaci. tumen aniya iooni hûwaliyasun o ho manggi. meimeni // [f. 4a] gurun-i irgen-i mujilen ele sain de isibure bithе / obufi geren gurun-i sahaliyan ujungga ırgese gemu / buyen be ashüfî mujilen be silgiyafi. amba si yang ni / nialma de isitala. elhe taifin be uhei alihaküngge / akü tumen irgen / dergi abkai kesi be gıyohosıme baimе / hûwangdi be yargiyan-i / abka be ginggaula dasan de kiceme mutehenge bahaci tumen aniya / otolo soorin de bibure. enteke kesi // [f. 4b] abka ci şangnabureo seme jalbarimbi. ere (changed to: yaya) jergi bisirele turgun be / aha (changed to: amban bi) gemu suduri bithè dorgide dosimbure banjibuki. erei / ejehenge gemu / ejen-i yabuha sain dasan. amgan nialma de tutabuha / durun tuwakû. entememe / enduringgei enen de / ujen jiramin-i kesi be ujui ninggude hukšehei. tumen / tumen aniya de isitala alhûdahai (changed to: otolo). jecen (changed to: mohon) akü de / isinambikai (changed to: alahùndambikai). damu yertesengge. aha (changed to: amban bi) albatu mentuhan bengsen // [f. 5a] ereri fisembume banjibuhangge. getuken nahrûn ojoro unde / uttu ofi ginggaule iletuleme wesimbure bithè arafi / dorolon (changed to: dorolohame) / donjibume wesimbuhe. jai suduri jise be ginggaule alibufi / ejen de tuwabuki. bairengge / enduringge ejen genggiyen (added: -i) bukekuşefi tuwancihiyame toktobureo. aha (changed to: amban) / alimbaharakû golome sengguweme / hese be baimbi. erei jalin niyakûrafi / wesimbuhe //
Translation from Manchu
following the corrections in the text

[f. 1a] Official Nikolay respectfully reports:

Following the Imperial order to compile the history of the state, I, humble person, with all my efforts have checked all the facts and after more than ten years have finished (writing the history). With respect I present the final version (of the text). [f. 1b] Submitting it for Imperial consideration, I humbly ask for corrections and instructions of the sage Monarch. With bound head I dare to think that I, an official of low grade, stupid and boor, had been bestowed an exceptional grace of the Monarch. That is why day and night I have worked selflessly. Heat and cold have changed each other many times, and after twelve years I have finished the draft of the book. [f. 2a] Starting from the year 1811 from the Nativity of Christ I have collected almost everything that I had heard or read from my birth in order to present all this to the Monarch.

This book begins with the time when Batyi-han invaded our state being known for his cruelty. Our blessed duke Dmitry Donskoy himself compiled a secret plan, not missing anything, himself collected selected and brave troops. [f. 2b] Relying on the Spirit of War, he destroyed bad enemy and performed miraculous feats of valor. At that time the whole Russian state was seized by fear, the leaders were persecuted(?), nobody met secretly. Now, when they faced a strong envy, all forces were collected. And when the duke Dmitry headed a great affair, everybody bravely set out. [f. 3a] They were fighting courageously unexpectedly attacking the enemy. When he caught the enemy, he killed him; when chased the enemy, he brought him to exhaustion and completely destroyed. Various fearsome, sagacious, divine heroes were fighting with numerous enemies, but once decided to win a victory, they accomplished a great feat. ⁶ Indeed, the wise Monarch has destroyed the villain for the sake of ten thousand families of his state; have received the grace of the Heaven which has reached everyone in the state. Everybody was praying: may this mercy pour out [f. 3b] and may its light remain for ten thousand years, as well as great happiness of high and fair love. Indeed, the while spreads the fame of the Monarch’s love, everybody in the Underheaven receives alms. I, an official, when compiled and wrote

---

⁶ The battle on the Kulikov field on September 8, 1380.
down the events of our times, I thoroughly selected them and put into chapters in consecutive order. Then, I, an official, have checked all deeds of all generations that lived in peace for ten thousand years, wrote down about good and bad affairs of every people of the states; refused from the desires of common people of [f. 4a] these states, and with clear heart reached the peoples of great Siyang (Europe). Haven’t they reached prosperity(?) Ten thousand people prayed for the grace of the Heaven asking for ten thousand years rule of the Emperor who venerates the Veritable Heaven. We pray for this Heaven grace.

[f. 4b] That were the reasons why I, an official, have compiled this book of history. Everything what is written there will be an example for future generations and will be useful for good governing. May it be a sample for imitation to eternal sage coming generations for ten thousand years and forever.

[f. 5a] With great embarrassment I, an official, humble and stupid, have told and collected [the stories]. Though haven’t made [the book] clear and well organized, I dare to report and present the book for the Monarch will look through the respectfully delivered the draft of the history. [I] humbly ask the sage Monarch to check, correct and approve [the book]. I, an official, am much timid and scared to receive the [imperial] decision. For this I report [to the Monarch] standing on my knees.
Dedication in Chinese

Pl. 10. НБ СПбГУ, Xyl. F-60, f. 1a
臣所誦所聞之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之書之书
臣尼潤賚謹奏為遵旨纂輯國史事。臣竟盡駑駘。
群摉博採。十餘年間。 甫克告成。 恭繕樣本進呈。
伏侯我皇上睿裁訓示。 窮思微臣一介庸愚。才識淺陋。
仰蒙我皇上眷寵獨隆。激勵特至。愛是不憚勞瘁。 晝夜編集。屢易裘葛。
歲周十二。 乃能全書粗竣。
溯自耶穌降生一千八百十一載之間。 迄臣生世之頃。凡
臣所誦所聞之書。 約畧為我皇上陳之。 緣此書之端倪。
乃巴特雅汗。 䦨吾國之際。 兇威甚熾。 而我先皇多那第米特理帝。
廟算無遺宸衷獨斷。 躬率貔貅之師。 全恃神勇。棄彼猖獗之寇。
克底奇動。 維時羅西亞。亦甚畏葸而懾。 令我皇上聞之。莫不神往而默契。
乃茲所遇之敵。 殆視前事為尤甚。而第米特裏帝。 萬難措置之事。 以今較之為尤難。
因大張撻伐。必擊乎親行。相機剿捕。 乃可掃穴犁庭。 於是神謨武烈。
多方捍禦。 既握勝算。 乃奏膚功。 洵為我皇上為萬姓除殘。
克邀上天眷佑。遂及普地人民 胥稱。我等景仰大皇帝之澤。
實貽萬載之光明。誠皇帝仁義之洪庥。亦似皇上仁聞之芳聲。
則大地生人。均蒙福蔭矣。臣遂於斯世。 遇有可書之事。跡其緣起。
條分縷析而書之。抑臣觀今事。因念萬年和睦。為各國民心益。[f. 2b]
善之文。 諸國黎元。皆克勝殘去殺。波及大西洋。 莫不共享太平。
萬民籲懇昊蒼。俛順輿情。垂念皇上。實克敬天勤政。即萬年禦世。莫不可行。
凡此纖悉。臣皆纂入史冊。所載胥為我皇上躬行善政。贻為後人模範。永為聖子神孫頂戴。鴻恩。億萬斯年。效法於無疆也。第愧微臣識陋菲材。
敘述未臻詳盡。 謹拜表以[f. 3a]聞。併將藁本恭呈禦覽。伏侯我皇上聖明鑒定。臣不勝屏營待命之至。謹奏。

Translation from Chinese

[f. 1a] The official Nikolay respectfully reports:

Following the Imperial order to compile the history of the [Russian] state, I, humble person, with all my efforts have collected all the facts and after more than ten years can report on the end of the work. With respect I present
the final version of the book and ask for corrections and instructions of the sage Monarch. With bound head I dare to think that I, a humble person, stupid and boor, had been bestowed an exceptional grace of the Monarch and was greatly encouraged. That is why day and night I have worked selflessly compiling the History, changing winter to summer clothes many times, and after twelve years I have finished the draft of the book. Starting from 1811 from the Nativity of Christ I have collected almost everything that I had heard or read from my birth in order to present all this to the Monarch. [f. 1b] The reason why I started compilation of the book from the times when Batyi-han invaded our state being known for his cruelty. The duke Dmitry Donskoy himself decided to fight a battle and lead his brave troops. He defeated those rampant rebellions relying on [his] exceptional courage, and thus shook the foundations [of the Mongol rule]. Our Emperor knows that in those days Russia was in fear and embarrassment, he thought on the [history of the duke Dmitry] and understood it. But the war of Our Emperor was even more cruel than before. The duke Dmitry with great effort planed his strategy, while the war of our times was much difficult — it was not a battle, but a war. [f. 2a] The Emperor had to lead the war himself, and command according to the circumstances to win, completely destroy the enemy and push him from the country. Carefully planning, fighting bravely, protecting his forces (army), he was sure in his victory. Finally, he won a crushing victory. Indeed, Our Emperor has destroyed the villain for the sake of all peoples, and hence have received the grace of the Heaven and approval of the peoples of different countries. Peoples respect benevolence of our Emperor. Our Emperor has bestowed us with eternal light, happiness of imperial humanity and justice, as well as great happiness of high and fair love. Indeed, the while spreads the fame of the Monarch’s love, and people everywhere receive alms. I live in the time which should be described. I have studied the roots of those events, collected them, and thoroughly put into chapters in consecutive order. That is how I saw the events and why it is necessary to preserve peace and eternal tranquility. I have compiled a book which would be useful to the peoples of different countries. [f. 2b] Common people of various states stopped fighting and killing, and that influenced on Europe. All peoples enjoy peace together. Ten thousand people prayed for the grace of the Heaven asking the Heaven to protect the Emperor. Our Emperor venerates the Heaven, rules diligently and protects the world. We

---

7 Karamzin speaks about the Russian war against Napoleon in 1812 and the battle of Borodino on September 7 (old style — August 26), 1812.
believe in it. I wrote about it in the book of History, and it contains the
description of good government of my Emperor. It will be an example for
future generations and will be useful for good governing. May it be a sample
for imitation to eternal sage coming generations for ten thousand years and
forever. With great embarrassment I, humble and stupid, though haven’t
made [the book] clear and well organized, [f.3a] I dare to report and
respectfully present the book for the Monarch. [I] humbly ask the sage
Monarch to check, correct and approve [the book]. I am much timid and
scared to receive the [imperial] decision. For this I report with respect [to the
Monarch].

In “The History of the Russian State” the Dedication of Karamzin is
addressed to the Russian tsar Alexander I, but the Manchu and Chinese texts
are written according to the Chinese tradition of this genre, and actually they
are interpretations of the Karamzin’s original. The Manchu text is inserted
only into the manuscript kept at the Scientific library of the St. Petersburg
state university, the other copies of the translation are written entirely in
Chinese. Zakhar Leontievsky follows the Chinese ethic rules referring to
the Emperor calling himself 臣 — “your subject, official”, in Manchu version
original aha — “a servant, slave” was changed to amban — “a subject, an
official”. The main idea of Manchu and Chinese versions of the dedication is
the importance of nourishing good moral qualities which help the monarch
to fight against the enemy.

The translation of Karamzin’s “History of Russian state” into Chinese was
the first introduction of Russian history to the Chinese reader. The work by
Zakhar Leontievsky have been kept in manuscript form for many years and
only recently was published in China. The comparison of the original
Karamzin’s Dedication to the Russian tsar Alexander I with its Manchu and
Chinese versions clearly shows the translator’s way of interpretation of the
text.

---
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Abstract: The Treaty of Nystad signed between Russia and Sweden put an end to the prolonged Northern War (1700–1721). Russia gained an access to the Baltic Sea, acquired new territories and strengthened its international prestige. In a letter written on September 30 (October 11), 1721, Tsar Peter I informs the Ottoman Sultan Ahmed III about Russian military and diplomatic success. Till nowadays, there is no information about the original letter, but its text has been preserved in translation into Ottoman-Turkish. The contents of the letter reflect the desire of the Russian Tsar, who had just finished a long war, to maintain good-neighborly relations with the Ottoman Empire. Being a source on the history of Russian-Turkish diplomatic relations, the letter is also an example of the Ottoman-Turkish language of the first half of the 18th c.
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The letter in question was written by the Russian Tsar Peter I shortly after the end of the Great Northern War (1700–1721). Russia gained an access to the Baltic Sea, acquired new territories and strengthened its international prestige. At the same time, the state was weakened by the long war. Therefore, one of Peter’s concerns was to avoid military confrontation with the Ottoman Empire, relations with which were very tense at the beginning of the 18th c. The contents of the letter sent to the Ottoman Sultan Ahmed III (ruled 1703–1730) reflect this desire of the Russian Tsar.

The letter is a part of the manuscript known as “İbretnümâ-ı Devlet-i Câvid” (“Instruction to the State by Jävid”), kept at the Rare Works Library

© Mark A. Kozintcev, Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, Russian Academy of Sciences; HSE University (m.kozintcev@mail.ru)

1 Jävid is listed as the compiler of the manuscript by mistake. See KESIL 2002: XXIX–XXXI.
of Istanbul University (shelf mark: İÜNEKTY 5943). The manuscript includes texts of different official documents copied by an Ottoman official who wrote under the pseudonym Kesbî. The documents were used by this Turkish historiographer in his work “İbretnümâ-yı Devlet” (“Instruction to the State”). The manuscripts of this work have been preserved in Istanbul, Paris and St. Petersburg. Writing his work, Kesbî did not use all the material available to him; many documents, including the letter in question, were not introduced into the final text. The letter of Peter I was copied by the historiographer along with some other samples of diplomatic correspondence. Among them are letters from Russian monarchs: Anna Ioannovna (ruled 1730–1740), Ivan VI (formally ruled 1740–1741), Elizabeth Petrovna (ruled 1741–1762), Catherine II (ruled 1762–1796), as well as from rulers and diplomats of some European and Asian states.

As indicated in the text itself, the letter is dated by September 30 (October 11), 1721. It seems that this is one of the last letters to foreign monarchs written by Tsar Peter before accepting the title of “Emperor of All Russia” on October 22 (November 2), 1721. Translation of the letter allows to see the differences of the title of the Russian Tsar before it was officially changed to the Emperor. Besides, some features of the translation of the monarchic title into the Ottoman-Turkish can be seen.

---

2 The text of Kesbî’s work “İbretnümâ-yı Devlet” was published in 2002 by Ahmet Öğreten based on the manuscript Ali Emîri, Tarih nr. 484 kept at the National Library of Turkey. The text of the manuscript İÜNEKTY 5943 was also included into the publication. See KESBÎ 2002. Unfortunately, the publication does not contain a facsimile reproduction of the Ottoman-Turkish text in Arabic script. I express my gratitude to the colleagues from the Rare Works Library, Library and Documentation Department of Istanbul University who kindly provided me with a digital copy of the manuscript İÜNEKTY 5943.

3 One of the later copies of “İbretnümâ-yı Devlet” is kept in the collection of the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts, RAS (Collection of manuscripts written in Arabic script, shelf mark: B 747). In 1881 it was published by Vassily D. Smirnov (1846–1922). See SHORNİK 1881.

4 Until 1918, the Julian calendar was officially used in Russia. The corresponding dates in the Gregorian calendar are given in parentheses.

5 According to Peter’s decree, issued on November 11 (November 22), 1721, the title of the Emperor of All Russia in the correspondence with foreign sovereigns had to be written as follows: “By the Grace and Aid of God, We Peter the First, Emperor and Sovereign of All Russia, of Moscow, Kiev, Vladimir, Novgorod; Tsar of Kazan, Tsar of Astrakhan, Tsar of Siberia; Sovereign of Pskov and Grand Duke of Smolensk; Duke of Estland, Lifland, Korelia, Tver, Yugria, Permia, Vyatka, Bolgary and others; Sovereign and Grand Duke of Novgorod of the Lower Land, Chernigov, Ryazan, Rostov, Yaroslavl, Beloozero, UDia, Obdoria, Kondia, and Ruler of all Northern territories; and Sovereign of Iberia, Kartalinian and Georgian Tsars; and hereditary Sovereign and Ruler of the Kabardinian lands, Circassian and Mountain Princes and others.” See Polnoe sobranie 1830: No. 3850.
Most of the names of Russian cities and territories are transliterated accurately. However, in some cases, the Turkish translator resorts to transliterating the words that should be translated. This refers, for instance, to the words “cümle Siverya memleketlerinin” which definitely should be translated as a “(Ruler) of all Northern territories”. Another example is “Novgrod’in, Nijoya’nın” which can be recognized as Nizhny Novgorod (in the original the city’s name “Novgorod of the Lower Land” is used). The Tsar’s title of Grand Duke, which in the letters of later monarchs is usually translated as “Büyük Duka”, here is partly transliterated, partly translated, and looks like “Büyük Knez”. Similarly, the Russian interpreters from Ottoman-Turkish in the Ambassadorial Office, when unable to find synonyms for the Sultan’s titles, transliterated them. For instance, the Ottoman title of Persian origin “Hudâvendigâr” (‘the second or the other God’, ‘godlike’) was never translated: it was usually rendered in various distorted forms (“Khandyker”, “Khanker”, etc.) in Cyrillic script. At the same time, in the absence of the original text, this approach allows, if necessary, to recreate it accurately enough.6

The text of the letter contains the names of the territories conquered by Russia during the war. Despite the peculiarities of Arabic script, toponyms are transmitted quite accurately and can be easily recognized. They include such regions as Liflandia,7 Estlandia,8 Ingermanlandia9 and half of Karelia, as well as the largest and most significant cities and fortresses: Riga, Dünamünde,10 Pernov,11 Revel,12 Dorpat,13 Narva, Vyborg, Kexholm.14

---

6 ZAYTSEV 2006: 56.
7 Before 1713 — Swedish Livonia; now its territory partly lies in Latvia, partly in Estonia.
8 Northern part of today’s Estonia.
9 Historical region which now lies within the territory of Leningrad Oblast, Russia.
10 Daugavgrivas fortress near Riga, Latvia.
11 Now Pärnu, Estonia.
12 Now Tallinn, Estonia.
13 Now Tartu, Estonia.
14 Now Pioziersk, Russia.
The text in Ottoman-Turkish (Pl. 1–3)

15 The title of the letter added by the compiler as well as the Sultan’s name printed in bold here, in the manuscript are written in red ink.

16 Should be read: نوغروداک.
Transcription

(f. 146 v.) Moskov Çarı tarafından gelen nâmesi tercemesidir. 25 Zi’l-ka’den sene 1134 |


17 Should be read: Nôvgorôd’în.
18 Should be read: Belôzeryâ’nın.
budur ki bi-takdir-i | hûdâ-yi lá-yezâl nîce müددet bu dostunuz ve Ísvec Krâli beyininde na’îr-i ceng | u cidâl iş’âl ve harb u kitâl-i müstedd ve mümtedd olup bi-inâyetihi’l-lâhi teâlâ | el-ânehû şikak u nifâk vedd u vifâka mübeddel ve bûrûdet ve <u> adâvet | meveddete muhavvel olmak müyesser olmağa irâdât-ı budâ-ya müteâl taalluk edüp | tarafeyniden murahhaslar nasb u ta’în ve Niştâd nâm mahal mûkâlême içtin | imtiyâz ve mahall-i merkuma cêm’ olundukda ba’de’l-mûkâlême ve’l-mûzâkere ile’l-yevm | kralîğindan darb-ı destimiz ile ahz u kabz eyedîgilimiz eyâletler ki Liflândiyâ, | İslândiyâ, | Kermûlândiyâ ve Kareliyâ’nın nısfî ve bunlara tâbi’ ve lâhik | sevâhil ve şehrîstân Rîğâ, Dînâmend, Pernâv, Revel, Dörpt, Nârvâ, | Vîpûrg, Kişgûlm cumle nevâhî ve cezâyirleriyle zabt u tasarrufununda kalmak üzere | işbu Milâd-ı Hazret-ı Ís’â’nın bin yediyüz yiğirmi birinci senesinde mâh-ı | Ağustosun otuz dördüncü (sic!) gününde te’yîden musâlaha ve müsâlême akd olunup | hitâm u feysal verilmekle cenâb-ı hûmâyûnlarla aramızda neşv ü nemâ bulan | mûvâlât-ı müebbede ve musâfât-ı müekkede binân | tarafîn pâd-şâhânelerine | vâktî kemâl-i meyl ü muhabbetimizi izhâren cumleden akdem işbu sadâkat-nâmêmiz ile | ihbâr u i’lâmnda tekâsül revâ görûlmeyüp ifadesi ta’cîl olundu. Ve bu haber dostluğa | binân makhbûl-ı hûmâyûnlarla olacağında istibâhım yokdur. Binânın alâ-zâlik || (f. 147 v.) hâlâ Der-i Devlet-i Aliyyelerinde ikamet üzere olan kapukethüdâmız dahi ahvâl-i merkumeyi | ale’t-tavâif-i meyl ü muhabbetimiz izhâren | agre快乐l-ı dest ü hükümetinizde olanlara | ale’l-husûs Tavâif-i Tatar’a bir dür hasâret u isâl-i mazarratdan ihtirâz ve icînînâbı ile’l-yevm | tutulacağına itirâyâ buyurulmayıp tarafî pâd-şâhânelerinden danh kemâ-yenâhi müsâfât u mûvâlâtın ri’âyet ve ihtirâmında himmet-i mülükâneleri derkâr buyurulmak melhûzdur. Ve tarafeynin re’âyâ u berâyâsinin | mîlâd-ı Hazret-ı Ís’â’nın bin yediyüz yiğirmi birinci senesinde | Eylülün otuzuncu gününde Çarlığımızın kırkıncı senesinde Petrevburğ nâm sehri nizde tahrîr olunmuşdur. 19 In the manuscript it is written together with the previous word.
Pl. 1.
Istanbul University, Library and Documentation Department, Rare Works Library.
İÜNEKY 5943, f. 146 v.
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Translation

Translation of the letter from the Russian Tsar. 25 Dhu al-Qa’dah 1134

We Petrus Alekseevich,20 by the Grace of God, Tsar of Moscow, Sovereign of All Great and Small Russia, Grand Duke of Kiev, Vladimir, Novgorod; Tsar of Kazan, Astrakhan, Siberia; Sovereign of Pskov, Smolensk, Tver, Yugria, Permia, Bolgary, Novgorod of the Lower Land, and others; Chernigov, Ryazan, Rostov, Yaroslavl, Bielo-ozero, Obdoria, Udoria, Kondia, and Ruler of all Northern territories; <Sovereign> of Iberian lands, Ruler of Kartalinian and Georgian rulers; hereditary Sovereign, and Ruler of Kabardinian, Circassian, and many other provinces and lands in the East, West, and North. From our side, to the Greatest of the Great Sultans and the Most Venerable of the Glorious Rulers, the Sovereign of Monarchs and the Protector of Mecca the Honored, Medina the Enlightened, and the Holy City of Jerusalem; hereditary Sovereign, and Ruler of Anatolia and Rumelia, the White and the Black Seas and many other places; Monarch of the House of Osman, Sultan Ahmed Khan, the son of Sultan Mehmed Khan, the son of Sultan Ibrahim Khan; our great friend His Royal Majesty, with the announcement of the most sincere friendship, the following is amicably proclaimed. Without the approval of the Almighty God, for such a long time hot battles and fights between your above-mentioned friend and the Swedish King had been flaring up and protracted wars and murders had been carried out. At the same time, as, by God’s grace, it became possible to turn discord and strife to friendship and consent and to change cooling and hostility to amity, which refers to the permission of the Great God, delegates were appointed and approved from both sides, and a place called Nystad was chosen for negotiations, and when they gathered in that place, then, after discussion and conversation to this day, by the power of our hands, we have annexed from his kingdom such lands as Liflandia, Estlandia, Ingermanlandia and half of Karelia, and the adjacent coasts related to them. And the large cities of Riga, Dünamünde, Pernov, Revel, Dorpat, Narva, Vyborg, Kexholm with all districts and islands have been conquered and they will

20 A latinized version of the name “Piotr” (Russian for: Peter) is used. Tsar’s patronymic is given in transliteration.
remain in my possession, in confirmation of which on August thirty fourth\(^{21}\) of this year of our Lord seventeen hundred twenty one, peace was established and at the same time the end and resolution were laid. On the basis of the growing and developing eternal friendly ties between Your Royal Majesty with us, first of all, with this message of our devotion, we hasten to express our highest degree of affection and love to Your Imperial Majesty, carelessness in the expression of which we do not consider appropriate. And we have no doubt that this news, based on amity, will be received joyfully. Therefore, our representatives, currently residing in Your High State, have been instructed to inform <You> in detail verbally. And because of this, the endless friendship and unity that exists between us, along with the most sincere intentions, is not subjected to any secret or obvious doubts from our part, and from Your Royal part, the consent of the undoubted royal favor in respect and reverence of friendly ties is also expected, as it should be. And in accordance with the eternal peace it is requested that for the serenity, security and welfare of the subjects on both sides, it should be strongly prescribed especially to the Tatar tribes that are under Your subjection and authority, that they avoid and refrain from causing any harm and damage. On our part, we have also issued strict decrees to ensure that those who are in our subjection, respect to the highest degree the rights of their neighbors. May the Almighty God send down from His bounty in the splendor of His kingdom a prosperous health throughout <Your> life. Recorded on the thirtieth of September, in the year of our Lord seventeen hundred twenty one, in the fortieth year of our reign in our city of Petersburg.
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