

Review article

Michał Németh

Jagiellonian University of Cracow

REMARKS ON THE NEW EDITION OF *WU TI QING WEN JIAN* (ED. BY OLIVER CORFF ET AL. 2013), OR WHAT FORM CRITICAL EDITIONS OF LEXICOGRAPHICAL MANUSCRIPTS SHOULD TAKE

Abstract. The present article provides a concise, positive review of a new edition of the Manchu Pentaglot Dictionary (ed. by Oliver Corff. et al. 2013).

Keywords: *Wu ti Qing wen jian*, Pentaglot Dictionary, Manchu multilingual dictionaries (18th century), Eastern Turkic, Turki, Uyghur

1. The year 2013 saw the publication of a new comprehensive critical edition of *Wu ti Qing wen jian* (五體清文鑒), which is also known as the Manchu Pentaglot Dictionary dating from the late 18th century. It was edited by Oliver Corff along with a team of researchers assembled by him: Kyoko Maezono, Wolfgang Lipp, Dorjpalam Dorj, Görööchin Gerelmaa, Aysima Mirsultan, Réka Stüber, and Byambajav Töwshintögs. The editors appear to have perfectly understood the importance of interdisciplinary studies and published the finest possible edition of this monumental lexicographical manuscript.

The editors had three sources at their disposal, i.e. photomechanical reproductions of the Chonghuagong and the Fengtian manuscript, and the original of the London manuscript (see Corff et al. 2013: xxiv). The basis of their work was a photomechanical reproduction of the Chonghuagong manuscript published in Beijing in 1957 (= PDB) and later again in 2008, but the linguistic material in this case is contrasted with the content of the other two sources and

a number of other studies that dealt with the dictionary so far. The edition is therefore not a simple transcription of the manuscript, but rather a result of what appears to be painstakingly laborious or, at least highly meticulous comparative philological work, as a result of which the content of the manuscript of the Beijing reproduction has been amended and supplemented in a responsible manner using other sources. This work was necessary given that the above-mentioned 1957 edition is not free of shortcomings, including missing, incomplete, displaced or redoubled headwords, orthographic errors and wrongly identified lexemes – as we can see in the informative introduction (see Corff et al. 2013: xxxiii, xxxvii).

Accordingly, every lemma is supplemented with a critical apparatus provided in footnotes, in which the available versions of the *Wu ti Qing wen jian* are compared. The user of the edition receives all the necessary information on the autograph: any kind of textual, editorial or orthographical peculiarities are separately indicated, the reader is informed of difficulties in the reading, of errors including *lapsus calami* and *errores significativi*, of any type of inconsistencies within the dictionary, as well as of comments made by other researches dealing with the relevant fragment (doubts, etymological remarks, different readings, etc.). Additional, consistently applied cross-references between headwords facilitate reading, understanding, and analysing the content of the manuscript.

Needless to say, the edition follows the original semasiological, not alphabetical, arrangement of the lemmas.

It is obvious that the edition was carefully planned. First, the lemmas are transparent, even though they contain in eight sections the transcription and transliteration of linguistic data in five languages written in five scripts: in the original manuscript, the headword is in Manchu (in Manchu script), which is followed by parallel explanations in Tibetan (in Tibetan script, but they are additionally transliterated using the Manchu alphabet as well as transcribed phonetically using Manchu script), in Mongolian (in Mongolian script), in Turki¹ (in Arabic script enhanced with additional diacritics and transcribed phonetically using Manchu script), and in Chinese (in Chinese script). In the edition, with reason, the content of the whole manuscript is transcribed, obviously, except for the Manchu transliteration of Tibetan and Turki.

Secondly, the edition bears all the elements and features that a critical edition of a lexicographical manuscript should have: the editors consulted and compared all the accessible copies of the manuscript, provided an exhaustive description, including of their history, and prepared their *stemma codicum* and established the time of its creation (which is probably 1794). Moreover, the facsimile is widely accessible thanks to the Beijing edition from 1957 (and 2008), the location of every portion of text is provided precisely so that the

¹ In fact this material reflects the local variants of Uyghur as spoken in Turfan and Qumul (see Shogaito 1999: 235).

reader can easily find the fragments he is interested in not only in the above-mentioned Beijing reproduction, but also in the London manuscript and the Japanese facsimile edition of the Fengtian manuscript printed in 1943 (= PDJ), the text received a transcriptual interpretation along with a critical apparatus and a translation into German of the meanings of the headwords (based mainly on Hauer 2007 [1952]). Finally, the scribal errors have been accordingly amended, and the missing fragments have been reconstructed.

Thirdly, the edition has been enhanced by a number of solutions that facilitate its use: the Mongolian fragments are supplemented with their modern Khalkha equivalents in Cyrillic script, the Chinese part received a transcription; the edition is preceded with a detailed introductory part, a number of very helpful qualifiers, editorial marks and symbols as well as abbreviations are used in the edition, in the critical apparatus comments that are attached to single word forms are clearly distinguished from those that concern the whole lemma, etc.

To sum up, the editors follow the good practices and standards established in such authoritative works on textual criticism as Maas (1959), West (1973) or Kenney (1974). The edition is an example of excellent work and excellent cooperation involving a large team of specialists of various disciplines.

2. The entire opus consists of a two-volume edition of the dictionary itself and an additional five volumes of indices containing the Manchu², Tibetan³, Mongolian⁴, Turki⁵ and Chinese⁶ lexicons of the dictionary – all of them published one year after the edition appeared! As a result, the book is a far more convenient tool than one could have possibly expected.

In the past, researchers mainly concentrated on a linguistic analysis of certain semasiological groups, cf. e.g. the contributions of Himly (1895–1899), Ross (1909), Haenisch (1934/1935 and 1953), Meyer (1982, 1989), Doerfer (1985), and Wadley (1992). In these cases, a lexicon encompassing shamanism,

² Corff, O., Maezono, K. 2014. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Index 1: Manjurisch.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 184. ISBN 978-3-447-10149-3.

³ Corff, O., Mirsultan, A. 2014. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Index 2: Tibetisch.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 198. ISBN 978-3-447-10150-9.

⁴ Corff, O., Dorj, D. 2014. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Index 3: Mongolisch.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 279. ISBN 978-3-447-10151-6.

⁵ Corff, O., Mirsultan, A. 2014. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Index 3: Turki.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 267. ISBN 978-3-447-10152-3.

⁶ Corff, O., 2014. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“. Index 3: Chinesisch.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, pp. 332. ISBN 978-3-447-10153-0.

riding, hunting, games and the names of birds, aquatic animals, and trees has been presented and listed in alphabetic indices. Given, however, that no comprehensive indices were available, the use of the dictionary was quite problematic⁷ and therefore the linguistic material from the Pentaglot dictionary was rarely quoted in Turkic comparative studies.⁸ For instance, as far as I know, neither the Japanese edition from 1943 nor the Beijing edition from 1957 was quoted in any of the seven volumes of ÈSTJa (1974–2003), in Räsänen's (1969) *Versuch*, in Clauson's (1972: xxiii) etymological dictionary (he only quotes Turki material from Shaw's (1878, 1880) dictionary and grammar), or in the unfavourably reviewed EDAL (2003). On the other hand, as far the most comprehensive studies are concerned, we find the Beijing edition quoted in Doerfer's (1963–1975) TMEN and in the most recent etymological dictionary of West Old Turkic loanwords in Hungarian containing extensive comparative Turkic (and Altaic) data – in TLH (2011). In the latter etymological dictionary, however, the linguistic data from the Pentaglot Dictionary was mostly gathered on the basis of Ross (1909), given that three bird names and a tree name entered the dictionary⁹.

Today, the comprehensive indices open up new possibilities and make a much greater utilization of the Pentaglot Dictionary possible, above all in comparative and etymological studies.

3. The edition is, obviously, above all an extremely valuable contribution to Manchu studies. Nevertheless it seems obvious that it will not go unnoticed in none of the disciplines its material concerns. The critically edited manuscript is one of the finest examples of Manchu lexicography available with a total of 18,671 lemmas organized into 36 semantic groups and further divided into subgroups. The lexical data we find in the dictionary is highly reliable having been proofed by specialists in Uyghur studies – unlike for instance some of the available Chagatai dictionaries compiled by Ottoman authors in the 19th century, in which the Chagatai linguistic material was often confused with the Ottoman lexicon, like e.g. in Vefik (1876) or Şeyḫ Süleymān (1881: 97).

From the point of view of the Turkic linguistic material, the Manchu transliteration which accompanies the traditional notation in Arabic script (in the so-called Naskhi calligraphic style) makes the dictionary unique and paves the way for further research on 18th-century Turkic in Eastern Turkistan (e.g. on its innovative and unusual features – cf. the *a > e* change before a syllable with *i* – or its relation to Chagatai).

⁷ See, e.g. Wadley's (1992: 110) complaint on this matter.

⁸ The desideratum to compile comprehensive indices has been earlier expressed by some researchers, see e.g. Krueger (1963) or Mimaki (1988).

⁹ See TLH (I 508; II 736, 859): Man. *angir niyehe* 'anggir duck', Tu. *čuli* (*čawli*) 'falcon', and Tu. *qoy quš* 'a kind of eagle' and cf. with Ross (1909: 298 s.v. *sarigh urdak*, 271 s.v. *čuli*, 271 s.v. *huy quš*). Ross's article was eventually not included in the bibliography in TLH.

Abbreviations

Ma. = Manchu; **Tu.** = Turki

References

- sir Clauson, G. 1972. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Corff, O., Maezono, K., Lipp, W., Dorj, D., Gerelmaa, G., Mirsultan, A., Stüber, R., Töwshintögs, B., Li, X. (eds.). 2013. *Auf kaiserlichen Befehl erstelltes Wörterbuch des Manjurischen in fünf Sprachen*. „Fünfsprachenspiegel“, vol. 1–2. Wiesbaden.
- Doerfer, G. 1985. Terms for aquatic animals in the Wu T’i Ch’ing Wên Chien. In: *Proceedings of the International Symposium on B. Pilsudski’s Phonographic Records and the Ainu Culture*. [Edited by the executive committee of the international symposium; chairman Toshimitsu Asakura]. Sapporo: 190–202.
- EDAL = Starostin, S., Dybo, A., Mudrak, O. (with the assistance of Gruntov, I. and Glumov, V.). 2003. *Etymological dictionary of the Altaic languages*, vol. 1–3. Leiden.
- ÈSTJa = Sevortjan, È.V. et al. (ed.). 1974–2003. *Ètimologičeskij slovar’ tjurkskich jazykov*, vol. 1: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na glasnye*, (1974); vol. 2: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvu «b»*, (1978); vol. 3: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvu «v», «g» i «d»*, (1980); vol. 4: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie osnovy na bukvu «ž», «z» i «j»*, (1989); vol. 5: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie leksičeskije osnovy na bukvu «k» i «q»*, (1997); vol. 6: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie leksičeskije osnovy na bukvu «q» [qoba–qyš]*, (2000); vol. 7: *Obščetjurkskie i mežtjurkskie leksičeskije osnovy na bukvu «l», «m», «n», «p» i «s»*, (2003). Moskva [the editor-in-chief of vol. 4: Levitskaja, L.S.; the editor-in-chief of vol. 5: Blagova, G.F.].
- Haenisch, E. 1934/1935. Die Abteilung Jagd im fünfsprachigen Wörterspiegel. – *Asia Major* 10/1: 59–93.
- Haenisch, E. 1953. *Zur japanischen Phototypieausgabe des fünfsprachigen Wörterspiegels*. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (= Institut für Orientforschung Veröffentlichung 16). Berlin [contains a description of words connected to “Riding and loading”].
- Hauer, E. 2007. *Handwörterbuch der Mandschusprache*. 2nd, revised and extended edition by Oliver Corff. [1st, posthumous edition: 1952]. Wiesbaden.
- Himly, K. 1895–1899. *Die Abteilung der Spiele im „Spiegel der Mandschu-Sprache“*. I–VII. – part 1: *T’oung Pao* 6/3 (1895): 258–267; part 2: *T’oung Pao* 6/4 (1895): 345–363; part 3: *T’oung Pao* 7/2 (1896): 135–150; part 4: *T’oung Pao* 8/2 (1897): 155–180; part 5: *T’oung Pao* 9/4 (1898): 299–327; part 6: *T’oung Pao* 10/4 (1899): 369–379; *T’oung Pao* (Second Series) 2/1 (1901): 1–23.
- Kenney, E.Y. 1974. *The classical text: Aspects of editing in the age of the printed book*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London.

- Krueger, J.R. 1963. Toward greater utilization of the Ch'ien-lung Pentaglot: The Mongolian index. – *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 35: 228–240.
- Maas, P. 1959. *Textual Criticism*. [3rd edition]. Oxford.
- Meyer, I.R. 1982. Das schamanistische Begriffsinventar des manjurischen Wörterspiegels von 1708 (Beiträge zum Schamanismus der Manjuren, I). – *Oriens Extremus* 1–2/29: 173–208.
- Meyer, I.R. 1989. Zum Terminus *uyun jafambi* im manjurischen Schamanismus. In: von Sagaster, K., Eimer, H. (eds.). *Religious and Lay Symbolism in the Altaic World and other Papers. Proceedings of the 27th Meeting of the Permanent International Altaistic Conference, Walberberg, Federal Republic of Germany, June 12th to 17th*. Wiesbaden: 225–238.
- Mimaki, K. 1988. *A Tibetan Index to the Pentaglot Dictionary from the Qing Dynasty*. In: Uebach, H., Panglung, J.L. (eds.). *Tibetan studies. Proceedings of the 4th seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies. Schloss Hohenkammer Munich 1985* (= *Studia Tibetica* 2). München: 279–282.
- PDB = Pentaglot Dictionary (photomechanical reproduction). 1957. *Sunja hacin-i hergen kamciha manju gisun-i buleku bithe*, Beijing.
- PDJ = Pentaglot Dictionary (photomechanical reproduction). 1943. *Han-i araha Sunja hacin-i hergen kamciha Manju gisun-i buleku bithe*. Tōkyō.
- Räsänen, M. 1969. *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen* (= *Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae* 17/1). Helsinki.
- Ross, D. 1909. A polyglot list of birds in Turki, Manchu and Chinese. – *Memoirs of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 2/9: 253–340.
- Shaw, R.B. 1878. *A sketch of the Turki language as spoken in Eastern Turkistan (Kàshgar and Yarkand). Part I: Grammar*. Calcutta.
- Shaw, R.B. 1880. *A sketch of the Turki language as spoken in Eastern Turkistan (Kàshgar and Yarkand). Part II: Vocabulary*. Calcutta.
- Shogaito, M. 1999. *On the Ming Dynasty Central Asian Turkic language transcribed in the Chinese character*. In: Fujishiro, S., Shogaito, M. (eds.). *Issues in Turkic languages. Description and language contact* (= *Contribution to the Studies of Eurasian Languages Series* 1). Kyoto: 235–250.
- Şeyx Süleymān [Buhārī], 1298 [after Hiğra, i.e. 1881], *Luğat-i Čağatay ve Turkī-yi Osmanī*. İstanbul.
- TLH = Berta, Á., Róna-Tas, A. (with the assistance of Károly, L.). 2011. *West Old Turkic. Turkic Loanwords in Hungarian* (= *Turcologica* 84), vol. 1–2. Wiesbaden.
- Vefik, A., 1876, *Lehçe-i 'Osmānī*. [İstanbul].
- Wadley, S. 1992. A preliminary investigation of Manchu tree names in the Wuti Qingwenjian. – *Central Asiatic Journal* 36: 107–122.
- West, M.L. 1973. *Textual criticism and editorial technique, applicable to Greek and Latin texts*. Stuttgart.