THE MANILA INCUNABULA
AND EARLY HOKKIEN STUDIES

by P. VAN DER LOON

PART 2

In the first part of this study I dealt with the earliest history of printing in the Philippines, the contributions made to it by the Chinese immigrants, and the role played by the Dominican friars. I shall now concentrate on the Chinese studies of the missionaries and show that they are of some importance for linguists of today. In particular, they enable us to reconstruct the phonological system of one identifiable Hokkien dialect as spoken around the year 1617 and to glean interesting information on vocabulary and grammatical usage.

During the seventeenth century the ministry of the Chinese in Manila remained largely in the hands of the Dominicans. Outstanding personalities in the mission included Francisco de Herrera, who had arrived in about 1600 and died in 1644, and the well-known Juan Bautista de Morales (1597–1664). The former served, among other capacities, as vicar of Binondo, vicar of the Paríán, prior of Santo Domingo and provincial, and is said to have become fluent in both Chinese and Tagalog. Both were appointed examiners in Chinese by the provincial chapter held in 1627, and four years later Morales was reappointed to the same function. It appears, however, that no more Chinese books were published in Manila. We should add that in 1679 the Chinese parish of Santa Cruz was transferred to the Jesuits, some of whom then also applied themselves to the study of spoken Hokkien.

The emphasis laid on a knowledge of Hokkien changed when the Dominicans at last succeeded in establishing themselves in China. In 1626 they accompanied the Spanish expedition to northern Formosa and at once began missionary work among the natives. Their limited success was quickly undone when in 1642 the Spaniards were ejected from the island by the Dutch, but in the meantime some of the friars had crossed the Formosa Straits and set foot on the mainland. The first was Angelo Cocchi, who in 1632 started preaching at Fu-an, in north-eastern Fukien, and he was soon followed by Morales and Francisco Diaz. They had received some

---

1 Asia Major, N.S. 12, 1-43.
2 Acta capitolorum provincialium 1, 148 and 160.
3 La Costa, The Jesuits in the Philippines, pp. 373-374, 392, 413.
training in Mandarin at a kind of language course organized in Formosa. As a lingua franca this was clearly of more use to them than Hokkien, which is not understood in Fu-an because the inhabitants of that district speak the Foochow dialect. Consequently the dictionary that Díaz and his Chinese collaborator Joachim Ko compiled in Bataan between 1640 and 1642 was in Mandarin.4

But what had happened meanwhile to the vocabularies and dictionaries of Hokkien made by the pioneers of the mission in Manila? We have seen that, according to his own testimony supported by that of Montilla, Cobo had compiled a vocabulary, but it is not known whether it survived its author. Nieva too is said to have written, "practically afresh", a grammar and a dictionary. More doubtful are the claims advanced on behalf of Benavides9 and the Augustinian friar Martín de Rada (1533–1578).8 The attribution of manuscript dictionaries to Alberto Collares O.P.7 and Francisco Frias O.P.8 is also unsubstantiated. It is, however, safe to conclude that some anonymous manuscripts were circulating among the missionaries and that they were copied and enlarged as occasion arose.

Apparently one of these manuscripts, which was entitled Dictionarium linguae Chinesinis, cum explicaciones Latina et Hispanica, charactere Chinesini et Latino, was brought to Rome at an early date. Diego Collado, the procurator of the Dominican mission in Japan, who in 1632 had his own Japanese dictionary published at the press of the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, is reported to have taken care of the Chinese work at the same time, although the hope that it would be printed was never fulfilled.9 I may mention here that in 1801 the Spanish linguist Hervás quoted from the introduction to an anonymous Hokkien-Spanish dictionary which he had seen in the library of Propaganda.10 Unfortunately that manuscript is no longer available.

Despite extensive enquiries I have been unable to find the present whereabouts of an anonymous manuscript called Diccionario de la lengua Chin cheo que contiene los vocablos también simples que compuestos, con los caracteres generales y peculiares a questo dialecto, según lorden del alfabeto español y las cinco tonad. These, allegedly dating from 1609. It had belonged to M. J. L. d'Hervey de Saint Denys (1731–1732), whose Chinese library was sold two years after his death, and before him to Stanislas Julien (1709–1773), who had bought it at the sale of the books of his predecessor at the Collège de France, Abel Rémusat (1788–1832). The latter has left a detailed description of the dictionary, but does not say where he had obtained it.12 The manuscript was of quarto size, containing 356 leaves of Chinese paper. Each page was divided into two columns of 24 lines by means of a rule printed in red. Apparently the title was not in the same handwriting as the text.

Chincheo is a name which originally must have stood for Chang-chou, but was generally used by Europeans to denote the Bay of Amoy and its hinterland, or even Fukien province as a whole.13 A note in the dictionary explained that the relation between the Chincheo language and Mandarin was comparable to that between Basque and Castilian in Spain. Since, however, all the local Chinese had come from the province of Chincheo, a knowledge of their language sufficed for anyone in Manila.

The romanized entries of the dictionary were arranged alphabetically and further differentiated by five tones. Each entry contained a number of phrases, often amounting to more than a hundred. In practically all cases the Chinese characters were followed by the transcription and the meaning in Spanish. Judging from the title, the characters peculiar to Hokkien were well represented. Rémusat does not reproduce the characters and also suppresses the diacritical marks, so that we are unable to judge the value of the dictionary from the examples he gives. Two observations can, however, be made without risk. In the first place, the transcription agrees with that of Juan Cobo in its frequent representation of the alveolar implosive by -r: "huar xier, "brotar la calentura": that is huat dzaiz 熱, "to develop a fever";14 "huar char lay, "brotar la yerba": that is huat ts'ut lai 好出來, "grass shooting forth''.

Secondly, there is some evidence that the dialect described in the dictionary was closer to modern Chang-chou than to Amoy or Ch’uan-chou: no, "two" : no (Chang), nang (Amoy, Ch’uan) 南.

---

5. Gio. Michele Cavallieri, Galleria de’ sommi pontefici, patrizi, archevich, e vescovi dell’Ordine de’ Predicatori, Renzeno 1696, f. 231, credits Benavides with the same classification of Chinese characters into four categories that Montilla attributes to Juan Cobo ("The Manila incunabula and early Hokkien studies", Part 1, p. 18).
9. Leone Alacci, Apes urbanas, sitae, de viris illustribus, qui ab anno MDCXXXII, Romae adhucuent, ac typis aliquot exemplarunt, Rome 1593, p. 81, where both dictionaries are listed, the Chinese one as being "in the press".
14. For the system of transcription I have adopted and my sources for the modern dialects see below.
numbered 1–337, each page measuring 14.5 by 10.3 cm and containing 24 lines and a catchword. Five main parts can be distinguished:

22a–224b, “Bocabulario de lengua sangleya por las letras de el A.B.C.” This is a Hokkien-Spanish dictionary, arranged under about two hundred and fifty syllabic headings, each with a number of entries. There are at least fifty more monosyllables in entries not corresponding to any of the headings. A typical entry consists of a word in romanization, followed by remarks on the tone and other features of pronunciation, the meaning in Spanish, and a few phrases or compounds. Practically no Chinese characters are included; in the few cases where a character is mentioned as figuring in the margin (15a, 44a, 159a) it is not there in the present manuscript. Diacritical marks are mostly restricted to those for aspiration (a superscript ʰ) and nasalization (a swung dash), whereas the tones are vaguely described rather than marked by a system of diacritics. Spelling mistakes are frequent, both in the romanized Hokkien and in the Spanish text: “material” for “manantal” (193a), “cheio” for “cielo” (98b), “oveja” and “abisa” for “abeja” (191a), “cuerpo” for “suegro” (212b), etc. Moreover, in many places words or whole sentences are repeated by mistake or a passage is interrupted (e.g. on 10a, 98a, 216b). Several entries have been left without an appropriate heading, while some headings are given twice. All this suggests that this “Bocabulario” was copied from an earlier source. It is not even a complete copy, since several words to which reference is made are not included. The dictionary records some dialect variants within Hokkien, which will be discussed below.

225a–238a, “Lo que deve saver el ministro para administrar los sacramentos”, a manual consisting of five sections which deal with the administration of the sacraments of baptism, eucharist, extreme unction, matrimony and penance. Neither translation nor Chinese characters are present, but the whole text is systematically provided with diacritical marks, including those for the tones.

239a–279a, with the heading “Principio de la doctrina en sangleya” and containing the romanized text and Spanish translation of the Doctrina christiana, but no Chinese characters. The text is an almost verbatim transcription of the edition as printed by Keng Yong and therefore a document of great interest. The language is Hokkien throughout, even in the mysteries of the rosary, where the printed edition only sparsely makes use of the special Hokkien characters. However, the explanations of the fifteen individual mysteries are left out, and only the invocations to Mary, which largely repeat them, are transcribed. Diacritical marks are but occasionally supplied.

18 On 280a we find, written in a different hand, the title of a treatise in Spanish, beginning: “Demonstracion clarissima, en discurso suelto y breve, de la inmaculada y purissima concepcion de la virgen sacratissima Maria Madre de Dios, Reina de los Angeles y Señora nuestra...”
Which five dialects are meant here? Are they the different languages spoken in Fukien province as a whole, including the dialects of Fuchow and Hsing-hua, which are unintelligible to each other as well as to Hokkien speakers? Or does the parallel with the Romance languages of the Iberian peninsula suggest a closer relationship and are dialects of the Hokkien language itself intended? The problem is not without importance, for if the latter is the case both the grammar and the dictionary (which according to the preface was compiled at the same time) were based on the speech of one particular district. This interpretation seems to be borne out by the dictionary said to have been in the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, for its preface stated that the Chinchoe language was the common language of the Chinese who were engaged in trade in the Philippines and that it had five dialects, the best of which was the one used in the metropolis.  

The grammar is divided into nine chapters, dealing with pronunciation, declension, conjugation, adverbs, other adverbial particles, conjunctions, negative particles, interrogative sentences and syntax. The first chapter sets up ten “modes” of pronunciation, which (as interpreted below) distinguish words with an open vowel, an implosive final consonant, an aspirated initial, a nasalized vowel, a syllabic velar nasal, or combinations of these features, all represented by an elaborate system of diacritical marks. In addition there are accents for the tones, only five of which, listed in the traditional Chinese order, are recognized as distinctive. The two “entering tones” in words with implosive final consonants are identified with the rising and the upper falling tones respectively. (It will be remembered that the dictionary described by Rémusat also indicated only five tones.) In the examples characters are inserted, with the express purpose of “having them read by a Sangley,” so that one may understand in practice what is put here in rules. The same advice is given in a kind of preamble, now placed at the end of the chapter, but originally forming an introduction to the pronunciation, as it refers to the “following rules” and “following examples”. As such, however, it duplicates to some extent the beginning of the present chapter; moreover, it speaks of eight modes of pronunciation instead of ten. It seems therefore that this grammar was copied from two different versions. Another interesting point in the preamble is the claim that the rules for

---

19 Also written “Chinchoe”. Tsing-tsiu is the Chi’yan-chou pronunciation of “Chang-chou” 該州, and is written in the “Bocabulario” as “Chenchieh”, “Chinchoe” or “Chinchoo”. None of the forms quoted could have represented “C’hu’an-chou” 吳州 (tsian-tsiau, tra-tsaau), let alone “Chin-chang” 宮江 (tin-hong).

20 “La lengua comun del reino de China es la lengua mandarina, corre por todo el reyno, y con la provin* de Chinchoe, do ay particular lengua, todos los que saven letra entienden lengua mandarina. En la provincia de Chinchoe ay particular lengua, que es la que aqui se habla. Pero a de se de adverte que en esta provincia ay sinco lingua algo diferentes, como lo son portuguesa, valenciana, aragonesa, castellana *. La mas comun es la de Chinchoe, y la que mas aqui se habla, por lo qual el arte y bocabulario yan en esta lengua, que es mejor que no hazer chapunrrew de todas, como quien ubiese de aprender lengua toledana que no un chapunrrew de portugues, espanol &.” (My punctuation.)

21 Herré, Catálogo de las lenguas 2, 92. It is not clear whether “metropolis” refers to Manila or to a city in China.

22 “Bocabulario” 166a offers two explanations of the name “Sangley”: “he who comes very often” [常来], or “those who come to trade” [商來], both expressions pronounced niang lay; it prefers however the latter. Cf. Governor de Sande to Philip II, Manila, 7 June 1576: “Throughout these islands they call them Sangleyes, meaning people who come and go...” (Retana, Archivo del bibliofilo filipino 2, 34; Blair and Robertson, Philippine islands 4, 50). The term is unlikely to be of Chinese origin; see Boxer, South China, p. 260.
pronunciation had been “extracted from Chinese vocabularies”. No Hokkien vocabularies or rhyme dictionaries dating from such an early period are mentioned in Chinese sources, but it is by no means impossible that they existed. In any case the informants of the missionaries were familiar with some of the theoretical aspects of their language.

The use of accents to denote tones in Chinese may not have been a local invention. It is well known that the Jesuits on the mainland devised a system of romanization with discrital marks for Mandarin. Their earliest syllabary, not written before 1598, seems to be lost, but we find the system applied in Matteo Ricci’s autographs (dated 9 January 1606) as included in the Ch’eng-shih mo-yüan 程氏墨苑, an album of designs and illustrations on ink cakes published by Ch’eng Ta-yüeh 程大約. Based on Portuguese, this romanization is quite different from that of the present manuscript; the discritics consist of five tone accents, the aspiration mark and a single dot indicating a change in vowel value. Even if the Spanish missionaries in the Philippines had borrowed the idea of tone accents from the Jesuits (which is not certain), their system as a whole must be considered original, since it was designed for a very different language.

Unfortunately, in the examples illustrating the grammatical rules of the other chapters the discrital marks are almost all left out, and in three cases (226ab, 327a) the superscript aspiration mark is an ă, as in the “Bocabulario”, instead of the rough breathing prescribed by the “Arte” itself. Characters, too, hardly appear outside the first chapter, where no doubt they were put in by a Chinese; thus after qué, “casa” (house), the informant did not write 案 but 加, representing a homonym, because he was concentrating on the sound (314b). Many errors and omissions prove that the Spanish priest did not understand the grammar, but merely copied it for his own use. The clearest examples are on 320a-321a, where six lines are misplaced and, moreover, the description of the superlative degree occurs twice.

23 D’Elia (ed.), Storia dell’introduzione del cristianesimo in Cina 2, 32-33. The early history of Chinese lexicography by Europeans has not been systematically studied and is not well known.

24 Berthold Laufer, “Christian art in China”, Mitteilungen des Seminars für Ostasiatische Sprachen zu Berlin 13, 1910, Erste Abteilung, pp. 110-118 and PI. IX-XX. The autographs have been retranslated by J. J. L. Duyvendak in T’oung pao 35, 1940, 385-398. In a copy of the T’ien-ch’u shih-i 天主教義 which Ricci sent to Rome soon after its publication in 1603 he romanized the beginning of both chapters; tones and aspiration are indicated in two cases (D’Elia, Storia 2, PI. XVIII).

25 The phonological system represented by Ricci’s autographs and by the syllabary Ch’ang-p’ei 蔡常培, “Yeh-su hsi-shih t’ai yin-yin hahch shang ti hung-hsen” of Nicolas Trigault, the Hsi-ju erh-mu tzu 四書釋ム譜 (1626), has been studied by Lo 蕭麟, “The phonological system of the pronunciations of Chinese characters in Ch’ing-yüan and the yuan-chiu yen-chiu to chi-lan 1, 1939, 287-338. Cf. Lu Chih-wei 陸貴偉 in Yen-ching hsueh-pao 33, 1947, 115-128; Tôdô Akiyama 森繁明 in Tôshôgaku 5, 1952, 99-122.

We have gathered sufficient evidence to be able to describe the manuscript as a collection of heterogeneous material copied from different sources. Proceeding now to the problem of date and authorship, we shall have to distinguish between the origin of the manuscript and that of the works in it. The Doctrina christiana, represented here by two romanized versions and discussed at length in the first part of this article, is no doubt the earliest of these works. A passage from it occurs in the “Arte” (326b) as well as in the “Bocabulario” (132b), the latter quoting explicitly from the Doctrina. It is not without significance that the Apostles’ Creed in both the long and the short romanized versions follows the text as printed by Keng Yong and not the variant readings found in the Simbolo de la fe of Tomás Mayor.26

The differences between the two manuals for the administration of the sacraments — perhaps we should call them confession manuals, as they are to a large extent made up of interrogation — are too great for them to be of the same authorship. Apart from their contents, they also differ in the use made of the discrital marks. The first manual is fully equipped with them, being in this respect the only part of the manuscript to conform exactly to the rules laid down in the “Arte”, whereas the other manual has practically none. The latter is also distinguished by its table of contents, in which the titles of some sections are followed by “fol.” and others by “fol. col.”, with only the beginning of the first section filled in as “fol. 1 col. 1”. Because of this slavish copying we know that the original had been written on pages of a large enough size to be divided into two columns, like the dictionary formerly in the possession of Rémuza. Until further evidence is produced it will be impossible to say more about the authorship of these manuals, but it is possible that one of them is by Domingo de Nieva, the only one of the early missionaries to whom a manual of confession is specifically attributed, together with a grammar and a dictionary.27

Was Nieva then the author of the present “Arte” and “Bocabulario”? According to the preface to the former, a dictionary was written at the same time as the grammar, but even for the “Arte” we have found some evidence that it was copied from two different versions. As Nieva’s grammar may have circulated in more than one copy, revisions could have been made to any of these. The “Bocabulario” refers twice (on 29b, 134b) to an “arte” for grammatical explanations that are not found in the present grammar. As we have seen, the “Bocabulario” itself is an incomplete copy, but it still preserves traces of its original in the form of references (on 212a, 119b) to “fol. 14” and “fol. 26”, which in the present manuscript correspond to foli.
mention in a dictionary. A third entry in the "Bocabulario" contrasts the cast-iron guns of the Dutch with the Spanish ones, which were made of bronze (1763).

The worst defeat suffered by the Dutch during this period took place near the entrance to Manila Bay in April 1610, when the Spaniards, heavily outnumbering their enemies, captured two ships with fifty cannon and 132 men, while the third ship was blown up. Vice-admiral François Wittet was killed, and many with him.35 Seven years later, a Dutch squadron under Jan Dircksz. Lam lost three ships on the same stretch of water, but the other six escaped.36

Thanks to other passages in the "Bocabulario" it is possible to narrow the period of compilation yet further. The word for "horse" provides the opportunity for an explanation of the animal cycle as applied to a period of twelve years (21b–22a). Although all the animals are enumerated, it is only for the sixth and seventh that, by way of illustration, the years which they represent are mentioned: 1617 as the year of the snake and 1618 as that of the horse. It is unlikely that these examples were chosen at random. Indeed, a short description of the Festival for the Hungry Ghosts (cho bong lang che) contains the sentence: "In this year 1617 they hold it from 12 to 15 August" (344).

Having thrown some light on the composition of the Doctrina, the manuals, the grammar and the dictionary, we now have to consider the origin of the manuscript itself. It comes as somewhat of a surprise that it was not copied by a Dominican friar, but by a Franciscan. In the printed edition of the Doctrina christiana, the Confiteor twice mentions a number of saints whose intercession is sought, the last one being St. Dominic. In each case the two romanized versions replace his name by that of St. Francis, except for the second passage of the short version, where, no doubt through an oversight, "Sancto Lomingo" is kept. A similar substitution has been noted in a manuscript copy about 1710 by the Jesuit José Astrudillo, in which St. Dominic is replaced by St. Ignatius Loyola.37

It is not generally known that the Franciscans too worked for a time among the Sangleys and not many details of their activities are available. In 1621 Archbishop Miguel García Serrano reported to the King that, apart


37 Antonio Domínguez, "Observaciones filológicas", in Gayo, Doctrina christiana, p. 112.
suggested that a knowledge of the language of Fukien might help to solve a particular philological problem. La Croze informed him that the Royal Library in Berlin had a grammar and dictionary of the Fukien dialect, written in Spanish by somebody who was not very learned. Bayer was interested and asked for the text of the Hail Mary, which was sent to him in due course. Soon he was able to see more of the manuscript, and in a letter to a friend written in 1724 he discussed the Lord’s Prayer, this time copied from the short romanized version. A few years later he was appointed a member of the newly founded Academy of St. Petersburg, where he published his large work on the Chinese language, entitled *Museum sinicum*. Among the supplementary material of the book is also a grammar of the vernacular of “Chin chou province”, together with the Lord’s Prayer, the Apostles’ Creed, Hail Mary, Salve Regina and the Confiteor, all taken from the manuscript in Berlin. In his lengthy introduction, the author confesses that he, as he did not understand much of the original grammar, it had been translated for him into Latin by Bernardo Riberis a Dominican who was at that time chaplain of the Spanish ambassador to Russia and then entirely rewritten by himself. Chin chou is identified as Ch’en-chou 楚州 in southern Hunan. Thus, drastically edited and often misunderstood, the contents of the “Arte” were made known to the scholarly world.

But as the manuscript is now in London, how did the Royal Library in Berlin come to lose it? Suspicion falls on Julius Klaproth (1783-1835), whose signature, with the words “Finis Vocabularii linguae popularis Sinensium”, is found at the end of the “Bocabulario” (224b). Already as a young man Klaproth coveted other men’s dictionaries and later he became notorious for taking manuscripts from public collections. Nobody seems to have noticed the theft of this particular manuscript, which was included in the sale of Klaproth’s books in 1840, fetching fr. 80.00. It passed to a

---

28 Serrano to the King, Manila, 31 July 1622, reproducing the contents of an earlier letter, Blair and Robertson, *Philippine Islands* 26, 232.

29 I am grateful to Father Bibiano Bascones Lexcano, librarin of the Franciscan Seminary at Panasra, for consulting on my behalf the unpublished *Tablas capitulares* of the Philippine province.


31 Kurt Taute, *Die Bibliothek der Churfürstlichen Bibliothek zu Colln in der Spree*, Leipzig 1923, pp. 198-201; Walter Arlett, Christian Mentzel: Leibniz des Grossen Kurfürsten, Botaniker und Sinologe, Leipzig 1940, pp. 22-23. How Clever collected these books is a question that needs further research.


scholar in Ghent, P. L. van Alstain, who died in 1862. The British Museum purchased it the following year through B. Quaritch.

A comprehensive linguistic analysis of the manuscript is not envisaged here; perhaps such an effort would be unwise as long as there remains some hope that a better original, at least of the dictionary, will be rediscovered. I am concentrating on the romanized versions of the *Doctrina christiana*, which are published as an appendix to the present study, in the first place because we have the corresponding printed edition in characters and secondly because they provide continuous passages, which we know were composed by the Chinese collaborators of the missionaries working in Manila around the year 1600. Naturally such a contextual guarantee cannot be given for the grammar and the dictionary. The latter work will supply some additional information, particularly on dialect contrasts and grammatical particles, whereas the shorter of the two manuals of confession will be used to illustrate the function of the diacritical marks, since these are only sporadically found in the romanized versions of the *Doctrina*.

For the purpose of systematic comparison I shall frequently refer to the modern Hokkien dialects. My transcription for standard Amoy is largely the same as that adopted by modern Chinese linguists. Accordingly, *ts-* is used for both *ch-* and *ts-* of the invaluable dictionary by Carstairs Douglas; *ts-* replaces his *chh-*; and *dz-* replaces *j.* The aspirated consonants are distinguished by an inverted comma and not by *h* (*p’ai* for *phai*, etc.). I use *a* for the half-open back vowel which Douglas writes as *α*; *ae* and *ua* instead of *oe* and *oa*; *-ing* and *-ing* instead of *-eng* and *-ek*; *-ang* and *-ak* instead of *-ang* and *-ok*; *-ian* and *-iat* instead of *-ien* and *-iet*. Nasalized vowels are indicated by a swung dash (*pt* instead of *pt*). For practical reasons I have retained *ng* to represent the velar nasal *[ŋ]* and *h* to denote the final glottal plosive [ʔ].

Some further symbols are needed for phonemes in dialects other than Amoy. I use *e* for the half-open front vowel in Chang-chou. In Ch’ian-chou there appear to be two unrounded back (or central) vowels, the half-close [y] which Douglas writes as *α*, here represented by *e*; and a close vowel [u].

---

58 C.f. Huang Tiing-hua 鄭丁華, in Fang-yen yu p’u-t’ung hua chi-k’ an 1, 1958, 74. 59 The Han-yu fang-yen tsu-hua and Han-yu fang-yen tz’u-hua distinguish in Amoy the vowels [u] and [α]. The latter is the Pekingese vowel in e.g. 恩, which Karlgren has defined as an unrounded dental apical. For Amocho it is probably more convincing to describe it as the close unrounded central vowel [α]. It is in any case in complementary distribution with [u]; see Li Yung-ming 李永明, Ch’ao-chou fang-yen 昌州方言, Peking 1959, where this phoneme is denoted by *y*. Note that [un] and syllabic [ŋ] are also in complementary distribution.

50 For convenience I have reversed the order of categories 4 and 5. 51 "con un cierto desaire como de uno que se enfada." This suggests a falling intonation; cf. T. Navarro Tomás, *Manual de pronunciación española*, 11th ed., Madrid 1963, p. 230.
4. Words pronounced "gutturally"; that is, with an aspirated initial, for which the rough breathing (as in Greek) is used, e.g. chui 敷, chuì 初.
5. Words pronounced "gutturally" and with an "effort of the chest", that is, words with an aspirated initial and an implosive final consonant, e.g. cuüm 倡.
6. Words with an aspirated initial, open vowel and implosive final consonant, e.g. tè宅, quí客.
7. Words pronounced with a nasal voice, that is, words with a nasalized vowel, marked with a superscript n, e.g. quíáä, quíá 行.
8. Words pronounced "nasally but close",82 that is, words with syllabic velar nasal, marked with a superscript ㄹ, e.g. tùng 豪, tùng 長.
9. Words with an aspirated initial and a nasalized vowel, marked with a superscript ㄴ, e.g. chi β 謝, chi 透.
10. Words with an aspirated initial and syllabic velar nasal, marked with a superscript ㅁ, e.g. chuì 吁.

The scheme provides for a total of 13 diacritics, to be used alone or in combination. Seven of these are tone accents; the others represent not so much a systematic classification as a series of single or double changes in the rules of pronunciation, thus serving a practical end. Nevertheless, they would, if consistently applied, have enabled us to make a detailed analysis of the dialect in question. Most parts of the manuscript only contain diacritical marks for aspiration and nasalization, probably because of the existence of a less developed notation. In the Doctrina even these are found very sporadically, no doubt owing to the indifference of the copyst. The only part which shows nearly the whole range of diacritics is the shorter of the two confession manuals. It gives no examples of the sixth and tenth modes, whereas the eighth mode is represented by the word tùng-zoá, that is, tùng 唐山, meaning "China". All the other categories are illustrated on the specimen page opposite.

In the following transcription the diacritics have been replaced according to the rules given above, with the tones marked in the traditional Chinese way. It should be noted that the final glottal stop is not indicated as such in the original and can only be identified through the appropriate mode. I have normalized the spelling of Spanish words, standardized i and y as i, and changed qu- (before i and e) and c- (before other vowels) to k-

1. A reconstructed character text is appended for reference.

2. "Gangoso pero cerrado o diplicado de tal suerte que parece se dice todo por las narices."

38 I have disregarded the aspiration mark over ㎥, which I cannot explain.

82 The original text has yì.
are relatively stable. The analysis will thus be confined to the initials and the finals. Examples are all taken from the Doctrina, unless otherwise stated.

When dealing with the initials, it will not be necessary to make a detailed comparison with the modern Southern Min dialects, which are remarkably uniform in this respect.

\( p \) - corresponds to two voiceless bilabial plosives, one aspirated, the other not. The aspirate is attested by two examples on the specimen page of the manual reproduced above (\( p'\text{h} \) 打, \( p'\text{a} \) 判) and can be reconstructed for the Doctrina on the basis of the modern dialects:

\( p \) - in \( pi \) 底, \( pe \) 彼, \( pang \) 放, \( po \) 抱.
\( p' \) - in \( pang \) 香, \( pang \) 婚, \( po \) 抱, \( po \) 破.

\( b \) - when initial is pronounced in Castilian as a voiceless bilabial plosive and here corresponds to the plosive of the modern Hokkien dialects:

\( b \) - in \( bi \) 奔, \( bue \) 未, \( ba \) 备, \( bo \) 無.

\( m \) - corresponds to the bilabial nasal, which in Hokkien is usually considered as being in complementary distribution with [b], a problem that we shall discuss later. Occurrences in the Doctrina are:

\( m \) - in \( mi \) 物, \( mi \) 也, \( ma \) 也, \( ma \) 麦, \( mia \) 命, \( mia \) 名, \( moa \) 摩, \( mo \) 魔.

\( t \) - corresponds to the two voiceless alveolar plosives, one aspirated, the other not. The aspirate is attested in the “Arte” (\( t'\text{ch} \) 坐) and the manual (\( t'\text{e} \) 脖, \( t'\text{au} \) 頭, \( t'\text{i} \) 天) and can be reconstructed elsewhere from the modern dialects:

\( t \) - in \( to \) 道, \( tou \) 徒, \( tong \) 童, \( tu \) 在.

\( t' \) - in \( to \) 息, \( tou \) 向, \( tong \) 通, \( tam \) 贪.

\( l \) - corresponds to the voiced alveolar lateral, which in Hokkien is a very lax consonant, with an acoustic effect similar to [d] or the single apical flap [l]. Evidently it had the same articulation in the early seventeenth century for, while \( l \) - is the normal notation in the manuscript, the “Bocabulario” gives the alternative spellings \( liau/riau, lin/rin \) and \( lu/riu, lu/ru/du, \) and the same irregularities occur in the Doctrina, as the following examples show:

\( l \) - in \( li \) 理, \( liau \) or \( riau \) 了, \( riap \) 立, \( liang \) 梁, \( dian \) 年, \( ley \) 禮, \( lang \) 人, \( luy \) 累, \( loc \) 樂.

\( n \) - corresponds to the alveolar nasal (usually regarded as being in complementary distribution with [l]) as in the following cases:

\( n \) - in \( ni \) 年, \( na \) 那, \( na \) 掌, \( nai \) 乃, \( no \) 乃, \( nio \) 娘, \( nio \) 母.

---


67 Bilabial \( b \) - and labiodental \( w \) - merged during the sixteenth century into [b] in absolute initial and postconsonantal medial positions, but into bilabial fricative [β] between vowels. See Amado Alonso, De la pronunciación medieval a la moderna en español 1, Madrid 1935, pp. 23–71.
The voiceless affricates [ts], not occurring before i, and [tʃ], only found before i. It also represents the aspirates of these allophones, as attested in the "Artė" (ch`un 茅, ch`i 该) and the specimen page (ch`in ch`i`o 設像). We do not know the sound values of these Hokkien consonants in the early seventeenth century; the Castilian ch, though suggesting an alveopalatal, may merely have been used for lack of a better alternative. I therefore keep the more neutral symbols:

**ts**: in chit 七, Cheng 亜, chay 貴, chu 紹.

**ts`**: in chit 七, cheng 亜, chay 柴, chu 紹.

**y**- and **x**- correspond to the voiceless affricates [dz] and [dz], which are in the same kind of complementary distribution as their voiceless counterparts. This initial exists in Chang-chou, Amoy and Chaochow, but not in Ch`üan-chou; many Amoy speakers now also lack it, using [l] instead. The long version of the Doctrina and the "Bocabulario" mostly write **y**-, although in the present copy the superscript i is often omitted; less frequently they use x- (sometimes again with superscript i). The two confession manuals, including the short version of the Doctrina, have x- throughout.

**Examples**:

**dz**: in yit 目, xi 二, fian 肆, fia 若, xio 懶, yu 如.

**s**- and, in the short version, sometimes before back vowels also **s**- correspond to the voiceless alveolar fricative:

**s**: in sit 實, san 山, su 思, zun 順.

---

A simplified account may be given here of the Castilian consonant shift, for the first stage of which see André Martinet, "The unvoicing of old Spanish sibilants", Romance Philology 5, 1952, 133-156. The latter half of the sixteenth century saw the completion of the gradual unvoicing of all sibilants, the affricate [dz] merging with [ts]; the apicoalveolar [s] with [z]; and the alveopalatal ([dz] or [s]) with [ʃ]. Since, however, the spelling failed to keep pace with the changes in pronunciation, often two or more different letters were used interchangeably for the same sound. As a second stage in the consonant shift, [ts] developed into interdental [ʃ], except in parts of Andalusia and in Spanish America, where it merged with [ʃ]; furthermore [ʃ] changed to velar [x]. For the main Castilian area the changes may be schematically represented as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
  [ts] & \rightarrow [ʃ] \\
  [d] & \rightarrow [z] \\
  [s] & \rightarrow [x] \\
  [ʃ] & \rightarrow [x] \\
  [x] & \rightarrow [ʃ] \\
  [ʃ] & \rightarrow [ʃ] \\
  [z] & \rightarrow [z] \\
  [x] & \rightarrow [x]
\end{align*}
\]

In the Doctrina, ch in Spanish words (gracios, confirmacion, unión, sacerdotal) is rendered by Hokkien 亜. Evidently it had not yet been velarized, as Hokkien 亜 serves for this consonant also (in jueves, feste, vigen, Jerusalen), but 亜 had already lost its plosion (cf. in general Alonso, op. cit. pp. 362-450).

The choice of voiceless x and the continuant y (with a superscript i indicating that it should be pronounced as a sibilant) clearly shows the absence of a voiced affricate in Castilian. However, in Juan Cobo's translation of the Ming-hsin pao-chien, made in 1590, this Hokkien phoneme is still represented by ge- (Kue gián si 擊孩時, chia-sin 拾成) and [ʃ] was completed later than in Old Castile.

c-, k-, q-, qu- correspond to the two voiceless velar plosives, one aspirated, the other not. These symbols are not differentiated by aspiration but based on two distinct systems of transcription. The short version writes qu- before i, e; and c- before a, o, u. Occasionally it has k- (instead of qu-) before i, but on the whole it conforms to modern Spanish usage. The long version writes k- before i, e; and c- before a, o, u, except that it uses q- before the diphthongs ue, ao. Only in three cases are these rules broken. Accordingly, the u in, for instance, que is silent in the short, but not in the long version. The qu/c system is applied in the two confession manuals, and also in the first chapter of the "Artė", whereas the other chapters freely use k- before i and e. The "Bocabulario" adheres to the k/c/q system.

The aspirate is attested in the "Artė" (c`art 幼) and the specimen page (c`ong 懶, etc.) and can be reconstructed elsewhere from the modern dialects:

**k**: in ke (que) 來, que (cue) 過, cui 劉, cou 顧.

**k`**: in kiam (quiam) 欠, qua (qua) 見, cui 開, cou 口.

**g**: and, in the short version, sometimes also gu- correspond to the voiceless velar plosive. As far as the Doctrina is concerned, gu- with silent u can only be identified in gue 矢, but in the "Artė" it occurs before i and e, for instance pa guin gue long, "platero" (332b), that is 打鎚舊人 "siversmith". The long version has g- throughout, as in the following examples:

**g**: in gi 政, gin 長, ge 矢, gue 益, guan 閣, gau 賞.

ng- corresponds to the velar nasal, usually regarded as being in complementary distribution with [g]. Although we do not find it in the Doctrina, there are a few examples elsewhere in the manuscript. The following words occur in the "Bocabulario": c`ngiأ, "barreno" (41b), that is 矗仔 "earthen pan"; ngou sec, "todas colores" (177b), that is 五色 "the five colours"; ngé, "cosa dura" or "hacer fuerza" (148b, cf. 97b), that is 硬 "hard"; ngé lay, "traer del braço sobra la yjada" (168a), that is 捡來 "to carry under the arm".

**h**: corresponds to the voiceless glottal fricative sounds in modern Hokkien:

**h**: in hi 喜, hue 歡, hap 合, hoc 福.

In addition to the initial consonants discussed above, the Southern Min dialects have the glottal plosive [ʔ]. It occurs at the beginning of an utterance or stressed syllable; elsewhere it is replaced by zero. This initial is therefore not distinctive at the syllabic level and, hardly surprisingly,

---

Cobo normally writes k- before i, e, and twice even before other vowels, e.g. Kei Kon 告岡 (fol. 149).

La sim e nga chat'au, "mas duro es tu corazón que una piedra"; chui nga ru, "quien te fuerza". The two versions of the Doctrina hardly ever leave out h- where it should be or the reverse, in contrast to Cobo's transcriptions, where such cases are frequent. A number of times h- is confused with ch-, probably through a copist's error.
is not reflected in the transcription of the missionaries. In the following
table of initials it is treated as o.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voiceless stops</th>
<th>p (p)</th>
<th>t (t)</th>
<th>ts (ch)</th>
<th>k (c, k, q, qu)</th>
<th>o</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirated stops</td>
<td>p' (p')</td>
<td>t' (t')</td>
<td>ts' (ch')</td>
<td>k' (c, k, q, qu)</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stops</td>
<td>b (b)</td>
<td>l (l, r, d)</td>
<td>dz (j, x)</td>
<td>g (g, gu)</td>
<td>ng (ng)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuants</td>
<td>m (m)</td>
<td>n (n)</td>
<td>s (s, x)</td>
<td>ng (ng)</td>
<td>h (h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the initials, the Southern Min dialects show considerable
differences in their finals. It is clearly advisable to identify the finals of the
dialect represented by the Doctrina before offering any comparisons. Our
first task will be to reconstruct the nasalized finals and those ending with a
glottal stop, which are discriminated in the "Arte" and of which examples are
given both there and on the specimen page of the manual reproduced above:
such 誠, t'ch 宅, p'ah 打, oah 活, loh 落, chioh 石.
t'i 天, së 生, sà 三, p'òë 剃, kià 子, chìà 上.
Elsewhere in the manual there are examples of other glottalized and
nasalized finals, which, originally marked as belonging to the third or ninth
modes, can be transcribed as follows:

mih (231b, meaning "thing",物), chiaoh (234b, meaning "to eat",食).
c'ui (235a, meaning "to exhort",勤), p'ai (227b, meaning "bad",歹).

In order to decide whether the final of an individual syllable is
nasalized we must have recourse to the modern dialects. The nasalized finals
listed above all occur regularly in one or more dialects and none is bound to
a particular class of initials. One class of initials is however excluded,
since [b, l, g] are never found before nasalized vowels. On the other hand,
initial [m, n, n], at least in Amoy and Chang-chou, do not occur in syllables
ending in a consonant (except the glottal stop) but only before vowels
which can be nasalized.\textsuperscript{73} It is from this feature that modern scholars
have concluded that [b] and [m], [l] and [n], [g] and [ŋ] are in complementary
distribution, in other words, constitute single phonemes.\textsuperscript{74} If we adopt this
principle without qualification, the presence of initial [m, n, n] should be
taken as evidence that the following vowel is nasalized. In some cases,
however, this would result in the identification of nasalized finals occurring
only after [m, n, n] (and [h], which is a problem I shall not enter into here).
We cannot consider them nasalized on the sole evidence of the initials,
because it is precisely the supposed exclusive association with nasalized

\textsuperscript{73} Cf. the cautious attitude of Yuan Chia-hua, Han-yü fang-yen kai-yao, pp. 244-245. Fred C. C. Peng, "Amoy phonology: Phonomization of the three nasal con-
sonants [m n n]", Archivo Orientali 34, 1966, 411-416, offers a more radical
solution, denying that the nasality in the vowels following nasal consonants is phonemically
significant at all. He does not, however, specify the Hokkien dialect that he discusses,
nor does he provide any concrete examples.

\textsuperscript{74} The specimen page from the manual gives also no indication that the finals of
may 嘉 and mia 謝 are nasalized, but does so for niu 燕. Actually, in the manual this
is the only word beginning with -n, -ń or ng- which is distinguished by a nasaliza-
tion sign, although the "Bocabulario" describes moa, "cosa llana" (146a), that is "full",
and strongly nasalized. The Doctrina has giu 娣, where there is little doubt that the initial
should be nasalized to ng-; cf. ca ngiū quoted on p. 115 above with hia giu, "horse-
ma" ("Bocabulario" 144a), that is 駒 "ant". A good example of interchangeability
between -n and -ń is niou-li-juan, "nunja" (145b), that is 女 "nun", but there is no
comment on the nasality of the vowel in ni. Cf. also to-ńo, "viejo en edad" (139a), that
is 老 "old".

\textsuperscript{75} The rule is not so strict in Ch'üan-chou (see Tung T'ung-ho, "Ssu-ko Min-nan
fang-yen", pp. 792-793) and does not apply at all to Chaochow.

\textsuperscript{76} Nicholas Cleveland Bodman, Spoken Amoy Hokken, Kuala Lumpur 1955-1958.
nasalized vowel, as in  生 (233a, meaning "ill" 病); in Chang-chou this is always an open vowel.

Much easier to recognize than the preceding is the diphthong written -ei (or -ey). Although such a final is apparently not found in the modern Hokkien dialects, all parts of the manuscript carefully distinguish it from -e, the "Bocabulario" explicitly so (21b, 111b, 178b). The sound value of -ei is difficult to determine; in Spanish it represents [sí]. Another problem is the diphthong written -ou, not occurring in modern Hokkien but common in Chaochow, where it begins with a close variety of [o].

The remaining finals present fewer difficulties, but some features call for comment. First there is the alternation between -e and -r, the former mainly used after  i, ia, ie, and the latter prevailing after  u, ua, a. I have already observed that -r, in Castilian pronounced as a single flap [l], can be regarded as a convincing representation of the alveolar implosive. One may, however, wonder whether this unreleased final consonant was voiced, especially since r is interchanged with l and d to denote the voiced alveolar initial. As regards the other final implosives, -b in contrast to -p is rare, but -g often serves for the velar, especially after e, whereas -c is more frequent elsewhere. It is unlikely that any of these distinctions are phonemically significant. The same applies to the alternative forms  uel,  uel,  uel, and  ien.

A phonemic solution is also desirable for the two finals which the Doctrina writes as -eng and -ec (or -eg). The "Bocabulario" gives the following alternative transcriptions:

*biec/bec, *trigo, *tinta* (27a): that is 糧 "wheat", 漆 "ink".
*biec/bec, *carne* (104a, 16b): that is 肉 "meat".
*leg/lig, *pasar tiempos y edades* (133a): that is 過 "to pass through".

Moreover, bec, "tinta", is said to be pronounced "with closed teeth and, semi-diphthongized with an i" (38a), whereas the i in hien, "hombre bueno" (that is 同 "good conduct"), is described as "more or less absorbed so that it is hardly heard" (104b). It is clear that the pronunciation of these finals was very close to their values in modern Amoy and Chang-chou, which are [iŋ], [i⁵]. Structurally the vowel may be identified with that of the finals  -ip, -in, especially in view of the few variant spellings of the latter occurring in the "Bocabulario":

*chep*, "servir administrando alguna cosa" (73a): that is 與 "to manage".
*chenchín*, "verdadera" (73b, 85a): that is 真 "real".

Examples of each of the finals, all taken from the Doctrina:

- i in pi 漢, ti 值, chi 志, ki 忌.
- ih in mi 也, mi 物.
- i in pi 遙, ti 天, ki 見.
- ui in tui 鈦, chui 金, cu 水, cui 鬼, ui 爲.
- e in te 赖, te 處, che 坐, ge 圖.
- eh in pe 八, te 提, che 節.
- ue in bue 尾, chue 椅, que 過, hue 戰.
- ueh in bue 卜, sue 弱, gue 月, hue 血.
- e in pe 父, che 異, ke 家, he 家.
- eh in pe 百, che 册, he 喝.
- e in pe 平, pe 病, se 性.
- ei in hei 衛, tey 帝, chey 威, kei 解.
- a in cha 旱, ca 敢, ca-ti 獨自, a 啞.
- ah in pa 打, ba 肉, la 蠔, ca 可.
- a in ta 使, ta 今, sa 三, ca 數.
- ai in bai 壞, tay 財, chay, hay 貝.
- ai in chay 個.
- au in tau 傳, cau 九, gau 賢, au 後.
- ua in tua 大, gua 我, hua 化, oa 頭.
- uah in bua 株, ua 活.
- uá in pia 打, toa 且, hua 銅, uá 聞.
- ia in tia 聲, sia 鳴, kia 立.
- iah in chia 食, chia 章.
- iá in tía 聲, chia 正, sia 鳴, ká 行.
- iau in biau 穀, tiau 株, liau 了, yao 稻.
- o in bo 無, to 透, cho 左, co 高.
- oh in bo 落, lo 落, cho 作, 數, hou 后.
- ou in pou 拼, tou 糞, sou 素, hou 侯.
- io in bio 廚, kio 叫.

---

88 This diphthong also occurs in Cobo's translation of the Ming-hsin pao-chien, e.g. chei 漢, sei 西, key 病 (-i, -e and -y are, of course, merely spelling variants).

89 Navarro, Manual de pronunciación española, p. 65.


91 The same final consonant is sometimes rendered by -r, as in cart (see the examples from the "Arte" quoted above) and art ("Bocabulario" 10a: "doblegar", which must be ar 辛, "to bend"). As these two syllables are transcribed in such a distinctly Castilian form, it is worth mentioning that Tomás Mayor was a native of Játiva in the ancient Kingdom of Valencia.

92 Chiu Bien-ming, "The phonetic structure", p. 257, distinguishes between final [p, t, k] and devoiced (b, d, g), which he relates to the historical upper and lower entering tones respectively. It is not clear whether the distinction is preserved on etymological grounds or based on phonetic observation. Søren Egerod, The Chug dialect, Copenhagen 1926, states that the final stops in Swatow tend to be voiced (p. 16) and that in Lung-tu, a Hoklo dialect spoken in Chung-shan, Kwangtung, there are both voiced and unvoiced final stops, which are however in complementary distribution (p. 535). Tung T'ung-ho, "Hsi-men fang-yen t i yin-yün", p. 239, shows that final [l, r] can be the result of sandhi. Incidentally, Spaniards too pronounce final [k] in words of foreign origin as an implosive (Navarro, Manual, p. 138).

---

88 "a diente cerrado medio adiorgado con la i".

89 "sordidiula que caia no se persicide".
discrepancies. In addition to scribal errors, we have to reckon with the likelihood of assimilation, as in the following cases:

giam bong 仰拜 (30a) from giang bong.

sen bo 聖母 (2b, 27a) from seng bo.

sim bay [身埋 (4a) from sin bay.

kiem Pilatos 見使徒 (19b) from kian Pilatos.

tey yoc 地狱 (4b, 72a, 30a) from tey yoci.

can nan 艾難 (2b, 4a) from can lan.

The last case is yet another example of the difference between the short version and the two manuals on the one hand and the long version and the "Bocabulario" on the other. Also to be noted are some instances of synalepha and consonantal gemination:

cu it 氣德 (2b) from cui it.

sei iong 所用 (1a) from sei iong.

che chua 氣霎 (6a) from che chua.

che chui 氣威 (6a) from che chui.

The following tabular survey of finals is based on the material in the Doctrina and the "Bocabulario":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>m</th>
<th>ng</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>im</td>
<td>in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ih</td>
<td>it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ui</td>
<td>ui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ueh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ua</td>
<td>uai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ia</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>ou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i0</td>
<td>i0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ioh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i0k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form of this table is similar to Bodman, Spoken Amoy Hokkien 1, 168, but note that his -ou corresponds to my -o.

Syllabic -m is represented by m não (in the short version often written um). Syllabic -ng, although defined in the "Arte" and represented in the shorter manual of confession as quoted above, does not seem to occur in the Doctrina at all; the following examples are taken from the "Bocabulario":

c'ung, "yuncubre una cosa" (67b): that is 藏 "to conceal".

síng, "helo" (158a): that is 霜 "frost".

tung, "açucar" (221a): that is 糖 "sugar".

Also not in the Doctrina but in the "Bocabulario" is the final -uai, represented by:

quac, "el diablo, una cosa mostruosa" (169b): that is 怪 "strange".

way, "cossa tuerta como caminho" (222b): that is 歪 "crooked".

Although we have thus accounted for all the finals in the two romanized versions of the Doctrina, there remain a comparatively small number of
Which part of southern Fukien was the home of this dialect? No linguistic survey of the area is available, but the more important differences between the main dialects are well known. Historically there appear to be connected by the limits of the administrative control exercised by the ancient prefectures of Ch'üan-chou and Chang-chou (see sketchmap on p. 133 below). The two capitals were also cultural centres, and their dialects, particularly that of Ch'üan-chou, enjoyed a prestige which only declined after the emergence of Amoy as a modern seaport. Though originally part of Ch'üan-chou, Amoy lies in the transition zone and its dialect is in several respects intermediate between the other two.

The following table compares a number of words from the Doctrina with their corresponding forms in the three modern Hokkien dialects and the dialect of Cha'o-an, the old prefectural city of Chaochow. The examples for most of the finals could be increased, particularly if the material in the "Bocabulario" were included; it should, however, be noted that to one final there is sometimes more than one correspondence, because the distinctions in one dialect are fewer than in another. I am not concerned with the question whether the Doctrina uses the "correct" character for a given Hokkien word, nor do I include alternative pronunciations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ch'üan-chou</th>
<th>Amoy</th>
<th>Doctrina</th>
<th>Chang-chou</th>
<th>Cha'o-an</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 處</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>蒙不</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>t'ė</td>
<td>t'o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>坐</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>tea</td>
<td>tso</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>褒</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>ge</td>
<td>kui</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 八</td>
<td>pueh</td>
<td>pueh</td>
<td>phe</td>
<td>poih</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>規節</td>
<td>t'weh</td>
<td>t'weh</td>
<td>t'ē</td>
<td>t'ē</td>
<td>poih</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>會</td>
<td>tsw'eh</td>
<td>tsw'eh</td>
<td>tsw'h</td>
<td>t'ē</td>
<td>t'ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 地</td>
<td>tsw'h</td>
<td>tsw'h</td>
<td>tsw'h</td>
<td>tsoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>細</td>
<td>sue</td>
<td>sue</td>
<td>sei</td>
<td>soi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>結</td>
<td>kue</td>
<td>kue</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td>koi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>會</td>
<td>mwe</td>
<td>mwe</td>
<td>mwe</td>
<td>mwe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 佩</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>無熙</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>畏</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>會</td>
<td>ts'e</td>
<td>che</td>
<td>ts'ē</td>
<td>ts'ē</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| E 白 | peh         | peh | peh       | peh         | peh       |
| 册 | ts'ēh       | ts'ēh| che       | ts'ēh       | ts'ēh     |
| F 平 | pi          | pi  | pe        | pë          | pë        |
| 病 | pi          | pi  | pe        | pë          | pë        |
| 夜 | mi          | mi  | me        | me          | me        |
| 生 | si          | si  | se        | së          | së        |
| G 尹 | ba          | bc  | hue       | hue         | hue       |
| 勝 | ts'a        | ts'c | chue     | ts'ue       | ts'ue     |
| 過 | kə          | ke  | que       | kue         | kue       |
| 望 | ha          | he  | hue       | hue         | hue       |
| H 說 | sah         | seh | sue       | sueh        | sueh      |
| 月 | gah         | geh | gue       | gueh        | gueh      |
| J 度 | to          | to  | tou       | tou         | tou       |
| 路 | lo          | lo  | lou       | lou         | lou       |
| 祖 | tso         | tso | chou      | tso         | tso       |
| 進 | k'o         | k'o | cou       | k'o         | k'o       |
| K 量 | liang       | liang| liang    | liang       | liang     |
| 將 | tsiang      | tsiang| chiang  | tsiang      | tsiang    |
| 仰 | giang       | giang| giang    | giang       | giang     |
| 拥 | l'ang       | l'ang| yang     | l'ang       | l'ang     |
| L 娘 | nio         | nio | nio       | nie         | tsié      |
| 上 | ts'ê        | ts'i | chio     | ts'ê         | ts'ê      |
| 俊 | ts'ê        | ts'i | chio     | ts'ê         | ts'ê      |
| 素 | siü         | siü | sio      | sio         | sio       |
| M 枝 | kün         | kün | kin       | kin         | kin       |
| 銀 | gung        | gung| gin       | gin         | gin       |
| 思 | un          | un  | in        | in          | in        |
| N 饞 | peng        | peng| pui      | pui         | pui       |
| 銅 | sng         | sng | sui      | sui         | sui       |
| 光 | kng         | kng | kui      | kui         | kui       |
| 圈 | hng         | hng | hui      | hui         | hui       |
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Southern Min dialects, although it is closest to Chang-chou -e; the latter corresponds to Hokkien -e and only agrees with Chaoshow -ou. Comparisons, both within Southern Min and with other Chinese dialects, make it plausible that these diphthongs originally formed part of the Chang-chou dialect, but at this stage of the discussion it is perhaps more appropriate to examine the system of finals as established by local scholars.

Traditional Chinese scholarship has rarely, if ever, considered it worth while to undertake the systematic study of a dialect other than Mandarin. Various reasons can be adduced for this attitude; the contempt of the centralized administration for aberrant idioms is one; the belief that linguistic change meant degeneration another. However, for at least some dialects there are dictionaries, not written with any scholarly ambition but for the practical purpose of helping the common people to write correctly.

These works are arranged by finals, initials and tones, and the very brief explanations are merely intended to identify the characters. Hence they are not dictionaries in the proper sense, but handbooks for correct spelling. Adapted or invented characters as used in vernacular literature are not well represented; moreover, the number of colloquial words included is generally insufficient. The value of such handbooks depends on the classification of sounds which they establish, because unless this conforms to actual usage consultation will be difficult. Consequently they are useless to speakers of another, even if related, dialect, in which the distribution of sounds will probably be different. Furthermore the usefulness of these works decreases as structural changes take place in the dialects on which they are based.

Some of the practical limitations mentioned should be a boon to the modern linguist. Although the pronunciation of the characters is only indirectly given and the phonetic values may have to be inferred from other sources, a dictionary of this type is perhaps a more reliable guide to the sound classes of a particular dialect than many learned (and therefore archaising) rhyme dictionaries are for Mandarin or earlier stages of the Chinese language. Written for the common people of a specific region and remaining popular for a comparatively short period, they can be very helpful to us, provided we know when and where they were compiled.

Among the southern dialects Foochow appears to be the first for which a dictionary of this kind was provided. The earliest work is the Pa-yin tsu-i pien-lan 八音字義便覧, which is arranged in 36 finals, 15 initials and 8 tones and is attributed to Chi Chi-kuang 仇藹光 (1528–1587). The authorship is however doubtful. A second work, arranged in 35 finals and attributed to Lin Wen-ying 林文英 (chi-shih in 1688), is entitled Chu-yü t'ung-sheng 珠玉同聲. A combined edition of the two dictionaries was published in
There are several other works of the same type, but the most important and the one that concerns us directly is the *Hui-chi ya-su t'ung shih-tou yin 彙集雅俗通十五音*, which is arranged in 50 finals, 8 (in reality 7) tones and 15 initials. The different readings of a character are carefully distinguished by printing it in red where it represents the so-called “literary” pronunciation, and in black for the more colloquial form. It contains no preface, and the titlepage merely refers to the author as Hsieh Hsin-lan 許秀嵒 of the Eastern Park (Tung-yüan 東苑); unfortunately, neither the courtesy name Hsin-lan nor the location has been identified. The oldest edition that I have seen was printed in 1818 by the Wen-lin t'ang 文林堂, but it is unlikely that this was the first edition, since we are told elsewhere that by 1820 it had already achieved a wide circulation. There is no evidence that it was influenced by the *Hui-yin miao-wu*; on the other hand, it has adopted many of the names of the finals in the *Chu-yü t'ung-sheng* from Foochow. Provisionally I shall treat it as a compilation of about 1800. The dialect represented is that of Chang-chou.

---

87 Copies of the edition of 1841 are available in the British Museum and the former Chinese collection of the Royal Asiatic Society, now in the Brotherton Library of the University of Leeds. It was published by the Fu-mei t'ang 鳳梅堂, but the blocks have not been kept at the L-chih t'ang 彌彰堂, since that name is on the fold. The preface of 1749 is by Ch'ü An 鄭安, and the two works, each consisting of 4 ch'üan, occupy the upper and lower register respectively. For a linguistic analysis see Hui Yu 許嵒 in *Nan-yang hsiieh-pao*, 6, 2, 1930, 25-36.

88 I have two editions, kindly presented to me by Professor Wu Shou-li of the National Taiwan University. One, in a ch'üan, was published in 1903 by the Ch'ien-t'ang 彌新堂 in Foochow; the other, not divided into ch'üan, is a lithographic reprint published in 1905 by the Hui-wen t'ang 彥文堂 in Amoy.

89 See the preface, dated 1820, to the Ts'eng-pu hui-yin 春浦彙音, a dictionary in 6 ch'üan and 39 finals which is based on Hsieh Hsin-lan’s work and of which I have seen two early editions, that of the Ch‘ung-yang t‘ung 彰陽堂 (apparently the original edition) in the British Museum, and that of the Wen-lin t'ang 文林堂, dated 1829, in the Bodleian at Oxford. The 1818 edition of Hsieh’s own dictionary is also in the British Museum; I am using the edition of Yen Chin-hua 車禎華 printed in 1869, which belongs to the Sinologisch Institut in Leiden.

90 Douglas, Chinese-English dictionary of the vernacular of Amoy, Preface p. viii, says that the *Shih-tou yin* was based on the dialect of Chang-p’u rather than that of Chang-chou city itself, but there is no evidence for this. The book has been knowingly misapplied to the Amoy dialect by Lo Ch‘ang-p’ei in his *Hiu-men yin-hsi*.  

### The Manila Incurabula and Early Hokkien Studies

We have already discussed the view of several modern scholars that the initial consonants *b* and *m* and *n* and *g* and *ng* in the dialects of Amoy and Chang-chou are in complementary distribution, because *b, l, g*, never occur before nasaled finals, whereas *n, m, ng* are usually followed by nasaled finals. There is nothing new about this theory, for the system of 15 initials in the Hokkien dictionaries is based on the principle that *m, n* are variants of *b, l, g*. Consequently, the author of the *Shih-tou yin* placed all syllables beginning with *m-, n-, ng-* under nasaled finals, even if he had to set up finals that did not occur after any other initial, except sometimes *h-.* 

When drawing up the table of finals in the dialect of the Doctrina I felt that such a procedure was not fully justified, which accounts for the formal differences between my table and the list of finals of the *Shih-tou yin*. Among the finals that cannot be identified in the Doctrina and the “Bocabulario”, several end with a glottal stop, others are predominantly onomatopoeic, but all are represented by very small numbers of words. In general, therefore, the finals of the *Shih-tou yin* are comparable to those of the Doctrina; what is more, the distribution of words among the finals is, with one important exception, the same.

Let us now reconsider the differences between the dialect of the Doctrina and modern Chang-chou. First of all we note that the *Shih-tou yin* has two finals corresponding to modern Chang-chou -e. Of these finals, which I have numbered 13 and 39, only the latter comprises words ending with a glottal stop. All words which the Doctrina writes as -ei, such as those compared in group C of my table, are found under final 13; all words, except the first, that are listed as groups A (-e) and B (-eb) are found under final 39. The distinction observed by the Spanish missionaries, but apparently no longer valid today, had not yet disappeared by the beginning of the nineteenth century.

But was this a significant distinction? Doubts arise because many of the characters under final 39, including two listed in our group A (胎, 耳), are included under final 13 as well. A good example of the interchange is the word for “dwarf” 矮, which is given under both finals of the *Shih-tou yin* and occurs in the “Bocabulario” as *e*, “enano, nino pequeño” (95b), but also as *sy*, “enano” (96a). On the other hand, the practical purpose of the *Shih-tou yin* makes it unlikely that the two sounds were so similar as to be indistinguishable by the ordinary user. The spelling of the missionaries takes the difference between -e and -ei for granted; the vowels that without the diacritical marks prescribed by the “Arte” were liable to be confused were -e
and -e, in the Shih-wu yin represented by finals 39 and 45. In the dictionary of the Chang-chou dialect published in 1832 by Medhurst, whose main source was the Shih-wu yin, it is also finals 5 and 39 that are said to resemble each other very closely, whereas final 13 was a “peculiar sound”. Field work will perhaps yield a satisfactory answer to the problem, but for the time being we can best account for the evidence at our disposal by assuming that the final -ei represented [ei]. Under certain conditions the diphthongal glide was reduced to [e]; the words ending with a glottal stop always had the latter vowel.

As shown in group J of our table, -ou differs from modern Chang-chou -o, but is comparable to the Chaochow diphthong. Here the Shih-wu yin does not help us. Final 11 includes the words which in the Doctrina occur as -ou, and there is no interchange with final 15, which corresponds to -o and -oh. Further evidence is needed to confirm that final 11 was originally pronounced [ou]. However, the fact that it was not distinguished from -o by a diacritical mark but written as a diphthong, even by the earliest missionaries, strongly suggests that the difference between the two was not principally one of degree of opening. It is unlikely that the first vowel of the diphthong was the same as -o, but on structural grounds I prefer not to differentiate them. For the same reason I do not use 3 for finals 7, 14, 35 and 47. The preceding list therefore gives the finals of the Shih-wu yin partly as interpreted in the light of our manuscript. Finals not occurring in the Doctrina or the “Bocabulario” are followed by an asterisk.

The Shih-wu yin offers one important clue to the identity of the dialect represented by the Doctrina. When comparing the finals of the latter with modern Chang-chou, we discussed a major difference in the distribution of words among finals -u and -i. In this respect the Shih-wu yin agrees with modern Chang-chou; the examples given are all included under -i. However, the following words occur under -u as well: ti’tu 狐, “chopsticks”; li’lù 勢, “you”; kí’kú 去, “to go”; gí’gí 魚, “speech”; gí’gí 魚, “to meet”. The alternative pronunciation is in each case explained as that of the “seacoast dialect” or, as I think we should interpret it, “Hai-ch’eng dialect” (hat’chiang 福州).  

As we noted above, the pronunciation -u prevailed in southern T’ung-an, which belonged to Ch’üan-chou prefecture. It now appears that at the beginning of the nineteenth century it still extended to one part of Chang-chou itself. The “Bocabulario” will serve to confirm that the dialectal incidence of -u and -i in Chang-chou prefecture is an important reason for assigning the dialect learned by the missionaries to Hai-ch’eng.

The manuscript gives dialect variants of over sixty words and, in addition, records some differences in vocabulary. More than half of the variants come from specific dialects; several are introduced as “others say” or “in other provinces” (meaning “districts”, hsien 縣); some occur as plain alternatives.

There is, of course, the chance that the inclusion of extraneous material has affected the uniformity of the dictionary. Thus under the two entries cou, “borrador”, cou, “espiga”, the compiler mentions the view that the two words were not homonymous with (or related to) cou, “antiguo”, and that the pronunciation cou was preferable (59b-60a). Actually, in the Chang-chou

---

24 Another reference to this dialect merely serves as a “keyword” to final 33. In all but five cases the finals are represented by words with the upper even tone and beginning with k-. When such a word was not available in the dialect of the prefectoral city, the final was named after a word from a local dialect. This has also happened with finals 40 and 49, the names of which were adopted from the dialect of Ch’ang-tai: hat (corresponding to Chang-chou hat) and kái (Chang-chou kái). The former word is also said to follow the “Amoy pronunciation”. Amoy was originally part of T’ung-an, where -ut normally takes the place of Ch’üan-chou -ut. It is interesting that the same pronunciation seems to have prevailed in neighbouring Ch’üang-t’ai, even though it belonged to Chang-chou. The Shih-wu yin contains no other information about local dialects.

---

dialect ko 稷, "stalk of grain, draft," is not a homonym of kou > kő 古, "old," but in Ch'üan-ch'ou the former word has both pronunciations. Despite the protestations in the preface to the "Arte," the missionaries were perhaps not primarily concerned with the dialect of their informants, but recorded useful knowledge wherever they found it. Therefore we cannot be certain that all entries without a variant derive from the same dialect. We shall, however, use the dictionary to show that many differences between the modern dialects can be traced back to the Ming period, thus confirming the identity of the language of the Doctrina.

The dialect most frequently mentioned is that of the "Anhayes" or "those from Anhuy," which occurs 34 times, including one mention in the "Arte." The port of An-hai is less than thirty kilometres from Ch'üan-chou and has the same dialect. Its prosperous merchants were regarded as more respectable than the other Sangleys, because the foreign trade of the colony depended on their annual visits to Manila. During the uprising of 1603, the five or six hundred Anhai merchants in the Parián chose the Spanish side, but were nevertheless nearly all killed. Encouraged by the Governor, the fleets soon resumed their visits, and the merchants from An-hai continued to hold a major share in the trade between China and the Philippines.

The dialect of "those from Chang-chou" (the name occurs in several different forms) is quoted ten times in the "Bocabulario"; the "Arte" mentions it once, in addition to the preface. It usually agrees with the material of the Doctrina and is in three cases specifically contrasted with the dialect of An-hai (that is Ch'üan-chou). In a few instances, however, Chang-chou usage is given as a variant, not agreeing with the entry.

A third dialect, only mentioned once, was spoken in the "province of Tanghua," that is T'ung-an (tang-wā). Its modern form, although closely resembling Chüan-chou, has certain peculiarities, one of which (-us instead of -us) has been discussed above.

In the following examples the first form represents the Chang-chou dialect, in three cases explicitly; the second is the An-hai variant. A colon precedes my own restitutions, including the character.

beibe, "yingnant" (214)89
beijebei, "no poder" (19b)
beikwey, "desatar" (125a)
pelpue, "ocho" (154b, 158)

89 Once misspelt as "Cônghay" (13b), another time as "Vahayes" (18b).
91 Cf. Governor de Silva to the King, Manila, 1 August 1621, trans. Blair and Robertson, op. cit. 20, 109.
92 "Los de Anhay dizen be, no mas". Cf. "rei, 'pequeño' ... otros dizen re" (178b), that is "small".
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chejchue, "fiesta" (34a)
ombe, "pulso" (33a)
séisi, "parir" (176a)
huei/hui, "sangre" (112b)
bou/beu, "traição" (31b)
ch'ou/ch'e, "triste" (37b)
hou/beu, "virtuoso" (109a, 212a)
bio/beu, "templo" (30a)
ch'io/cheo, "pedir" (86b)
ch'io/cheo, "prestar" (29a)
pepo, "medicine" (121a)
tengtan, "clavo" (18b)
an'han, "termino" (101a)
m inj, "cavalo" (19a)
tuyo/nung, "quitarse vestido" (28b)
c'in/cieng, "poner en paz" (68a, 120a)
essential to the present discussion. Under the entry lu, "pronoun of the second person singular", the comment is made that "those from Chang-chou change this u into i and say li" (141a). Two other examples of the variation u/i are mentioned without place name:

chui-ji, "cozer" (90a) : 煮 tsutsi, "to boil".

gu togi tio, "encontrar" (98a) : 遇果 gu-tioh/gi-tioh, "to meet".

According to the Shih-wu yin, lu and gu were thus pronounced in the "seacoast" or "Hai-ch'eng" dialect, whereas the normal pronunciation was li and gi. Most likely, therefore, the name "Chang-chou" denotes here the prefectural city, in contrast to a subordinate district.

The pronunciation -u in lu and the other words compared in our tables did not extend to the city of Chang-chou, even in the Ming period. But it is still possible that it occupied a wider area than at the time of the compilation of the Shih-wu yin, when it was specified as Hai-ch'eng usage. In particular, it may have prevailed in the adjacent district of Ch'ang-t'ai. There is, however, some evidence that the Ch'ang-t'ai dialect was distinguished by at least one important feature from the dialect spoken by the majority of the Chinese in Manila. As a variant of k'ng 貴, "to store up, to conceal", the "Bocabulario" gives the form ko, which it describes as aspirated and nasalized, hence k'o; it adds however that this form was not common but belonged to another district. The same -o can be identified in two other entries: to, "enpeñar"; t'o so, "asucar piedra" (213b), which correspond to Chang-chou tng 當, "to pawn", and t'ng sng 糧箱, "candy" (cf. 198a, 221a). Since the final -o was a peculiarity of Ch'ang-t'ai, k'o, t'o, t'o and so should probably be ascribed to that dialect.

I conclude that the Hokkien dialect which was studied by the earliest Spanish missionaries and of which I have endeavoured to reconstruct the phonological system represents the vernacular of Hai-ch'eng at the beginning of the seventeenth century.

A few remarks must be made on the relation between language and script in the Doctrina, because the lack of uniformity in the printed text has been one of our main criteria for dating and authorship. We have seen that the adapted or invented characters used in written Hokkien colloquial

Continued from previous page:
as ke, which I cannot explain, unless it results from a confusion with ke 賢, "excellent". The other case is discussed in the "Arte" and concerns the two "reciprocal particles" sa and so fil; the latter is said to belong to the Chang-chou dialect and is rejected (388b). In the rest of the manuscript both forms are used; the "Bocabulario" prefers sa in some expressions (382a). According to the specimen page reproduced above (p. 111) the vowel in sa was not nasalized.

106 "I've, cargado y en la mar, no alto, 'guardar'. Este es de una provincia; en lo común dizen cung en el mismo tono" (355b). The word occurs on 67b as cung, "yncuñar, esconder" (316a).

107 See p. 129, note 94 above.

and common in the first part of the Doctrina rarely occur in the mysteries of the Rosary (12b–27b), where they are normally replaced by the "standard" characters of Mandarin. Is this merely an orthographic peculiarity or does the romanized version show the same aversion to colloquial usage?

Let us first see how the romanized version reflects the inconsistencies in the use of "standard" characters. The following table gives the number of occurrences of each transcribed form (here standardized to facilitate comparison):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>He</th>
<th>他 (28),  t (1)</th>
<th>伊 i (1)</th>
<th>&quot;he, they&quot;.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This</td>
<td>t'su (3), tsi (15)</td>
<td>只 tsi (1)</td>
<td>&quot;this&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>與 u (4), t'ou (14)</td>
<td>度 t'ou (1)</td>
<td>&quot;(give) to&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>與 u (3), kang (9)</td>
<td>共 kang (2)</td>
<td>&quot;with, for, from&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two trends can be discerned. On the one hand, two different characters may represent the same word, e.g. 此 and 只 tsi. Such irregularities can hardly be attributed to the printer, since they do not occur in the first part of the Doctrina. On the other hand, one character may represent two different transcribed forms, the second of which is colloquial, e.g. 此 t'su, tsi;
A character can thus function as either a phonetic or a semantic loan. Even more frequently, however, it represents two (or more) words of the same derivation but disagreeing in sound, usage and sometimes also in connotation. The origin of these doubllets is still a matter of speculation, but it is possible that they were introduced at different periods or social levels when Fukien was settled from the north. The phenomenon is not unknown in other Chinese dialects nor indeed in European languages (cf. English purpose, propose; sire, senior; fashion, faction), but in Hokkien the number of etymological pairs is so large that some regular phonetic correspondences can be formulated.\footnote{112} It would, however, be absurd to suggest that Hokkien possesses two phonological systems. As the two forms were written with the same character, one became known as the "colloquial", the other as the "reading" or "literary" pronunciation. These terms are appropriate to the extent that the "reading" pronunciation was used for literature in Classical Chinese; in other respects they are very misleading. On the one hand, many forms classified as "literary" are part of the spoken language, where they are fully productive even if "colloquial" counterparts are available. Moreover, two contrasting forms are rarely interchangeable but are subject to semantic and morphological differentiation, hence representing distinct words or parts of words. On the other hand, it is probable that the pronunciation applied to Classical Chinese was in many cases reconstructed from dictionaries and extended by analogy over the whole vocabulary. Such a bookish pronunciation, maintained in the schools through the medium of the characters, obviously was of no use to the reader of vernacular texts.

Since the etymological doubllets in the Doctrina are all attested in modern Chang-chou, it is unnecessary to list here more than a few examples. The three forms that only occur in the Rosary should perhaps have been excluded, not on phonological grounds but because its style is not representative of colloquial usage. However, the problems of semantic dissimilation and word formation fall outside the scope of the present study.

\footnote{112}{The most reliable tables of correspondences for Amoy are those by Ch'en Ch'u-min "Précis", which are included in Yuan Chia-hua, Han-yâ fang-yen hai-yao, pp. 254-259. For Chang-chou some rules were formulated by Medhurst, *A dictionary of the Hok-kân dialect*, pp. lvii-lxii.}
We have seen that the "Bocabulario" contains a number of dialect variants. One group not yet discussed comprises words alternating between final -iang, corresponding to the Chang-chou dialect, and -iòng, which resembles modern Ch'üan-chou and Amoy. None of these forms is assigned to any particular dialect, but some are specified as "mandarin":

liàng\liòng (M), "cosa buena" : 良 liàng\liòng, "good".
(yang yoe(M)/yang yoc, "sustentar" : 善宜 yang yoe\iòng, iök "to nourish".
(chiu iòng(M)/ching iòng, "tener la vista levantada" : 寬 chiu iòng\iòng, "to look upwards".
(chiu iòng, "a menudo" (186a) : 每 chiu iòng, "continuously".
(chiu iòng(M), "consertar" : 相相 chiu ts'uí\iòng ts'u, "to compose differences".
(tiong(M), "herir" (100b) : 伤 tio\iòng, "to wound".

Since the forms with the final -iang as well as those with -iòng belong to the so-called "literary" tradition, they should have been differentiated according to dialect instead. The Doctrina and most of the "Bocabulario" agree in this respect with Chang-chou; for instance, there must have been supplied by informants from Ch'üan-chou or, more specifically, An-hai.

Doubtless no longer occurring in the modern Hokkien dialects with special attention. Admittedly the present dictionary is a very poor copy; and it seems advisable to defer consideration of some of the variants included till a more reliable version is brought to light. The following cases are however plausible in terms of comparative phonology:

tijet, "el rey" (201b) : 密 tiyet, "emperor".

shu huo, "cosa muy menuda" (105b) : 小 shu\ho, "minute part".

shu suan\iòng, "cosa quadrada" (206b) : 四方 shu suan\iòng, "square".

shu huan\iòng, "apartamento" (153a) : 睡房 shu huan, "room".

shu huan, "apartamento" (153a) : 睡房 shu huan, "bedroom".

---
117 Cf. group K in the table on p. 123 above.
118 A notable exception is yang in ym yong (120b), which from the long description is easily identified as 長陽 in tong.
119 An objection might be raised on account of the double nö, which in modern Ch'üan-chou would be nö or ng (cf. group L on p. 123 above). However, the existence of final -iò at this early stage is not certain, and the "Bocabulario" does not mention it at all. A literary form that is definitely of Ch'üan-chou provenance is found (106b) in the terms used by the "scholars" (los letrados) for "grandmother", chou beu, gue beu (that is under see p. 131 above). Variants, attributed to the "mandarins", are chu mò, guay chu mò, which no longer exist in modern Hokkien dialects. The colloquial words were la\o\o, go\o (that is 内席, 外席).
Appendix I: Selected Particles

The following list is intended to serve two purposes. The first is to explain the role of some of the adapted characters used in the first part of the Doctrina (as in other Southern Min literature); the second is to facilitate a comparison with the systems of grammatical particles in modern Amoy and Chaochow. Since the Doctrina is short and, moreover, omits several enclitics, the material has been supplemented from the "Arte" (A) and the "Bocabulario" (B). The latter is much the richest source of information, despite the absence of characters and diacritical marks. Examples are taken from all parts of the work (more than eighty percent of which can be easily understood) and not necessarily from the entries where they are explained. I have not added characters to words and phrases unless they occur in the Doctrina, but transcribe all quotations according to the rules followed in the main part of this article.

gua 我, I, my, me
guan 政, we, our, us; my (B.99b)
lan 俺, our (inclusive)
lun, you (plural); your (B.141b)
in, they, their, them; his (B.119a)

lu 你, you, your

i 伊, he, his, him

ka tī/ka hi 獨自, self, alone (B.42a, 91a)
i ge hak sing, his disciples (B.94b)

Dios ge hok 神氏箋、the blessing of God

sou guan ge hok 所屬箋, the blessing which he promised

Días hua ge 神氏化箋, created by God

sāi 三箋, three

bo ge k'ah tua 無箋可大, none is greater than the others

hsi 之, this, these

hsi ge, this (B.97b)

hu 許, that —

hu ge, that (B.97b)

hu si 許時, then

tong kim 常今, now

tā 今, now (B.199a)

an tsī'lan tri sē, like this (B.8b)

tsī te, here (B.78b, 207a)

an tsī te, this way (A.328a, B.7b)

tu tsī te, here (A.328a)

hu te, there (A.328a, B.7b)

tu h'ā te, there (B.138b)

tu te, here, present, alive (B.45a, 167a, 216b)

tsiông lang tong tu te k'ūā hi, everybody is watching the play (B.193b)

The similarities with Chaochow are very striking. Cf. the six articles on particles in Amoy by Huang Ting-hua in Chung-kuo yü-yen 1958, 1, 21-24; 2, 81-84; 4, 189-196; 1959, 12, 571-574; 1961, 12, 23-29; 1963, 4, 296-308; Bodman, Spoken Amoy Hokkien; Li Yung-ming, Ch'ao-chou fang-yen; J. Campbell Gibson, Manual of Swatow vernacular, 2nd ed., Swatow 1923.

120 方, 芳, 防, 防, 防, 防, 防 etc.: Chaochow hung (cf. Foochow xung), Hokkien hung. For a no form with a glottal initial has been preserved in any of the dialects mentioned (Chaochow pang, Hokkien pang). The Hokkien doubles of some of these words, pang or p'ang, are also attested in the "Bocabulario" and the Doctrina.

121 John C. Gibson, A Swatow index to the Syllabic dictionary of Chinese ... and to the Dictionary of the vernacular of Amoy ..., Swatow 1885, Introduction, pp. 6-9. These bookish forms are not mentioned in the survey of the "literary" and "colloquial" readings by Chan Po-hui 香伯惠, "Ch'ao-chou fang-yen."潮州方言. Fang-yen ho p'ii-fung hua ts'ung-kan 2, Peking 1959, pp. 73-82. The "Bocabulario" contains yet another form corresponding to 學, hoc seng, "hijo por enseñanza" (176b), that is hok sing, "student".

122 The form sāi, in the specialized sense "good food", also occurs ("Bocabulario" 191b).
so k'i k'it' i k'o'ah, rub his legs so as to make him comfortable (B.192b)
k'it tsu bou bi', to be seduced by a woman (B.20b)
t'ai, to give, to, for (B.213a, A.335a)
gua kung tu t'ai, I asked you for it (B.137b)
na, that, only; if (B.147b-148a, A.329b)
na u, that has, only; na si' na, that is, only
tsiu tsu, even if (B.88b, 109a)
bong, tolerable, although (B.32b)
bong si' p'au su at tsuk huat, although he is the judge we want to punish him (B.33a)
bueh卜, intend to, will (A.324b)
at, to love, want to (B.4)
ci, can, be able
ci tso tit, can be able, can be done (B.19b)
bei, that, cannot
bei k'u tit, cannot go (A.329b)
t'ang, may, suitable for (B.201b-202a)
m'ang, not, should not
k'o' ling (or lian)可怜, to pity (12a)
k'ah, comparatively
iau k'a'h pau ti dzu, still more beautiful than the sun (B.40a)
ling, it is better that
ling k'o' jue ts'ut si, it would be better if he had never been born (B.134a)
kai tit, ought to get
kai tioh, ought to, must (B.52b)
hap kai 合該, ought to, properly (B.53a)
hap kai tioh, should (B.20b)
tioh 着, right, must, to hit, to succeed (B.210a-211a)
m'ioh, not, wrong
boh 莫, do not! (B.27b)
au boh tit isai huan, do not sin again! (B.124b)
bue 裏, not yet
bat, to know, to be used to doing (B.15ab, 154a)
u, to have, to have done (B.221b)
u siu kan lan 有受艱難, he underwent sufferings
bo, 裏, not to have, not to have done (B.29b)
bu kih, 無極, infinite (12a)
m'ising, not to have done (B.74b)

---

124 B. adds that this word, which had no character, was common in Chang-chou but was rarely used elsewhere.
125 Stated to be derived from tsi.
126 Stated to be derived from hua.
127 Stated to be An-hai usage; hence Ch'üan-chou dialect.
Appendix II

Doctrina christiana en letra y lengua china

In this combined edition, the character text follows the Doctrina published about 1605 by Keng Yong (and photolithographically reprinted in 1951). As a rule abbreviated characters are replaced by their full forms, but characters adapted to Hokkien vernacular are retained. I also keep the original punctuation marks, supplementing them where necessary (especially towards the end).

The two versions of the romanized text have been copied from the manuscript in the British Museum (Add. 25 317). I retain the few scattered tone marks, but replace the aspiration sign (a superscript h) by an inverted comma. Where nasalization is indicated by means of a swung dash this is preserved, but superscript n, which has the same function, is changed. The swung dash over syllabic n is also kept. In Spanish words, syllabic division is not maintained and the first letter is transcribed as a capital; all abbreviations are expanded.

Notes refer to alterations in the original manuscript. They also offer conjectured characters when the romanized text differs significantly from the printed edition. Mistakes in the romanized text are not normally indicated or corrected.
學生文家。木頭倪氏教院。因爲山礁居
guan u uan ke pun tao Diosi kiu guan ya ui Santa Cu-
guan u uan que pun tao Diosi quiu guan in ui Santa Co-
律氏。記號。父子井卑厘廚山廰。力助院。
lusi ki ho pe kia pen Piritu Santo lar chan guan
lutsi qui ho pe qia pen Pilitu Santo lat chan guan
啞民西士。
Amen Jesus
Amen Jesu

俺爹你在天上。你賜乞阮稱美你名。你
lan tia lu tu ti chío lu su kí guan cheng suan lu mia lu
guan tia lu tu ti chío lu su quit guan cheng zoan lu mia lu
國賜來乞阮。你賜乞阮只地上。順守你
cog su lay kí guan lu su kí guan chi tey chío sun su
lu
cog su lay qit guan lu su qit guan chi tey chío zun su
呪。親像在天上。日日所用箇物。今且日
beng chin chío tu ti chío yí yí sei ong ge mi kin toa yí
beng chin chío tu ti chío xì xì sou iog gue mi quin toa xì
你賜乞阮。你亦赦阮罪。親像阮赦得罪
lu su kí guan lu ya sia guan chue chín chío guan sia teg chue
lu su quit guan lu ya sia guan chei¹ chin chío guan sia tec chue
阮人。魔鬼卜迷阮心惶。你莫放乞阮僧行
guan lang mo cuy po bee guan sim chun lu bo pang kí guan cho
guan lang mo cuy bue bey guan sim chun lu bo pang qit gua cho
寧教阮苦難。啞民西士。
leng quiu guan cou lan Amen Jesus
leng quiu guan cou lan Amen Jesus

1 Originally chei cua, but cua crossed out; probably chue intended.
仙礁妈厘啝。僚氏圣母娘娘。你是阮娘
Santa Maria Diosi seng bo nio nio lu sy guan nio
Santa Maria Diosi seng bo nio nio lu sy guan nio

奶。慈悲可怜阮。阮惜你甚甜。阮仰望你。
ley chu pi co leng guan guan sio lu sim ti guan giang bong lu
ley chu pi co leng guan guan sio lu sim ti guan giang bong lu

看佑你。圣母娘娘。阮是姨妈子孙。阮是
qua cou lu sen bo nio nio guan si Eba kia sun guan si
cua cou lu seng bo nio nio guan si Eve quia sun guan si

處。开声叫你。阮只世上艱难所在。
pieng hue lang cui sia kio lu guan chi si chio can lan sou chay
pien hue lang cui sia quio lu guan chi tey chio can nan sou chu

吐气切气忆着你。你是阮恩人。慈悲目
tou cui che czy it tio lu si guan yin lang chu pi bac
tou cui che czy it tio lu si guan yin lang chu pi bac

嘱看佑阮。阮处罪满了。赐乞阮儿你子
chui qua cou guan guan pien hue moa liao su kia guan ki lu kia
chui qua cou guan guan pien hue moa liao su quit guan qui lu kia

西士氏。山礁妈厘啝。你即是慈心。你共
Jesu Santa Maria lu chia si chu sim lu cang
Jesu Santa Maria lu chia si chu sim lu cang

僚氏求人情。乞阮受西士奇尼寕道所
Diosi kiu xin cheng kir guan siu Jesu Kirisito sou
Diosi kiu xin cheng quit guan siu Jesu Christo sou

1. 2. 3. x written across original
善人上天去受福。後七件。乞人識俺本

頭西士奇尼寶道。做人箇所行。第一件。

胎山礦哈佛。美里知腹內。是卑尼

奇尼寶道。是山礦哈佛。美里知生箇。
無了。因爲是逆傣氏法度。啞民西士。
bo liau yn ui si geg Diosi huar tou Amen Jesus
bo liau in ui m tan Diosi huar tou Amen Jesus
傣氏律法。總有十件。先三件是尊敬傣
Diosi luer huar chong u chap kia seng sa kia si chun keng Dio-
Diosi luer huar chon u chap kia si chun queng Dio-
氏。後七件。是和順衆人。第一件。惜傣氏
si au chit kia si ho sun chiong lang tei it kia sio Diosi
si au chit quia si ho sun chiong lang tei it kia sio Diosi
勝過各衆物。第二件。不可亂咀誓。第三
seng que cog chiong bur tei xi kia i t'ang loan chiu chual tei sa
seng cue cog chiong mi tei xi quia umi tang luan chiu chua tei sa
件。尊敬禮拜好日。不可作工夫。第四件。
kia chun keng ley pai ho xit m tang cho cang hu tei si kia
quia chun queng le pay ho xit m tang cho cang hu tei si quia
孝順父母。第五件。不可害死人。第六件。
hau sun pè bo tei gou kia m i tan hay si lang tei lag kia
hau zun pe bo tei gou quia um tang hai si lang tey nag quia
不可姦淫等事。第七件。不可偷捑。第八
m i tan can ym teng su tei chit kia m i tan sau tei pè
m tang can im teng su tei chit kia m tang sau tei pè
件。不可生事害人。亦不可說白賊。第九
kia m i tan seng su hay lang ya m i tan sue pe char tei cau
quia um tang seng su hay lang ya m tang sue pe char tei cau
件。不可思想別人妻。第十件。不可貪圖
kia m i tan su sio par lang chei chap kia m tan tám tou
kia um tang siau sio pat lang chei tei chap kia m tang bau
別人財物。只十件律法。合上那有二件
par lang chay bur chi chap kia lurn huar hap chio na u no kia
par lang chay bur chi chap quia lurn huar chap chiong na u no quia
事。一件惜偽氏勝過各樣物。一件惜別
su chit kia sia Diosi seng quie cog chiong bur chit kia sia par
su chek quia sia Diosi seng cue cog chiong mi chek kia sia par
人。親像惜你獨自。啞民西士。
lang chin chio sia lu ka ti Amen Jesus
lang chin chio sia lu ca ti Amen Jesus

仙礁益禮社律法。總五件。第一件。禮
Santa Ecclesia lur huar chon g u1 gou kia tei it kia ley
Santa Yglesia lur huar chon g u chuia tei it quia le
拜拜好日。着看緞廿完完。第二件。年年
pay peng ho xit tio qua Missa uan chuan tei xi kia ni ni
pay peng ho xit tio cuia Missa uan chuan tei xi quia ni ni

着解罪一過。險死怖。亦着解罪第三件。
tio kei chue chek que hiam si chun ya tio kei chue tei sa kia
tio qwey chek cue hiam si chun ya tio quhey chue tei sa quia
俺本頭西士奇尼實道。再活起來節氣。
lan pun t'au Jesu Kirisitto chai ua ki lay che quy
guan pun tau Jesu Christo chai ua qui lay che quy

着食腰加厘實爹。第四件。山礁益禮社。
tio chia Ucarisititia tei si kia Santa Ecclesia
tio chia Eucalisititia tei si kia Santa Yglesia

敵人有日減減。着減減。亦不可食肉。第
cal lang u xit kiam tui ti kia kiam tui ya mi tan chia ba tei
cal lang u xit kiam tui ti quiam tui ya mi tang chia ba tei

5a

五件。地上所生篤物。着先送入廟感謝
gou kia tey chio sou seng ge mi tio seng sang xib bio cam sia
gou kia tey chio sou seng ge mi tio seng sang xib bio cam sia
偽氏亦著加一抽。巴禮該得。啞民西士。
Diosi ya tio ke it tio Pare cay tit
Diosi Amen Jesus

山礁益禮社有七件微妙。總名沙膠覽
Santa Ecclesia u chit kia bi biau chon mia Sacala-
Santa Yglesia u chit quia bi biau chon mia Sacra-
民庵。賜乞人呀勝舍。赦人罪靠。第一件。
mento su kir lang Galacia lang chei coa tei it kia
mento su quit lang Gracia sia lang chaua tei it kia

茅知氏冒。是巴禮共人濘水。第二。公
Mautismo si Pare cang lang liam chui tei xi kia1 Con-
Baptismo si Pale cang lang liam chui tei xi quia Con-

丕馬常。是巴禮王共人打十字號。抹山
pirmacion si Pare ong cang lang pa chap xi ho bua San-
pimassion si Pale ong cang lang pa chap xi ho bua San-

廚油。乞人專心信偽氏道理。第三件。卑
to yu kir lang chuan sim sin Diosi to li te sa kia Pe-
to iu quit lang hoan sim sin Diosi to li tei sa quia Pe-

尼珍舍。是巴禮共人解罪。第四件。腰加
nitensia si Pare cang lang kei chue tei si kia Yauca-
litensia si Pale cang lang kei chue tei si quia Euca-

厘實爹。是巴禮做緞廿。念經了。俺本頭
risittia si Pare cho Missa liam keng riau lan pun tau
listia si Pale cho Missa liam queng liau lan pun tao
西士奇尼實道在許阿賓人內落。

7a 伊抹山蔚油第六件。阿陵沙西羅達。是

巴禮王陛人做巴禮。第七件、馬直文畔。

是巴禮共人牽手啞民西士。

傑氏敎人可怜人。有十四件事。先七件。

去賑濟伊。第二件。人有口渴。我可怜施

水乞伊。第三件。人有典質為奴。我可怜

1 uy y bay chong au chit quia misplaced and crossed out.
件人有恥辱我。我可怜乎伊。我报怨。弟
kia lang u ti xio gua gua co leng nio y bo po uan tey
quia lang u ti xio gua gua co rien nio y bo po uan tey

六件。人有憂憤。我可怜伊。改憤。第七
lag kia lang u ya bun gua co leng ui y kei bun tey chit
lag quia lang u ya bun gua co rien ui y quey bun tey chit

件。我可怜人。求伊保庇生人。賜乞伊
kia gua co leng lang kiu Diosi po pi se lang su kir y
quia gua co riong lang quiu Diosi po pi se lang su quit

86 吥勝合亦保庇瀦水死人。賜乞伊]
Galaça ya po pi liam chui si lang su kir y siu
Galaça ya po pi liam chuy sy lang su quit y y siu

嘆囉哩。啲民西士。
Gloria Amen Jesus
Gloria Amen Jesus

七條犯罪根源。第一根源。驕。傲肆志。
chit tiau huan chue kin guan tei it kin guan kiu go su chi
chit tiau huan chue quin guan tei it quin guan quiu u go su chi

第二根源。貪財鄙吝。第三根源。行淫邪。
tei xi kin gua tam chay pi rin tei sa kin guan cheng im sia
tei xi quin guan tam chay pi lin tei sa kin guan heng im sia

第四根源。忿氣怨恨。第五根源。喃嘆。
oe tei si kin guan hun ki uan hun tei gou kin guan pou choar
oe tei si quin guan hun qui uan tei gou quin guan pou chuar

無厭。第六根源。妒忌賢富。第七根源。懶。
bu yam tei lag kin guan tou ki hiam hu tei chin kin guan lan
bu yam tei lag quin guan tou qui hien hu tei chin quin guan lan

1 San Francisco instead of Santo Domingo; see p. 105 above.
尊敬是誰。答日。尊敬俳氏。天地是俳氏
chun quen chi chui tap uar chun keng Diosi ti tey si Diosi
否。答日。不。那是俳氏化箇。天地會保
hou tap uar m ni na si Diosi hua ge ti tey si po
庇人否。答日。不。不是誰保庇人。答日。那
pi lang hou tap uar bei si chui po pi lang tap uar na
是俳氏會保庇得人。會責罰得人。天地
si Diosi ey po pi tit lang ey cheg huar tit lang ti tei
有起頭。否。答日。有。俳氏有起頭。否。
u ki tau a bo tap uar u Diosi u ki tau a bo
答日。無。俳氏是七物。答日。俳氏第一大。
tap uar bo Diosi si mi mi tap uar Diosi tei it toa
第一好。第一賢。俳氏有幾箇。答日。一箇。
tei ho tei it gau Diosi u cui ge tap uar cheg ge
別孫。有幾箇。答日。三箇。叫是七名。
Perssona u cuy guē tap uar sa ge quio si mi si mia

10a 答日。俳氏父。俳氏子。俳氏卑尼廚山廚。
tap uar Diosi pe Diosi kia Diosi Piritutu Santo
只三箇別孫仔。有箇可大否。答日。無箇
chi sa ge Piersonya u ge ca toa hou tap uar bo ge
可大。都平大。都平好。都平賢。只三箇別
cal toa tou pe tua tou pe ho tou pe gau chi sa ge Pier-
孫仔。總名叫是七名。答日。名叫山治氏
sona chong mia kio si mi mia tap uar kio Santisi-

1 hoe tap uar interpolated, although catchword of previous page is haa.
馬知哔力。值一箇別孫仔做人。答曰。第
ma Timilat ti cheg ge Piersonya cho lau tap uar tei
二別孫仔傣氏子。落來做人。伊做人了。xi Piersona Diosi kia lo lay cho lang y cho lang diu
名叫是也。答曰。名叫西士奇尼實道。伊
mia kio si mi tap uar mia kio Jesu Kirititto y
做人七事。答曰。愛教人真正傣氏道理。
cho lang mi tap uar ay ca lang chin chia Diosi to li
替人罪靠。人有是也罪靠。答曰。第一祖
t'e lang chei coa lang u si mi chei coa tap uar tei it chou
公。祖婆。早時逆傣氏法度。所累子孫。有
cong chou po cha si ge Diosi huer tou sou lui kia sun u
只罪靠。人獨自做不着。亦有罪靠。俺本
tau Jesu Kirititto y cho lang chun u nio pe hou
答曰。無。有娘奶否。答曰。有。伊娘奶叫是
tap uar bo u nio ley bo tap uar u
七名。答曰。名叫山礁database美里剌。只
mi mia kio Santa Maria Virigen chi
名美里剌做年改說。答曰。伊是得道婦
nia Virigin cho ni kei' sue tap uar y si tec to hu
人。平生不識男人氣味。伊不識男人氣
xin peng seng mi bar lan jin ki bi y mi bar lam xin ki
味。做年會生子。答曰。是卑尼廈山廈化
bi cho ni ei se kia tap uar si Pitu Santo hua
箇。俺本頭西士奇尼實道。做人了。後有
ge lan pun t'au Jesu Kirititto cho lang liau u
受艱難否。答曰。有受艱難。乞人釘死在
siu can lan hou tap uar u siu can lan kirlang teng si tu
居律上。愛替人罪靠。教人神魂上天去。
Culu chio ay te lang chei koa ki lang sin hun chio t'i cu
伊死了。身值處去。答曰。理在石塭內。伊
y si liau sin ti te cu tap uar bay tu chio cong lay y
神魂值處去。答曰。落去臨暮內。落去臨
sin hun ti te cu tap uar lo cu Limbong lay lo cu Lim-
暮內七事。答曰。牽古時道人神魂上
bong lay mi tap uar can cou si tec to lang sin hun chio
天去。俺本頭西士奇尼實道。死後有日
ti cu lan pun t'au Jesu Kirititto si au y fit
再活起來否。答曰。有日再活起來。値時
chay ua ki lay hou tap uar y yit chay ua ki lay ti si
活起來。答曰。第三日活起來。値處去。答
ua ki lay tap uar tei sa yit ua ki lay ti te cu tap
日。上天去。上天去値處落。答曰。在傣氏
uar chio ti cu chio ti cu te te lo tap uar tu Diosi
娘父大手邊坐。俺本頭西士奇尼實道。
nio pe toachiu pi che lan pun t'au Jesu Kirititto
士奇尼實道箝身。巴禮捧起銀鐔內是
su  Kirititto ge sin Pare pang ki gin chiong lay si
七物。答日。西士奇尼實道箝血。
1 mi mi tap uar Jesu Christo ge hue
教人數珠 微妙道理。全數珠一百五
ca lang sou chu keng⁴ bi biau to li chu  chou chu chit pe gou
十粒。是念啞迷娘厘啞。十五粒。是
天 chap riap si liam Abe Maria chap gou riap si liam² ti
上偲爹。此數珠。分作三分。首一分五十
上偲爹。此數珠。分作三分。首一分五十
chio lan tia chu sou chu hun choc sa hun siu chit hun gou chap
粒啞迷娘厘啞。五粒天上偲爹。是山礁
riap Abe Maria gou riap ti choi lan tia si Santa
媽厘啞。得意道理。第一件。是天人山呀
Maria tec y to li tei it kia
13a 勝迷。奉命降下。與山礁娘厘啞報喜。乃
稱之日。亞迷娘厘啞。汝有呀勝舍充滿。
本頭僚氏在汝心中。娘厘啞聽見此言。
忽有驚動。天人乃慰之曰。僚氏極厚愛
汝。僚氏子要投胎汝腹內。他既出世。汝
與之表名曰。西士氏。娘厘亞答天人曰。
我乃微里矧。平生不識男人情意。何如
能為此大事。天人復謂娘厘亞曰。汝不

1人
須驚疑。此事乃卑尼廚山廚化的。媽厘啞聞見此言。乃謙細答天人曰。我乃像
13b 氏姪僕。隨本頭像氏主意。斯時像氏子
便投胎於腹中。仙礁媽厘啞。我念此十
Santa Maria gua liam chi chap粒啞迷媽厘亞。一粒天上俺爹送與汝。
riap Abe Maria cheg riap ti chio lan tia sang tou lu
因為汝最謙細。天人山呀勝迷。降下與
yn yi lu choe kiam sei Angel Galabe cang he cang
汝報喜。說像氏要選汝為他聖母啞山
lu po hi sue Diosi ay suan lu ui ta seng bou San
礁媽厘亞。微里煒。為最清潔。為最標致。
ta Maria Virigen ui choe cheng kiar ui choe piau ti
香至極。我今求汝。汝賞我能謙細稱汝
pang chi kec gua ta kiu lu lu su gua leng kiam sey cheng lu
14a 意。能受汝子之福啞。民西士第三件是
y leng siu lu kia ge hoc Amen Jesus tei xi kia
山礁媽厘亞。既受孕知他表姊山礁依
沙迷。他乃年老。亦受孕有六箇月。就往
探他。依沙迷歡喜迎接媽厘啞與媽厘
亞敟話。時他孕子山茅茅知實踏在腹
中。翻胎踢蹂。歡喜感謝像氏恩德。赦他
祖累之罪。依沙迷亦歡喜。高聲稱讚曰。
山礁媽厘亞。汝最好命。像氏賜福與汝。
勝過衆婦人。腹內汝子是西士氏。更有
像氏大福。依沙迷又曰。我無功勞。因何
14b 賜此最大。人之母。來探我。山礁媽厘啞。
聽見此話。斯時神魂歡喜。感謝像氏恩
德。因我謙細。像氏故選我。為他母。方知
像氏惜謙細。人愚驕傲人。山礁媽厘亞。
Santa Maria
我念此十粒啞迷媽厘亞。一粒天上俺
gua liam chi chap riap Abe Maria cheg riap ti chio lan
爹。我送與汝。因為汝往探汝表姊山礁
tia gua sang u lu yin ui lu ong tiam lu piau chi Santa
依沙迷。他乃年老。亦受胎有六箇月。山
Ysabel tā nay ni lau ya siu tay lag ke gue San
美茅知實踏。在他腹內。汝子赦他祖累
Juan Baptisitta chay ta pac lay lu kia sia ta chot luy
之罪啞。山礁媽厘亞。汝甘至極。我今求
chi choe a Santa Maria lu ti chi keg gua kiu
15a 汝。汝賞與我。汝子來探我。神魂。赦我罪
lu lu su u gua lu kia lay tam gua sin hun sia gua chei
靠啞。民西士。第三件是山礁媽厘亞。受
coã Amen Jesus tei sa kia
喜稱汝為着汝要作貧人。啞民西士。hi cheng suan lu ui tio lu ay cho keng lang Amen Jesus

世四十日。從古時禮法。抱往禮拜中。送還偽氏。亦行貧人禮儀。送一對鴿仔。感謝偽氏贖伊子。有一得道人名日。時冥王。與一得道婦人名日。安那。他久待要見西士氏。時一見。無極歡喜。大家作樂。

在彼禮拜中。顯揚作證。西士氏。是俺真正本頭。仙珈。偽氏啞。我念此十粒啞啞。Santa Maria gua liam chu chap riap Abe

媽啞啞。一粒天上俺爹。送與汝。因爲汝。Maria cheg riap ti chio lan tia sang tou lu yin ui lu

子西士氏。出世四十日。汝從古禮抱汝。Kia Jesusi chur si si chap yit lu chiong cou la po lo

子入禮拜。送還偽氏。汝亦行貧人禮儀。ley pay sang huan Diosi lu heng pin yin re gy

送一對鴿仔。贖汝子出來。有一得道。sang cheg tui pe cap sioc ta chur lay u cheg tec to

老者。名日。時冥王。與一得道婦人。名日。lo chia beng uar Sibengyon cheg tec to hu yin beng uar
安那久待要见汝子西士氏。他见时大
Ana kiu tai ay ki lu kia Sesu ta ki si tay
家作乐，高声颂扬汝子西士氏。乃我等
ke choc loc co seng hian yang lu kia Jesu ray gua cheng
真正本头。呜山礁妈厘亚，微里别，清洁
chin chia pun tau Santa Maria Virigen cheng kiat
至极。我今求汝，汝赐与我神魂清洁。要
chi kek gua ta kiu lu lu su gua sin hun cheng kiat yau

17a 從汝古禮，效汝好所為。啣民西士氏第五。
chiong lu cou re hau lu ho sou ui Amen Jesus tei gou
件。是西士氏於十二岁时。與母山礁妈
kia
厘亚山須習，同往西吕沙陵禮拜。内後
山礁妈厘亚同家尋不見西士氏，與山
須習三晝夜懼。後尋见在彼原禮拜
內坐。在上位，與年高者相辯論，敎徒氏
正道山礁妈厘亚。看见极其喜慰。謂西
士氏日，为人子。當順父母之命。汝何故
使我與汝父，受此等懼。西士氏就與
17b 伊母山礁妈尼亚同家，山礁妈厘亚。我
Santa Maria gua
念此十粒啣，連妈厘亚一粒天上俺爹。
liam chap riap Abe Mariya cheg riap ti chio lan tia

我送與汝，因為汝子西士氏於十二歲
gua sang tou lu yn ui lu kia Jesu u chap yi hue
時。與汝同往西吕沙陵禮拜。汝同家
si tong lu ong Jerusalem ley pay tiong lu hue lay
尋他不見。汝與山須習。三晝夜懼。煩惱。
hue ta ní ki lu cang San Josef huan lo san tiu ya
後至第三日，尋見在原禮拜內。坐。在
chi tei sa yit chue ki tu guan ley pay lay che ki tu
上位。與年高者辯論。敎徒氏正
chio ui cang dian co yu tec chia pien lun ca lang Diosi cheng
理。汝看見，歡喜。不勝。汝子西士氏。便
to li lu qua ki hue hi pur seng lu kia Jesusi pian
與汝同。啣山礁妈厘亚。微里别，好至極。
u lu hue Santa Maria Virigen ho chi kec
我今求汝，汝赐我能如汝懼。要尋見
gua ta kiu lu lu su gua leng。yu lu huan lo yau chue ki
18a 西士氏，使我死後。上天見他面。啣民西
Jesus su gua si au seng tian ki ta bin Amen Je-
士。此五件。得意。道理。當偽挨氏。與衰
sus chu gou kia tec y to li Lune liam kip Sue-
微氏日念。
bisse yit liam

中一分。有五件。是山礁妈厘亚與西士
tiong chit hun u kia si Santa Maria cang Jesu

1 來 2 煩惱三晝夜 3 有勝 4 道 5 念
奇尼實道憂尓事實第一件是俺本頭
Kirisittoo yu bun to lii tei it kia

西士奇尼實道於三十三歲時心念世人有多罪惡。一晝往園中念經。懇求憐
18b 某大父。乞赦世人罪惡。因爲煩惱甚極。遍身血汗流出至地。及半夜時。孚騰氏
同引兵人來拿西士奇尼實道。縛他手。縛他眼。打他嘴邊。受人凌辱。他不開口。
顧隨人去。山礁媽厘啞。我念此十粒亞
Santa Maria gua chi chap riap A-

十粒啞。天神。我送與汝。因為
be Maria² cheh riap ti chio lan tia gua sang tou lu in
為汝子。西士氏。於三十三歲時。自思世
ui lu kia Jesu u sa cha sa hwe si chu su
人罪重。一晝往園中三次念經。煩惱甚
yin chue tiong it ya ong hui tiong sam chu liam ken huan lo sim
極遍身流出血汗。叩拜。協氏大父。乞
kek pien sin riu chur hiat han cau pay pay³ Diosi tua pe kiet

赦人罪。至半夜。兵人來拿受人縛縛推
sia chi poa me peng lang lay na siu lang pac⁴ chui
d拖啞。山礁媽厘亞微里矧。汝慈心至極。
tui a Santa Maria Virgen lu chu sim chi kec

我今求汝。汝賜我有關於念經。莫使惡
kia lu su gua yu guan sim liam keng boc su kia
鬼來迷我。啞民。西士。第二件是俺本頭
 cui lay bey gua Amen Jesus tei yi kia
西士奇尼實道於綿挨氏早被兵人送
見本事。卑膳廚。惡人妒他。生事害他。作
虛證證他。齊聲放鴨他。卑膳廚就縛西
士奇尼實道於大柱上毒打五千餘。遍
19b 身破裂。血流不止。山礁媽厘啞。我念此
Santa Maria gua liam chi

十粒啞。送與啞。我送與汝。因為
yi chap riap Abe Maria cheh riap ti chio lang tia gua
送與汝。因為汝子。西士氏。於綿挨氏早
sang tou lu yi yi lu kia Jesu Viernessi cha
被。人縛往見。卑膳廚。惡人生事害
pi peng¹ lang pan sang ong kiam Pilatos kiap lang seng su hay
他作虛證證他。被本事。卑膳廚。縛在大
ta cho hu cheng cheng ta pi Ponsu Pilato pang chai toa
柱上毒打他。五千餘。遍身破裂。血流不
tiao chio toc ta gou cheng u pian sin po riat hiat riu pur
止啞。山礁媽厘亞微里矧。協氏聖母。我
chi Santa Maria Virrigen Diosi seng bo gua
今求汝。汝賜我。要效汝子。受艱難有
kia lu su kir² gua hau lu kia siu can lan yu

1 某 2 我 3 我 4 e written across original a.
十粒啱迷唔喱啱。一粒天上俺爹。我送chap riap Abe Maria cheg riap ti chio lan tia gua sang
與汝。因爲汝子西士氏。

人討薙獲。獲他頭著之長。紅衣。與之竹
lang to chi cou cou ta tau tioc chi tiang hong y u chi te
杖。執他手。使自打他。惡人假跳朝拜他。
tiang chip ta siu su ta chu t’a kiap lang ke cui tiau pai
俱是俺弄他啱。山礁唔喱啱。微里細。汝
cu si bu long ta a Santa Maria Virigen lu
乃我等慈母。我今求汝。汝賜我不要只
nai gua teng chu bo gua kiu lu lu su gua m ay chi

世上假歡喜。止要如我本頭受艱難。啱
si chio ke hua hi chi yau yu lan pun tau siu can lan A-
民西士。第四件。是俺木頭西士奇尼寶
men Jesus tei si kia

1 I have changed original assi to si. 2 俺
21b 五件。是俺本頭西士奇尼實道。往至山
gou kia

上。被兵人剝盡衣裳。拿他倒在居律上。
釘他手足。後將居律氏豎起。他因重勞
口渴。說要飲水。惡人聽見。便與他酸醋
苦膽。西氏奇尼實道。綿挨氏十二點鐘
時。被人釘在居律上。至三點鐘時。魂乃
離身死矣。他死時。天昏地震。日月失明。
廟軒自裂。石自相觸。人亦大家揷胸。天
下諸物。均為之痛傷。因爲俱是他化的。

山礁媽厘啞。我念此十粒啞送媽厘啞。
Santa Maria gua liam chi chap riap Abe Maria

22a 一粒天上俺爹。我送與汝。因爲汝子西
chit riap ti chio lan tia gua sang tou lu ya ui lu kia Je-
士氏。往至山上。被人剝盡衣裳。將他手
su ong chi san chio pi lang pac chic y chio chiang t'a siu
足釘在居律上。他渴。說要飲水。惡人聽
chio t'eng tu Culu chio t'a qua sue ay im chui kiap lang t'ia
見。便討酸醋苦膽與他。他綿挨氏日午
ki pin to sui chou cou ta u ta Viernesli gou
十二點鐘。被人釘。至三點鐘乃死。他死
chap xi tiam cheng pi lang teng chi sa tiam cheng nay si ta si
時。天昏地震。日月失明。廟軒自裂。石自

22b 西士氏。手足釘在彼居律上。不要此世
Jesu siu chiooc teng chay Culu chio m ay chi si
上之物。止要受艱難。至死能升天上。啞
chio chi bur chi siu can lan chi su leng seng tian chio A-
民西士。此五件憂鬱道理。當媽羅値時
men Jesus chi gou kia yu bun to li Mate
與綿挨氏日念。

Vienesli yit liam

尾一分有五件。是山礁媽厘啞作樂事
bue cheg hun u gou kia si Santa Maria choc loc su
實。第一件。是俺本頭西士奇尼實道。死
sit tei it kia
後第三日。獨自復生。他身輕清標致。豪
光燦爛。無有可比。先往見伊母山礁媽
厘啞。與之解憂。亦見他學生。及得道男
女諸人。使之齊同歡喜。山礁媽俚亞。我
Santa Maria gua
念此十粒啞迷媽俚亞。一粒天上俺爹。
liam chi chap riap Abe Maria chit riap ti chio lan tia
我送與汝。因為汝子西士氏。死後第三
gua sang tou lu yn ui lu kia Jesu si au tei sa
d日復生。身極清潔。囊光燦爛。先見汝。與
xit hoc seng sin kec cheng kier ho cong chan lan seng ki lu
汝解憂。亦見他學生。及得道諸人。使之
d ke yu ya ki y1 hac seng kip tec to chu yin su chi
大家歡喜。啞。山礁媽俚亞。微里矧清潔。
tay ke hua hi Santa Maria Virigen cheng kiat
我今求汝。汝賜我神魂如復生清潔。莫
gua kiu lu su gua sin hun yu hoc seng cheng kiat bo
23b 使再能得罪。啞民西士。第二件。是俺本
su chai leng tec chue Amen Jesus tei xi kia
頭西士奇尼實道。復生至四十日。要升
tian时。分付伊學生。分遍天下。教人僚氏
道理。與人淨水。西士奇尼實道當伊學
生面前。日中獨自升天。有彩雲蔽他身。
後看不見。衆天人迎接西士奇尼實道。
坐在僚氏大父右手邊。作樂難言。山礁
Santa
24a 媽俚亞。我念此十粒啞迷媽尼亞。一粒
Maria gua liam chap riap Abe Maria chit riap
天上俺爹。我送與汝。因爲汝子。阮本頭
ti chio lan tia gua sang tou lu yn ui lu kia
西士奇尼實道復生。至四十日。欲升天
Jesu Kirisitto hoc seng chi si chap yit yoc seng tian
時。囑他學生。分遍天下。教人僚氏正道。
si chioec ta hac seng hun tien he ca lang Diosi cheng to
與人淨水。囑畢。即當衆學生面前升天。
cang lang cheng sui p'it chiu1 chiong hac seng bin chen seng tien
有彩雲遮他。後看不見。衆天人迎接他。
u chai hun chia ta au gua m1 ki chiong tian yin geng chiap ta
作樂難言。西士奇尼實道。在僚氏娘父
choc loc lan gien Jesu Kirisitto tu Liosi nio pe
右手邊坐。啞。山礁媽尼亞。汝乃僚氏聖
yu chiu pi che Santa Maria lu nai Diosi seng
母。亦乃我慈母。我今求汝。汝賜我此
bo ec nay gua teng1 chu bo gua kiu lu lu su chi
世上。不要別物。只要思憶天上寶貝。得
si chio m1 ay par mi chi ay su it ti chio po pue tit
24b 見伊面啞民西氏。第三件。是俺本頭西
ki y bin Amen Jesus tei sa kia
士奇尼實道。升天去。山礁媽俚亞。與衆
啞裏土多黎氏。同一家專心念經。仰候
卑尼府山府。至第十日。卑尼府山府。降下其家。时有暴風震雷。有火舌遍宿衆
學生頭上。賜之大呀勝舍。聰明靈通盡
諸天下音語。可傳正道。山礁媽尼啞。我
Santa Maria gua
念此十粒啞迷媽厘亞。一粒天上俺爹。
liam chi chap riap Abe Maria chit riap ti chio lan tia
25a 我送與汝。因爲汝子西士。上天去。後第
gua sang tou lu yn ui lu kia Jesu chio ti su au tey
ten日。汝與衆啞褒士多黎氏 聚同一
chap xit lu tang chiong hac seng1 leng chu tong it
家。念經時。卑尼府山道降下。有迅雷風
ke liam keng si Piritu Santo cang he yu sin lui hong
烈。有火舌宿在衆啞褒士多黎氏頭上。
riet yu ho siet soa tu chiong Apositolesi tau chio
賜之大呀勝舍。有靈通。使之能言天下
su chi toa Galacia leng tong tian hê
萬邦之語。可以傳授僈氏正教。啞山礁
ban pang chi gu co y toan sin Diosai cheng cau Santa
媽厘亞。汝乃我等慈母。極要庇蔭我。我
Maria lu nay gua teng chu bo kec ay pi ym gua gua
今求汝。汝賜我能受卑尼府山府呀勝
kiu. lu su gua leng siu Piritu Santo Gala-

舍。有壯力。能為好事。專心要顯揚汝子
chia u chong lec leng ui ho su choan sim hien yang lu kia
25b 西士氏道理。啞氏西士。第四件。是山礁
Jesu to li Amen Jesu tei si kia
媽厘亞。於六十三歲時。西士氏差一天
人。名曰。山呀勝迷。降報與山礁媽尼啞
日。僈氏要援汝身共神魂升天。山礁媽
厘啞。極歡喜感謝僈氏恩德。於將死時。
僈氏變化。使衆啞褒士多黎氏。齊同來
見。山礁媽尼啞與之慰問訖。無疾病艱
難。止是思憶僈氏。乃氣絕身死。衆啞褒
士多黎氏恭敬埋之。後至三日。有一學
生後來。開看其身尸不見。是西士氏援
26a 他身與神魂。同升天堂受福。山礁媽厘
Santa Mari-
啞。我念此十粒啞迷媽厘亞。一粒天上
a gua liam chi chap riap Abe Maria chit riap ti chio
俺爹。我送與汝。因爲汝於六十三歲。
lan tia gua sang tou lu yn ui lu lag chap sa hue si1
汝子西士氏。差一天人。名曰。山呀勝迷。
lu kia Jesu che tien yin San Galabe

1 學生
大赦羅里耶。勝過衆天人。衆山廚氏。封
之為太后。萬戟作樂。永遠無窮。山礁媽

27a  涅。一粒天

上俺爹。我送與汝。因為汝在天上。啾氏

父。啾氏子。啾氏卑尼廚山廚。封汝為大

父。啾氏子。啾氏卑尼廚山廚。封汝為太

pe Diosi kia Diosi Spiritu Santo hong lu u tay

後。賜汝大福。勝過衆天人。衆山廚氏。啞。

hou su lu tay hoc seng que chiong tien yen chiong Santo

山礁媽厘啞。汝乃啾氏聖母。我今求汝。

Santa Maria lu nay Diosi sen bo gua kiu lu

汝。共啾氏求人情。賜我有呀勝舍。能

lu su1 rang Diosi kiu yen cheng su gua u Galasia leng

為好事。死後得升天。受赦羅里耶。啞氏

ui ho su si au tec seng tien siu Goloriya Amin

西士。此五件作樂道理。當紡高黎氏與

西士。此五件作樂道理。當紡高黎氏與

Jesu chi gou kia choc loc to li si2 Mecolesi cang

27b 沙無呂 念。

Sabalo yen3 liam

人要念數珠。先須至誠畫十字號。然後

lang ay liam sou chu su chi seng oa chap yi bo yen au

念十粒啞迷媽厘亞。一粒天上俺爹。至

liam chap riap Abe Maria chit riap ti chio lan tia chii
完且歇。思彼一件事实。诚心送与山礁。

Maria toc ta kiu yin cheng yu quan quan chay liam sui

齐送亦好。宜至诚宽宽念。细想彼十

chong liam sui yoc chi soc uan su liam ho ec chay

完全。如遇礼拜好日。须宜看绵卅

chong liam chui lang ley pai peng ho xit tio¹ qua Missa

来者。若不至完。其罪同。入礼拜内。

qua m chi uan choan² ki chue tong lang xip ley pai

要看绵卅时。礼拜若抱册过左手边了。

qua Missa Pare po chê que cho chiu pi

衆人皆起立。虽看绵卅则为不及。

chong lang kai ki kia lang³ sui lay⁴ qua Missa cheg ui pur kip

无益而有罪矣。人来看绵卅。礼拜未

sui qua bo so tit⁵ lang sui⁶ lay qua Missa Pare

高冒牙。未与衆人打十字号。若先出去。

bue cang chiong lang pa chap xi ho yiac seng chur c'u

有罪。开具一年衆好日。合该看绵卅。如

yu chue cay cu chin chiong ho yit hap cay qua Missa cou¹

28b 遠有罪。西士奇尼實道出世好日。做新

ui yu chue Jesu Kirisito chor si ho yit cho sin

年好日。三位皇帝好日。迎西士奇尼實

ni ho xit sa ui hong tey ho xit gia Jesu

Kirist道在沙膠览民迄好日。山礁媽呢啱送

to to Sacalamento ho xit Santa Maria sang

子往禮拜做民尼踏蠟燭好日。山礁媽

kia ong ley pay Benita la cheg ho xit Santa Ma-

厘啱出世好日。山礁妈呢啱受孕好日。

ria chur si ho xit Santa Maria siu yn ho xit

29a 山礁媽呢啱上天好日。山敵羅山喀羅

Santa Maria chio ti ho xit San Pelo San Palo

好日。己上此等好日。合该看绵卅。不可

ho xit chu teng ho yit hap cay qua Missa m tangible

作工夫求利。与犯礼拜日同罪。其餘雖

cho cang hu u yu⁷ ley pai yit tang chue ki u

是好日。不合该看绵卅。亦可作工夫。人

ho yit m qua Missa bo chue³

若自愿要看绵卅。更好更有所益。若

yiac chu guan ay qua。 u sou tit⁸ ec
不看亦無罪。人或疾病。或伏事病人。不
可 oc say pe lang
得身離。或遇遠禮拜。雖是好日。不看綿
sa ya1 bo chue chiong liam chui2 lang cheg ni chi u hap cay kiam
凍九日。西士奇尼實道出世時。先一日。
tui cau yit Jesu Kizisito chur si seng chit xit
當凍凍。高黎氏馬入齊時。各七箇綿挨
tong kiam tui Colesima xip chai yit u3 chit ge Vierne-
氏。并入齊盡。一箇沙無呂。是微希里
si chi chia yu4 chit ge Sabalo si Bigili.
啞。此共九日。當凍凍。如違有罪。其餘難
a chu cang cau xit cay5 kiam tui yu ui yu chue u sui
是綿挨氏微希里啞。若不凍凍無罪。只
Viernesi Bigilia yiac m kiam bo chue chi
不食肉而已。人若自愿要凍凍更
si m tang6 chia ba u lang7 chu guan kiam tui keng
好。更有所益。人遇凍凍之日。早飯不可
ho gu kiam tui yit cho huan m tan
食。止食午飯。黃昏食點心。可食半碗飯。
chia chi chia gou huan hong hun si8 tiam sim chi9 chia poa ua pui
或食一菜羹。或一壺酒。不可食別物。
hec chia10 chia chit chay que hec chit pue chiu m t'ang chiu par mi

30a 人或有病。或年老。或作重労工夫。或婦
lang hec u pe ni lau hec tiong lo cang hu hec hu
人有孕。乳幼兒。或人未及二十一歲。若
yin u yin yu xi hec lang bu u chap yi1 hue yaic
不凍凍無罪。
kiam tui bo chue
凡諸入廟者。已受僚氏聖教矣。或臨難
chiong2 xip bio lang2 siu Diosi seng cau hec rim lan
險死之時。或無巴禮可與他解罪。須當
hiam si si yu bo Pare tang cang y4 kei chue su
仰望思憶僚氏。看悟他慈悲心。愛赦人
giam hong Diosi qua cou y chu pi kir sia lang
罪。亦宜心想記憶。凡汝自己所作之罪。
chue ya tong5 sim sia ki it huan lu chu ki sou choc chue
心內痛戚煩惱。因過得罪咱第一本
lui6 sim tiang tong chieq huan lo si ui tec chue lan
pun
頭僚氏。論地獄之艱難。浩大罔極。但是
tao Diosi lun7
得罪僚氏。尤加醜甚地獄。是以人想苦
30b 切時節。宜驚怖僚氏。勝於憂懼地獄。故
當真心誠意。與僚氏苦求赦宥。言日本
guen uat pun

1 有十二  2 衆  3 人  4 椋  5 當  6 門  7 中
8 The following paragraph has a different arrangement and appears to be
corrupt. tay yoc si y yin siu cou che si che gi keng pou chia toy yoc chi
can lan u si tec chue Diosi cou kiam cou tang chiam sim tuu tii Diosi
cou kui sia yu ki chue.
頭僚氏。我乃不孝。不聽咱爹僚氏汝言
tao Diosi gua si pur hau m tia lu gien
語。我乃頒民。遠逆僚氏你規誠。我甚歹
gua si guan bin ui ge lu cui cay gua sim
人。得罪本頭僚氏汝。是我不着。是我不
tec chue Diosi si gua m tio si gua m
着。是我即不着。噫。我得罪僚氏你。慈
tio si gua cha si m tio lu chu
悲可怜我。本頭僚氏既我真正娘父。
pic co leng gua pun tau Diosi lu
赦我罪過。我想反悔了。愛改過。不敢再
sia gua chue co gua sio huan huy riau chai ke que m ca chai
得罪汝。後或遇着巴禮。我愛共伊解罪。
tec chue lu hec gu Pare gua ki y kei chue

31a 入教者。若有人毎夜靜思其罪。永常從
liam chui chi yiac u liang beuy ya cheng su ki chue eng chiong
此經文而念之。妙之極也。但不可徒念
chu keng xi liam biau kec ya t'an pur co tou quan
慣口。只宜心口如一。追悔己罪。呼嗟嘆
cou liam chi gi sim yu c'ou it tu huy ki chue
息。決意而不欲再踏前愆者。則其受益
boc' chay tap chian k'ien chec ki siu ec
安有量哉。如有巴禮在焉。雖己哀悔。亦
an yu liang chay yu Pare chai yan siscy ki ay huy ya
當解罪。不可恃己知悔而不解也。
tong kei chue m t'an si ki ti huy yi pur kei y