

## THE COMPOSITE NATURE OF THE *CH'IEH-YÜN*

KUN CHANG

*Academia Sinica and  
University of California, Berkeley*

The source materials for the different periods of Chinese phonological history differ in nature. In the modern period, we have records of various individual living dialects and we know the different localities they represent. For the Archaic period, we base our reconstruction on the riming patterns of the *Shih-ching* and the analysis of phonetic compound characters; we assume that these materials are more or less homogeneous and that they represent the literary pronunciation of the middle course of the Yellow River Basin during the Chou Dynasty. Although the songs of the *Shih-ching* derived from different sources, they had become the common property of the educated in the Chou Dynasty, whose custom it was on various social occasions to recite certain passages from memory. This implies standardization. Our knowledge of the Ancient period is derived from the *Ch'ieh-yün*, which is composite in nature and represents more than one dialect from the several hundred years preceding 601 A.D. The categories of rimes and finals in the *Ch'ieh-yün* comprise most of the rime and final distinctions of the earlier rime dictionaries. (Within a rime category there may be several finals with different medials. The *Ch'ieh-yün* has both rime categories and final categories.) The rime dictionaries which preceded the *Ch'ieh-yün*, but whose categories are included in it, range in time from the Chin Dynasty to the Liang Dynasty, in space from Loyang in the north to Chin-ling in the south. When we compare the rime and final categories of the *Shih-ching*, the *Ch'ieh-yün*, and the modern Mandarin dialect of Peking, we have a bulging middle like that of a snake which has swallowed a frog. There are many categories in

the *Ch'ieh-yün* for which there are no counterparts in the Peking dialect; there are some (e.g. 元 and 文, 殷) for which we find no counterparts in the *Shih-ching* system. (We do not, however, find *Shih-ching* or Peking rimes or finals which are not represented in the *Ch'ieh-yün*.) These extra categories remind us that for a single, natural dialect, the *Ch'ieh-yün* system would be implausibly complex. The explanation is, of course, simple: the *Ch'ieh-yün* categories represent the dialects of different regions; the *Shih-ching* and the Peking dialect do not.

Among the writings on the nature of the *Ch'ieh-yün*, there are two important articles: Ch'en Yin-k'o's (1949) "Ts'ung Shih-shih lun *Ch'ieh-yün*" ("The *Ch'ieh-yün* Problem in the Light of Historical Reality") and Chou Tsu-mo's (1966b) "*Ch'ieh-yün* te hsing-chih ho t'a te yin-hsi chi-ch'u" ("The Nature of the *Ch'ieh-yün* and the Basis of its Phonological System"); Chou's article was translated into English by Göran Malmquist (1968).

We owe to Ch'en our insight into the Lo-yang element in the *Ch'ieh-yün* system. Ch'en showed that, beginning with the Eastern Chin Dynasty, scholars in the south adopted the tradition of chanting the Classics and other literature which had prevailed in the Royal Academy in Lo-yang.<sup>1</sup> According to Ch'en, northern scholars who moved to the south held onto their old literary pronunciation, and the southern scholars gradually acquired this pronunciation, which was, then, the basis of the *Ch'ieh-yün* categories. This is, however, a partial truth. The literary pronunciation of the Royal Academy in Lo-yang was obviously modified in the south, where scholars gradually developed a conventional literary pronunciation during the Ch'i-Liang period: the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s rime and final categories are not completely identical with those of the Lo-yang tradition as transmitted to us in Lü Ching's rime dictionary. (This dictionary is supposed to represent the literary pronunciation of the educated people in Lo-yang, the capital of the Chin Dynasty.) (See Footnote 4.)

1. See *Shih-shuo Hsin-yü*, Chapters 6 and 26 (Ya-liang 'Tolerance' and Ch'ing-ti 'Rudeness') and the biographies of Hsieh An and Ku K'ai-chih in *Chin-shu*, Volumes 79 and 92.

Of all the articles on the *Ch'ieh-yün*, Chou's is undoubtedly the most substantial and the most thoroughly documented. Chou, however, failing to take into account the difference between the literary pronunciation and the colloquial, erred in assuming that the literary pronunciation developed in the south during the Ch'i-Liang period was equivalent to the spoken language of the officials in the city of Chin-ling.

Most of the categories in the *Ch'ieh-yün* were adopted from earlier dictionaries; this is explicitly stated in its Preface. As a result of the serious deliberations and great care which went into the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s compilation, its categories constitute a system, even though this system is made up of phonological distinctions deriving from the speech of various times and various places. The synchronic description of a single dialect is a practice of modern linguistics. During the fifth and sixth centuries, no one felt it necessary to faithfully and exhaustively describe any one living dialect.

It is true, as Chou says, that there is almost complete agreement between the *Ch'ieh-yün* categories and the riming practice of the sophisticated writers of the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en Dynasties. This does not necessarily mean that the *Ch'ieh-yün* categories and those of the language spoken by the officials of Chin-ling, the capital of the southern dynasties, were one. (Although we have no way of knowing this language, we do know that no natural spoken language tolerates so many distinctions.) What it may mean, I suggest, is that the *Ch'ieh-yün* codified the riming practice of the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en writers, who followed the same conventional rime categories as did the compilers of the *Ch'ieh-yün*. This practice was part of the literary movement of the Yung-ming period in the Southern Ch'i Dynasty, during which writers had become phonologically sophisticated. (See Footnote 10.)

After comparing the fan-ch'ieh spellings of the *Ch'ieh-yün* and of Ku Yeh-wang's *Yü-p'ien* (preserved in Kūkai's *Manshō Myōgi*), Chou concluded that the *Ch'ieh-yün* must have been based on the reading pronunciation

of the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en Dynasties.<sup>2</sup> Though it is true that educated people may have been able to make all of the distinctions represented by different fan-ch'ieh spellings in reading, there is no evidence for equating this reading pronunciation with the colloquial pronunciation of the officials in Chin-ling, as Chou did.

In his Preface to the *Ch'ieh-yün*, Lu Fa-yen describes the two-stage compilation of this dictionary. In the first stage, around 580 A.D., Lu Fa-yen's father gathered together eight of his colleagues at his home in Ch'ang-an, where he had an extensive library which he had brought with him from Yeh, the capital of the Northern Ch'i Dynasty.<sup>3</sup> They discussed Chinese phonology, its historical differences and geographical variations, and devised an outline for a rime dictionary; this implies a working out, to some degree, of the rime and final categories. In doing this, they supplemented their personal knowledge of these categories by consulting

---

2. Ku Yeh-wang (519-81 A.D.) was a native of the Wu commandery. In the *Yü-p'ien*, the characters are arranged according to their graphic shapes. Though the original version of this dictionary is preserved only in fragmentary manuscripts, its fan-ch'ieh spellings were adopted by a Japanese monk, Kūkai (774-835 A.D.) when he compiled his *Banshyō Myōgi* (*Wan-hsiang Ming-yi*), a Chinese-Chinese dictionary. (See Chou Tsu-mo's study of the fan-ch'ieh spellings in *Banshyō Myōgi* in his *Wen-hsiieh-chi*, pp. 270-404, 1966).

3. It is often said that Lu Fa-yen's *Ch'ieh-yün*, a riming dictionary completed in 601 A.D. in the Sui Dynasty capital of Ch'ang-an, was based on the Ch'ang-an dialect of its time. This was not the case. First, none of those who deliberated on the format of this dictionary spoke the Ch'ang-an dialect. Second, Ch'ang-an did not at this time have the sort of widespread cultural prestige that would have made it a national standard. Third, philological evidence on the Ch'ang-an dialect of the seventh through ninth centuries shows a much simpler phonological system than that described by Lu Fa-yen's *Ch'ieh-yün*. As Ōshima Shōji, for example, points out, the Ch'ang-an dialect revealed by Yen Shih-ku (581-645 A.D.) in his phonetic glosses to the *Han-shu* has far fewer distinctions than the *Ch'ieh-yün*. (Ōshima Shōji, "Gan Shiko *Kansho* ongi no Kenkyū" ["A Study of Yen Shih-ku's Phonetic Glosses to *Han-shu*"], *Hokkaido Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 17.145-238 and 19.41-85 [Sapporo, 1969 and 1971] and "Gan Shiko *Kansho* ongi Inrui Ko" ["A Study on the Finals of Yen Shih-ku's Phonetic Glosses to *Han-shu*"], *Gengo Kenkyū* 59.43-61 [Tokyo, 1971]. Yen's system lacks the following *Ch'ieh-yün* contrasts: 1. 山:刪; 咸:銜; 耕:庚; 佳:皆; 夬. 2. 仙:先; 鹽:添; 清:青; 宵:蕭. 3. 眞:文. 4. 仙:元. 5. 屋<sub>III</sub>:燭. 6. 支:脂; 之:微. 7. 覃:談.

the rime dictionaries of Lü Ching, Hsia-hou Kai, Yang Hsiu-chih, Li Chi-chieh, and Tu T'ai-ch'ing.<sup>4</sup> In most cases we know from the footnotes under the rime rubrics in the table of contents to Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün* (706 A.D.) which rime dictionary was the source of which *Ch'ieh-yün* category. In general, if one dictionary had two categories where another had just one, the *Ch'ieh-yün* followed the former. If, however, there was a strong reason for not recognizing a division made by an earlier dictionary, Lu Fa-yen's father and his colleagues did ignore it. (See, for example, my discussion of 益 and 石, 爲 and 奇 below.)

In the synthesis and systematization of all previous rime and final categories which the *Ch'ieh-yün* provides, two dictionaries clearly played decisive roles: the oldest, most archaic rime dictionary, that of Lü Ching, representing the early northern literary pronunciation, and the dictionary of Hsia-hou Kai, representing the later, southern literary pronunciation. In twenty-seven cases, the *Ch'ieh-yün* accepted Lü Ching's distinctions; in thirty-four cases, it accepted Hsia-hou Kai's distinctions. (I base these

---

4. Lü Ching, who lived in the Chin Dynasty, came from Jen-ch'eng (now Ch'ü-fu in Shantung Province). In the *Wei-shu* (biography of Chiang Shih), it says that he arranged his material in five categories, kung, shang, chüeh, chih, and yü; these are, traditionally, names for notes of the musical scale. (See Lin 1972.) Yang Hsiu-chih, who was from Wu-chung (west of Peking; now Chi-hsien in Hopei), was the son of Yang-ku, a Lo-yang magistrate in the Northern Wei Dynasty. Yang Hsiu-chih served under the Northern Dynasties of Ch'i and Chou. Li Chi-chieh (personal name: Kai) was from P'ing-chi in the commandery of Chao (now Chao-hsien in Hopei) and served under the Northern Ch'i. Tu T'ai-ch'ing came from Ch'ü-yang in Po-ling (now Ting-hsien in Hopei) and served under the Northern Ch'i and the Sui. Hsia-hou Kai has no biography in the dynastic histories. Li Fu of the T'ang Dynasty says in his *K'an-wu*: "Hsia-hou Kai of the Liang Dynasty compiled his *Szu-sheng Yün-lüeh* in twelve chüan". (According to the bibliographical chapter of the *Sui-shu*, the work contained thirteen chüan.) Yen Chih-t'ui mentions in the philological chapter of his *Yen-shih Chia-hsün* that Hsia-hou Kai had read several thousand chüan, which indicates that he was a man of wide learning. In the period of the Wei, Chin, Ch'i, and Liang Dynasties, most members of the Hsia-hou family lived in the commandery of Ch'iao (now Po-hsien in Anhwei). Since Hsia-hou Kai served under the Liang, he probably took up residence in the south with the southward migration of the northerners which began early in the fourth century.

statistics on Chou Tsu-mo's tabulation of information on these early rime dictionaries preserved in the manuscripts of Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün* [see Malmquist's translation, *BMFEA* 40.51-5].

The dictionaries of Yang Hsiu-chih, Li Chi-chieh, and Tu T'ai-ch'ing, though they had many fewer categories than those of Lü Ching and Hsia-hou Kai, were responsible for the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s third-division categories 脂, 之, and 微.

Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* was a riming dictionary of the Chin Dynasty. Since Lo-yang was the capital of this dynasty, it was probably through the incorporation of the *Yün-chi* categories into the *Ch'ieh-yün* that we find the similarities to the Lo-yang Royal Academy literary pronunciation. From Hsia-hou Kai would derive, then, the modified literary pronunciation of the south.

Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* was modelled after Li Teng's *Sheng-lei* in its arrangement of words labelled under the five notes of the musical scale (宮, 商, 角, 徵, and 羽). These terms may have been used to denote tonal distinctions before the adoption of 平, 上, 去, and 入 by Shen Yüeh and his associates. Unlike Li Teng, however, Lü Ching classified according to the rime and final categories.

Since the rime and final categories of Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* are not identical with those of the *Ch'ieh-yün*, we may reasonably assume that the rubrics of the two dictionaries also differed. In the footnotes to the table of contents in Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün*, discussions of the classifications of the earlier rime dictionaries are mainly in terms of the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s rubrics; the evidence is too scanty and the possibility of errors and omissions in the manuscripts of Wang's work too great to permit us to reconstruct with confidence the categories of the five previous dictionaries. From Yen Chih-t'ui's comments on the *Yün-chi* in his *Chia-hsiun*, we know that for Lü Ching 成 (*Ch'ieh-yün* 清) and 宏 (*Ch'ieh-yün* 耕) formed one category, as did 仍 (*Ch'ieh-yün* 蒸) and 登 (*Ch'ieh-yün* 登). (The order of these four characters, given as 成, 仍, 宏, 登 in the present

edition of the *Chia-hsiun*, was correctly emended by Chou Tsu-mo.) The footnotes of Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün* show that in yet another case Lü Ching had just one category where the *Ch'ieh-yün* has three categories: *Ch'ieh-yün* 耿 (耕上), *Ch'ieh-yün* 靜 (清上), *Ch'ieh-yün* 迴 (青上). We may infer that the corresponding p'ing-sheng and ch'ü-sheng categories also formed one category in the *Yün-chi*; however, Wang Jen-hsü has no notes on the rubrics 耕平 (Lü Ching 宏), 清平 (Lü Ching 成) and 青平 and 靜去勁去徑去. He also has nothing on the classification of the earlier rime dictionaries under the *Ch'ieh-yün* rubrics of 蒸 (Lü Ching 仍) 拯證職 and 登 (Lü Ching 登) 等嶝德.

In his *Chia-hsiun*, Yen Chih-t'ui also criticized Lü Ching for over-categorizing 爲, 奇, 益, and 石 by putting them into four categories where the *Ch'ieh-yün* had only two (Lü Ching 爲 and 奇: *Ch'ieh-yün* 支; Lü Ching 益 and 石: *Ch'ieh-yün* 昔). This information, too, is missing in the notes to the table of contents in Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün*. It has been commonly felt that the difficulty in reporting all the minute differences among the earlier dictionaries was the source of such omissions in Wang's footnotes. A less common and, to my mind, far less likely position is that the discrepancies between the information on Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* in Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün* and the comments on Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* in Yen Chih-t'ui's *Chia-hsiun* indicate that there were two different editions of the *Yün-chi*. It is highly improbable that Yen Chih-t'ui—one of the decisive figures in designing the *Ch'ieh-yün*—would have used two different versions of Lü Ching's *Yün-chi*, one for the compilation of the *Ch'ieh-yün* and another in writing his *Chia-hsiun*.

The information that we gather from the manuscripts of Wang Jen-hsü's revised *Ch'ieh-yün* suggests that Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* was not as systematic, consistent, or comprehensive as Lu Fa-yen's *Ch'ieh-yün*. Under 語, for instance, there is a comment that in Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* 語 (上) and 麌 (上) form one category; there are, however, no comments under the p'ing sheng and ch'ü sheng counterparts of these shang sheng cate-



gories, 魚 (平), 御 (去), 虞 (平), and 遇 (去). Under 談 (平) there is a comment that in the *Yün-chi* 談 and 銜 form one category, and under 敢 (上) a comment that 敢 and 檻 form another category, but nothing is said about the corresponding ch'ü sheng and ju sheng finals 闕 (去), 鑑 (去) and 盍 (入), 狎 (入). Though Lü Ching made two categories each for 尤 (平) and 侯 (平), 有 (上) and 厚 (上), he classified 宥 (去) and 候 (去) in one category.

Among the rime dictionaries which preceded the *Ch'ieh-yün*, Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* was the most divergent. It diverged somewhat less, however, from Tu T'ai-ch'ing's dictionary than from the dictionaries of Hsia-hou Kai, Yang Hsiu-chih, or Li Chi-chieh. Lü Ching, for example, recognized the third-division : fourth-division contrasts (1) 仙 : 先, (2) 獮 : 銑, (3) 線 : 霰, (4) 薛 : 屑, (5) 小 : 篠, (6) 笑 : 嘯, (7) 昔 : 錫 and (8) 祭 : 霽.<sup>5</sup> Hsia-hou, Yang, and Li recognized none of these contrasts; Tu recognized (5) and (6). Lü Ching was alone in recognizing the distinctions of (1) 哈海代 and 灰賄隊, (2) 元 and 魂痕, (3) 阮 and 混很, (4) 月 and 沒. On the other hand, neither Lü Ching nor Tu T'ai-ch'ing recognized the 陽養漾藥 : 唐蕩宕鐸 distinction, though Hsia-hou, Yang, and Li did.

The categories of Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* coincide, in most cases, with those implicit in the riming practice of the Wei-Chin Dynasties. (For a study of this riming practice, see Ting 1975.) Thus, words of the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s 魚語御 and 虞麌遇 categories rime with each other, as do many words of the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s 眞 (臻) 軫震質 (櫛) and 文 (殷) 吻 (隱) 問 (焮) 物 (迄) categories. In this last case, judging from the information in Wang's

5. Except after initials which were labiovelar or velar in Ancient Chinese, the modern Wu dialects of Yi-wu and Chin-hua have different reflexes for the *Ch'ieh-yün* third and fourth-division finals with -m, -p, -n, -t endings. Of the following examples, for instance, the first two belong to the third division, the last four to the fourth (A is p'ing, B shang, C ch'ü, D ju; 1 is ying, 2 is yang):

	尖		仙		點		先		疊		截	
Yi-wu	tsie <sup>33</sup>	A1	sie <sup>33</sup>	A1	ñie <sup>42</sup>	B1	sie <sup>33</sup>	A1	die <sup>212</sup>	D2	zie <sup>212</sup>	D2
Chin-hua	zie	A1	sie	A1	diaa	B1	sia	A1	dhiah	D2	hsiah	D2

(See Chin 1964 and Yüeh-chai 1958.)



edition of the *Ch'ieh-yün*, Lü Ching is inconsistent: 眞 (平) and 文 (平) are in one category, but 質 (入) and 迄 (入) are two categories. (Hsia-hou, however, puts 質 and 迄 in one category. Could Wang's information have been erroneous?) In his *Chia-hsiun*, Yen Chih-t'ui criticized Lü Ching for putting 益 and 石 in two categories. This, however, is just the way these are treated in the Wei-Chin riming practice. (益 is Ting's \*-jiek, 石 is his \*-jiak.) On the other hand, there is no Wei-Chin support for the *Yün-chi*'s classification of 爲 and 奇 in two categories, which Yen Chih-t'ui also criticized. These finals do rime with each other in Wei-Chin poetry.

Hsia-hou Kai's *Yün-lüeh*, which represents a later, southern tradition, is another major source of *Ch'ieh-yün* categories: Hsia-hou's rime dictionary is characterized by the inclusion of 魂痕 and 元 in one category and the segregation of (1) 山 and 刪, (2) 櫛 and 諫, (3) 耿 and 梗, (4) 諍 and 敬, (5) 咸 and 銜, (6) 賺 and 檻, (7) 陷 and 鑑, (8) 狎 and 洽, (9) 夬 and 怪, (10) 蟹 and 駭, (11) 語 and 麌, and (12) 眞 and 文 (殷). (Contrasts [1] through [9] are "second-division" rimes.) These are also characteristics of the poetry of the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en Dynasties. (See Yü 1936.) Just four of the above distinctions had been recognized by the compilers of the early rime dictionaries: (1) by Tu T'ai-ch'ing, (8) by Lü Ching, (11) by Yang Hsiu-chih, Li Chi-chieh, and Tu T'ai-ch'ing, (12) by Yang Hsiu-chih and Tu T'ai-ch'ing.

In the south, as we see from both Hsia-hou Kai's *Yün-lüeh* and the poetry of Shen Yüeh, Liu Hsieh, and many others, words of the 元 category rimed with words of the 魂痕 categories; in Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* and the poetry of the north during the Wei-Chin period, they did not. The *Ch'ieh-yün*, then, established a separate category for 元 not because either Hsia-hou Kai or Lü Ching did, but because they treated it in different ways, showing that it had merged differently in different dialects. The arrange-

ment of 元 between 文殷 and 魂痕 in the *Ch'ieh-yün* reflects the close phonetic resemblance of 元 and 魂痕.<sup>6</sup> (See Kun Chang 1975.)

The *Ch'ieh-yün*'s 眞軫震質 and 文(殷)吻(隱)問(焮)物(迄) are firmly established as two independent categories in the riming practice of the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en Dynasties, and are recognized as such by Hsia-hou Kai, but in Wei-Chin poetry there are many cases where words of the 眞 category rimed with words of the 文 category,<sup>7</sup> and Lü Ching put them in one category.

The distinction between the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s 魚語御 and 虞麌遇 was lost as early as the Chin Dynasty for certain, and even earlier in all probability, in most areas except for the region along the lower course of the Yangtzu River—and mostly south of it, in an area around the Lake of T'ai. Again, Lü Ching did not record this distinction, but Hsia-hou Kai did.<sup>8</sup>

The categories 山產欄(黠) and 刪潛諫(鎋), which Hsia-hou Kai recognized, differed in the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en period (see Yü Hai-yen's tabulations) in that members of the 刪潛諫鎋 category rimed only among themselves, while members of the 山產欄黠 category occasionally rimed with members of the 先銑霰屑 and 仙獮線薛 categories. The riming practice of this period also coincides with Hsia-hou Kai's classification of 佳蟹卦, 皆駭怪, and 夬. There is just one discrepancy: though Hsia-hou Kai separated (庚)梗敬(陌) and (耕)耿靜(麥), even the most sophisticated writers of

6. The independent status of the 元 category is also supported by modern-dialect reflexes. In the dialect of Foochow and the Japanese Go-on pronunciation, words of the 元 category have a rounded vowel, -o-, while words of the 仙 category have an unrounded vowel, -e-. 建 (category: 元) is, for example, kioŋ (Foochow), kon (Go-on); 乾 (category: 仙) is kieg (Foochow), gen (Go-on). (See Kun Chang and Betty Shefts Chang 1972, particularly Chart 15.)

7. The reflexes of 眞:殷 in some modern dialects show a contrast of an unrounded vowel, -i-, with a rounded vowel, -y-, -u-, or -o-. 因 (category: 眞) has, for example, the reflexes iŋ (Foochow), in (Amoy and Go-on); 殷 (category: 殷) has yŋ (Foochow), un (Amoy), and on (Go-on). (See Chang and Chang, *ibid.*, especially Chart 16.)

8. Lo Ch'ang-p'ei discusses this problem at length in his 1931 article.

the Ch'i-Liang-Ch'en Dynasties rimed words of the 庚 category with words of the 耕 category. In Shen Yüeh's poem 會圃臨春風, for example, 驚 (category: 庚) rimes with 莖, 驚 (category: 耕).

Some twenty years after the *Ch'ieh-yün* was first planned, the Lu family found itself in disfavor with the Sui court. Lu Fa-yen lost his government position and, in the second stage of the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s compilation, began to fill in the original outline worked out around 580 A.D. It is clear that, in doing this in isolation, he relied heavily on the fan-ch'ieh spellings of previous dictionaries. Although Lu Fa-yen did not enumerate the dictionaries he consulted, we find most of the *Ch'ieh-yün* categories confirmed by the fan-ch'ieh spellings preserved in a sixth-century dictionary, Ku Yeh-wang's *Yü-p'ien*.

The *Yü-p'ien* and the *Ch'ieh-yün* both aimed at maintaining the new standard literary pronunciation which, originating in the north, had been developed and modified in the south. The northern tradition was the way the Royal Academy students in the Chin Dynasty capital of Lo-yang chanted the Classics and other literature. (It is only reasonable to suppose that they used the literary pronunciation for this, not the colloquial pronunciation of the uneducated common people of Lo-yang.) Lü Ching's *Yün-chi* represents this northern tradition. With the invasion of the northern barbarians in the fourth century, the Chinese moved south, taking with them their traditional mode of chanting. During the next two or three hundred years, however, when the political and cultural center of China was in Chin-ling, the southern dialects had their effect on this literary mode of pronunciation.

The southern element in the new literary pronunciation was due to political events. It was, however, contact with Indian Buddhists in the Ch'i-Liang Dynasties which gave scholars the phonological sophistication to recognize the distinctions they did and to codify the riming patterns

of the new literature.<sup>9</sup> Shen Yüeh had said to Wang Yün, "There is almost no one who really knows the proper pronunciation" (知音) (Biography of Wang Yün, *Nan-Shih*, Vol. 22). Lu Fa-yen echoed this lament in his Preface to the *Ch'ieh-yün*: "If our purpose is to encourage more people to write poetry, we can of course relax some restrictions; but if we value the proper pronunciation, we should certainly maintain all proper phonological distinctions". The *Ch'ieh-yün* was, then, intended as a dictionary which would categorize all these distinctions. Shen Yüeh and his associates, the first to formally recognize four tonal categories in the Chinese language (平, 上, 去, and 入), established meticulous riming schemes.<sup>10</sup> These rime distinctions were observed by the phonologically sophisticated writers of the Ch'i-Liang Dynasties. In the four-line verses which come at the end of each of the fifty chapters of Liu Hsieh's *Wen-hsin Tiao-lung*, for instance, the riming practice is almost completely in agreement with the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s specifications.<sup>11</sup>

The *Ch'ieh-yün* is a composite. Lu Fa-yen made this amply clear in his Preface, when he said that historical differences and geographical variations in Chinese phonology were discussed before the outline of the *Ch'ieh-yün* was laid down. The notes under the rime rubrics in the table of contents of Wang Jen-hsü's edition confirm it. The *Ch'ieh-yün* system consists of many phonological distinctions based on various dialects. There has never been a single natural dialect at any time or in any place with

---

9. The Southern Ch'i Prince of Ching-ling, Hsiao Tzu-liang (460-94 A.D.) was one of those instrumental in bringing together the Buddhists and the literary men. The Prince was seriously interested in Buddhism. So, for instance, in the seventh year of Yung-ming (480 A.D.), he assembled a number of Buddhist monks who were versed in phonology and had them compose new melodies for chanting hymns. He was also a patron of many writers; one of them, Shen Yüeh, was a frequent companion of the Prince. (See the biography of the Prince of Ching-ling, *Nan-ch'i-shu*, Vol. 40, and *Nan-shih*, Vol. 44.)

10. Chou Yung was also mentioned in the *Nan Shih* (Vol. 34) as having compiled a dictionary in which the words were arranged according to four tonal categories. (See Feng 1965, and Lin Ming-po 1976.)

11. See BMFEA 40.67-8.

all of these distinctions. The literary language the *Ch'ieh-yün* represented and fostered was an artist's instrument which had grown increasingly complex and which the artist had to learn to play, in part with the *Ch'ieh-yün*'s help.

### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chang, Kun and Betty Shefts Chang. 1972. *The Proto-Chinese Final System and the Ch'ieh-yün*, The Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Monographs Series A, No. 26, Taipei.
- Chang, Kun. 1975. "Dialect Variations in Chinese Historical Phonology", *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 46: 613-35, Taipei.
- Chin, Yu-ching. 1964. "Yi-wu-hua-li Hien Shan Liang-she San-szu-teng Zu te Fen-pieh" ("The Distinctions between the Words of the Third and Fourth Divisions in the Hien and Shan Rime Groups"), *Chung-kuo Yü-wen* 128-61, Peking.
- Ch'en, Yin-k'o. 1949. "Ts'ung Shih-shih lun *Ch'ieh-yün*" ("The *Ch'ieh-yün* Problem in the Light of Historical Reality", *Ling-nan Hsüeh-pao* 9: 1-18, Canton.
- Chou, Tsu-mo. 1966a. "*Wan-hsiang Ming-yi* chung chih Yüan-pen Yü-p'ien Yin-hsi" ("The Phonological System of the Original Yü-p'ien Preserved in the Banshyō Myōgi"), *Wen-hsüeh-chi* 270-404, Peking.
- Chou, Tsu-mo. 1966b. "*Ch'ieh-yün* te hsing-chih ho t'a te yin-hsi chi-ch'u" ("The Nature of the *Ch'ieh-yün* and the Basis of its Phonological System"), *Wen-hsüeh-chi* 434-73, Peking.
- Feng, Ch'eng-chi. 1965. "Lun Yung-ming Sheng-lü-Sze-sheng" ("On the Versifications of the Yung-ming Style Poetry—The Four Tones"), *Ta-lu Tsa-chih* (*The Continent Magazine*) 31: 271-5, Taipei.
- Han, Yao-lung. 1970. "*Wen-hsin Tiao-lung* Wu-shih-p'ien Tsan-yü Yung-yün K'ao" ("A Study of the Riming Patterns of the Four-line Verses attached to the Ends of the Fifty Chapters in *Wen-hsin Tiao-lung*),

- Wen-hsin Tiao-lung Yen-chiu Lun-wen-chi* (Collected Essays on the *Wen-hsin Tiao-lung*) 33-69, Taipei.
- Lin, P'ing-ho. 1972. *Lü Ching "Yün-chi" Yen-chiu* (A Study of Lü Ching's "Yün-chi"), M. A. Thesis, Institute of Chinese Literature, National Cheng-chih University, Muchai, Taipei.
- Lin, Ming-po. 1976. "Shen Yüeh Sze-sheng Pien" ("On Shen Yüeh's Sze-sheng"), *Kuo-wen Yüeh-pao* (Bulletin of Chinese of National Taiwan Normal University) 5: 47-63, Taipei.
- Lo, Ch'ang-p'ei. 1931. "Ch'ieh-yün Yü Yü te Yin-chih chi ch'i Suo-chü Fang-yin K'ao" ("A Study of the Phonetic Values of the Two Categories of Yü [魚] and Yü [虞] in the *Ch'ieh-yün* and their Pronunciations in Various Dialects"), *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 2: 358-85, Shanghai.
- Malmquist, Göran Malmquist. 1968. "Chou Tsu-mo on the *Ch'ieh-yün*", *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 40: 30-78, Stockholm.
- Ōshima, Shōji. 1969, 1971. "Gan Shiko *Kansho* ongi no Kenkyū" ("A Study of Yen Shih-ku's Phonetic Glosses to *Han-shu*"), *Hokkaido Daigaku Bungakubu Kiyō* 17 (1): 45-238 and 19 (4): 1-85, Sapporo.
- Ōshima, Shōji. 1971. "Gan Shiko *Kansho* ongi Inrui Ko" ("A Study on the Finals of Yen Shih-ku's Phonetic Glosses to *Han-shu*"), *Gengo Kenkyū* 59: 43-61, Tokyo.
- Ting, Pang-hsin. 1975. *Chinese Phonology of the Wei-Chin Period*, Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Special Publication No. 65, Taipei.
- Yü, Hai-yen. 1936. *Han Wei Liu-ch'ao Yün-p'u* (Tabulations of the Rime Words in the Verses of the Han-Wei-Chin and Nan-pei-ch'ao Periods), Peiping.
- Yüeh-chai. 1958. "Chin-hua Fang-yin yü Pei-ching Yü-yin te Tui-chao", ("The Phonological Correspondences between the Chin-hua and the Peking Dialects"), *Fang-yen Yü P'u-t'ung-hua Chi-k'an* 5: 25-98, Peking.

# 切韻的綜合性質

張 琨

(摘 要)

切韻系統之龐大，絕對不會代表一時一地的活方言。切韻是採取以前的韻書的韻類加以系統化而成的。以前的韻書，對於切韻分韻影響最大的是呂靜韻集和夏侯該韻略。呂靜韻集是晉朝北方韻書，夏侯該韻略是梁朝南方韻書。切韻的韻類的劃分是根據書本上的材料，與口語有一段距離。當時“知音”者稀，是說很多人的讀音不夠標準。也就是說，讀者多以方音所礙，讀音與切韻中所定的標準不合。切韻的讀音大概是齊梁時代文人的讀書音。切韻的產生與齊梁時代音韻學的發達有關。齊梁時代音韻學的發達與佛教的影響有關。齊竟陵王子良在這方面的貢獻恐怕很大。可惜我們知之甚少。