CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Jiyun (JY) 集韻 was edited at the proposal of Song Qi 宋祁 and Zheng Jian 鄭戩 to the order of the Emperor Song Renzong 宋仁宗 by Ding Du 丁度, Li Shu 李淑 and other Northern Song 北宋 scholars (Ding 1980: 1-1). This enlarged and revised edition was based on Guangyun (GY) 廣韻, which was edited about thirty-one years earlier than JY. JY was completed in the second year of the Bao Yuan 寶元 reign (1039 A.D.) The vocabulary of JY contains 53,525 characters, 27,331 characters more than GY. It includes all the proper forms 正文, clerical scripts (li-scripts) 隸書, zhou forms 篆文, ancient forms 古文 and others, which can be found in the traditional lexicons and etymological texts. Traditionally, JY was a phonological text and it was arranged according to the rhyme in its form (Ding 1980: 1-1b).

The inadequacy of GY in general application—including the cited material and the pronunciations listed in it was the main reason for the compilation of JY. The pronunciations listed in GY, which, according to the reading system of the middle ancient times (3rd to 9th century), are different to the reading system of that time. For the compilation method of Ding Du and others, there are two editions, one is a simplified edition, Libu yunlue 禮部韻略, and other is a comprehensive edition, JY. Libu yunlue was edited in 1037 A.D., three years before the completion of JY. They are two volumes of phonological texts that complement each other. As the simplified edition, Libu yunlue was condensed for the candidates in their rhythmical literary composition. So, for the need of the examination (the main objective of the publication of phonological text), Libu yunlue was more convenient for the candidates. As a detailed edition, the content of JY is
massive and comprehensive. It contains a lot of data which is useful to the study of Chinese phonology, etymology and semantics. Thus, based on the quotation of various facts, JY was not as popular as QY or Libu yunlue (Ding 1980: 1-1; Chen 1993: 575–577).

After a long vacuum period in the study of Chinese etymology and semantics in Yuan 元 and Ming 明 dynasties, JY became unfamiliar to scholars. Gu Yanwu 郭炎武 of the Ming dynasty suspected that JY had disappeared when he wrote the book Yinlun 音論. It was not until the early period of the Qing 清 dynasty that Zhu Yizun 朱彝尊 discovered the recopied copy of Song manuscripts of JY in Mao Yi’s 毛扆 Jiguge (Jigu private library) 汲古閣. In the forty-fifth year of the reign of Kang Xi 康熙 (1706 A.D.), he handed this set of manuscript to Cao Yin 曹寅, who published it in Yangzhou 楊州 (Ding 1980: 1-1). From then, scholars realised that JY was important and useful in the study of Chinese phonology, etymology, semantics and dialect. Yu Xiaoke 余巖客, Duan Yucai 段玉裁, Niu Shuyu 鈕樹玉, Yan Jie 嚴傑, Chen Huan 陳樊, Wang Yuansun 汪選孫, Chen Qingyong 陳慶鏞, Fang Chenggui 方成珪 and others were the scholars who used JY to correct the errors and discrepancies of the ancient lexicons (Fang 1968:999). The value of JY can best be seen in Chen Huan's saying, "JY is a phonological text that quotes various facts from the ancient lexicons and etymological texts. For those who study phonology and the critical interpretation of ancient texts, JY is the only text that contains the biggest number and variety of lexicons" (Qiu 1974:25). Even though JY is getting popular and being given much attention by the scholars, it is still not enough. JY is valuable in the Chinese phonological study, moreover, it is also useful in the study of Chinese etymology and semantics (Zhao 1991:58).
JY lists the characters by dividing them according to their rhyme into ten volumes. The even-tone rhyme 平聲韻 characters are found in volume one to four, while the rising-tone rhyme 上聲韻, depart-tone rhyme 去聲韻 and enter-tone rhyme 入聲韻 characters occupy two volumes each. The form of this text like GY, is divided into 206 rhymes. Under each rhyme are the unison characters. Each unisonant group displays a "fanqi" 反切 and the total figures of those same rhyme characters after the explanation. For the characters listed in JY, normally, the first character which appears is considered the leading word (proper form). The character (or characters) listed after the leading word (proper form) is (are) considered the variant form(s) ("beiti").

JY collects a lot of variant forms in its vocabulary. Its editorial rules no. 2 says, "(this text) quotes all the ancient forms that can be found in the ancient lexicons" (Ding 1980: 1-1b). Due to this concept, most of the characters include different ways of writing, i.e., variant form, ancient form, zhou form, zhuo form 篆文, qizi 奇字, li-script and others. For example,

1. Under the rhyme Jiang 江 in volume one, JY lists 從 as the variant form of 長 (Ding 1980: 1-10b).

2. Under the rhyme Jie 輝 in volume two, JY lists 陸, 隕, 隕, 燃, 燃, 燃, 風, 風, 風 and 風 as the ancient forms of 輝, whereas 陸 as the zhou form of 榮 (Ding 1980: 2-17).

3. Under the rhyme Yang 楊 in volume three, JY lists 雅 as the zhuan form and 雅 as the ancient form of 雅 (Ding 1980: 3-26b).

4. Under the rhyme Xiao 郭 in volume three, the JY lists 郭 as the zhuan form and 晃 as the variant form of 郭 (Ding 1980: 3-12b).
5. Under the rhyme Jie 皆 in volume two, JY lists 齊 and 齊 as the li-script, 乏 as the ancient form, 被 as the zhou form and 壺 as the variant form of 壺. (Ding 1980: 2-15b)

6. Under the rhyme Tang 唐 in volume three, JY lists 仝 as the qizi of 倉 (Ding 1980:3-30b)

7. Under the rhyme Zhun 撈 in volume seven, JY lists 填 as the ancient form, 曹 as the qizi, and 曹 as the li-script of 撈. (Ding 1980:7-35b).

The examples listed above are to prove that JY collects a lot of different kinds of variant forms of characters from the ancient dictionaries. The examples that prove that JY also collects a lot of the variations of the characters from other sources as follows:

1. JY cites the opinion of Cui Zhuan 崔譚 and lists 墊 as the variant form of 塊. (Ding 1980: 1-3)

2. JY cites that 仲 is written as 憐 in Chuci 楚辭. (Ding 1980: 1-6)

3. JY cites that 叩 is written as 飲 in Zhouli 周禮. (Ding 1980: 1-11b)

4. JY cites that 廷 is written as 偼 in the Taixuan 太玄 (經). (Ding 1980:1-12b)

5. JY cites the opinion of Yang Ziyun 揚子雲 and lists the script 擷 as 擷. (Ding 1980: 1-13)

6. JY cites that 伸 is written as 信 in the classical text. (Ding 1980: 2-20)

7. JY cites that 臣 is written as 慎 by the Empress Wu of the Tang dynasty 唐武后. (Ding 1980: 2-20b)

8. JY cites that 繞 is written as 綃 and 纲 in Yili 儀禮. (Ding 1980: 2-23)

9. JY cites that 睽 is written as 粥 in Shiji 史記. (Ding 1980: 2-31b)

10. JY cites that 茅 is written as 蕃 in Erfa 瘦雅. (Ding 1980: 2-33b)
11. JY cites that 飯 is written as 瓦 in Boya 博雅. (Ding 1980: 2-34)

12. JY cites the opinion of Lu Jing 吕静 that 䍪 is the variant form of 華. (Ding 1980: 2-34)

13. JY cites that 燦 written as 闌 in Zuoshizhuan 左氏傳. (Ding 1980:2-35b)

14. According to JY, the Nanshi 南史 writes the script 磯 as 孻 when citing it from Futushu 浮屠書. (Ding 1980: 7-34)

The collection of variant forms of the characters in JY is quite large. The amount of variant forms for a proper form character varies from one to four. Some of them run up to nine or ten. For example,

1. The script 彬 has nine variant forms: 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬, 彬. and 惠. (Ding 1980: 9-566)

2. The script 鍵 has ten variant forms: 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵, 鍵. and 鍵. (Ding 1980:3-4b)

Thus, if those variant forms of JY are not taken into account, the total number of quoted characters are about 30,000 (Yuyan 1992: 15). Therefore, JY is actually a phonological lexicon which comprises different and numerous variant forms of characters.

**SCOPE OF STUDY**

In addition to the proper form of the characters for the explanation of the reading, JY also records their structure and variant forms 'as has been discussed' before. Because of its massive scope, those who are not familiar with the ancient lexicons may spend a whole life on the study, and yet are still unable to totally explore its profoundness. In
view of its inexhaustibility, therefore, this thesis can only focuses on the structures of the characters recorded in it.

Chen Huan, in his preface to Ma Yuanlin's *Jiyun jiaokanji*, 马远林集韵校勘记, says, "Those who are not erudite or devoted, nor willing to persevere for decades in his study will not be able to acquire full knowledge of *JY*" (Qiu 1974: 64). This is a creditable comment on *JY*. For this reason, the scholars who have studied *JY* from the beginning of the Qing dynasty till present time could at most make progress in only one aspect of it, which is the textual research of the pronunciations of pre-Tang. For instance, Duan Yucai, Yan Jie, Wang Yuansun, Chen Huan, Ma Yuanlin were among those who made achievements in this area.

There were other scholars like Ren Dachun 任大椿, Ma Guohan 马国翰 and etc., who checked and emended the characters in *JY* with the ancient literary texts, lexicons and dictionaries (Qiu 1974: 25). As far as contemporary research on *JY* is concerned, there are an MA dissertation, *Jiyun ying Shuowen kao* 集韵引说文考 written by Wang Guilan 黄桂兰 (1973, Taiwan), and a Ph.D. thesis, *Jiyun yanjiu* 集韵研究 by Qiu Qiyang 邱荣疆 (1974, Taiwan), both being the research materials I have drawn from. But both studies mainly check and quote materials in *JY* with the ancient related lexicons and texts from the angle of Chinese phonology.

To conclude, although Duan Yucai had used *JY* to rectify the writing structures of *SW*, Wang Niansun 王念孙 had used *JY* to supplement the omission, to correct the corrupted form of *GYa* (Fang 1968: 3), both had only quoted partly the variant forms of *JY*. Sun Yirang 孙贻让 is of the opinion that *JY* quotes a lot of variant forms unmatched by other ancient phonological texts (Fang 1968: 999). Scholars in later times who
studied JY did not follow this pursuit. They were more focused on pronunciation. However, I agree with Sun Yirang and hence, the objective of my thesis is to study the aspects of the Chinese semantics and etymology in JY.

Zhou Zhongfu 周中孚, in volume fourteen of Zhengtang dushuji 郑堂讀書記, criticises JY that "it was not discriminating enough in its selection of characters for inclusion; for example, that of zhuan and zhou forms which may be irrelevant" (Liu 1992: 212). Similar criticism appeared in volume forty-two of Siku quanshu zongmu 四庫全書總目 (Siku 1981: 359). Hence, the focus of the analysis is on a comparative study between the above-mentioned variant forms and the relevant scripts listed in the major ancient Chinese lexicons works, e.g. Erva (EY) 儒雅, Shuowen jiezi (SW) 説文解字, Guangya (GYa) 廣雅, Shiming (SM) 释名, Fangyan (FY) 方言, Yupian (YP) 玉篇, Longkan shoujing (LKSJ) 龙龛手鏡, GY and other solid works in the study of Chinese etymology and semantics of the scholars through the ages.

At the same time, a comparison of these variant forms of characters with some of the related texts and their explanation was also undertaken. Furthermore, as Sun Yirang has pointed out, JY contains many quotations of numerous ancient texts which are no longer in use (Fang 1968:999). In this way, JY has contributed to the preservation of some of the ancient literary materials.

It is a fact that scholars of the Qing dynasty used JY as a tool for literary research. However, there are some scholars who have criticised JY for its complexity which is not related to phonology. This criticism is biased and unfounded because JY has been recognised as a useful reference for research in etymology, phonology and semantics. It serves not only as a vital phonological text but also as a useful guide to Chinese
etymological research as well. Therefore, this thesis is an initial study of the variant forms of the characters listed in *JY*.

**THE PRINCIPLE, METHOD AND MATERIALS DRAWN FOR THE THESIS**

The total number of characters collected in *JY* is 53,525, which are the so-called "leading characters" (proper forms) according to *JY*. There are 9,311 characters that contain variations, which are listed after their individual leading characters. These so-called "variations" (bieti) are in actual fact what we understand to be variant forms today.

From the examples listed in *JY* we came to discover that Ding Du and others were quite cautious in collecting and discriminating characters in the course of editing the book. For instance, in editorial rule no. 5 of *JY*, the ancient texts have quoted numerous loan words, but these characters had already acquired their individual semantic element and used independently by the Song dynasty. Hence they can only be called "interchangeable characters" and not variations, and were not listed after the leading characters.

In editorial rule no. 7, some characters share the same semantic or phonetic element and only differ in the structure or conversion of character. The configuration of examples, the words 坪、坪 consist of identical strokes. Although the positioning of the character strokes differ, *JY* is of the opinion that 坪 can be written as 坪 . Hence they are not to be regarded as variations. Other examples include “寸，汼” “心，忄” “水，氵” etc.

Furthermore, in editorial rule no. 11 of *JY*, the vulgar forms were created by latter generations who assigned new meanings to them; they are worthless and may even create...
confusion in our efforts to identify the proper forms. Hence JY states that they are used in a popular context and may not be correct. Hence they are not listed after the leading characters. (Ding 1980:1-1)

For this reason, JY has stated clearly that those characters listed after the leading characters are variant forms, which excludes loan words, vulgar forms and two characters which shares the same semantic and phonetic elements.

The "variant form" concerned with in this thesis refers to two characters that differ in pictographic element (i.e. character construction) but share the same phonetic element and meaning. In other words, it means two ways of writing one character. Based on this analysis, the range includes tongbu chongwen 同部重文 (orthographic variants under the same radical in SW), yibu chongwen 異部重文 (orthographic variants under different radicals), leizeng zi 累增字 (character with superadded radicals), ancient form, zhou-script, variant form, and vulgar form as understood in SW. Using this criterion, when we contrasted the above-mentioned concept with the variant forms collected in JY, we discovered that quite a number of "variant forms" (bieti) listed in JY differ from the "variant forms" that is mentioned above. The mistake that JY makes contribute to the study of this topic and makes this study interesting and worthy of exploring. (see appendixes B and F)

After a comparison and classification, we discovered that the criterion JY adopted in word-collection leaves much to be desired. The problem lies in the fact that among the "variant forms" in JY, half of them are actually loan words (see appendix B & F). The following examples serve to bring out this observation.
1. Under the rhyme zhi 子 in volume two, 
   IV renders that 戲 is the variant form of 徙. SW defines, "廾 meaning standard of a commander". Duan Yucai
   annotates that 徙 is the vulgar form of 廾 (Duan 1985: 616). SW defines,
   "戃 meaning side wing or a weapon" (Ding 1959: V.9.5684). Hence, 徙 and
   戲 are different in meaning.

   The script 戲 appears in Biography of Huiyin 洪徽侯列傳 of Shiji 史記, Pei Yin
   貝蹁 cites the annotation of Xu Guang 徐廣 that 戲 is also written as 徙
   (Shuangchuan 1983:1064). It appears again in Biography of Li Guang 李廣、蘇
   建傳 of Hanshu, Yan Shigu annotates that 戲 is a loan word of 徙 (Ban 1992 :
   V.8.2446). Thus, the relation between 戲 and 徙 was loan word, not variation.
   (See 2.17)

2. Under the rhyme yu 魚 in volume two, IV renders that 徐 is the variant form of
   邪. According to SW's definition, 徐 means "walk slowly", whereas 琅邪 is "a
   county name" (Ding 1959: V.5.2869). YP interprets 邪 to mean "evil" (Gu 1987 :
   11). Hence, 徐 and 邪 are different in meaning.

   LKSJ interprets that 徐 is the same as 徐 (Xing 1985:27). Xu Kai 徐楷 is the
   same annotation that 徐 and 徐 are the same in meaning (Ding 1959 : V.7.
   3573b). The script 邪 appears in Beifeng 北風 under the title Beifeng 邪風 of
   Shijing 詩經, Zheng Xuan 鄭玄 annotates that 邪 is a loan word of 徐 (Kong
   1980:310). The same sentence appears again in the annotation of Li Shan 李善,
   under the poetry of Youtong 幽通賦 by Ban Gu 班固, in which 邪 is written as
   徐 (Li 1981:209). Thus, it is believed that 邪 is a loan word of 徐 (徐). (See 2.27)
3. Under the rhyme **you** 館 in volume two, **JY** renders that 愁 is the variant form of 揳. **SW** defines 揳 as meaning "get together" and 愁 as meaning "worry" (Ding 1959: V.8.4768). Both 揳 and 愁 are different in meaning. **LKSJ** interprets 揳 as the same as 搏，which means "get together" (Xing 1985: 208). Duan Yucai 段玉裁 and Zhu Junsheng 朱駿聲 are of the same opinion that 愁 is a loan word of 搏 (Duan 1985: 518; Ding 1959: V.8.4768). The script 愁 appears in the chapter Zhouhe 宇合 of Guanzi 管子, and Wang Niansun 王念孫 comments that 愁 is the same as 搏 (Yin 1981: 60). Thus, 愁 is a loan word of 搏, and not a variant form. (See 2.141)

4. Under the rhyme **yu** 該 in volume three, **JY** renders that 貯 is the variant form of 著. **SW** defines 貯 to mean "store". 著 is not listed in **SW**. **GYa** interprets 著 as meaning "remarkable" (Wang 1983: 112). Hence, 貯 and 著 are different in meaning.

Duan Yucai and Gao Xianglin 高翔麟 are of the opinion that 宁 is the vulgar form and 宁 is the same as 貯 (Duan 1985: 283; Ding 1959: V.5. 2760b). The script 著 appears in the Biography of Huozhi 貨殖列傳 of Shiji, Pei Yin records that 著 is a loan word of 貯 (Shuangchuan 1983: 1356). The script 著 appears again in the chapter Shize 時則 of Huainanzi 淮南子, Zheng Liangshu 鄭良樹 is of the opinion that 著 is a loan word of 貯 (Zheng 1968: 93). (See 3.180)

5. Under the rhyme **yan** 優 in volume three, **JY** renders that 辨 is the variant form of 責. **SW** defines that 責 means "reduce", whereas 辨 means "distinguish" (Ding 1959: V.4.1838b). Both 責 and 辨 are different in meaning.
The script 

appears in chapter Yuzao 玉藻 of Liji 礼记. Zheng Xuan 郑玄 and Lu Deming 陆德明 comment that 

is a loan word of 贬 (Kong 1980: 1485). According to Zhu Junsheng 朱骏声, 

can be a loan word of 贬, since both of them are alliterated in pronunciations (Ding 1959: V.4.1839). Gao Xianglin is also of the opinion that 

can be a loan word of 贬 (Ding 1959: V.5.1839; V.5.2772). Thus, 

is a loan word of 贬. (See 3.267)

6. Under the rhyme zhun 禅 in volume four, JY renders that 进 is the variant form of 資. SW defines 資 as meaning "the gifts, usually money ", whereas 進 means "move forward" (Ding 1959: V.3.745). Both 資 and 進 are different in meaning.

The scripts 进 appears in The Biography Sketches of Gaozu, the Emperor 高祖本紀 and The Biography of Lu Buwei 目不韋列傳 of Shiji. Sima Zhen 司馬貞 annotates the preceding clause by citing the opinion of Yan Shigu 顏師古 that 进 means "the gifts when both sides get together" (Shuangchuan 1983: 161).

For the latter, Sima Zhen remarks that 进 is a loan word of 資, means "money" (Shuangchuan 1983: 1019). Duan Yucai, Gui Fu 桂馥 and Zhu Junsheng are of the same opinion that 进 is a loan word of 資 (Duan 1985: 282; Gui 1987: 537; Ding 1959: V.3.745, V.5.2750). (See 4.322)

7. Under the rhyme xue 薛 in volume five, JY renders that 率 is the variant form of 鎰. SW defines 鎰 as "an ancient weight unit", whereas 率 means "net" (Ding 1959: V.9. 5936b). Hence, 鎰 and 率 are different in meaning.

The script 率 appears in The Biographical Sketches of Emperors Zhou 周本紀 of Shiji. Pei Yin interprets this by citing Xu Guang's opinion that 率 is the same meaning as 繼. Sima Zhen cited Ma Rong's 马融 opinion that 鎰 is the same with
Kong Anguo 孔安國 comments this as "an ancient weight unit, six liang" (Shuangchuan 1983: 76). Zhu Junsheng concludes that 燮 can be a loan word of 铜 (Ding 1959: V.9.5936). Thus, it is believed that 燮 is a loan word of 铜. (See 5.419)

The research on the variant forms which led to a discovery of the fact that half of the variant forms in JY are actually loan words proves that JY has confused loan words with variant forms and has grouped characters that belong in two different categories under the category of variant forms. Yet, precisely because of this error, we have been given the basic conditions for research into the definition that scholars of the Song dynasty (dating to 960 AD) had given to variant forms. This is an interesting and exciting finding of this thesis and leads one to think that JY is truly worth a detailed study.

As is commonly known, scholars of different times who studied the variant forms have all based their researches on the 1,163 variant forms listed in SW. These variant forms have provided researchers on the subject of characters with the same pronunciation but with different pictographic element. They also provided important materials on the determination of ancient pronunciation and the changing of the semantic element and meaning of Chinese characters. These have been various contributions made by scholars who contrasted them with ancient texts, zhou-script, oracle-bone inscriptions and bronze inscriptions. Yet, when one looks at JY—the book with the greatest number of characters with interesting origins or strange and mysterious pictographic elements—-one wonders why the massive book has failed to generate curiosity and scholastic
interest? Aren't these fascinating characters worthy enough to deserve a closer study? Could it be because of its wrong classification of characters that the research value of JY has been demoted? It is certainly hoped that this initial study and finding of the variant forms in JY not only helped to classify these variant forms properly but has also thrown some light on future researches in the study of the pictographic, phonological and semantic changes of characters spanning about 939 years, starting from the period of SW down to that of JY.

Listed below are some examples that will illustrate how a study of the variant forms in JY can contribute to the research on etymology.

1. 乱 is found under rhyme zhi 之. It appears twice in JY, means "administer", and is the ancient form of 治 (Ding 1980: 7-8b). This character is missing in the lexicons and classical texts before JY. SW defines 鬱 (受) to mean "administer". 鬱 is the ancient form (Ding 1959: V.4.1690). YP interprets, "章 is the ancient form of 旨" (Gu 1987: 130). JY lists 夏 as 夏. (Ding 1980: 7-44) The Hanjian 汉简 written as 鬱 (Guo 1990: 192). According to Duan Yucai, 受 (储) and 乱 are the same in meaning and pronunciation. (Duan 1985: 747).

The bronze inscriptions have 夏 as 夏, 夏 etc. It is a symbol of sorting silk ( oracle bone ) with both hands ( 匠 ). This meaning is the same as script 乱, where 乱 (乙) is the phonetic element (Chen 1987: 456), and 夏 is wrongly written as 夏. This is an attested example. Again, the Zuchuwen 诅楚文 is written as 夏 (Xu 1980:552), Jinshi dazidian 金石大字典 listed as 夏, 夏 etc. (Wang 1984:40). The Yishanbei 嶧山碑 is written as 夏 (Mingta 1986: 3). The
Shuihudi's bamboo scripts written as 璐, 録 (Zhang 1994:216), and the Mawangdui silk manuscript of Laozi 老子甲一文 二 写 as 璐 (Hanyu 1993 : 24). According to Kang Yin 康殷, 乱 is a wrongly written version of these characters (Kang 1990 : 519). Thus, the rendering of JY is acceptable. (See 2.21)

The above-mentioned example show that JY has included characters that were not included in the ancient texts. We can prove the accuracy of the character by the use of archaeological finds uncovered in recent years. We have reason to believe that the contribution of JY towards etymology is undeniable.

2. 菰 and 棒 are found under rhyme mo 模. The term 於菟 appears in the Zuozhuan and the term 菰絲 appears in chapter Shicao of EY. The script 菰 also appears in the bronze seal of Han Dynasty, 良 菰, which is written as 良 (Kang 1994 : 157).

The term 於棒 appears in Hanshu 漢書. The script 棒 also appears in the chapter titled Shisangli of Yili 儀禮 (Jia 1980:1131). Thus, it is obvious that 菰 and 棒 are missed out in SW. (See 2.40) This proves that JY is important in complementing and enriching SW.

3. Under the rhyme yao 薯, 煜 is the variant form of 祐. Lu Deming annotated that 祐 is also written as 祐 in EY, whereas Liu Biao's 劉表 edition writes 祐 as 煜 in Yijing 易經. This is the only example that can be found in the classical texts. (See 5.421) From this example, we found that some characters representing specific meanings which hardly appear in the ancient classical text are also in the compilation of JY.
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4. SW defines 靥 by citing Zhouli, "求三斛" which means "a measuring instrument of capacity in ancient time". This sentence is written as "漆三斛" in the present edition of Zhouli 周禮 Yan Kejun 嚴可均 annotated that 漆 is the loan word of 靼, and 靼 is wrongly written as 求 in SW. (Ding 1959: V.10.6384b). JY wrote the word as 靿 (裬). This proves that the character was still listed as 靿 when Ding Du compiled JY (See 3.186). From this example, JY has pointed out a mistake of the present version of SW.

5. JY renders 歮 as the variant form of 韦. YP lists the character 歿 as 歡 and is the same as 韦. 韦 and 歜 are the same meaning in Lishi chunqiu. Thus, is the same as 韦, where 韦 and 歜 are the same character (Gu 1987: 3). Based on JY, 歜 is the correct word (See 5.388). Through this example, JY has pointed out a mistake that can be found in YP.

6. JY renders 鼎, 包, 匠 as the variant forms of 蠟虎. LKSJ interprets 鼎 and 包 in the same meaning as JY, but does not consider them as being the same word. Gu Yewang 顧野王 and Lu Deming 隆德明 are of the opinion that 鼎 and 包 are the same word. Thus, the rendering of LKSJ is disputable (See 2.11). From this example, JY has pointed out a mistake that can be found in LKSJ.

7. JY renders 盂 and 篇 as the variant forms of 錵. GY lists 錫 and 盂 as the same meaning and pronunciation, but not the same word. YPCJ lists that 錫 is the same as 篇 and YP lists that 盂 is the same as 篇. Thus, GY's separation of 錫 and 盂 into two words is disputable (See 2.1).
8. Under the rhyme 麻, *JY* lists 垅 as the variant form of 隆, which means "a name of a mound". They are neither listed in *SW* nor any other lexicons. 隆 consists of 皚 (f) as semantic element and 屠 (da 定魚) as phonetic element, whereas 垅 consists of 土 as semantic element and 宅 (děak 定鍫) as phonetic element. Both 屠 and 宅 are quite close in their ancient pronunciation. As for semantic elements of 皚 (f) and 土, they are exchangeable in ancient dictionaries. For examples, 垰 and 雌, 墚 and 隱, 堮 and 隠 (Chen 1982: 306, 97, 242), 陒 and 址 (Duan 1985: 741) etc. It is suspected that 垰 is the vulgar form of 隆. (See Appendix C no. 58).

The examples mentioned above reveal many characters that wait to be further researched, yet such research is dependent on the uncovering of more characters or relics. Based on all evidences mentioned, the contribution of *JY* towards etymology is indeed indisputable. It should not be regarded merely as an ordinary rhyming dictionary.

Having ascertained the research value of the variant forms in *JY*, the next step of work is to decide what kinds of character and in which scope are worth a study in this thesis.

My statistics showed that of the 53,525 leading characters in *JY*, 9,311 of them or one sixth of it carry "variant forms"("bieti"). The total number of the variant forms (excluding the leading characters) derived from this pool adds up to 12,415. This is a huge figure; it would at least take more than 10,000 pages to study each character in detail. This is not only unnecessary but also beyond the scope of this thesis.

These 12,415 characters of variant forms can be classified into 3 main categories: zhou-script, ancient form and others. Upon deeper analysis, 194 characters are zhou-
script, 1,345 characters are ancient form while variant form ("bieti") take up 10,876. Ancient form and zhou-script are of a small number and hence are insignificant. Further more, as a rhyming dictionary, JY derived its character pool from GY. It is a subject which my teacher Dr. Tan Ooi Chee has already researched extensively in his M.A. thesis titled "A study of the archaic forms of Chinese characters in Kuang-yun". The same topic has also been discussed in a major portion in Wang Guilan's "Jiun ying Shuowen kao". Hence a study of the 10,876 variant forms is the centre of attention and interest. It is necessary to select a representative sample from this figure which is much too massive.

The 10,876 variant forms can be further branched into 2 main heading:

1. As Ding Du and others have mentioned in their editorial rules (Ding 1980:1-1), when Chen Pengnian and others edited GY, they had based their work on the Qieyun 《切韻》and latter editions of rhyme books that enlarged the Qieyun. Hence the attraction and value of those characters whose origins can be traced in GY are much less than those that appear only in JY. For this reason, after a contrasting study, 2,212 characters that can be found in GY and Shiyun Huibian 《十韻彙編》have been excluded from my study (see appendix G).

The semantic element of a character more or less reflects its nature and meaning, while its phonetic element presents its significance and sound when it was created. Two characters that share the same semantic and phonetic elements not only can be categorised under the same origin or same meaning, they may also be related in terms of same sound and interchangeability. Since this study is restricted to "variant form", I did not include these two kinds of character, which number 7,161.
Only those that do not come under the principles or guide mentioned above have been chosen for study in this thesis. For example, the script 錢 appears under rhyme Xian 像 in volume three of the even-tone rhyme, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢, 錢 and 錐 are its ten variant forms. The script 錢 is included in QY as the variant form of 錢; the scripts 錐, 錐, 錐 and 錐 are of the same semantic element as 錢; the scripts 錐 and 錐 are of the same phonetic element as 錢. Thus, only 錐, 錐 and 錐 are in accordance with the principles of the study and hence are valuable for the research.

In addition, a total of 646 characters appear more than once and have been excluded (see appendix G). The remaining 857 characters are therefore the focus of this study. However, in this number there are 278 characters whose origins cannot be traced through the etymology dictionaries of various dynasties and ancient texts, and hence cannot be further researched in the absence of strong supportive materials. They are regarded as characters that deserve further study in future.

On the 1,040 characters (461 leading characters and 579 variant forms), other rhyme books obviously did not consider them to have variations. Why did JY collect them? On what basis has it done so? The relationship between these two are very complex and can be roughly classified into 5 main groups: the variant form, synonym, the loan word, the characters that form based on sound and the characters that having the same source (see appendix F). These questions arouse my interest and prompt me to call for further research.
So, the method of studying the 706 groups (857 sets) of variant forms which accord with the principles of study are listed below:

1. Each group of variations has been arranged according to its volume and rhyme respectively. The characters that repeatedly appear because of different pronunciations are stated in the first volume and rhyme which it first appears.

2. Based on the reorganised data, the 706 groups of variant forms are copied separately in a card; noting the explanations of SW, dictionaries, the utilisation in the ancient lexicons, the conjecture of the ancient, the middle ancient and modern pronunciations, and the theory of the scholars. This is to make it a "variant form card".

3. The study of the variant forms from chapter two to five are sorted according to the "variant form card".

4. For those whose origins cannot be traced (245 groups, 278 sets), the question is left open for further study.

5. An index and indexing system for the variant forms study are made for easy examination. (See Appendix A and B)

6. An index is also made for the variant forms which remain to be verified. (See Appendix C)

7. The characters which are missed out in SW in the research of this thesis are listed in Appendix D.

8. Appendix E lists the glossary of some Chinese terms as appeared in the thesis.

9. Appendix F lists the statistics / classification of the variant forms of the Chinese characters research in this thesis.

10. Appendix G lists a number of characters which removed from this research.
THE TRANSMITTED EDITIONS OF JY AND THE BASIC TEXTS OF THE

THESIS

JY was completed in September, in the second year of the reign of Bao Yuan (1039 A.D., the Northern Song). On the 11th of the same month, the Emperor Song Renzong ordered the printing of JY. The set of woodblocks used for printing was completed in the third year of Qing Li's 慶歷 reign (17-8-1045 A.D.) This original set of wood blockprints was reprinted again later in Northern Song when the words started to blur out because the woods had gone rotten. It is believed that the Shugutang yingsong chaoben edition 述古堂影宋抄本 was based on this indistinct printing edition.

The indistinct blocks were repaired and reprinted again into a new edition, also in the same dynasty. It was believed that the Jiguge edition was a copied version of this edition. A recopied set from the copied Jiguge edition was kept by Zhu Yizun. Zhu Yizun then handed it to Cao Lianting, who published the manuscripts in 1706 A.D. Lianting's edition was based on Gu Guangqi's 顧廣圻 revised and reprinted edition, the Siku huiyao edition 四庫薈要本 and Yao Jinyuan's 姚觐元 revised and reprinted edition.

The Qing Li's original edition was revised and reprinted again by Tian Shiqing 田世卿 in the fourteenth year of Chun Xi's 淳熙 reign (1187 A.D., the Southern Song). It was then revised and collated with the Gu's edition and printed in the ninth year of Tian Bao's reign of Japan (1838 A.D.)

Tian's edition was reprinted again in Southern Song. This reprinted copy had been a precious edition in the Inner Palace of the Ming and Qing dynasties. At
present, this valuable edition is kept in the Beiping Library, China (Qiu 1974: 969–1002; Ding 1986: 793–799).

This thesis has adopted the Sibu beiyao 四部備要 edition of Zhonghua Press 中華書局 as the basic text; the Shugutang yingsong chaoben 述古堂影宋抄本 edition of Shanghai Library 上海圖書館 (published by the Xuehai Press 學海出版社) and the Guoxue jiben congshu sibaizhong 國學基本叢書四百種 edition of Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館 as the assisting texts. It fact, the Shugutang yingsong chaoben edition and the Guoxue jiben congshu sibaizhong edition are better than the Sibu beiyao edition (please refer to the diagram of "the transmitted editions of IV"). When I first started my research, I have only the Sibu beiyao edition for my basic induction work. Later on, then only I received the Shugutang yingsong chaoben edition and the Guoxue jiben congshu sibaizhong edition from my friend in Taiwan, they were collated together with Sibu beiyao edition and Fang Chenggui's Jiyun kaozheng. Anyhow, the three editions mentioned above are the basic reference texts used in this thesis.

Based on Lianting's edition, which is based on the recopied copy of the Northern Song edition from Mao Yi's Jiguge edition, Gu Guangqi's revised and reprinted edition is undeniably inadequate in compilation. The Sibu beiyao edition is based on the Gu's edition. Thus, it is not a reliable text in general. The Shugutang yingsong chaoben edition is a copying copy which is based on the Song edition. It is believed that the wood blocks for printing were indistinct when the printing of IV in the Northern Song and the copying copy of Shugutang edition also suffer from gaps and omissions. So, the present edition (Xuehai Press) has referred to Gu's edition in its publication. And, for the Guoxue jiben congshu sibaizhong edition, it is based on the Japan edition, which
was revised and collated in 1828 A.D. with Southern Song and Gu's editions in its publication (Qiu 1974: 969–983). Consequently, there are pros and cons in using the three different editions. As the research method of this thesis was to trace the exact characters in JY, therefore, the efforts involved in the comparison among and examination of the three different editions collated with Fang's Jiyun kaozheng are both important and necessary.

The thesis follows the original arrangement of JY, i.e., that the rhymes of the variant forms are recorded; then the variant forms are written in bold characters; attached to them are the conjecture of the ancient, the middle ancient and the modern pronunciations, and the explanation of JY and SW. This conjecture of the pronunciations is based mainly on the pronunciation-conversion by Guo Xiliang's 郭锡良 Hanzi guyin shouce 漢字古音手冊 (Beijing University Press, Beijing, 1986). For example, under the even-tone rhyme in volume one, chapter II, character 2.1: 蒯, the conjectures are: m oŋ / m uŋ / m ōŋ

The first is the ancient pronunciation (the pronunciation before Qin dynasty, 221-207 B.C.); the middle one is the middle ancient times pronunciation (the pronunciation from 3rd to 9th century); the third is modern pronunciation.

The reference in the parenthesis appears at the end of each explanation of JY, e.g. (Ding 1980: 1-3b), it means that the details are extracted from page 3b of volume 1, the compilation of Ding Du which was published in 1980.

Owing to the difficulty in obtaining data, time constraints and the length of the thesis, the scope of this study is limited. Furthermore, the reference resources of the library of the University of Malaya are not relevant to this study. So, to obtain the latest
up-to-date material, I had to look for information in China, Taiwan and Hong Kong. For this reason, this thesis has quoted a great deal of valuable material from the following texts and voluminous modern dictionaries: Ding Fubao's 丁福保 Shuowen jiezi gulin 說文解字詁林, Zhongwen dacidian 中文大辭典, Hanyu dazidian 漢語大字典, EY, SM, GYa, FY, LKSJ, GY, Ruan Yuan's 阮元 edition of Shisanjing zhushu 十三經注疏, Lu Deming's 陸德明 Jingdian shiwen 經典釋文, Hui Lin's 釋 - 慧琳 Yiqiejing yinyi 一切經音義, Xuan Ying's 釋 - 玄應 Yiqiejing yinyi 一切經音義, Xiao Tong's 蕭統 Wenxuan 文選, Shuangchuan Guidailang's 瀧川龜太郎 Shiji huizhu kaozheng 史記會注考證, Ban Gu's 班固 Hanshu 漢書, Fan Ye's 范曄 Hou-Hanshu 後漢書, Zhuzi jicheng 諸子集成 etc. as seen in the bibliography.

NOTES :-

1. Fanqie 反切: A traditional method of indicating the pronunciation of a Chinese character by using two other Chinese characters, the first having the same consonant and the second having the same vowel (with or without final nasal) and tone as the given character.
2. The transmitted editions of the JY (only for the major editions).

**Northern Song (960–1127 A.D.)**
- Qing Li’s original edition (1045 A.D.)
- Reprinted edition (Revised and reprinted edition)

**Southern Song (1127–1279 A.D.)**
- Shuguang yinling chaoben edition (1629–1701 A.D.)
- Jiguang yinling chaoben edition (1599–1659 A.D.)
- Zhubao’s re-copying copy

**Ming (1368–1644 A.D.)**
- Cao Lanting’s edition (1706 A.D.)
- Gu Guangyao’s revised and reprinted edition (1814 A.D.)
- Tian Shiqing’s reprinted edition (1187 A.D.)

**Qing (1644–1911 A.D.)**
- Keeping by Shanghai Library, China
- Published by Xuehai Press, China (1986 A.D.)
- Keeping by Tuanyige, Ningsbo, China

**At present**
- Keeping by Guoli Zhongyao yanjiuyuan, Taiwan
- Keeping by Guoli Zhongyao Library, Taiwan
- Keeping by Guoli Zhongyao yanjiuyuan Fu Sinian’s Library, Taiwan
- Siku beiyao edition (1890 A.D.)
- Published by Zhonghua Press, China (1980 A.D.)
- Keeping by Guoli gugong bowuyuan Library, Taiwan
- Keeping by Guoli gugong bowuyuan Library, Taiwan
- Keeping by Bejing Library, China
- Keeping by Bejing Library, China
- Keeping by Zhongwen yanyuoshi, Guangzhou University, Japan
- Keeping by Jiangshu Wenwu, Japan
- Published by Shangwu yinshuguan, China (1968 A.D.)

Notes: For the editions which circle with a dotted line square block are the editions that fail to keep nowadays.