

802.3624
108
國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所

單刊甲種之十二

唐五代西北方音

羅常培著

中華民國二十二年

上海

108

國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所

單刊甲種之十二

唐五代西北方音

羅常培著

中華民國二十二年

上海

版權保留
不得翻印

本書定價二元六角

國內代售人得酌加寄費運費

本所刊物在國外售價適用國幣一元折合美金一元之率此外不加郵運各費

國立中央研究院院址	南京成賢街
本所現在所址	上海曹家渡小萬柳堂 北平北海靜心齋 電報掛號： 電報掛號 中文〇六七〇(史) 中文二九八〇(歷) 洋文Philologie 洋文Philologie
本院駐滬通信處住址	上海白利南路愚園路底
總批發處	國立中央研究院出版品國際交換處 上海白利南路愚園路底 國立中央研究院歷史語言研究所 上海曹家渡小萬柳堂
國內代售處	南京 中央大學出版部 保文堂 國粹書店 花牌樓書店 鍾山書店 上海 中國科學公司 中國書店 新月書店 開明書店 生活週刊社 青光書局 北平 來薰閣 廣州 林記書莊
國外代售處	Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner, & Co. London, W. C. I. Paul Geuthner & Cie. 13, Rue Jacob, Paris VI. Buchhandlung. Otto Harrassowitz. Leipzig, C. I.

上海中國科學公司代印

此 書 之 印 費

由

中 華 教 育 文 化 基 金 董 事 會

資 助

特 此 誌 謝

國 立 中 央 研 究 院 歷 史 語 言 研 究 所 白

自序

自從一九二三年鋼和泰 (A. von Staël-Holstein) 發表了那篇音譯梵書和中國古音之後,國內學者第一個應用漢梵對音來考訂中國古音的,要算是汪榮寶的歌戈魚虞模古讀考。因為這篇文章雖然引起了古音學上空前的大辯論,可是對於擬測漢字的古音確實開闢了一條新途徑。我在知徹澄娘音讀考那篇論文裏也曾經應用這種方法考訂過中古聲母的讀音問題,我相信如果有人肯向這塊廣袤的荒田去耕植,一定還會有更滿意的收穫! 然而漢梵對音的材料祇限於一些零碎的譯名,並且新舊譯的糾紛,底本來源的異同,口譯者跟筆受者的方音差別,在在都得經過一番審慎的考查。比較起來看,自然還是燉煌石室所發現的那一批漢藏對音的寫本更可貴一點。因為這些寫本原來是為吐蕃人學漢語用的,牠們所有的對音並不專限於零碎的名詞,而且從發現的地域看,大致可以斷定牠們所代表的是唐五代時候流行於西北的一部分方音,所以很值得我們重視的。

我這本書裏所用的漢藏對音材料一共有五種:

- (1) 漢藏對音千字文殘卷;
- (2) 漢藏對音大乘中宗見解 (Mahāyāna-Mādhyamika-Darśana) 殘卷;
- (3) 藏文譯音阿彌陀經 (Smaller Sukhāvati-vyūha) 殘卷;
- (4) 藏文譯音金剛經 (Vajracchedikā) 殘卷;
- (5) 唐蕃會盟碑拓本。

前四種是燉煌石室中的寫本，後一種是唐穆宗長慶二年 (A.D. 822) 的刻石；這五種都算是直接的材料。其中的第一種曾經伯希和 (P. Pelliot), 馬伯樂 (H. Maspero), 羽田亨 等引用過；第一種、第三種跟第四種曾經財津桃溪 引用過；第五種裏關於漢譯藏音的部分勞佛 (B. Laufer) 跟伯希和 也曾經用牠來討論第九世紀的藏語音韻；至於第二種却從陶慕士 (T. W. Thomas) 等把材料發表以後始終還沒有人利用過呢。我所以要重新整理這一批材料的觀點是和前面幾個人不同的。因為他們不是零零碎碎的引用，就是缺乏歷史的起點跟切近的參證；好像還沒有一個人能夠窮源竟委的利用這一批可靠的材料把牠所代表的方音系統給擬測出來。我這一本小書是打算朝着這個方向努力的。

我所用的方法是先拿這幾種漢藏對音的材料同切韻比較去推測牠們的淵源，然後再同六種現代西北方音比較來探討牠們的流變。由這番比較研究的結果，我發現唐五代西北方音很有些前人所沒說過的特點。在這幾種材料裏，唐蕃會盟碑的對音雖然很有限，可是牠的年代是確鑿不移的，這對於我們考證幾種材料的時代先後上有很大的幫助。其餘的四種一共有一百五十二個對音，牠們不單可以代表切韻所有的聲類，就是對於韻部也祇有幽廢夬臻耕櫛盍洽鎋迄十韻找不到例字。所以我們根據這些對音就可以把切韻音同唐五代西北方音的關係推想出十之七八來。如果專從藏文的寫法來講，在聲母一方面我們可以看見：

- (1) “輕唇音”非敷奉大多數寫作送氣的 p' 已然露出“重唇音”分化的痕跡 (看17, 18頁)。

(2) 明在收聲-n或-ñ的前面讀m,其餘的變'b; 泥在收聲-m或ñ的前面讀n,其餘的變'd(看17—19,22頁)。

(3)“舌上音”混入“正齒音”(看20—22頁)。

(4)“正齒音”的二三等不分(20—22頁)。

(5) 牀大部分由禪變審,但澄却變成照的全濁(看20—21頁)。

(6) 摩擦音的濁母禪邪匣變同清母審心曉(看21—25頁)。

(7) y化的聲母並不專以三等爲限(看30頁)。

至於全濁聲母的字在大乘中宗見解裏大多數變成次清,那顯然更近代化了。

在韻母一方面,我們可以看見:

(1) 宕梗兩攝的鼻收聲[n]一部分開始消變(36—42頁)。

(2) 魚韻字大部分變入止攝(看43,45頁)。

(3) 通攝的一三等元音不同(看57,58頁)。

(4) 同韻字往往受聲母的影響變成不同韻(看66頁)。

(5) 一等[a]元音同二等[a]元音在藏文寫法上沒有分別(看67頁)。

(6) 合口洪音同合口細音在藏文寫法上沒有分別(看68頁)。

(7) 入聲的收聲[p],[t],[k],藏文寫作b,r(或d),g(看69頁)。

不過我們得要知道:藏文的寫法大部分固然可以代表實際的語音,其中却也有寫法同而語音未必全同的(看160頁);也有語音同而寫法稍微不同的(看161頁);這從現代西北方音的演變上可以看得出來。所以我們雖然不承認從這幾種材料祇能得到“大部分想像的結論”,然而對於哪些是當時的實際語音,哪些是藏文的替代音,可得要很仔細的辨別清楚:這一點在全部工作的效率上關係很重要的。

此外，還有一種同漢藏對音相輔而行的材料就是注音本開蒙要訓。這個寫本的末一行明白寫着“天成四年九十(?)八日燉煌郡學士郎張□□□”，所以牠的時代跟地域是可以確定的。但是這本書裏所有的注音，除去同音互注，形訛難識，類推誤讀，音理難通的以外，可以供我們從注音的錯綜處考見當時方音狀況的，不過才有二百四十二對，其中還有一部分是誤讀半邊字所致，不能完全代表實際的音變；那麼，所餘的材料就很有限了。然而，我根據這一點兒材料却也發現幾個有趣的現象，例如，梗攝同齊祭兩韻“對轉”，止攝同魚韻旁通，都跟千字文的藏音相合；這絕不是偶然的。至於聲母一方面可就變得很厲害了。照這些錯綜的注音來看，不單全濁聲母有變成全清的趨勢，甚至於連“齒頭音”的四等也受顎化的影響開始混入“舌上音”跟“正齒音”。此外，像泥來不分，娘日不分之類，也是漢藏對音所沒有的現象。可見這種材料非但比那幾種漢藏對音的時代較晚，恐怕還有方音上的差異呢。

我寫這本書的動機是從二十一年十二月間引起的。其中唐五代西北方音的前三章是由本年一月二日到三月九日寫成的，後來因為歷史語言研究所南遷，中間稍有停頓，在四五兩月裏又把前篇的第四章跟唐蕃會盟碑中的漢藏對音繼續完成，直到六月六日全書才能付印，算到現在，已然有十個多月了。不過我因為有幾種期待中的材料還沒完全採進去，總不免有點兒“半折心始”的感覺！這祇好等將來有機會再作補編了。

我在這兒應當謝謝陳寅恪趙元任李方桂林語堂錢玄同魏建功羅膺中丁聲樹諸位先生！他們有的供給我很多的材

料,有的提示我很好的意見,有的替我校訂訛誤,有的幫我覆閱全稿:這對於本書的完成都有莫大的助力!至於排比材料,繕寫全書,多虧唐虞程霖兩君勤懇的幫忙,我也應當在此聲謝!

“最末了兒但是不最小”我還得鄭重的謝謝劉半農先生!因為他不單費了一個星期的時間從頭到尾的給我審查全稿,並且他聽說我在研究開蒙要訓的注音,就把自己關於這個題目“從事將半”的文章立刻擱筆了!本來劉先生在燉煌掇瑣的序錄裏早就說過:“此篇可貴之處,不在本文而在所注之音”,我所以能夠展轉的利用這種材料當然得謝謝劉先生的輯錄跟啓示!現在又承他本着“只求有所發見,不必成功自我”的宗旨,犧牲了自己“從事將半”的文章,那麼,即使我所得的結果是完全獨立的,我對於他這種態度也應當十二分的感謝!

中華民國二十二年,十一月,八日,羅常培識於上海小萬柳堂。

附註:

本書中所用的切韻音值大部是根據高本漢的擬測,但是關於聲母非 [pf], 敷 [pf'], 奉 [bv'], 微 [w], 知 [t, t'], 徹 [t', t], 澄 [d, d'], 跟韻母模 [o], 魚 [io], 東 [on] 等,是照我自己的意見稍加修改的;修改的理由在我從前發表的幾篇論文裏大半都說過了。請參閱本所集刊第二本第三分378—385頁,第三本第一分121—157頁跟慶祝蔡元培先生六十五歲論文集上卷476頁註1。

PREFACE

Since the publication of Baron A. Von Staël-Holstein's article on "The Transliterated Sanskrit Text and the Ancient Pronunciation of Chinese Characters" in 1923¹, the first Chinese writer who used this method to reconstruct the pronunciation of Ancient Chinese was Mr. Uang Rongbao (汪榮寶) in his article "On the Ancient Pronunciation of the rimes 歌戈魚虞模"². While the publication of this article aroused most vigorous protest from the old school Chinese phonologists, it really opened up a new road to the reconstruction of the Ancient Chinese pronunciation. In my article on "The Ancient Pronunciation of the initials 知徹澄娘"³, I also used this method in discussing the sound value of certain ancient initials, and I believe that any one who is willing to cultivate this extensive and fertile field will succeed in reaping further valuable results.

Now the materials for Chinese-Sanskrit transliteration are limited to isolated terms; moreover there are the controversies over the value of the new and old transliterations, the differences in the transmission of the original text, the divergencies in dialect between the translators who pronounced the words and those who wrote down the translation, all of which should undergo the most careful scrutiny. On the whole, it is safe to say that the group of Chinese-Tibetan manuscripts discovered in the well-known Hidden Library of Duenhwang (燉煌) is more useful than all the others; for these manuscripts were originally meant for the use of Tibetans in learning Chinese, their transliterations are not strictly limited to isolated terms, and judging from the region where they were recovered, we can with great probability determine that they represent a part of

(1) Cf. The journal of Sinological studies of the National University of Peking, vol. I. No. 1, January, 1923.

(2) Cf. *ibid.* vol. I. No. 2, April, 1923.

(3) Cf. Bulletin of the National Research Institute of History and Philology (BNRIHP), vol. III, part 1.

the Northwestern dialect during the Tarnǵ (唐) and Five Dynasties. For these reasons, they distinctly deserve our attention.

In this monograph, there are five Chinese-Tibetan sources used:

- (1) Fragments of *Chiantzyh Wen* (千字文) with interlinear Tibetan transliterations¹;
- (2) Fragments of the *Mahāyāna-Mādhyamika-Darśana* (大乘中宗見解) with interlinear Tibetan transliterations²;
- (3) Fragments of a Chinese version of the *Smaller Sukhāvati Vyūha* (佛說阿彌陀經) in Tibetan writing³;
- (4) Fragments of a Chinese version of *Vajracchedika* (金剛經) in Tibetan writing⁴;
- (5) Rubbings of the *Tarnǵ-Fan Hueymeng Bei* (唐蕃會盟碑)⁵.

The first four are manuscripts from Duenhwang, while the last is a stone monument of the second year of the period Charngching (長慶) in the reign of Muhtzong (穆宗) of the Tarnǵ dynasty. These may all be considered as primary sources. The first has been quoted and discussed by Prof. P. Pelliot⁶, Prof. H. Maspero⁷, and Dr. Haneda Toru (羽田亨)⁸. The first, third and fourth have been arranged by Mr. Takaradzu Tokei (財津桃溪) who made a comparative study with the *Yunnjing* (韻鏡) in the initial part only⁹. With regard to the fifth, B. Laufer and P. Pelliot have, for the purpose of reconstructing Tibetan phonology in the ninth century, used that part which contains a Chinese Transliteration of

(1) Cf. 羽田亨 藏傳遺書 第一集

(2) Cf. F. W. Thomas, S. Miyamoto and G. L. M. Clauson: *A Chinese Mahāyāna Catechism in Tibetan and Chinese Characters*, J.R.A.S. 1929, pp. 37-40.

(3) Cf. T. W. Thomas and G. L. M. Clauson: *A Chinese Buddhist text in Tibetan writing*. J.R.A.S. 1926, p. 508-511.

(4) Cf. F. W. Thomas and G. L. M. Clauson: *A Second Chinese Buddhist Text in Tibetan Characters*, J.R.A.S. 1927, pp. 281-283.

(5) Cf. S. W. Bushell's *The Early History of Tibet*, Appendix I. J.R.A.S., 1880, pp. 535-538.

(6) Cf. Kao-tch'ang, Qučo, Houo-tcheon et Qurá Khodjá, J. As. XIX (1912) pp. 584, 589, 590.

(7) Cf. *Le Dialecte de Tch'ang-ngan sous les T'ang* B.E.F.E.O. XX (1920) pp. 21, 32, 37, 41, 46-50.

(8) Cf. 漢蕃千字文之斷簡, 中洋學報 vol. XIII, No. 3 (1923) pp. 390-410.

(9) Cf. 藏傳出土漢藏對音之材料與韻鏡之比較(其一), 懷德 No. 10, 1932.

Preface

Tibetan sounds¹. But of second source, from the time when T. W. Thomas and others published these materials, no one has hitherto made any use whatever. My reason for studying this whole group of materials again is that my method of approach is different from that of any who have previously made use of them. They have either used them in a fragmentary way, or have lacked a historical background for their studies and a systematic correlation with other relevant materials. It seems that no one has ever been able to make complete use of these reliable sources and tried to reconstruct the entire phonological system of the dialects which they represent. In this small monograph, I desire to make a definite endeavour in this direction.

My method is, in the first place, to compare the Chinese-Tibetan transliterations with *Chiehhyunn* (切韻) in order to trace their origin, and then afterwards to compare them with six modern Northwestern dialects in order to follow out their later developments. From the results of this comparative study, I discovered some special peculiarities in the Northwestern dialects during the Tarng and Five Dynasties period which have not been mentioned by previous scholars. Among those five documentary sources, the *Tarng-Farn Hueymeng Bei* has only a limited number of transliterations, but the fact that the date is beyond doubt is invaluable in investigating the order of the dates of these documents. The other four have a total of 152 transliterations. These not only represent all the initials in the *Chiehhyunn*, but even in the case of the finals all except the ten finals 幽廢央臻耕櫛盍洽鎋迄 are represented. Basing my study on these transliterations, I have been able to reconstruct 70 or 80 per cent of the relationships between the *Chiehhyunn* sounds and those of the Northwestern dialects of the Tarng and Five Dynasties period.

Speaking solely from the point of view of Tibetan orthography, we note, with regard to initials, that:

1. The Labio-dentals 非敷奉 were almost always written with

(1) Cf. B. Laufer's *Bird divination among the Tibetans*, T'oung Pao ser. 2, vol. XV (1914) pp. 64-94; and P. Pelliot's *Quelques Transcriptions Chinoises de noms Tibétains*, T'oung Pao, ser. 2, vol. XVI (1915) pp. 1-26.

the aspirated initial p' , which evidently indicate a transitional stage towards forming a separate group of Labio-dentals (cf. pp. 17, 18).

2. The initials 明 became m for finals ending in $-n$ or $-\tilde{n}$, but $'b$ in all other cases; the initial 泥 became n for finals ending in $-m$ or $-\tilde{n}$, but $'d$ in all other cases (cf. pp. 17-19, 22).
3. The 舌上音 intermingled with 正齒音 (cf. pp. 20-22).
4. The second and third division of 正齒音 were not differentiated (cf. pp. 20-22).
5. The initial 牀 changed from 禪 to 審, with a few exceptions, but the initial 澄 filled the space of the Hard Sonant (全濁) which corresponds to the Unaspirated Surd (全清) 照 (cf. pp. 20, 21).
6. The Sonant fricatives 禪, 邪, 匣 were absorbed by the Surd fricatives 審, 心, 曉 (cf. pp. 21-25).
7. The yodized consonants were not limited to the third division (cf. p. 30).

as for the change of the Hard Sonant into the aspirated surd (次清) in the *Mahāyāna-Mūdhyaṃika-Darśana*, it seems however to be a much more recent phenomenon.

With regard to the finals, we note that:

1. The final nasals [ŋ] of groups 宕 and 梗 had begun to disappear (cf. pp. 36-42).
2. The characters of the rime 魚 almost always entered the group 止 (cf. pp. 43, 45).
3. The first and third division of the group 通 had different vowels, to wit, o and u respectively (cf. pp. 57, 58).
4. Under the influence of different initials, words of same rime often differentiated into different rimes (cf. p. 66).
5. The vowel [a] of the first division, and the vowel [a] of the second division were not distinguished in Tibetan orthography (cf. p. 67).
6. The medial [u] in the first and second divisions was confused with that of third and fourth divisions (cf. p. 68).

Preface

7. The final consonants [-p],[t],[k] of the Abrupt Tone (入聲) were written as -b, -r(or -d),-g in Tibetan transliterations (cf. p. 69).

It should be noted that while the greater part of Tibetan orthography accurately represents the actual sounds, there are cases where the same orthography do not represent exactly the same sounds (cf. p. 160) or the same sounds are represented by slightly different orthography (cf. p. 161). All of these can be observed from the evolution in the modern Northwestern dialects. While, therefore, we need not be so pessimistic as to fear that from the use of these materials "The greater part of such conclusions are an imaginary reconstruction" (Takaradzu Tokei), yet we must agree that it is important to discriminate very clearly what were the pronunciation of the actual speech of the period and what were the Tibetan approximate substitutions of the same time. This is a very important point to bear in mind for the effective conduct of this whole study.

Correlated to these Chinese-Tibetan transliterated manuscripts is a Chinese text entitled *Kaimeng Yawshiunn* (開蒙要訓) with pronunciation notations. The last line of this manuscript states clearly that it was written in the fourth year of the period Tianchenng (929 A.D.) 9th month(?) 8th day at Duenhwang by the "Shyueshyh Lang" Jang (天成四年九十(?) 八日燉煌郡學士郎張□□□). Its date and linguistic area is therefore accurately fixed. Eliminating now from the pronunciation notations in this book cases of (a) pairs of reciprocal notations, in which one character represents the other, (b) those whose written forms are so much in error as to be difficult to recognize, (c) misreadings arising from inference by analogy, and (d) renderings of pronunciation difficult to understand, we have 242 pairs which from the interlacing of their sound notations supply us with material for the examination of the condition of the dialectal pronunciation of that period. Even among these 242 pairs, there is still a part which cannot entirely represent the actual dialectal changes, for the reason that they were read only for the nonce by the so-called "phonetic" half of the character. Thus, the remaining materials left for

study are rather limited. Nevertheless, from these very limited materials I have discovered a number of very interesting phenomena: (a) Characters of the group 梗 drop their final nasals, and their sound notations alternate freely with characters in the rimes 齊 and 祭; (b) The group 止 and the rime 魚 are interchangeable, and are identical with those in the Tibetan transliterations of the *Chiantzyh Wen*, and this cannot be considered as merely accidental. As for the initials, the changes are no less radical. In the light of these interlaced sound notations whose pronunciations do not coincide with those of the *Chiehynn*, we not only perceive that the Hard Sonants (全濁) had a tendency to become Unaspirated Surds (全清), but also that the fourth division of the 齒頭音, by the influence of palatalization, were confused with 舌上音 and 正齒音. Moreover, the confusion of the initials 泥 with 來 and 娘 with 日 are phenomena never seen in Chinese-Tibetan transliterations. From this we see that this text is not only later in time than the Chinese-Tibetan transliterated manuscripts mentioned above, but may perhaps also be traced to some dialectal differences.

I found incentive to write this monograph in November 1932. The first three chapters of Part I were written from January 2 to March 8 1933. During the removal of our Institute from Beiping (北平) to Shanghai (上海) this work was interrupted for some time. The final chapter of Part I and the whole of Part II with the three Appendices were next completed during April and May, and the whole manuscript was sent to the press on June 6. That was more than ten months ago. Because there are some other sources which I have not been able to include, I still do not feel fully satisfied with the present work. A supplement will be added as soon as these sources come to hand.

For the completion of this monograph, I am most indebted to Prof. Chern Ynkeh (Yinko Tschén), Dr. Jaw Yuanren (Y. R. Chao), Dr. Lii Fanggüey (F. K. Li), Dr. Lin Yeutarng (Y. T. Lin), Prof. Chyan Shyuantong, Prof. Wey Jianngong, Prof. Luo Ingjong and Mr. Ding Shengshuh. They have either put at my disposal a great deal of material, or made very valuable suggestions. Some have read the whole manuscript

Preface

over and corrected a number of mistakes. For suggestions as to the arrangement of the materials and the proof-reading of the whole work, I am also obliged to Mr. Tarng Yu and Mr. Cherng Lin.

Last but not least, I must acknowledge my indebtedness to Dr. Liou Fuh (F. Liu). He has not only spent a whole week reading over my manuscript, but also given up a half-completed treatise concerning the notations of *Kaimeng Yawshiunn*, when he heard that I was working on the same problem. In the preface of 敦煌掇瑣, Dr. Liou has already said: "the value of this manuscript does not lie so much in the text as in the sound notations." While, therefore, my results are arrived at independently, yet I must sincerely express my gratitude to Dr. Liou Fuh for this suggestion of his, and for his generous scrapping of his own work.

Shanghai, November, 8, 1933.

Luo Charngpeir.

Note:

In giving the *Chiehyunn* sound values in this monograph, I am mainly following Prof. B. Karlgren's reconstruction with the exceptions of 非 [pf], 敷 [pf'], 奉 [bv'], 微 [m], 知 [t, t'], 徹 [t', t'], 澄 [d', d'], 模 [o], 魚 [io] and 東 [oŋ]. For the reasons for these modifications of mine, I refer the reader to my articles in B. N. R. I. H. P. vol. II, Part 3 pp. 378-385; vol. III, Part I, pp. 121-157; and *Studies Presented to Ts'ai Yuan P'ei on His Sixty-fifth Birthday*, Part I. p. 476, note 1.

漢藏對音千字文殘卷

1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 而登詠樂
 和聲大昌
 隨
 子江兒
 投子切
 義
 動神
 雅樸好
 自