

On *Chuan-chu* 轉注

By Rokurô KÔNO

Introductory Remarks

It is well known that the *Liu-shu* 六書, i.e. the Six Kinds of Writing, have been used in classifying the Chinese characters. According to the order adopted in the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ* 說文解字, the *Liu-shu* are *chih-shih* 指事, *hsiang-hsing* 象形, *hsing-shêng* 形聲, *hui-i* 會意, *chuan-chu* 轉注 and *chia-chieh* 假借.¹⁾ As this classification is ingeniously devised, it is often mentioned in works treating the archaic writing of Egypt or Mesopotamia. Among the Six Kinds of Writing only the nature of *chuan-chu* has not yet been made clear in spite of various efforts devoted from old, while the concepts of other five kinds of writing are comparatively comprehensible. Here I am going to state my own view on *chuan-chu*, but I am afraid that I shall end by adding one more strange opinion to the interpretation of *chuan-chu*.

The reason why only *chuan-chu* has not yet been clarified can be ascribed to the term *chuan-chu* itself, its definition and the examples given in the *Shuo wên*. First of all, the term *chuan-chu* 轉注 is not intelligible directly from the characters *chuan* 轉 and *chu* 注, while the terms of other five types of writing are quite easy to understand. Secondly, the wording of the definition given in the *Shuo-wên* is rather misleading. In Volume 15 of the *Shuo-wên*, its Introduction, the definition of *chuan-chu* is stated as follows: *chien-lei-i-shou* 建類一首, *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* 同意相受. While the latter half of the expression (同意相受) seems to be able to be understood, the sentence of the former half is not self-evident. Further, in the *Shuo-wên* two examples are cited for each kind of writing, and for *chuan-chu* the two characters 考 and 老 are selected. The character 老 is a *hui-i* character, as is known from its composition. The *Shuo-wên* explains the character as composed of 人, 毛 and 匕. The character 考 is clearly a *hsing-shêng* character, composed of the abbreviated 老 and the phonetic 丂, as explained in the *Shuo-wên*. Conse-

1) The terms and the order of the *Liu-shu* are not always the same. In Chêng Hsüan 鄭玄's commentary to the passage of *Pao-shih* 保氏 in the chapter of *Ti-kuan* 地官 of the *Chou-li* 周禮 the order of the *Liu-shu* is *hsiang-hsing*, *hui-i*, *chuan-chu*, *ch'ü-shih* 處事, i.e. *chi-shih*, *chia-chieh* and *hsieh-shêng* 諧聲, i.e. *hsing-shêng*. In the *I-wên-chih* 藝文志 of the *Han-shu* 漢書 the order is *hsiang-hsing*, *hsiang-shih* 象事, i.e. *chih-shih*, *hsiang-i* 象意, i.e. *hui-i*, *hsiang-shêng* 象聲, i.e. *hsing-shêng*, *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh*. Though the terms and the order are different somehow, the term *chuan-chu* is invariable.

quently, *chuan-chu* is not a kind of graphic composition, but it seems to indicate a relation between characters.

Although it is said that in the classification of the Chinese characters there are the Six Kinds of Writing, according to Tai Chên 戴震,²⁾ the Ch'ing scholar, in reality the four types of writing, i.e. *chih-shih*, *hsiang-hsing*, *hsing-shêng* and *hui-i*, are sufficient for the formal classification of the Chinese characters. These four types well cover the whole Chinese characters. Tuan Yü-tsai 段玉裁, his disciple, said that *chih-shih* and *hsiang-hsing* are simplex in composition (獨體), while *hsing-shêng* and *hui-i* are complex (合體).³⁾ Therefore, Tai and Tuan held that *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh* concern the use of characters, not formal species. At least *chiac-chieh* is no doubt a way of using a character, since the term *chia-chieh* means 'to borrow' an already existing character for another word. Although we have not yet grasped the real nature of *chuan-chu*, the examples 老 and 考 seem to suggest that *chuan-chu* also concerns the usage of a character. If so, the classification of *Liu-shu* shows a very orderly system consisting of three pairs, i.e. the pair of simplex type, that of complex type and that of usage. Hsü Ch'ieh 徐鍇, the scholar of the Nan-t'ang dynasty, called the system as the Three Pairs (三耦).⁴⁾

2) Tai Chên wrote a letter to his teacher Chiang Yung 江永 (答江慎修先生論小學書), saying as follows:

"Generally speaking, at the time of the creation of writing, one could have recourse to nothing. In the universe the fact and the form make two great motives. To symbolize the real situation of a fact is called *chih-shih*; 一 and 二, or 上 and 下 are the examples. To depict the general outline of the form of a thing is called *hsiang-hsing*; 日 and 月, or 水 and 火 are the examples. After the writing system had been established, the sound could rely upon a character, and thus the character could have the sound to be harmonized; the meaning could rely upon a character, and thus the character could have the meaning to be communicated. These are also two great motives to create characters. Expanded from these motives, a character formed by taking the harmony of sound is called *hsieh-shêng* (i.e. *hsing-shêng*); and a character formed by joining the meanings of constituents, not by the harmony of sound, is called *hui-i*. With these four types the formal kinds of writing were exhausted. Then several characters came to be used for the same meaning for example, 初, 哉, 首, 基, all used for the meaning 'beginning', or 印, 吾, 台, 予, all used for the meaning 'I'. These characters could mutually serve as a comment to one another to indicate the meaning. This is called *chuan-chu*. When one character came to serve several words, either by the development of meaning or by the transfer due to phonetic similarity, this character was borrowed to that word. This is called *chia-chieh*. As to the use of characters, these were two great motives (大致造字之始無所馮依, 宇宙間事與形兩大端而已, 措其事之實曰措事, 一二上下是也, 象其形之大體曰象形, 日月水火是也, 文字既立, 則聲寄于字, 而字有可調之聲, 意寄于字, 而字有可通之意, 是又文字之兩大端也, 因而博衍之, 取乎聲諧曰諧聲, 聲不諧而會合其意曰會意, 四者書之體止此矣, 由是之于用數字共一用者, 如初哉首基之皆爲始, 印吾台予之皆爲我, 其義轉相爲注曰轉注, 一字具數用者, 依于義以引伸, 依于聲而旁寄, 假此以施于彼曰假借, 所以用文字者, 斯其兩大端也)".

(*Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-ku-lin* 說文解字詁林, Vol. 15, Supplement, 188-189).

3) Tuan Yü-tsai, *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-chu* 說文解字注, Vol. 15; the commentary to the definition of *hsing-shêng*.

4) Hsü Ch'ieh, *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-chi-chuan* 說文解字繫傳, the commentary to the character 上 (the edition of the *Ssŭ-pu-ts'ung-k'an* 四部叢刊).

Thus, *chuan-chu* seems to be a kind of usage, but as mentioned above, the true nature of *chuan-chu* cannot be recognized, if one relies solely on its term, its definition and its examples. So, though a great many hypotheses have been offered, yet up to this time no convincing view has been heard. Further, in the explanation of the *Shuo-wên*, a character of *hsiang-hsing* type is glossed as *hsiang-hsing* and a character belonging to the type of *chih-shih* is stated as such. And a character of *hui-i* type is explained as 'composed of a certain character and a certain character (从某 (从) 某)', while a character of *hsing-shêng* type is noted as 'composed of a certain signific and a certain phonetic (从某某聲)'. Such explanations are not observable in case of *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh*.⁵⁾ From this point, too, it can be inferred that *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh* are not formal species, but concern the use of a character.

Theories Hitherto Proposed

As the number of the opinions hitherto offered is too great to quote here, I am going to introduce several noteworthy hypotheses chiefly from among those collected in the *General Remarks on Liu-shu* (六書總論) in the beginning of the *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-ku-lin* 說文解字詁林 compiled by Ting Fu-pao 丁福保⁶⁾ and to attempt to criticize them. Among such hypotheses there are two views that have exercised an immense influence upon later scholars. One of the view held by Chiang Shêng 江聲, and the other is that of Tai Chên 戴震, both the Ch'ing scholars.

(1) Chiang Shêng says as follows:

"The *chuan* 轉 of *chuan-chu* means 'to turn from here to there'; and the *chu* 注 is understood as 'to pour (water)' like in the (*Shih-ching*) locution: *I p'i chu ts'ü* 挹彼注茲, i.e. to pour the water that one has drawn there. Now, the character 老 of 考老 belongs to *hui-i*. When a man becomes old, his beards and hairs will change white; therefore, the character is composed of 人 (man), 毛 (hair) and 匕 (to change). This character makes sense by combining the three characters. The character was made a radical (部首). This is so-called *chien-lei-i-shou* 建類一首 (literally, to establish a group and to make the head one). The word *k'ao* 考 is synonymous with the word *lao* 老. Therefore, the character 考 follows after the character 老 and is composed of its abbreviated form (从老省). Besides the character 考, all the characters like 耆, 耋, 壽, 考 etc. which represent the words synonymous with *lao* are composed of the abbreviated form of the character 老 and belong to the group of *lao*. It is to take the meaning of one character and to cover many words.

5) Wang Yün 王筠, *Shuo-wên-shih-li* 說文釋例, Vol. 1, *Liu-shu-tsung-shuo* 六書總說. The mention of *chih-shih*, however, is restricted only to the characters 上 and 下.

6) *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-ku-lin*, the revised edition, Shang-wu-in-shu-kuan 商務印書館 in Taiwan, 1976.

This is so-called *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* 同意相受 (literally, (characters) having the same meaning receive each other). When Hsü Shên 許慎, the author of the *Shuo-wên*, mentioned only the character 考, he exemplified it for the remaining. From this I reason in the following way. The whole book of the *Shuo-wên* is classified in 540 groups, and the radicals beginning with *i* 一 and ending at *hai* 亥 are the heads of the 540 groups. They show so-called *i-shou* 一首 (to make the head one), (i.e. to be united under one head). In the explanation of the radical character in the *Shuo-wên*, it is always said that 'all the characters semantically related to a certain radical is composed of this radical character (某之屬皆从某)'. This means *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* (characters having the same meaning receive each other). These are (my) theory of *chuan-chu*.⁷⁾

According to Chiang Shêng, *chuan-chu* is the grouping of those characters which are semantically related and which, therefore, are grouped under the same radical. The expression: 凡某之屬皆从某 (All the characters semantically related to a certain radical are formed by this radical character) represents *chuan-chu*. For example, the characters with the radical 木 represent the words the meaning of which concern the tree. The relation of 老 and 考 is identical. The character 老 is the radical, and the character 考 is a character belonging to the group of *lao*. This view is chiefly based on the interpretation of the sentence: 建類一首 of the definition, the examples 老 and 考 also being taken into consideration. It originates from the opinion of Hsü Ch'ieh,⁸⁾ and has given a great influence on later scholars. For instance, Ku Shih 顧實 is one of modern Chinese scholars who adheres to the theory of Chiang Shêng and has gone so far as to say that *chuan-chu* is after all a method of compilation of a dictionary.⁹⁾ However, if *chuan-chu* indicates a relation between a radical and the characters belonging to it, it becomes of different category from other kinds of writing, such as *hui-i* or *hsing-shêng*. It does not concern individual characters any more, while each type of the Six Kinds of Writing should be applied to an individual character. Already Wang Ming-shêng 王鳴聲, the Ch'ing scholar, criticized the theory by arguing that if Chiang's theory be correct, all of 540 radical groups would show the *chuan-chu* relation, and consequently, no need of establishing a special type of writing called *chuan-chu* is perceived.¹⁰⁾ Further, the *Liu-shu* had no direct relation

7) 「轉注則由是而轉焉，如挹彼注茲之注，即如考老之字者，屬會意也，人老則須髮變白，故老从人毛匕，此亦合三字爲誼者也，立老字以爲部首，所謂建類一首，考與老同意，故受老字而从老省，考字之外，如耆壽壽之類，凡與老同意者，皆从老省而屬老，是取一字之意，以概數字，所謂同意相受，叔重但言考者，舉一以例其餘爾，由此推之，則說文解字一書，凡分五百四十部，其始一終亥五百四十部之首，即所謂一首也，下云某之屬皆从某，即同意相受也，此皆轉注之說也」

(*Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-ku-lin*, Vol. 1; *Liu-shu-tsung-lun* 六書總論, 110. (Hereafter I shall quote simply as *Liu-shu-tsung-lun*).

8) Hsü Ch'ieh, *op. cit.*

9) Ku Shih, *Chung-kuo-wên-tzŭ-hsüeh* 中國文字學, 82.

10) Wang Ming-shêng, *Liu-shu-ta-i* 六書大意 (*Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 112).

with the compilation of the dictionary *Shuo-wên*.

(2) Another powerful theory is that held by Tai Chên, and Tuan Yü-tsai 段玉裁, renowned by his commentary to the *Shuo-wên*, who was a disciple of Tai Chên, supported this theory. Tai Chên said:

"I think that the two characters 考 and 老 belong to *hsieh-shêng* (i.e. *hsing-shêng*) and *hui-i* respectively. They are the two formal types of writing. Seeing that they are taken up as the examples of *chuan-chu*, one can recognize that *chuan-chu* is one way of using an existing character. The term *chuan-chu* was the appellation which ancient people gave, and the modern scholars would have said *hu-hsün* 互訓 (to comment each other). The expression 轉相爲注 'to turn (a character) and to gloss (another character)' is synonymous with the expression 互相爲訓 'to comment (a character) with (another character) each other', only being different by usage, ancient or modern. In the *Shuo-wên* the character 考 is commented as 老 (old), while the character 老 is commented as 考. Therefore, the author cites these characters as the examples in the Introduction when he discusses about *chuan-chu*. In the chapter *Shih-ku* 釋詁 of the *Êrh-ya* 爾雅 there are at most forty characters that have a common meaning. This is the method of *chuan-chu* of the *Liu-shu* system which can be understood when we find how a word can be used as a comment to other (synonymous) words, vernacular, variant, archaic or technical. Thus, it is justified to say *chien-lei-i-shou, t'ung-i-hsiang-shou*."¹¹⁾

Tuan Yü-tsai explains the doctrine of his teacher, by expanding as follows. He first commented on *chuan-chu*, "the term *chuan-chu* is synonymous with the term *hu-hsün*. *Chu* means 'to pour (灌也)'. Several characters take their turn in commenting to each other, just like many streams pour into each other to transport (goods) to each other or receive (them) from each other. *Chuan-chu* is the method of employing the four sorts of writing, *chih-shih*, *hsiang-hsing*, *hsing-shêng* and *hui-i*. If several characters have a common meaning, one may use this character or that among them. After the Han time one has called the comment to the canons as *chu*. This usage was derived from here. To draw the meaning and to make it have a place (a passage) to be applied to is like a stream having a place to be poured into."¹²⁾

Further, in explaining the definition, "*chien-lei-i-shou* means 'to divide and establish a group of meaning which can be united under one head', just

11) 「震謂，考老二字屬諧聲會意者，字之體，引之言轉注者，字之用，轉注之云，古人以其語言，立爲名類，通以今人語言，猶曰互訓云爾，轉相爲注，互相爲訓，古今語也，說文於考字訓之曰老也，於老字訓之曰考也，是以叙中論轉注舉之，爾雅釋詁有多至四十字共一義，其六書轉注之法，與別俗異言古雅殊語轉注而可知，故曰，建類一首，同意相受」
(*Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, Supplement, *Chuan-chu*, 188).

12) 「轉注猶言互訓也，注者灌也，數字展轉，互相爲訓，如諸水相爲灌注，交輸互受也，轉注者，所以用指事象形形聲會意四種文字者也，數字同義，則用此字可，用彼字亦可，漢以後釋經謂之注，出於此，引其義，使有所歸，如水之有所注也」
(*Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-chu*, Vol. 15; the commentary to the definition of *chuan-chu*).

like the first item of the *Shih-ku* of the *Êrh-ya* where several synonyms having the meaning 'beginning' are treated together. *T'ung-i-hsiang-shou* means that when innumerable many characters have an almost similar meaning, the meaning can reciprocally be received, and it can be poured and reduced to the same heading. For example, *ch'u* 初, *tsai* 哉, *shou* 首, *ch'i* 基, *chao* 肇, *tsu* 祖, *yüan* 元, *t'ai* 胎, *ch'u* 椒, *luo* 落 and *ch'üan-yü* 權輿 can be used as a comment to each other and all of them can be said to have the common meaning 'beginning', though there is a slight difference in meaning between them. That the *Shuo-wên* only cites 考 and 老 is to manifest the conspicuous ones. Under the radical 老 the *Shuo-wên* explains as 老者考也 and 考者老也. It is to comment the character 老 with 考 and the character 考 with 老. This is *chuan-chu*. The form of the character 老 is composed of 人, 毛 and 匕; thus it belongs to the *hui-i* type. The form of the character 考 is composed of the signfic 老 and the phonetic 丂; thus it belongs to the *hsing-shêng* type, and its use as a comment is *chuan-chu*. Throughout the whole book of the *Shuo-wên* such examples are innumerable. However, the case where characters of such kind are found within the same radical group is easy to know, but the case where characters are dispersed in different groups is apt to be neglected."¹³⁾ In this way Tai Chên and Tuan Yü-tsai regard *chuan-chu* as the relation between characters of similar meaning. This theory apparently lays stress on the expression *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou*. According to Tai, *chuan-chu* is a synonym for *hu-hsün*. Thus, in the *Shuo-wên* the character 老 is commented with 考, and the character 考 with 老. By *chien-lei-i-shou* he understood the relation that might be found between synonyms, like in the *Shih-ku* of the *Êrh-ya*.

However, this theory has already been criticized, since the classification of characters had no bearing on the manner of glosses.¹⁴⁾ Though some critics attacked Tai and Tuan with anachronism, saying that they identified the meaning of *chu* of *chuan-chu* with that of *chu* of *chu-shih* 注釋, while the latter meaning of *chu* is a later development. But at least Tuan Yü-tsai did not state to that effect, as seen in the quotation above. The reason, however, why we are not convinced by this theory, is that this approach is oriented from meaning, and that consequently the conception of *chuan-chu* is different in level from those of other types of writing. On the contrary, the classification of the *Liu-shu* concerned the composition or the use of individual characters. It is true that meaning is also a use of a character. Naturally

13) 「建類一首，謂分立其義之類，而一其首，如爾雅釋詁第一條說始是也，同意相受，謂無慮諸字，意情略同，義可互受，相灌注而歸於一首，如初詁首基肇祖元胎椒落權輿，其於義或近或遠，皆可相訓釋而同謂之始是也，獨言考老者，其最明親切者也，老部曰，老者考也，考者老也，蓋老之形，从人毛匕，屬會意，考之形，从老丂聲，屬形聲，而其義訓，則爲轉注，全書內，用此例不可枚數，但類見於同部者，易知，分見於異部者，易忽」
(*ibid.*)

14) For example, the opinion of Hsü Tsung-yen 許宗彥 (*Chien-chih-shui-chai-wên-chih* 鑑止水齋文集 quoted in *Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 196-197).

the difference of meaning of characters may have been taken up in the education of noble children during the Chou Dynasty.¹⁵⁾ Probably the origin of the *Erh-ya* will be sought in that direction. But in considering the *Liu-shu* the form or the use of an individual character should be made the very core of the subject. Besides, in the expressions of Tuan Yü-tsai is pre-supposed the existence of the *Shuo-wên*, so that the manner of comment is inseparably joint with the idea of *chuan-chu*.

(3) Tsao Jên-hu 曹仁虎 of the Ch'ing Dynasty wrote an article called "On the Old Meaning of *Chuan-chu* (轉注古義考)", in which he stated his own opinion, by examining and criticizing the views presented up to his time.¹⁶⁾ According to his argument, if one wants to make clear the concept of *chuan-chu*, one must consider first the wording of the definition. He says that, in so far as the sentence *ch'ien-lei-i-shou* is concerned, the characters in question should belong to the same radical group. Hence a character of a different radical is out of question, when one seeks to find out the true nature of *chuan-chu*. This idea is inherited from Chiang Shêng. In so far as the expression *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* is taken into consideration, the meaning of the two characters should be similar. Hence the difference of meaning must be kept apart. This is based on the idea of Tai Chên. In short, Ts'ao's theory is a compromise between the two theories discussed above. Further, he excludes those characters which show no phonetic similarity from *chuan-chu*, as is suggested from the examples 考 and 老. According to him,¹⁷⁾ *chuan-chu* resembles *hui-i* (*sic*), but the two are not identical, because a character formed by *chuan-chu* has retained the original meaning of the radical. For example, the character 考 is composed of 老 and 丂 (and thus it looks like a *hui-i* (*hsing-shêng?*) character), but *k'ao* is synonymous with *lao* and does not depart from its original meaning. Thus, his opinion seems to be rather faithful to the definition and the examples, but it is too much restricted in its application to count *chuan-chu* as one type of the Six Kinds of Writing.

(4) The opinion of Ma Shu-lun 馬叙倫, a contemporary Chinese scholar, is near to Ts'ao's theory, but slightly different.¹⁸⁾ According to Ma, if one

15) In the passage of *Pao-shih* 保氏 of the *Ti-kuan* of the *Chou-li* it is said: 「保氏掌諫王惡，而養國子以道，乃教之六藝，一曰五禮，二曰六樂，三曰五射，四曰五馭，五曰六書，六曰九數（下略）（*Pao-shih* takes charge of admonishing the king against doing something evil and of educating the noble children with morals, and then of teaching them with the Six Arts: the first is the Five Kinds of Rituals, the second the Six Kinds of Music, the third the Five Ways of Shooting, the fourth the Five Ways of Driving, the fifth the Six Kinds of Writing, and the sixth the Nine Ways of Counting.)」

16) *Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 189-196.

17) 「故轉注近乎會意，而與會意不同，轉注者，以此合彼，而不離其原義，如以老合丂爲考，而考字仍與老字同義」 (*ibid.*)

18) Ma Shu-lun, *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-liu-shu-shu-chêng* 說文解字研究法 and his more recent work, *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzŭ-liu-shu-shu-chêng* 說文解字六書疏證. Here I quote from his former work.

considers *chuan-chu*, three conditions should be fulfilled, namely, 1) *chien-lei* 建類, 2) *i-shou* 一首 and 3) *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* 同意相受. By *chien-lei* he understands the relation of a radical and characters belonging to it, based on the theory of Chiang Shêng. The third condition, i.e. the interpretation of *t'ung-i*, is an extension of Tai Chên's opinion. Only the interpretation of *i-shou*, the second condition, is somewhat different from the traditional ones. Ma understands by *i-shou* a phonetic similarity. The examples *k'ao* 考 and *lao* 老 belonged to a phonetic group of Archaic Chinese (the Group *Yu* 幽部). This idea is inherited from Chang Ping-lin 章炳麟. Chang Pin-lin regards *lei* of *chien-lei* as the group of initial consonants (聲類) and *shou* 首 as the so-called *yü-ch'i* 語基 (the root of words?).¹⁹⁾ But it is difficult to interpret the phrase *i-shou* phonetically, as Ku Shih pointed out.

If we follow the view of Ma, a character engendered by *chuan-chu* is a character of *hsing-shêng* type. He himself says, "a character formed by *chuan-chu* is always of *hsing-shêng* type (轉注字無非形聲者)."²⁰⁾ And further, "though a character by *chuan-chu* is formed by the method of *hsing-shêng*, it fulfills the strict conditions of *chien-lei-i-shou* and *t'ung-i-hsiang-shou*. This is the method constructing a *chuan-chu* character."²¹⁾ However, since the type of *hsing-shêng* was recognized in the *Liu-shu* system, it is strange to assume that special cases of *hsing-shêng* should have been taken up as a separate type of the *Liu-shu*.

(5) Many people considered *chuan-chu* as compared with *chia-chieh*. I think that this is a right attitude. Presumably from the examples of *lao* and *k'ao*, Hsü Ch'ieh said that "in case of *chia-chieh* one character is used for several words, while in case of *chuan-chu* one meaning is expressed by several characters (假借則一字數用, 轉注則一義數文)."²²⁾ This expression has been being used willingly by many scholars. Wang Yün 王筠, in discussing *chuan-chu*, said that "in short, in *chuan-chu* one meaning is expressed by several characters, while in *chia-chieh* one character represents several meanings."²³⁾ He explains the reason why one meaning has come to be expressed by several characters in the following way. "Why did one meaning come to be expressed by several characters? Because a word had a light or heavy shade of meaning, and the dialect varied between the south and the north, so that the meaning could not be expressed with the same character (何爲其數字也, 語有輕重, 地分南北, 必不能比而同之)." He ascribes the reason to the difference of dialects.²⁴⁾ The same opinion is held by Hu Yün-yü 胡韞玉. He said that "in ancient

19) Chang Pin-lin, *Kuo-ku-lun-hêng* 國故論衡.

20) Ma Shu-lun, *op. cit.*, 100.

21) *ibid.*

22) Hsü Ch'ieh, *Shuo-wên-chieh-tzû-chi-chuan*, Vol. 1; the commentary to character 上.

23) 「要而論之, 轉注者, 一義而數字, 假借者, 一字而數義」(*Shuo-wên-shih-li*, Vol. 4, *Chuan-chu*).

24) *ibid.*

times the language was spoken, but the writing had not yet been invented. At that time the speech varied with areas. When the language came to be represented by writing, each area chose its dialectal form for a character. Therefore, the same thing was signified by different characters. Then, if one unifies such different characters by *chuan-chu*, the characters of the same meaning, but of different forms, can be identified. This is the merit of *chuan-chu*.”²⁵⁾ In the period when the unity of the country was broken, so that there grew several political or cultural centres in various areas, as in the Period of the Warring States, the centre of writing also must have been broken up. It is easy to imagine that a character was invented for the dialectal form of a word at each centre. As a result, several characters were created for the same word. Hu seems to consider *chuan-chu* as putting together such synonymous characters. Thus, his theory draws near to that of Tai and Tuan.

(6) Taking various ideas mentioned above into consideration, Jao Chiung 饒炯, a Ch'ing scholar, presented a unique and remarkable view. He says in his *Liu-shu-tsu-chên* 六書存眞 as follows:

“I think that *chuan-chu* is a new formation of a character after the Chinese writing was already invented and came into use. First, when the form of a character was not clear and thus its signification was not distinct, the character was made clear by adding a signific or a phonetic (*chia-hsing* 加形 or *chia-shêng* 加聲). This is what Wang Yün 王筠 called in his *Shih-li* 釋例 a duplicate character 累增字. Secondly, when the meaning of a word changed so that the character that had represented the word could not discriminate the difference between the original and derived meanings, the character was made distinguished by adding a signific or a phonetic. Thirdly, when the reading of a character could not be recognized owing to a dialectal difference, the character was made distinguished by adding a phonetic. This is what Wang Yün called in his *Shih-li* a distinct character 分別文.”²⁶⁾ The *Shih-li* quoted here is Wang Yün's *Shuo-wên-shih-li* 說文釋例. Jao Chiung mentioned three causes of the addition of a signific or a phonetic, and he illustrated them with concrete examples in the subsequent discussions of his work. For the first case, he said that “there is a case where one made it clear by adding a signific (加形) when the signification became ambiguous (有因意晦, 而加形以明之者)”, and quoted the example of “the radical 丷 which itself already had represented a candle, but later a new character 主 was

25) 「蓋上古之時, 有語言而無文字, 而四方之語言, 各自不同, 聖由語言變爲文字, 則各取其地之方言, 而制以爲字, 所以同一事物, 而文字不同, 有轉注以會通, 則義同形不同之文字, 悉歸于同, 此轉注之功用也」 (Hu Yuün-yü, *Liu-shu-ch'ien-shu* 六書淺說, *Chuan-chu-shih-li* 轉注釋例, (1) *Chuan-chu-tsung-lun* 轉注總論; Cf. *Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 155).

26) 「炯案, 轉注本用字後之造字, 一因篆體形晦, 義不甚顯, 而从本篆加形加聲以明之, 是即王氏釋例之所謂累增字也, 一因義有推廣, 又無分辨, 而从本篆加形加聲以別之, 一因方言轉變, 音無由判, 而从本篆加聲以別之, 是即王氏釋例之所謂分別文也」 (*Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 135-137).

created by adding 王, a stand, to the radical 丩 (部首、己象火柱, 而主又从、加王).” (The present form 炷 is a further development by adding the radical 火). Again, he said that “there is a case where one made it clear by adding a phonetic (加聲), when the signification was ambiguous (有因意晦, 而加聲以明之者)”, and quoted as an example “the character 罔 which was formed by *hsiang-hsing* 象形. It has a variant 罔 that was made by adding the phonetic 亡 (罔象形, 而或體罔, 又从罔加亡聲).” For the second case, i.e. caused by the development of meaning (義之推廣), he said, “when a word for which a character had been invented became to have another meaning, one made it clear by adding a signfic (有別義, 而加形以明之者).” “The character 禘 represents the word meaning ‘to worship the god (祭上帝)’. It was derived from the character *ti* 帝, meaning ‘god’, by adding the signfic 示, and was exclusively used for the word *ti* ‘to worship the god’”. Again, he said that “when a character had another meaning, one made it clear by adding a phonetic (有別義, 而加聲以明之者)”, and quoted as an example “the character 示, the ancient borrowing for the character 祇 which is found in the *Chou-li* 周禮. And the character 祇 is distinguished by adding the phonetic 氏.” For the third case, i.e. in case of a dialectal change, he said that “there is a case where a character had another reading which was made clear by adding a phonetic (有別聲, 而加聲以明之者)”, and quoted as an example “the character 氓 which represented a changed reading of the character 民 to which was added the phonetic 亡 (氓爲民之變音, 而即从民加亡音以寄之).” In this way, Jao Chiung considered *chuan-chu* as the process to make clear by adding another graphic element to the original character, when the character already extant became ambiguous either in meaning or in its phonetic shape. Jao proceeds to say:

“When the ancient people invented the writing, the methods of *hsiang-hsing*, *chih-shih*, *hui-i* and *hsing-shêng* had already exhausted the means of formation of characters. In case a character was used concomitantly for another word, it became the precedent of the later *chuan-chu*. Hsü wrote the Introduction to the *Shuo-wên* in which he quoted the characters 考 and 老 as the examples and said that ‘*chien-lei-i-shou*, *t’ung-hsiang-shou*.’”²⁷⁾

This remark is noteworthy, but when he discussed about the definition, that “*chien-lei-i-shou* means the sound and the meaning developed from the original ones, and the original was made a ‘head’ (首), which could serve for the use of several characters by adding some element. *T’ung-i-hsiang-shou* means that, when a character of the same sound and the same meaning was made distinct by adding some elements, the resulted characters had a common meaning”,²⁸⁾ he seems to have considered the addition of a signfic or a

27) 「蓋古人造字, 形事意聲已盡其妙, 或有所兼, 皆即後起之轉注, 許叙故舉考老爲例, 而曰, 建類一首, 同意相受」(ibid.)

28) 「建類一首者, 謂推廣之聲義, 而舉本字爲首, 因一字而可加爲數字之用, 同意相受者, 謂取同聲同義之字, 而相加爲別, 數字仍是一字之意」(ibid.)

phonetic as the true nature of *chuan-chu*. The discrimination by the addition of a signfic caused eventually to make ambiguous the difference between *chuan-chu* and *hui-i*. Then he said, "A character formed by the addition of a signfic was apt to be confounded with a *hui-i* character. But it was not identical. The character that was made by *chuan-chu* and that had the same phonetic form, always had maintained its original meaning. For example, the character 老 was composed with the character 毛. When a man or a thing becomes old, the colour of the hair (*mao*) changes. So by having named a state of a thing from the name of the thing, one called oldness as *mao*. (Original Notes: the evidence is fully given under the radical 老). As a result, the *mao* became an antonym to the word *yu* 幼 'to be infant'. Then, as the character for oldness could not be distinguished from the character for 'hair', and by having named a thing by its state, one came to call a man of seventy years old as *mao*, and one distinguished it by adding the character 人 and the character 匕 to the original character. Afterwards, for the word *mao*, the antonym of *yu* 幼, was made the character 老. This shows that the character 老 was derived and formed by *chuan-chu* from the character 毛."²⁹⁾ This passage is a bit difficult to understand. He said that "one called oldness as *mao*," and pointed out in his notes that "the evidence is fully given under the radical 老," but the *Shuo-wên* explains the character only as follows: "(*lao*) means *k'ao* 老; a man of seventy years old is called *lao*. The character is composed of 人 (man), 毛 (hair) and 匕 (to change). It tells that the colour of beards and hairs change white (考也, 七十曰老, 从人毛匕, 言須髮變白也)." Jao Chiung seems to have considered the *mao* of 从人毛匕 as oldness. (In this sense at present the character 耄 formed by adding the radical 老 is used.) Further, he looks like to want to state as if he had taken the character 毛 as representing the word *lao*.

Jao Chiung goes on to say:

"A character formed by the addition of a phonetic was apt to be confounded with a *hsing-shêng* character. But it was not identical with a *hsing-shêng* character. The character made by *chuan-chu* had the same sound and meaning as those of the original one, while a *hsing-shêng* character had the same sound, but not the same meaning. For example, the character 考 was composed of the abbreviated radical 老. The meaning is the same as *lao*. I think that in some dialect the reading of *lao* changed to *k'ao*. Hence it was distinguished by adding the phonetic 丂. This shows that the character 考 is made by *chuan-chu* from the character 老."³⁰⁾ It is a fact that a charac-

29) 「然加形之字，多涵會意，而與會意不同者，轉注所从同聲之字，必包本義，如老从毛，謂凡人物年久，毛皆不同，因物名事，而稱年久曰毛髣髴部首，與幼爲對文，因其字與毛髮之毛無別，且又因事名物，爲人年七十之稱，而加人加七以別之，後遂毛幼之毛亦作老，是老卽毛之引借轉注也」(ibid.)

30) 「加聲之字，多涵形聲，而與形聲不同者，轉注所从之字，聲義皆合，諧聲則有聲無義，如考从老省，義卽同老，蓋方言有變老聲而呼丂者，而卽加丂以別之，是考卽老之轉注也」(ibid.)

ter made by adding a phonetic is apt to be confounded with a *hsing-shêng* character, for the result by the both methods is the same. Rather we may say that the both are the same thing, whatever Jao might have said about the existence or the non-existence of semantic similarity. Therefore, his view has the same defect as those discussed above. Only his assumption that there may have been a dialect in which the word *lao* was pronounced as *k'ao* is interesting.

Besides, in the *Shuo-wên* a pair of characters is cited as the examples of each type of the *Liu-shu*, e.g. the characters 上 and 下 for *chih-shih*, 日 and 月 for *hsiang-hsing*, 江 and 河 for *hsing-shêng*, 武 and 信 for *hui-i*, 考 and 老 for *chuan-chu* and 令 and 長 for *chia-chieh*. The two characters for each type are semantically related between them. Except *chuan-chu*, however, in case of the other five types of writing the two characters are mere two examples. It seems that only in case of *chuan-chu* the two characters cited as the examples show the relationship between them. Many people are of the same opinion. The characteristics of Jao's theory is that he considered both *lao* and *k'ao* also as two mere examples of *chuan-chu* just like in other five types of writing, not the examples for their interrelation.

I have introduced the view of Jao Chiung at great length, because his theory is the nearest to my opinion which will be stated later. Jao's view is very attractive and may be termed the differentiation theory. Although his work has not been duly paid attention, there are many scholars who entertain such a differentiation theory. In China, Sun I-jang 孫詒讓, an eminent scholar of the studies of the Chinese writing, is one of them.³¹⁾ In Japan, Mr. Shirakawa 白川靜³²⁾ and Dr. Akiyasu Tôdô 藤堂明保³³⁾ also express a similar opinion. Only they hold that *chuan-chu* is the process of forming *hsing-shêng* characters for semantically and phonetically related words, consequently cognate words. Thus their view is a variant of the Jao's theory of *chia-hsing* 加形. On the other hand, T'ang Lan 唐蘭, a Chinese scholar, considers *chuan-chu* as the process of derivation of *hsing-shêng* characters by adding a phonetic (加聲).³⁴⁾ But the resulted characters, as derived from the original character according to these scholars, are either *hui-i* characters or for the most part *hsing-shêng* characters. As pointed out above, it is not convincing to count special cases of *hui-i* or *hsing-shêng* characters as a separate type called *chuan-chu* in the system of the *Liu-shu* from quite different angle from other types of writing.

31) Sun I-jang, *Ming-yüan* 名原. Sun also remarks that a character formed by the composition of graphic elements through the method of *hsing-shêng* generally serves at the same time as *chuan-chu* (自來凡形聲駢合文無不兼轉注).

32) Shirakawa Shizuka, *Kanji no sekai* 漢字の世界 I, Tôyô-bunko No. 281, Heibonsha, Tokyo, p. 21-22.

33) Tôdô Akiyasu, *Kanji-gaisetsu* 漢字概説 (Iwanami-kôza *Nihongo* 日本語), 8 (Monji 文字), Iwanami, Tokyo, 1977, p. 71-72.

34) T'ang Lan, *Chung-kuo-wên-tzŭ-hsiieh* 中國文字學, Hongkong, 1963, p. 99-100.

(7) Lastly, I should like to mention the opinion of Chu Chun-shêng 朱駿聲, the compiler of the unique dictionary called *Shuo-wên-t'ung-hsüin-t'ing-shêng* 說文通訓定聲.³⁵⁾ He judged the definition of *chuan-chu* to be unintelligible so that he altered the text concerning *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh* of the *Shuo-wên* in the following way: 轉注者, 體不改造, 引意相受, 令長是也, 假借者, 本無其意, 依聲託字, 朋來是也 (*Chuan-chu* is the use of a character which indicates both the original and the derived meanings, itself unmodified; 令 and 長 are the examples. *Chia-chieh* is the use of a character which came to represent another word than the original word by the phonetic similarity, though the original word had had no such meaning; 朋 and 來 are the examples). As might be expected of a great scholar, he did not forget the Archaic rimes in his text of definition, but he altered the text so as to accommodate its words to his theory. He said that "(the use of) the original character which was employed to denote another meaning derived by revolving and extending from the original meaning is called *chuan-chu* (就本字本訓, 而因以展轉引申爲他訓者, 曰轉注)." In short, he defines *chuan-chu* as semantic derivation. And he put his theory in practice in his dictionary, in establishing the column of *chuan-chu* treating derived meanings in the explanation of each character. The alteration of text is undesirable and therefore he was unpopular, but his following remarks are noteworthy. "In case of *chia-chieh* several characters are used for one character (word) and there is always an original character, while in case of *chuan-chu* one character serves several characters (words) and it is not necessary to create other characters."

He removed the examples 令 and 長 of *chia-chieh* to *chuan-chu* and newly cited 朋 and 來 for the examples of *chia-chieh*. This alteration of text is not groundless. The examples 令 and 長 for *chia-chieh* in the *Shuo-wên* show that *ling* 令 meaning 'to order' and *ch'ang* 長 meaning 'long' are used at the same time for the meaning 'a chief of a local district (縣令 and 縣長)'. These cases can be regarded as the examples of semantic change of the words. The theory of Chu Chun-shêng is supposed to have originated from this fact. However, *ling* 'to order' and *ling* 'a chief of a district' can be considered as separate words, and the latter was represented by the same character which had been made for the former. Thus, the *Shuo-wên* has cited these examples for *chia-chieh* following the definition: 本無其字, 依聲託意 (Originally there was no character for the word, and another character was used to indicate the meaning of the word by phonetic similarity). By the way, the examples of *chia-chieh* in the *Shuo-wên* are not merely two examples for *chia-chieh*. The two examples 令 and 長 were cited, because both of them were used also in the meaning of 'a chief of a district' beside their original meanings, but the difference of meaning can only be made clear by citing both characters together. The manner of citing examples is quite resembling the examples *lao* and *k'ao* for *chuan-chu* which show the relation between the two charac-

35) *Liu-shu-tsung-lun*, 197-198.

ters. Since *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh* concern the use of a character, not the form of a character, it is natural to resort to a different device from the four other types of writing in citing examples.

Ekisai Kariya 狩谷掖齋 (1775–1835), a Japanese scholar of the Edo Period, also criticized the text of the definitions and the examples of the *Shuo-wên* as spurious.³⁶⁾ Based on the memorial by Chiang Shih 江式 presented to the emperor of the Wei Dynasty which is recorded in the *Wei-shu* 魏書, the history of Later Wei Dynasty 後魏, he concluded that the definitions and the examples were later interpolations into the text of the *Shuo-wên*. Ekisai eliminated the definition and the examples from the text and offered his own opinion on *chuan-chu*. He regarded *chuan-chu* as semantic change just like Chu Chun-shêng. It is to be noted that Ekisai also treated such examples as *ling* 令 and *ch'ang* 長 as the examples for *chuan-chu*, though he was somewhat older than Chu and he had not any opportunity of seeing Chu's work.

This view of Ekisai, however, is not well founded. It is certain that the memorial of Chiang Shih was based on the Introduction of the *Shuo-wên*, but Chiang did not mention the name of the *Shuo-wên*. Moreover, the text of the memorial is not identical with that of the *Shuo-wên*. Consequently, the definitions and examples are supposed to have been omitted in the memorial. After all, it is wrong to suppose that the definitions and the examples are interpolations, based on the memorial of Chiang Shih. In this connection, the Commentary 正義 of Chia Kung-yen 賈公彥 to the *Chou-li* 周禮 quotes the *Shuo-wên* in which the definitions and the examples are found, though slightly modified.³⁷⁾ So it is certain that the definitions and the examples already existed in the text of the *Shuo-wên* at least in the T'ang Period. Even if the definitions and the examples were interpolations after the theory of Ekisai, then one must examine how these interpolations were introduced and where they were taken from. Each definition consists of two sentences of four words, each sentence having a rime, and the rime follows the patterns of Archaic Chinese.³⁸⁾ From these peculiarities one may infer

36) Kariya Ekisai, *Ten-chû-setsu* 轉注說, in the collection of *Nihon-koten-zenshû* 日本古典全集, *Kariya-Ekisai-zenshû* No. 3, Tokyo, 1926.

37) 「…云六書象形之等，皆依許氏說文，(中略)云轉注者，考老之類是也，建類一首，文意相受，左右相注，故名轉注，(下略)」。

38) In the *Shuo-wên*, the definition of *chih-shih* is 視而可識，察而見意。 This text is based on Tuan Yü-tsai's criticism. Tuan says, various texts read 可見 instead of 見意, but it should be corrected on the basis of the Commentary of Yen Shih-ku 顏師古 to the *I-wên-chih* 藝文志 of the *Han-shu* 漢書, for the ancient reading of 意 was like 億, and 識 and 意 belonged to the Archaic Group I; the two sentences of other five kinds of writing are also rimed (見意各本作可見，今依顏氏藝文志注正，意舊音如億，識意在古音第一部，以下每書二句，皆韻語也)。 The definitions of other five types of writing are 畫成其物，髓體詰詘 for *hsing-hsing*; 以事爲名，取譬相成 for *hsing-shêng*; 比類合誼，以見措擗 for *hui-i*; 建類一首，同意相受 for *chuan-chu*; 本無其字，依聲託事 for *chia-chieh*. Especially the characters 識 and 意 in the definition of *chih-shih* are rimed well in Archaic Chinese, but not in later times.

that the definitions and the examples were formerly oral traditions. Anyway it is not praiseworthy for a philologist to commit a text mutilation.

There are several other kinds of view concerning *chuan-chu* besides the opinions discussed above. But none of them is convincing. The other five types of writing are all of simple nature and easy to understand. So *chuan-chu* should also be easy to grasp. What can be deduced from the opinions examined above is that, while *chia-chieh* concerns the phonetic relation between characters, *chuan-chu* seems to indicate some semantic relation between characters.

The Writer's Opinion on *Chuan-chu*

As observed above, one cannot grasp the true nature of *chuan-chu* by means of its term, the definition and the examples in the *Shuo-wên*. Then, departing from the Chinese writing, I turned my eyes toward other ancient writing systems of Egypt and Mesopotamia, hoping that any other use of a character might be discovered. Only by peeping into the hieroglyphic of Egypt or the cuneiform script, one can find a very common use of characters that is not easily found in the Chinese writing. For example, in Egyptian writing the character representing the word *r'* 'sun' indicates simultaneously another word *hrw* 'day' (Cf. No. 1 in Table on the next page).³⁹⁾

Though semantically affiliated, the two are entirely different words. One can easily presume that the character denoting the word 'sun' could be applied to the word meaning 'day', though there was no etymological relation between the two words. In the Sumerian cuneiform writing, too, the character representing the word *utu* 'sun' was used to indicate various other words, e.g. *ud* 'day, time, when . . .', *bar* or *babbar* 'white', or *zalg* 'white, clear, bright, . . .' and others.⁴⁰⁾ These words apparently had no etymological relation, but semantically associated to each other. This so to speak homographic use of characters is found comparatively more in Sumerian than in Egyptian. In passing, the character No. 4 in Table also denoted the word *u₄* (*ug₄*) meaning 'lion'. This is the *chia-chieh* use of the character owing to the phonetic resemblance between *u₄* (*ud₄*) and *u₄* (*ug₄*). Further, this character had gone to represent the meaningless syllables *ud*, *ut*, *tam*, *tu*, etc. The same character was borrowed into other languages than Sumerian, e.g. in Akkadian, Hittite, etc. And the character had developed to represent the Akkadian or Hittite equivalents and syllables, so that this Sumerian character became to be employed to denote a great many words and syllables.

It is comparatively easy to realize how such a use of a character was

39) Raymond O. Faulkner, *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian*, Oxford, 1962; under the headings of *r'* and *hrw*.

40) René Labat, *Manuel d'épigraphie akkadienne*, Paris, 1963.

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|----|---|----|---|
| 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  |
| 4 |  | 5 |  | 6 |  |
| 7 |  (盱鼎) | 8 |  | 9 |  (善夫克鼎) |
| 10 |  (受季良父壺) | | | | |
| 11 |  (盱鼎) | | | | |
| 12 |  (毛公旅鼎) | 13 |  (師楚簋) | 14 |  (大豐簋) |
| 15 |  (康侯簋) | 16 |  (兮仲鐘) | 17 |  (穿鼎) |
| 18 |  (杜伯盥) | 19 |  (鄉直) | 20 |  (禹鼎) |
| 21 |  (又尊) | |  (盱鼎) | | |

caused. In every archaic logographic system of writing there were not ready all characters for all words from the outset. By the device of *hsiang-hsing*, *chih-shih* or *hui-i* the representation of words was naturally restricted. Then, when a word that had not yet its own character came to be represented in writing, one must utilize a character already in use. In using a character available for another word two methods were possible. The one method was to employ the character that had the same or approximate pronunciation to the word in question. This is the method of *chia-chieh*. The other method was to use a character for another word, semantically associated with the word for which the character originally was made. This is the method seen in the use of the Egyptian character No. 1 in Table or the Sumerian character No. 4 in Table. Both of the methods are to transfer a character already in use from its original word to another word, and the resulted character shows a homograph 同字異語, i.e. the same character for different words. I have come to consider this latter kind of homographic use of characters as *chuan-chu*.⁴¹⁾

Now, I tried to examine if there are such instances even in the Chinese writing. Just as I thought, I could find some examples for this use of a character in somewhat older phase of the Chinese writing. For example, the character No. 7 in Table is the original form of the character 禾 which depicted the image of a plant belonging to gramineae by the method of *hsiang-hsing*. The character represents the word *hwa* 'a rice plant'. In the Shang bones the character was used for the word *nien* 'harvest' (年).⁴²⁾ The Seal form of this character in the *Shuo-wên* is No. 8 in Table. It is explained as 从禾干聲 (composed of the radical 禾 and the phonetic *ch'ien* 干). This explanation is wrong, for in the Chou bronzes it appears with the form of No. 9 in Table, and it is a *hui-i* character, by composing the character 禾 and the character 人 (man) which represents the word *nien* 'harvest'.⁴³⁾ However, in the early stage of the development of the Chinese writing the character No. 7 was sufficient to denote the word *nien*. In the same way, the character 立 shows very often the homographic usage. This character originally represented the word *li* 'to stand', by showing the standing form of a man. In the Chou inscriptions the character is much more used for the word

41) After I wrote and sent the manuscripts of this article to the editors, through the goodwill of Prof. Tôru GOMI 五味亨, I was made known that the same conclusion as mine was already published by Dr. Yomokurô NAKAHARA who is the pioneer of the Sumeriology in Japan ("The Sumerian Tablets in the Imperial University of Kyôto", Memoirs of the Research Department of the Tôyô-Bunko, No. 3, 1928). His study concerns Sumerian, but, in discussing about the *Liu-shu*, he stated his own opinion on *chuan-chu*, although by an entirely different approach.

42) Shang Ch'êng-tsu 商承祚, *Yin-hsü-wên-tzŭ-lei-p'ien* 殷墟文字類篇, the entry of *nien* 年, in which the compiler says, "I think that, though simply written as 禾, if one considers it in its contexts, it denotes the word *nien* 年 (祚案 [中略] 徑作禾, 以文理觀之, 則皆是年字).

43) Jung Kêng 容庚, *Chin-wên-p'ien* 金文編, the entry of *nien* 年.

wei 'throne', which was later modified into 位 by adding the radical 人, in order to avoid the ambiguity. Among the canonical texts transmitted up to the present time one can point out the character 示 in the text of the *Chou-li*: 太宗伯掌天神人鬼地示之禮, where it denotes not the word *shih* 'to show', but the word *ch'i* 'deity'. Lu Tê-ming 陸德明 comments here in his *Ching-tien-shih-wên* 經典釋文 as 示或作祇, showing that there was a variant in which the character 祇 was used instead. In this case, to distinguish it from the ordinary *shih* the character 氏 was added to the character 示 as the phonetic.

In later times one can hardly find such instances, yet a few cases have remained. The character 車 is one example. This character has two authentic readings, namely, AC. *kîo* (廣韻: 九魚切) and AC. *tš'ia* (廣韻: 昌遮切). Though the meaning is the same, these two readings reflect two separate words. In Sino-Japanese the latter reading (SJ. *sha*) is exclusively used, while in Sino-Korean both readings are employed even today. In the Sino-Korean words *chən-ch'a* (電車) and *ki-ch'a* (汽車) the reading *ch'a* is used, which is derived from AC. *tš'ia*, while the words *cha-jən-gə* (自轉車) and *chəng-gə-jang* (停車場) include the reading *kə* (or *gə*) which is the descendant of AC. *kîo*. These readings may be considered as the examples of "dialectal change (因方言轉變)" according to Jao Chiung. This character clearly shows the homography of two words, since the two words are etymologically separate ones, though of the identical meaning.

Another example is the character 樂. When it means 'music', it had the AC. reading *ngâk* (廣韻: 五角切), but in case of the meaning 'to be pleasant' it was pronounced in AC. as *lâk* (廣韻: 盧各切). Obviously the character represents two distinct words, of which the meaning also is different.⁴⁴⁾ Though semantically associated, the word *ngâk* and *lâk* are separate words. Prof. Karlgren supposes that the form *ngâk* is derived from **nglâk* and that the form *lâk* originates from **glâk*, by deriving the two forms from one origin.⁴⁵⁾ But I cannot agree with him, because the phonetic relation is rather doubtful. The two forms differ from each other in the initial consonant and the principal vowel. Moreover, the consonant alternation between *ng* and *l* is unusual. So they should be kept apart. Accordingly, the character must represent the homography of semantically associated words.

Certainly the transfer of a character between semantically, but not phonetically, related words is not common. However, in some cases it really happened. For instance, the character 袂 represents the word *mi* 'sleeve'. This reading *mi* is very strange, for the phonetic 夬 of this *hsing-shêng*

44) The character 樂 has one more reading. It is recorded as 魚教切 in the *Chi-yün* 集韻, i.e. AC. *ngau* (Karlgren ArCh. **nglög*). This reading denotes the meaning 'to find pleasure in something', as in the passage 仁者樂山 of the *Lun-yü* 論語. From its phonetic shape, it might have had some connection with the reading *ngak* 'music', which, consequently, had earlier meant 'to be pleasant'. Even if one admit such a supposition, the *lâk* and the *ngak* are separate words, and the character 樂 still shows homography,

45) Bernhard Karlgren, *Grammata Serica Recensa*, p. 289 (1125 a-c).

character suggests the initials *k*-, *k'*- or *ʔ*-, but never *m*-. Cf. 夬 AC. *kwai*, 快 AC. *k'wai*, 袂 AC. *kwet*, 缺 AC. *k'wet*, 袂 AC. *ʔwet* and the like. I think that originally this character 袂 did not represent the word *mi*, but another word of the same meaning, something like **kwet*, and that owing to the semantic identity the word *mi* took the character for its use, by expelling the original word **kwet* (?). This is not a mere supposition. Once, when I turned the leaves of the *Kuang-ya* 廣雅, a glossary of synonyms by Chang I 張揖 of the Wei Dynasty, I happened to come across the character 襖 meaning 'sleeve'. In the *Kuang-yün* 廣韻 the character is indicated by the reading *kwet* (古穴切). This very word *kwet* was the original word for the character 袂, but due to the predominance of the word *mi* the word *kwet* was robbed of its character and newly the character 襖 was created instead by the method of *hsing-shéng*. Probably there might be more instances of such kind, if one examines minutely. This case shows the transfer of a character from the original word to another semantically associated word even among *hsing-shéng* characters, much more the case with a *hsiang-shéng* character like 樂.

In this way, we can recognize that even in the Chinese writing there was the use of characters of the same principle as in the systems of hieroglyphic or cuneiform writing. And this usage can be said to go fairly well in parallel with the usage of *chia-chieh*. From these facts I am convinced that this homographic use of a character for semantically associated words, but not phonetically related, is the true nature of *chuan-chu*.

Now that this method of using a character for another semantically associated word is *chuan-chu*, the term *chuan-chu*, the definition and the examples in the *Shuo-wên* come into question. First, as to the term *chuan-chu*, as many scholars pointed out, the *chuan* means 'to revolve' (*chan-chuan* 輾轉) and the *chu* 注 means 'to pour' (*kuan-chu* 灌注). If so, the *chuan* and the *chu* are synonymous here just like the *chia* 假, and the *chieh* 借, and both *chuan* and *chu* denote the meaning 'to derive from an original'. In other words, suppose that there had been a certain character *A* representing a certain word *a*. When the same character *A* came to represent another word *b* that was associated with the word *a* in meaning, the character may be expressed as: it rolled (*chuan*) from *a* and was poured (*chu*) into *b*.

Secondly, how to interpret the sentences of the definition? The expression: *chien-lei* 建類 should not be understood as 'to establish a radical group' as Chiang Sheng held. It would be better to interpret it as 'to divide and establish a word group', following after the commentary of Tuan Yü-tsai ('to divide and establish a meaning group 分立其義之類'). Anyway, *chien-lei* implies a division. When two words *a* and *b* came to be represented by the same character, it was necessary to distinguish them. The distinction of words may be expressed by the phrase *chien-lei*. The phrase *i-shou* 一首 means 'to be derived from the same origin', as Jao Chiung said (舉本字爲首 'to

cite the original character as a 'head'). In other words, the original character remains the same, but as words the two should be kept apart, i.e. homography. The sentence: 同意相受 seems to indicate, as many scholars held, that there is a semantical association. In this case, the phrase *t'ung-i* is not necessary to be restricted to synonymy. This definition should be understood as stating the homography of words semantically associated, not always synonymous. This interpretation of the definition of *chuan-chu* is quite natural, as against *chia-chieh* that shows the homography of words phonetically related, but having no semantical association. In passing, it is to be noted that the definition of *chuan-chu* emphasizes *i* 意, i.e. meaning, (*t'ung-i-hsiang-shou* (同意相受) and the definition of *chia-chieh* insists on *shéng* 聲, i.e. sound, (*i-shéng-t'o-i* 依聲託意).

Finally, how can we solve the problem about the examples of *lao* and *k'ao*? One cannot say that the present forms of the characters 老 and 考 show homography. However, in the Chou inscriptions we can find several instances where the character 老 represents the word *k'ao*. In the entry dealing with *k'ao* 考 of the *Chin-wên-p'ien* 金文編 by Jung Kêng 宮庚 one can see the instances among the examples of *hsing-shéng* type (Cf. Table). From this fact I have come to conclude that the word *k'ao* was in olden times written with the character 老. But this homography obviously caused ambiguity, and thus to dissolve the ambiguity and to distinguish clearly the two words, the phonetic *k'ao* 𠂔 was added to 老 according to the principle of *chia-shéng* 加聲 as called by Jao Chiung. This process of *chia-shéng*, however, appeared only in later times, and in older stage the character 老 was used to represent both the words *lao* and *k'ao* indiscriminately. On such a stage of the development of the Chinese writing such instances probably were not rare. As a result, such a use of a character was a necessary knowledge for a teacher to teach his pupils and was adopted as the type of *chuan-chu* in the *Liu-shu* system. Probably Hsü Shên, the compiler of the *Shuo-wên*, took up in his Introduction the definitions of the *Liu-shu* and their examples which had been in use during the Chou Dynasty, when the Chinese characters were taught to children. Before they were taken into the *Shuo-wên*, they must have been for a long time transmitted orally between generations, for, as already pointed out, the definitions are composed of two sentences of four words and each sentence has an Archaic rime. As often happened everywhere in olden times, grammatical or other linguistic rules were rendered in verses in order to make the memory easy. If so, the *lao* and the *k'ao* of the example could clearly be distinguished in the oral transmission, as the pronunciation of the two words were fairly distinct, but in writing in a book, this discrimination was impossible, for the *lao* and the *k'ao* were represented by the same character. Thus, in the later writing, such as in the *Shuo-wên*, the distinction was made clear by writing the *k'ao* with the new *hsing-shéng* character 考 which had already begun to be used in the Chou

Period.

In this way I believe that one can explain what is *chuan-chu*, either from the observation of the usage of the ancient logographic writings or from the interpretation of its term, the definition and the examples in the *Shuo-wên*.

Why, then, the *chuan-chu* use of characters became to fall into desuetude so that many scholars had to face the solution of the difficult problem? As realized in case of 老 and 考, as well as in case of 禾 and 年, 立 and 位, or 示 and 祇, a signfic or a phonetic was added to the original character in order to avoid ambiguity caused by homography so that the results were characters of *hui-i* or *hsing-shêng*, and the number of *chuan-chu* examples was diminished. The cases of the characters 車 and 樂 are rather exceptional. The classification of characters by the *Liu-shu* was formulated on the phase where the elimination of the ambiguity caused by homography had not yet been sufficiently made. Afterwards as the elimination of ambiguity proceeded and consequently the formation of *hsing-shêng* characters developed, the ideal of the logographic writing to apply one character to one word was gradually approached. This is why examples of *chuan-chu* became scarce in later times.

It is a pity that Jao Chiung should have been misled into the belief that *chuan-chu* is the process of eliminating the ambiguity caused by homography, rather than the state of homography. The elimination of ambiguity was made also in case of *chia-chieh*. For instance, the character 求 that originally represented the shape of a fur-coat (Cf. No. 21 in Table) and that hence denoted the word *ch'iu* meaning 'fur-coat', was borrowed to another homophonous word meaning 'to look for'. In this stage the character showed the homography between two homophonous words. In due time the character 求 was monopolized for the word meaning 'to look for' and for the word meaning 'fur-coat' was newly created a character 裘 by the method of *hsing-shêng*, i.e. by adding the radical 衣 to the original character. Examples of this sort may be abundant.

The Chinese writing has become an almost perfect system of logographic writing by having established the principle of *hsing-shêng* formation.⁴⁶⁾ By this principle any word that had not yet had its own character could acquire its own character anytime. In the gradual process of the systematization of writing toward a perfect logographic writing there occurred the phenomena of *chuan-chu* and *chia-chieh*. These phenomena were very natural in the process of systematization in any ancient logographic writing, as seen in the hieroglyphic or the cueniform writing. But such a phenomenon brought about ambiguity in the logographic function of writing and thus sooner or later must be eliminated. In the Chinese writing the elimination was accomplished by the principle of *hsing-shêng*.

46) Cf. Rokurô Kôno, *Kaisei-monji-ron* 諧聲文字論, Tôkyô-Kyôikudagaku-Kanbungakkai-hô 東京教育大學漢文學會報, Vol. 14.