

The Chinese Writing and its Influences on the Scripts of the Neighbouring Peoples

—with special reference to Korea and Japan—

By Rokurô KÔNO

Introductory

Perhaps it is premature now to write something on a subject as this, for the science of writing has not yet been duly developed among the linguistic fields, on the one hand, and the research into the intended theme demands vast erudition, on the other, which naturally surpasses my ability. Yet the subject itself is attractive and seems to be not unworthy of scrutiny for a specialist. Thus, in spite of my limited knowledge and capacity, I venture to propose a tentative sketch about the diffusion of the Chinese characters and the reactions of the neighbouring peoples against the Chinese writing. The attitude of each people toward the Chinese writing is different one from another and new scripts were invented after having given up the adaptation of the Chinese writing to the indigenous languages. These different attitudes suggest us various phases of the acculturation of the peoples who imported the Chinese culture, and further, the comparison of these phases will bring a light upon the nature of the Chinese writing. Especially it is interesting to note the difference that lies between Korea and Japan, showing otherwise similarities in many points in borrowing language goods from China. Thus, focusing the attention on Korea and Japan, I should like to discuss about the graphological nature of the Chinese writing and about the reactions caused by the various peoples against the influence of the Chinese characters.

(*) This article is composed of the translations of my previous works in Japanese with some modifications; “Kojiki-ni okeru Kanji Shiyô (The Use of the Chinese Characters in the Kojiki)”, “Kojiki Taisei”, Vol. III (Gengo Monji Hen), published by Heibonsha in Tokyo, in 1957; “Kaisei Monji Ron (A Study of the Hsieh-shêng Characters)”, in Vol. 14 of the “Tokyo Kyôiku Daigaku Kambun Gakkai Hô (Reports of the Association of Chinese Studies of Tokyo University of Education)”, in 1953; and a part of Chapter III of the “Nihongo-no Rekishi (A History of the Japanese Language)”, Vol. II, edited by T. Kamei, T. Ôfuji and T. Yamada, published by Heibonsha in Tokyo, in 1963. As regards the last one, at first I wrote the draught which was revised with valuable suggestions of Prof. Kamei, chief editor. With his kind permission I have translated here the main part. I appreciate his lasting friendship and his excellent advice.

Writing is the secondary system of linguistic signs, based on, and transferred from, the primary auditory speech system, but it is no less important in performing the communicative functions in a society. Writing is in its nature essentially different from speech, but it has been treated wrongly in linguistics. Almost all introductions to general linguistics have paid little attention to writing¹⁾. The reason for this unreasonable treatment is that writing has been regarded merely as a garment for language, for the writing systems current in Europe or United States are all alphabetical, which are considered to be the means to denote sounds. This is entirely erroneous. Writing is not the phonetic sign, the true function of which is to represent sounds, but writing, even the most phonetic alphabet, is not designed for the representation of sounds²⁾. Writing belongs to a totally different order from its auditory counterpart. This can be comprehensible from the fact that there is radical difference in sensation between speech and writing, the former appealing to the auditive sense and the latter to the visual one. The gap cannot be overlooked, though a transfer is allowable to some extent between different senses. Thus, writing should be treated in its own way in linguistics.

A new branch dealing with writing, especially its linguistic functions, must be set up in linguistics, and it may be termed graphology, i.e. the science of writing. In these days some tokens have been seen to re-consider the importance of writing, but the systematization has not yet been attempted.

The study of writing has been hitherto concentrated in pursuing the history of writing, particularly the origin and the transmission of writing. But the study of principles underlying writing and of its linguistic function is far more important in making clear the nature of writing.

Now all the writings, past and present, have been classified into two main types: ideograph and phonograph. Recently the term 'ideograph' or 'ideography' has been replaced by the term 'logograph' or 'logography'³⁾. The true ideograph is a sign system directly associated with ideas. The mathematical signs like =, + or - are truly ideographic. Similarly the Arabic numerals. Also the Egyptian hieroglyphs, or the primitive forms of the Mesopotamian

(1) A rare exception is H. A. Gleason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, New York, 1956. The author has dedicated two chapters to the study of writing. The most recent account on the study of writing is given by E.A. Llorach in "Le Langage" in *Encyclopédie de la Pléiade*, edited by A. Martinet, in 1968.

(2) Even such an eminent scholar as I. J. Gelb was mistaken in distinguishing the difference between writing and the phonetic sign. Gelb says in his excellent work, "A Study of Writing", on p. 241, discussing about the future of writing: "What is needed now is one system of writing in which signs have identical or almost identical phonetic correspondences all over the world. That need is fulfilled in the IPA alphabet."

(3) P. A. Boodberg, *Some Proleptical Remarks on the Evolution of Archaic Chinese*, HJAS, Vol. II, No. 3-4, pp. 329-372, 1937. Cf. Y. R. Chao, *A Note on a Logographic Theory of Chinese Characters*, HJAS, Vol. V, No. 2, pp. 189-191, 1940.

cuneiforms and of Chinese characters can be said to be real ideographs. For instance, the Chinese pictographic forms ☉, ☾ can suggest us directly the ideas of the sun and the moon from their shapes and thus we can rightly call them ideographs, but the conventional forms of the two characters as are used at present cannot to be ideographic. These characters were certainly ideographic at their origin, but in order that may be the Chinese characters, they must first of all represent the Chinese words respectively. In other words, the Chinese characters should be called logographic rather than ideographic.

When we consider the nature of logography more precisely, we may find that every system of writing, whether 'ideographic' or phonographic, is logographic in its ultimate function. In so far as writing is a visual sign for language, all the writings can be said to be logographic. Even in a language where an alphabet is used, the phonography of the alphabet is a means for the representation of words, i.e. logography, which is attained by indicating sounds, in many cases phonemes, the components of words to be represented. For example, in English, the word {sun} is written <sun>, the letter <s> indicating the phoneme /s/, the letter <u> the phoneme /ʌ/, and the letter <n> the phoneme /n/. The important thing is that the combination of the three letters in the spelling serves to denote the word {sun}. Thus, a phonographic writing does not make the phonography its true function, but it indicates merely sounds, the components of words, for its logographic purpose. Here is the difference between the phonographic writing and the phonetic sign. The latter aims at describing the sound as its main objective and so it is not writing.

The best example that illustrates the logographic nature of a phonographic writing is the English orthography. The spelling of <knight>, for instance, that has retained even now the letter representing the old extinct phoneme /k/, should not only be ascribed to the conservatism of Englishmen. Rather the conservatism is supported by the logographic function of writing. This spelling was originally phonographic, the grapheme <k> also having had the real phonetic value (Cf. German *Knecht*). After the spelling lost its phonographic value due to the sound change, it has been maintained at the sacrifice of its phonography, for the spelling is effective in logography, the letter <k> serving well as a distinctive feature, distinguishing the word from the homophonous word, say {night}. Not the phonetic accuracy, but the "Gestalt" effect of the spelling is the vital point.

Thus, all the writings have their objective in the representation of words, i.e. logography. It is due to the difference of the method of representation that some scripts are logographs and others are phonographs, though all of them aim at representing words. While alphabets and other phonographic letters indicate single sounds or syllables composing a word,

a logograph represents a word as a whole. A phonograph represents a word form analytically, while a logograph denotes a word form synthetically. Further, between a logograph and a phonograph the unit belongs to a different level. The former represents directly a word so that the representation is directed to the morphological level, while the latter refers to the lower level, i.e. the phonological level. One can set up two kinds of graphological units corresponding to these levels. The one which corresponds to the morphological level may be called a *graph*, and the other corresponding to the phonological level may be termed a *grapheme*. If so, generally speaking, the unit of the so-called logographic writing is a graph and that of a phonographic script is a grapheme. And a graph of a phonographic writing is a combination of graphemes forming a spelling. In the logographic system of writing the graphemes are divided into two kinds, the phonetic and the semantic. A semantic determinative of a logographic system of writing, such as the Egyptian, the Sumerian or the Chinese, is a semantic grapheme and indicates the category of meaning of a word that a logograph represents. The grapheme, therefore, has a different nature according to the type of the writing.

The relations between a graph and a grapheme are varying according to the nature of a script. It may be noted that the distance between a graph and the phonetic shape of the word represented by it is not always the same. Compare the writings of Arabic and Hebrew. Both of them belong to the Semitic alphabet and the two languages are akin to each other. Nevertheless, the vocalic system shows a fairly different aspect. The Arabic representation of vowels is so rough as to indicate only three vowels, e.g. *a, i, u*, while actually more vowels are heard. In this case the vocalic representation may be said to be phonemic. In contrast to this, the Hebrew system shows a very minute description of vocalism. The indication of shewa, for instance, might be considered to represent sounds in a finer way than in the phonemic representation. In general, a sign indicating an accent or a tone is omitted in ordinary orthography, except a few cases, e.g. the Vietnamese Quoc-ngu which incorporates the tonal signs in the alphabet. Thus, an alphabet is not always faithful to the language for which it is used, and the distance between a sound and a letter varies with a language after a language.

The fact mentioned above signifies also that the way of representation is only suggestive. No alphabet, however it may be accurate in describing sounds of words, can indicate sounds exactly as they are pronounced in reality. This will show that the real function of writing does not consist in the phonetic representation, but in logography.

The suggestiveness of writing in indicating words is clearly observed in the old logographic scripts. As seen in the Egyptian system of writing, the quasi-alphabet letter suggests only a consonant or consonants of a word

to be represented. It does not describe a sound or sounds of a word accurately as it or they were pronounced. The sound representation is useful only in so far as it can suggest the form of the word. The indication of a few consonants of an ending or suffixes is sufficient to realize the whole form of the word in question. The *okurigana* of the Japanese writing has the same function in indicating a word by showing only syllables of an ending or suffixes of the word.

The Peculiarities of the Chinese Writing

The Chinese characters are the most important material for building up a system of graphology and they, therefore, are indispensable in discussing the problems of writing. The study of Chinese characters has been conducted in China since the earliest time, and not a few contributions have been made also in Japan. But the so-called *Wên-tzŭ-hsüeh* 文字學, i.e. the study of writing, is generally the research in the external forms of characters, and the linguistic function of the writing is not fully discussed. The most remarkable is the confusion of a character and a word, or the erroneous conception of the relations between a character and a word. In reality, a character is one thing, a word is another. A character is the visual sign for a word, but a word is not the auditory sign for a character. But in China a character has been traditionally regarded as the primary sign, and the phonetic form of a word represented by the character has been considered to be the reading for the character. This view is putting the cart before the horse, though it is justified in certain cases. Owing to the peculiarity of the Chinese character there are instances where a character survived after the word represented by it had fallen into desuetude, and a new phonetic value was created for the reading of the character. For example, in the *Kuang-yün* 廣韻 there is a character 疢 (AC. g'jiɛ¹) commented as: 病也詩云俾我疢兮. The verse is of the poem 白華 in the *Shih-king*. There is a variant 疢 which seems to have been current in the Six-Dynasty Period, as the *Shih-wên* 釋文 quotes the phonetic gloss by Hsü Miao 徐邈: 徐都禮反又禡支反病也, which shows that the text used by Hsü had the variant, for the *fan-ch'ieh* 都禮反 presupposes the character 疢 by its phonetic part of *hsieh-shêng* 兵. But this variant and the phonetic gloss of it by Hsü Miao are evidently erroneous, for the rime of the verse in question induces us to prefer the character 疢. The text runs as follows: 有扁斯石 履之卑兮 之子之遠 俾我疢兮. The character 疢 rimes well with the character 卑, but the character 疢 does not. Therefor, the *fan-ch'ieh* 禡支反 in the *Shih-wên* and in the *Kuang-yün* is right. However, the existence of this erroneous reading suggests us that the word had already died at the time of Hsü Miao. The phonetic gloss of Hsü Miao was probably created on the erroneous character 疢. In such a case a character stands for a word and its reading serves merely

as tzu-yin 字音, i.e. the phonetic value of the character. Such a word should be rightly called a "character-word" (字語). Of course, a character-word is a particular existence, and normally the relations between a graph and a word are not exceptional even in case of Chinese. The opinion that writing should always be referred to a word in its investigation, must be justified also in case of Chinese.

When we consider the linguistic function of the Chinese writing, various interesting problems are presented. The Chinese characters are equipped with the peculiarities of a logographic writing almost perfectly. In other logographs, e.g. in Egyptian hieroglyphs or in Sumerian cuneiforms, they mixed the phonographic use of characters among logographs, while in Chinese the logography is consistent. In the Chinese writing the principle of one-graph-one-word is thoroughgoing. This originated in the particular nature of the Chinese language. Chinese had in its archaic phase the peculiarities of a monosyllabic, non-structural and isolating type of language. Words were of single syllables and therefore a word could make easily a unit in the phonetic aspects. A word had morphologically no structure, being in no way analysable in a stem and an affix. As a result, no structural analysis could be reflected on the external form of a character. Moreover, a word had no connective index whatever with another word syntactically; in other words, it was isolating. Thus, one graph could be associated with one word and could be separated as an independent unit. Of course, even the Chinese writing had to have recourse to phonography, as in other logographic scripts. The chia-chieh 假借 and the hsieh-shêng 諧聲 are phonographic means by nature. But their phonography was syllabic and it was applied only between individual words. The representation was restricted to a syllable; for instance, when the character 來 which had originally indicated a word meaning "barley", was borrowed to another homophonous word meaning "to come", the whole syllable /læg/ was utilized, the syllable having never been resolved into three component phonemes /l/, /ə/, and /g/. The chia-chieh, i.e. the phonetic borrowing, was restricted between individual words, never used for the universal indication of the syllable /læg/ regardless of word. The more important thing is that the Chinese writing went on in the direction opposite to the phonographic representation. The possibility of phonography by means of the chia-chieh principle was checked by the invention of hsieh-shêng characters which strengthened logography at the sacrifice of phonography. In the process of borrowing the character <læg> to the word meaning "to come", it is evident that the identity of the syllable /læg/ was relevant, but once the character was no longer used for the original word meaning "barley" to which was in turn created a new character 麥 by adding the semantic determinative 麥 "wheat" to the graph 來 so that the two words came to obtain their own characters respectively, hence the logography could be maintained. Thus the graph 來 was destined

exclusively to represent the word {ləg}, to “come”. In general, the hsieh-shêng characters emphasized the logographization. As a result, the Chinese writing has become an almost perfect logographic system, though naturally some fluctuations are always recognizable.

Among the Liu-shu 六書 i.e., the Six Kinds of Writing, the hsieh-shêng characters are the most important. Here we shall discuss about the salient features of the hsieh-shêng characters. The definition of hsieh-shêng is so evident that leaves no room for doubt. It is a compound of graphemes like the hui-i 會意 characters. It consists of a *signific* (義符) and a *phonetic* (聲符). The characters made by this principle occupy about eighty or ninety percents among the whole Chinese characters. This fact shows that the invention of the principle of hsieh-shêng gave great facility to the development of the Chinese writing.

The addition of a signific is very interesting from the semantic view point. The signific, i.e. the semantic determinative, is a grapheme for the indication of the semantic category in which the word meaning is subsumed. If we observe the semantic categories as a whole, it may be said that it reflects the system of ideas conceived by the Chinese people at the time when the foundation of hsieh-shêng characters was established. The category itself is not indicated in the form of a word, but it is a result of classification of all the ideas that the Chinese people conceived of the whole world. The same signific can be found also in the Egyptian and Sumerian writings, but the classification of categories in the Chinese is far more general than in the two other countries. It goes without saying that the semantic function of a signific cannot be found in case of chia-chie.

The most significant thing is that the addition of a signific makes clear the differentiation of word meaning. For example, the word {AC. tsié¹} had various meanings related each other. It meant “branch”, “branch family”, “member”, etc. These meanings had a common moment “bifurcation”. This word was originally represented by the graph 支 to which were added various significs according to the differentiation of meaning. For the word meaning “branch” the signific 木 “tree” to the character 支, for the word meaning “member” the signific 月 “flesh”, thus the characters 枝, 肢, etc. were obtained. These are three different characters, but the word {tsié¹} was one. Thus, by the differentiation of graph the polysemy was avoided. To distinguish by the difference of graph what cannot be distinguished by sound contributes to isolate the written language from the speech.

The remarkable feature of a hsieh-shêng character consists in its phonetic (聲符). As long as it serves to denote the sound form of a word it is related somehow to the phonetic representation. But the phonetic grapheme does not indicate the phonological structure of the word. The character functioning as the phonetic represents the syllable of the word as a whole.

For instance, in the hsieh-shêng characters as 枝 and 肢 the character 支 serves as the phonetic grapheme. In this case, the value /tʃiɛ¹/ denotes the syllable of the words 枝 and 肢. In this example, as they were originally the same word, the phonetic representation is perfect. But in most cases the phonetic representation is imperfect or only approximate. For example, the character 江 is now read /tʃiang¹/, while the phonetic 工 is pronounced as /kung/. In this case the function of phonetic representation is almost lost. Though in Archaic Chinese the 江 was pronounced as /kũng/ (the less lip-rounding, neutral ŭ) and it drew nearer to /kung/ of the phonetic 工, the representation remains approximate. Further, the instance of 江, where the phonetic efficiency was hampered by the sound change, shows at the same time that the representative function of a phonetic worked only at the time of formation of the character, and that, once the character was fixed, the whole character was used only to represent the particular word, so that the phonetic ceased to perform a phonographic function.

The application of a phonetic is entirely specific and individual. The AC. /tʃiɛ¹/ was represented by various phonetics; 支, 卮, 只, 多, etc. Conversely, the same phonetic 支 indicated not only /AC. tʃiɛ¹/, but /g'jiɛ¹/, /kjiɛ¹/, etc. This fact shows that the phonetic grapheme has not attained a phonographic letter. From the phonetic representation it remains at the incomplete stage. It can be said that the hsieh-shêng character which had been formed by utilizing its phonography sacrificed its phonographic nature as soon as it represented directly a word. The situation resembles the case of the English spelling <knight>. In this respect, we can clearly discern the logographic nature of the Chinese character. This peculiarity is opposed to the Lolo writing which was developed from the same ideographic writing based on the same monosyllabic language. In the latter the originally ideographic character is used to represent universally the syllable of the word originally exclusively represented by the character, e.g. 〇, an ideograph originally indicating the word {shlà} "moon", which is used to represent the syllable /shlà/ irrespective of word. Thus, shlà of {i-shlà} "soul", {ieè-shlà} "egg" is represented by this character⁴⁾ In Lolo, as there were a limited number of homophones, the phonographic use of characters might have been allowed, but the Chinese writing went on in the different direction. If China had been situated on the same mental stage in the process of development of writing as in Lolo, the result would have been the transition to phonography. But in China the spiritual activity developed in an extraordinary degree besides the development of the script, and as a result the differentiation of ideas did not allow the writing tend to the phonographic direction, but rather pushed it to the extreme toward logography. The Chinese people made good use of the principle of fixing a certain character to a certain word so that it came to isolate a character from the sound of

(4) P. Vial, Dictionnaire français-lolo, Hongkong, 1909.

a word. And the role of hsieh-shêng characters with their significs was great in the codification of writing, for, as seen above, the addition of a signific served to differentiate characters. In this way, the hsieh-shêng character was to abandon its phonographic function, once it was fixed in representing a certain word.

However, the phonographic function of a hsieh-shêng character is not completely extinct. At the new formation of a character the function is suddenly awakened. The typical example is the case of the character 俺 which denotes the first person of the personal pronoun in Early Modern Chinese. According to the opinion of Prof. Lü Shu-hsiang⁵⁾, the 俺 originated in the plural form 我們. This opinion can be supported by the evidence of the phonetic history. /a³-mən/ (我們) was contracted in one syllable /am³/. just like /ni²/ (您) from /ni³-mən/ (你們). This {am³} appeared naturally first in the spoken vernacular. At first it was not fixed to a character. When it was admitted in the written language of colloquial style, it required a character. The hsieh-shêng principle came to satisfy the requirement. The character 奄 of the same phonetic value was selected for the phonetic, and character 亻 (人) for the signific. Thus, the character 奄 performed its phonetic function. In this case, too, the phonography of the phonetic 奄 worked only in this individual case, not as the phonetic symbol for the syllable /am³/ generally.

It is to be noted that the character 奄 is also found in the classical literary language, while it represented the personal pronoun of the first person in Early Modern Chinese of colloquial style. In its classical use, it is glossed in the Kuang-yün: 於驗切 (AC. ·jäm³) "to be great". This has no connection whatever with the personal pronoun. This is so-to-speak a "homograph". Examples of such a kind are sporadically found in other characters. The character 倭 denotes two mutually unrelated words; the one is {AC. ·uá¹} (Kuang-yün 烏禾切), which means "Japan", and other {AC. ·jwie¹} (Kuang-yün 於爲切), meaning "modest". The existence of homographs is very natural, when we consider the principle of hsieh-shêng. Among the characters which have several readings, it is supposed that many of them are homographs of this kind.

The phonetic of a hsieh-shêng character discharges its phonetic function at the formation of a new character, but its phonographic function can be observed in the readings of characters borrowed in the foreign languages. For example, see the present Sino-Japanese reading /yu/ of the character 輸 and /sen/ of the character 洗. The fan-chieh for the character 輸 is 式朱切, or 式注切, in the Kuang-yün. The Sino-Japanese reading to be expected would be /syu/, and in fact it is read rightly /syu/ in the set phrase "syu-ei o kessuru". The present reading /yu/ is the analogical formation from its phonetic 兪. The character 洗 has the fan-ch'ieh 先禮切 with a

(5) 呂叔湘, 說們 (呂叔湘教授言語學論文集, p. 160).

gloss "to wash". The present Sino-Japanese reading /sen/, not /sei/, is also the new reading formed by the analogy of the phonetic 先. In the Kuang-yün another fan-ch'ieh 蘇典切 is found, but this reading denotes a different word⁽⁶⁾. The same phenomenon can be recognized also in Sino-Korean. The characters 鷗 and 歐 are /AC. ·əu/ (Kuang-yün 烏侯切) that is transmitted rightly in Sino-Japanese as /ou/, but in Sino-Korean the reading is /ku/. Even 歐羅巴 "Europe" is read as /ku-ra-pha/. This is also an analogical formation from the phonetic 區 (SK. /ku/). These examples were originally misreadings, but the analogy overcame the legitimate readings. These examples show the cases where there is a phonetic distance between the character serving as the phonetic and the derived character, and so the phonography of the phonetic is displayed. But also in cases where the distance was small, the phonography was active, and the phonographic nature of a phonetic might be said to be effective rather in the preservation of traditional readings. Such a situation may have existed also in China. The phenomenon can be observed in character-words which are not current. For example, the character 駮 is seen under the reading 章移切 (AC. tsiɛ¹), as well as under the reading 巨支切 (AC. g'jie¹), in Rime 支 of the Kuang-yün. In the former case there is the gloss: 馬強, while in the latter we find the gloss: 勁兒. Thus, it evidently concerns the identical word. Most probably the reading 章移切 is the new reading created by the analogy of the phonetic 支. Also in the same rime we find the same two readings for the character 汶. The meaning for the readings is in this case also the same, but the Kuang-yün quotes the Shuo-wên 說文 for the reading 巨支切; thus it seems to reflect the traditional reading of the Shuo-wên. Then, the reading 章移切 will be an analogical formation. Thus, in China as well as in Japan or Korea, the possibility of forming a new reading against the traditional one always exists. Taking this possibility into consideration, many readings for a character recorded in the Kuang-yün or the Chi-yün 集韻 are not always traditional transmissions. The discrimination between a traditional reading and an analogical new formation should be kept in mind in the reconstruction of older words.

Now we shall proceed to consider how hsieh-shêng characters were formed. A systematic study will be expected in future, since it needs a great many positive investigations. But in so far as a cursory examination permits, at least the following fact may be ascertained. The principle of hsieh-shêng was probably invented by two different channels.⁽⁷⁾ The one was the case where a signific was added to a character according to the semantic differentiation of a word, as seen in the examples 枝, 肢. In this case, the signific is an 'aphonic determinative' as called by Creel⁽⁸⁾. It would be more exactly called

(6) '姑洗律名' (廣類卷三, 二十七銜).

(7) P. Pelliot, Brèves remarques sur le phonétisme dans l'écriture chinoise, TP, Vol. XXXII (1936), pp. 162-166.

(8) H. G. Creel, On the Nature of Chinese Ideography, TP, Vol. XXXII (1936), pp. 85-161.

a 'semantic determinative'. When this model was given, it was possible to add a signific to any character used as a chia-chieh (假借). For instance, the character 鎚 (AC. tuâi¹) is written as 追 in the Chou-li 周禮. The character 鎚 was produced by adding the signific 金 to 追 that had been used as a chia-chieh. Further, there is another case. When a word monopolized a certain character which had been borrowed from another word, a new character was brought by adding a signific to the character for the word for which it had been created. The character 求 represented originally the word {AC. g'jiəu¹ "furcoat"}, but later it was borrowed to denote the homophonous word {"to look for"}. Afterwards the latter word occupied exclusively the character 求, while for the word {"furcoat"} a new character added by signific 衣 was obtained: 裘.

In these examples we see logography clarified, by adding a semantic determinative to a character serving as a base. In contrast to this, however the number may be small, there are hsieh-shêng characters produced by adding a phonetic determinative to an already existing character. This phenomenon seems to be attested in rather more ancient period. For example, the character 禾 is in later times used exclusively for the word {AC. ɣuâ¹ "young millet"}, but in older period it was not so. On the oracle bones of the Yin Dynasty this character was evidently used to represent the word {AC. nen "year"}⁽⁹⁾. To discriminate the two words of different meaning, later the phonetic 人 (AC. nǐěn) was added, so that the character 年 was acquired. In the bronze inscriptions also we find the same instances. The character 立 which represents the word {AC. liəp⁴ "to stand"} was used for the word {AC. iwoi⁴ "seat"} (later 位). The examples of this kind may be found in many cases, if we examine more closely the inscriptions of oracle bones and bronzes. The differentiation of characters by adding a phonetic determinative is generally observable in the old logographs of Egypt and Mesopotamia.

In this way, a hsieh-shêng character was obtained by the addition of a semantic determinative on the one hand, and by the addition of a phonetic determinative on the other. The course was contrary to each other, but the result was the same. After the prototype of this method of combination was given, any character could be created ad libitum. Thus, a great number of characters came to be produced by the hsieh-shêng principle. The factor that enabled to bring out hsieh-shêng characters was the tendency to fix a certain word to a certain character. This tendency can be found in all the characters. As is well known, in the long course of the historical development of the Chinese writing the fixation and standardization of characters was incessantly attempted. The establishment of the Stone Canons (石經) and the compilation of dictionaries are nothing but these efforts of the fixation. And this effort could be seen in distinguishing equivoque, homophonous

(9) 商承祚, 殷虛文字類篇(說文解字詁林, p. 3120).

and polysemantic words, so that there appeared the peculiarity of the Classical Literary Chinese that distinguishes very many homophones which cannot be discriminated in the spoken language.

The Reactions of Alien Peoples against the Chinese Writing

From the very complicated situation of language in East Asia, one can easily suppose that in the remote past languages of more various kinds were distributed within the cultural zone of China. Among such complicated distribution of languages, only the Chinese language could acquire its own writing as early as about the middle of the second millennium B.C. and by the superiority of the Chinese culture the writing was diffused gradually into the languages of different origin and type. Among the peoples who were influenced by the Chinese culture, being in the neighbourhood of, or inhabiting together with, the Chinese people, not a few languages were absorbed in Chinese without any trace owing to the overwhelming power of the Chinese people. The peoples of Wu 吳 and Yüeh 越 are the examples. They have remained a very few words which suggest their non-Chinese origin and they are totally sinified.

Naturally there are some peoples who, though influenced greatly by the Chinese culture, managed to maintain their languages and could create their own scripts, because their ways of life were entirely different from that of the Chinese people, as is the case of the Mongols. Further, because of the geographical distance, some people succeeded in cultivating their own culture by making clever use of the Chinese culture and has adapted the Chinese characters wholly to their languages. Japan is the good example.

In short, how the peoples reacted against the Chinese influence depends upon the stage of development, the time of acculturation and the relative geographical distance with China, and the effects are various. In the following I shall describe the reactions of these peoples against the Chinese culture by focusing on the problem of writing.

The Mongols

The Khitans were a tribe of the Mongolian stock and it is almost certain from fragmentary evidences mentioned in Chinese historical documents that they spoke a dialect of the Mongolian language. They invented their script for the first time among the nomad Mongols. Yeh-lü A-po-ki 耶律阿保機, the first emperor of the Liao Dynasty, created the so-called Great Letters (大字) in 920 A.D., while the so-called Small Letter (小字) were invented by his brother Tieh-la 迭剌 by the order of the emperor.

The Khitan script is known by the inscriptions of the emperors Hsing-tsung 興宗, Tao-tsung 道宗 and others, but the decipherment of the script

has not yet been successful in spite of the efforts of Prof. Murayama who has contributed to the elucidation of the nature of the writing¹⁰. Prof. Murayama points out that probably the Small Letters are the modifications of the Rune writing of the Ancient Turkish, the T'u-küeh 突厥. And G. Toyoda suggested that the Great Letters may have been ideographs, while the Small Letters may belong to the phonographic type of writing¹¹. It seems very probable that there may have been some connection between the Khitan Small Letters and the Turkish Runes, since the Uighurs knew the Runes beside their own writing, and the brother of the first emperor of the Liao Dynasty is said to have invented the Khitan Small Letters on the basis of the writing that he had learnt from the Uighurs. On the other hand, when we take in consideration the relations of the Khitan script with the Chinese characters we must pay our attention to the fact that the Khitan Great Letters might have been logographs. This leads us to the supposition that the Khitans imitated the principles of the Chinese writing, and in fact some of the Khitan characters are clearly the modifications of Chinese characters. For example, the characters <主王> which might be interpreted as denoting the Khitan word {qagan "emperor"} appear to be the forms created on the model of the Chinese characters <王> and <主>. We can safely assume that the logography of the Khitan Great Letters was derived from the Chinese script.

The most interesting thing is that the Khitans were not satisfied with the "ideographic" Great Letters so that they went farther on to invent a new system of writing, i.e. the Small Letters, on the basis of the Great Letters or the Turkish Runes, as stated above. Prof. Murayama supposes that the Khitan Small Letters represent only consonants on the model of the Turkish Rune script. If we compare the letters in the inscriptions of the Obituary of Emperor Tao-tsung with the letters of the cover in the seal forms, it can be seen that in the Khitan writing each word appears to be represented in principle by a group of letters, either a logograph and some phonographs or a combination of phonographic letters. This suggests us that the Khitan script was based upon the logography of the Chinese writing.

This writing of the Khitans had a life of 270 years and it was used still in the time of the Chin 金 Dynasty. It was the predecessor of the Nüchên script, which will be discussed below. The Mongols of later times, however, did not take over the Khitan writing. At the time of Jhingis Haghan, they invented newly another script which was derived from the Uighur alphabet. This script of the Uighur origin was used even in the modern times. Again, Khubilai Haghan, Shih-tsu of the Yüan Dynasty, ordered ḥPhags-pa, the

(10) Shichirō Murayama, *Kittan Monji Kaidoku no Hôhō* (A Method of Decipherment of the Khitan Script), *Gengo Kenkyū* Nos. 18, 19., 1951.

(11) Gorō Toyoda, *An Analysis of the Major Ch'i-tan Characters*, *Memoirs of the Research Department of the Toyo Bunko*, No. 23, Toyo Bunko, Tokyo, 1964, pp. 119-135.

famous Tibetan priest to create an utterly new writing, by modifying the Tibetan letters. This script is called the Square script or the ḥPhags-pa letters. But this was used only for a short period.

What draws our attention, is that the Mongols adopted an entirely different script from the Chinese writing, whether the ḥPhags-pa writing or the Uighur alphabet. This fact may be explained by the resistance of the Mongols against the influence of the overwhelming China. But, on the other hand, it means nothing but the surrender of the Mongols to the superiority of the Chinese culture that the ḥPhags-pa letters took over the square form on the model of the Chinese character.

The vicissitudes of the writing among the Mongols show another interesting point in regard to the efficiency of the Chinese characters. As stated above, the Mongols made first a logographic script, and then having abandoned it, they adopted the phonographic Small Letters. This was caused by the fact that they faced the inefficiency of logographs and from that time on they never tried to develop the Khitan script. In the long run, they had recourse to an alphabet, what shows that they could not overcome the difficulty of the Chinese writing. Most probably they felt a keen affinity to an alphabetic writing from their nomadic characteristics. Originally the alphabet was a very practical writing that had been invented among the nomadic Semites. In contrast to the logographic script such as the Chinese which required the culture of a high level and of the exclusive nature, the alphabet is by nature 'democratic' and had no prerequisites for the learning of it⁽¹²⁾. The peculiarity that the Mongols have preserved their nomadic culture, without having been absorbed into the Chinese culture as the Manchus in later times were, has a close connection with the fact that they used the alphabetic Uighur script, having abandoned the Khitan logographic characters as well as the ḥPhags-pa letters. Further it is worth noting that the Republic of the Mongol People has adopted the Russian alphabet at the sacrifice of the Uighur alphabet. This means the incorporation of the Mongols into the cultural zone of the Soviet Union.

The Tungus

The Nüchên people who destroyed the Liao Dynasty and established the Chin Dynasty in 1115, employed the Khitan script for a while, but in 1119 they created their own writing on the basis of the Khitan Great Letters and promulgated the new writing in 1145. The Nüchên script also has not yet been deciphered, but in so far as it is known from the study of W. Grube, the German sinologue and linguist, on the "Hwa-i-i-yü 華夷譯語" (the I-yü of the Nü-chên-kuan 女真館), the script consists of logographs and syllabic

(12) Cf. D. Diringer, *The Alphabet. A Key to the History of Mankind*, London-New York, 1949.

letters¹³). The logographs are not only the products under the influence of the Khitan Great Letters, but the direct effect from the Chinese influence can be discerned in some basic characters, such as the graph <日> meaning "day" {inenggi} or the graph <月> representing the word {biya "month"}. The mixed use of logographs and phonographs can be said to be derived from the logographic quality of Chinese characters just as in the case of the Khitan script. However, the phonographic function differs from each other between the two scripts. While the Small Letters seem to suggest consonants only, the Nüchên script arranges letters one by one in a vertical order, unlike the Khitan Small Letters in which each word seems to be written with a group of several letters forming a unit. This is also inherited from the Great Letters of the Khitan system. The Nüchên writing appears to have had little practical value so that it became soon to fall in desuetude, for the use of logographs was so much complicated. The descendants of the Nüchên people, the later Manchus, did not follow to use this script, but invented newly their own system, having adapted the Mongol letters of the Uighur origin to the Manchu language.

When we read through the history of China and observe the rise and the decline of the dynasties, it is the Manchu people that attracts our attention most of all. This people was originally a nomad folk, but they had lost their own culture for the adoption of the Chinese culture. Their language is at present spoken only on the territory along the Amur and in the Hsin-chiang Province, and the descendants of the Manchus have almost completely abandoned their mother tongue and speak Chinese very well. From their inclination to the Chinese culture, it seems a great contradiction to adopt an alphabet instead of the Chinese writing, but this contradiction will be considered to be inherent in the exclusiveness of the Chinese culture. The culture of China has a peculiarity that makes the alien peoples abandon their own cultures and absorb them into her culture, but China has never disclosed herself and penetrated into the heart of a foreign people, so that the people might cultivate the culture of their own.

Naturally the Manchus did not remain indifferent, merely overlooking the decline of their fate. The famous emperors K'ang-hsi and Ch'ien-lung did their best to preserve their language from extinction, by compiling dictionaries, textbooks and others. In spite of the efforts of these emperors, the Manchu people became gradually to forget their mother tongue and on the contrary they began to speak Chinese fluently. It is worth noting that the Manchus could not get rid of the Chinese influence and finally were absorbed in the culture of China so far as to give up their language, while the Mongols emancipated themselves from the tie of the Chinese influence by having abandoned the adoption of the Chinese script.

(13) W. Grube, *Die Sprache und Schrift der Jucen*, Leipzig, 1896.

The Tanguts

The Tibetans were outside of the Chinese cultural zone, for they were influenced early by the Indian culture and their script also was the modification of an Indian writing. At the end of the T'ang Dynasty, under the oppression of the Tibetans the Tanguts, the kinsmen of the Tibetans, wandered into the northwest of China. They established a country called Hsi-hsia 西夏 during the period of the Sung Dynasty. The country prospered for a while as a kingdom. What we call the Hsi-hsia script, is the invention of the Tanguts by the simulation of the Khitan writing. It was promulgated in 1036.

The Hsi-hsia script also was not deciphered for a long time, but Prof. T. Nishida of Kyôto University has recently succeeded in decipherment, and the system and structure have been brought to light by his great efforts¹⁴). According to him, the principal structure of the Hsi-hsia writing is based upon the structural principles of the Chinese system. He classified the Hsi-hsia characters in "basic" characters and "derived" characters. In the latter the principles of hsieh-shêng and hui-i (會意) are active. Among the hui-i characters a character composed of a graph added by a grapheme, which Nishida calls a "semantic loan character" (借意文字), is more frequent than the genuine hui-i character; e.g. the character <to hear>, produced from the graph <ear> added by the grapheme <man>.

There is a peculiar principle which is not found in the Chinese system. It consists in the reverse arrangement of the same graphemes. For instance, the graph <thunder> and the graph <to blitter>, or the graph <water> and the graph <fish>, or the graph <cause> and the graph <effect>, change the position of the same graphemes. Nishida names this kind of characters as "contrastive characters" (對稱文字). In this way, the characters are multiplied by the combination of graphemes, either phonetic or signific. This method is entirely the same as that of the Chinese writing.

The "basic" characters are also combinations of graphemes that are not be used independently except 35 graphemes. Therefore, a unit used independently is generally a compound of graphemes. In this respect, the Hsi-hsia script is different from the Chinese characters, in which the basic characters of hsiang-hsing 象形 or chih-shih 指事 can be used independently, though they are not compounds of graphemes. And there are very few characters borrowed from the Chinese script. The contour of the character was modelled on that of the Chinese character.

By what process the Tanguts arrived at inventing such a script, we cannot make clear. Only when they wanted to create their own writing by imitating the Khitans, it is most probable, they adopted the structural principles of the Chinese system of writing, which consisted in most cases

(14) Tatsuo Nishida, *A Study of the Hsi-hsia Language*, Zauhô Kankôkai, Tokyo 1964-66.

in combining elements, i.e. graphemes.

As just mentioned above, while the Chinese characters are logographs by nature, the 90 percents of them are hsieh-shêng characters. In contrast to them the Hsi-hsia script seems to lay the stress upon the semantic derivatives, the hui-i and chieh-i (借意) characters, though it comprizes also hsieh-shêng characters. The Hsi-hsia writing can be said to have developed and strengthened the semantic aspect from among the Chinese structural principles of writing. The tendency shows a marked contrast to that of the Khitan script that tended towards phonography from logography. Such a difference of development found between the Hsi-hsia and the Khitan writing was caused mainly by the difference of type of language. It was due to the polysyllabic language of morphological structure that the Khitan script proceeded to the phonographic letters from the more logographic Great Letters.

In general, when the archaic logographic writing came to have a phonographic moment in it, the beginning could be sought in many cases in the attempt to represent graphically *morphemes* of words in the sense of the European linguistics. The phonographic elements of the Sumerian cuneiforms and of the Egyptian hieroglyphs as well as the "okurigana" representation by means of Chinese characters in the Japanese usage were derived from the phonographic use of characters for denoting morphemes.

When a polysyllabic and morphologically structured language as the Khitan language is reduced to writing, it will be very difficult to represent its words by logographs exclusively. Even in Chinese, if the principle of hsieh-shêng had not been invented, the logography could not have been realized. If one wants to indicate one word exclusively by means of one logograph, every word should have its own character, what is evidently impossible. Therefore, in order to maintain logography a phonographic means is always made available. In Khitan its phonographic method was to suggest its consonants on the model of the Turkish Runes. The way was thus opened to suggest the phonetic form of a word. By doing so the combination of consonant letters came to be applied to almost all kinds of words.

It is also due to the linguistic type of the Hsi-hsia language that the Hsi-hsia script did not take this direction. Prof. Nishida points out that the Hsi-hsia language was a monosyllabic language akin to Tibetan, and thus it had similar characteristics to Chinese, so that the Hsi-hsia people could create a logographic writing as in Chinese, in that one graph corresponded to one word. Further, here a word was represented by a combination of graphemes, so that the combination of graphemes did not demand an infinite number of graphs. And by making a clever use of the peculiar combination it came to emphasize the logographic nature more than the Chinese characters.

However, as combinations of graphemes need a considerable number

of graphs as in the Chinese writing, the efficiency of the function of writing is not high. This may be the reason why the Hsi-hsia script could not survive after the downfall of the Hsi-hsia kingdom.

The Lolo and the Moso

In the southwest of China there inhabit minor peoples such as the Lolo and the Moso. It must not be overlooked that these peoples on the frontier of China also should have their own writings. The languages of these peoples seem to belong to the Tibeto-Burmese language family, but the origin of their writings is not certain.

It can be easily presumed from its outer shape that the Lolo script will be a development of a hieroglyphic writing, but it does not appear to be derived from the Chinese hieroglyphs. From its geographical position one can reasonably assume that the Chinese writing may have given a stimulus to the invention of these writings, but it is clear that these peoples did not make use of the Chinese characters against our expectation. Moreover, the Lolo script has advanced to the stage of phonograph through the stage of pictograph.

The language of Lolo is a monosyllabic language, cognate to Tibetan. Consequently, one syllable can make a word, so that its graph is a syllabic letter on the phonographic stage. It is quite natural from the general direction of development of writing that the Lolo script proceeded easily to the syllabic letters from the original logographic stage. As was already observed, this transition can be explained by the fact that, as the language was not that of such a highly civilized people as the Chinese, the number of vocabulary might have been comparatively limited and the number of homophones is supposed to have been small. The development of the Lolo script gives us a clue to the elucidation of the hitherto unknown process of development of the Chinese writing. In the course of the development the differentiation of graphic words surpassed the speed of the development, and together with the phonetic change there appeared many homonymic words. The situation engendered the invention of the hsieh-shêng principle. It is just the high level of the Chinese culture that caused the Chinese script go another way than the destiny of the Lolo script.

The Moso writing is rather pictographic. It is a curious script and can be said to remain on the stage of an embryo writing. The writing is said to be used by magicians. At present the southern Moso use the Chinese writing, while the northern group employes the Tibetan script.

That these minor peoples have their own writings, may be due to the circumstance that they knew from earliest times the use of writing among the neighbouring peoples. But the origin is still uncertain and the question how they came to have invented their scripts remains unsolved. In contrast to the Khitan and the Hsi-hsia scripts which had started under

the influence of the Chinese writing and did not go back to the hieroglyphic stage, while they inherited the principle of logography from the Chinese writing, it is worth noting that the Lolo and the Moso characters originated from independent pictographs.

The Writing in Vietnam

At the southern end of the Chinese cultural zone is situated the Vietnamese people, whose neighbours are the Cambodians and the Thai, both of them belonging to the Indian zone. As early as at the time of the Former Han Dynasty, Vietnam had contact for the first time with the Chinese culture, and then during the long period of one thousand years under the dynasties of Sui, T'ang, and the Five Dynasties she was ruled under the Chinese empire. With the time of the Five Dynasties, she founded an independent kingdom by having emancipated herself from the oppression of China, but at present she remains still under the influence of the Chinese culture. It is under the same condition as in Korea that the Vietnamese people had recourse to the Chinese characters as their legitimate means of recording. Therefore they did not create their own script, but there was a period when the characters called *Chu-nom* made after the model of the Chinese characters were employed.

Chu-nom (chu'-nôm) 字喃 means "character of colloquial" as against *Chu-nyu* 字儒 meaning "character of scholars". It was invented by borrowing the principles and the forms of the Chinese characters. According to the study of Prof. Mineya of Tokyo University¹⁵⁾, there are several kinds of formation. First, there is an instance where a Chinese character was borrowed to represent a Vietnamese word without any modification. A loan from Chinese was naturally represented by this means; e.g. {tuôi³ "year"} by 歲. Besides, there is the case of chia-chieh, i.e. the borrowing of a Chinese character without taking its meaning in consideration. For example, the character 沒 is applied to the Vietnamese word {môt⁶ "one"}. Further, the abbreviated form is used; in this case there are two methods, one by utilizing the meaning and the other by its phonetic value. In the former case, the abbreviated form 𠄎 of the character 爲 denotes the word {lam²} meaning "to do", which resembles the use of the abbreviated form 𠄎 of the character 爲 for the Korean verb {hɛ- "to do"} in the so called *tho* in Ancient Korea. The *Chu-nom* character 𠄎 is an abbreviated form of the character 羅 which was used for the word {la² "to be"}. This also reminds us the similar abbreviation in the Korean *tho* (𠄎, 𠄎).

In the Liu-shu, the Six Kinds of Characters, there are two principles

(15) Tôru Mineya, Annango (Annamese), in "Sekai Gengo Gaisetsu (An Introduction to the Languages of the World)" Vol. II., published by Kenkyûsha, Tokyo, 1955, pp. 860-861.

of combination, hui-i and hsieh-shêng. These two were also made use of in the *chu-nom*. The example of the former case is 天 which denoted the word {gio'i² "heaven"} by compounding the characters 天 and 上. The combination of the characters 月 and 正 represents the word {giêng¹ "January"}. The *chu-nom* 𠄎 consisting of 巴 (Sino-Vietnamese reading /ba/) represents the word {ba¹ "three"} and the character 麵, the combination of 末 (SV. /mat/) and 面, the word {mat "face"}. These examples show the double utilization of both sound and meaning. From this it was only one step to the borrowing of the hsieh-shêng principle. The *chu-noms* 哄 denoting {cu'o'i² "to laugh"} and 餓 representing {đoi⁵ "to starve"} show the graphemes of semantic categories by adding the graphemes 口 and 食. In short, the *chu-nom* is the result of the effort to represent Vietnamese words by making use of the principles of the Chinese writing. As Vietnamese is a language of monosyllabic and isolating type like Chinese, the borrowing of the Chinese principles was far easier and more natural than in any other language.

It is not certain when the *chu-nom* was introduced, but it was current in XIII and XIV centuries. At the beginning it was used for the representation of proper names. It is in later times that it was used in the literature such as in the famous work, the Kim-van-kyu 金雲翹. The poem like this was obliged to use this method, for in poetical works it was indispensable to render the vernacular forms. The situation is just like in Japan and Korea, where verses were represented first by the phonetic use of the Chinese characters.

This *chu-nom* was, however, a colloquial one, just like the *kana* (informal letters) of Japan or the *ön-mun* (vulgar letters) of Korea, against the orthodox Chinese characters, and was not the national institution. The legitimate documents and official records were written with Chinese characters in the classical literary Chinese. In this respect, the *chu-nom* differs from the scripts of Khitan, Nüchên, and Hsi-hsia which were created intentionally as the national writings from the beginning, and it came to be used gradually as a natural product from the use of the Chinese writing.

Vietnam was located in a peculiar position in the historical development of writing in Far East. While she was for a long time under the rule of the Chinese culture, she was the first emancipated from the yoke of the Chinese characters. In XVII century, when the impact of the Western power commenced to extend over Asia, the Portuguese and the French missionaries landed in Vietnam soon. They did not employ the Chinese characters or the *chu-nom* in propagating the Christian doctrine, but they invented a new alphabet by introducing some modifications to the Roman alphabet. This alphabet was the basis of the present Quoc-ngu and it was diffused as the national script under the French dominion in XIX century.

The change from the Chinese characters for the Roman alphabet in

Vietnam means the replacement of the Chinese culture by the Modern Western culture and at the same time it signifies the downfall of the Chinese Cultural Zone at one corner of Far East. But nevertheless the Chinese vocabulary penetrated deeply in the lexical system and makes an important resource of the Vietnamese vocabulary. It is very interesting to see that the same phenomenon can be observed also in the Northern Korea after the use of the Chinese characters was abolished. On the surface the both countries are successful in abolishing the Chinese writing, but the influence of Chinese is still deeply rooted in the bosom of these countries. Therefore, in the countries that have once belonged in the Chinese Cultural Zone, it will be a vital problem to be solved in future how to handle with Chinese loan words in order to be liberated from the influence of the Chinese characters.

Another interesting problem about the Chinese characters of Vietnam is Sino-Vietnamese. The same problem is also relevant to Korea and Japan. In these countries a great number of Chinese loan words are used and this borrowing of vocabulary has a peculiarity as against the borrowing found elsewhere. The loan of a literary word was always by the medium of a character, and each character has its own phonetic reading (漢字音) which is peculiar to the phonetic system of each language. Of course such a reading exists in Chinese, too. Even in Chinese each character has its own phonetic reading apart from the colloquial form of the corresponding word. But in Chinese the discrimination between the phonetic reading of each character and the corresponding word is not always clear, as the phonetic form of the corresponding colloquial word is often the same as the phonetic reading of the character that represented the word, particularly in case of the basic words. In the three countries, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam, the phonetic reading of each character has been adapted to the phonetic system of the native language so that its phonetic aspect is quite divergent from the original Chinese form.

In these three countries the Chinese characters and the Chinese loan words are borrowed on a grand scale, and it may be said that the whole system of the Chinese writing was implanted. Therefore, the borrowing is different from an individual loan of word. The Chinese characters and loan words were for a long time resources of education and were regarded as forming the classical language. They may be said to correspond to Greek and Latin in Europe, and they cannot be regarded merely as ordinary borrowings. Nevertheless, they are clearly distinguished from the native language and served as the cultural language. Above all the Chinese words cannot be separated from the Chinese characters and they are always read with their phonetic readings. However, the importation of the Chinese characters and words varied from language to language as to its time and circumstances. The readings of the Chinese characters are different one

from another between Japan, Korea and Vietnam.

The Sino-Vietnamese reading of the Chinese character seems to have been brought from China in several waves of diffusion. The strongest wave is said to be the influence of the Chinese under the Dynasty of T'ang in Xth century. The transmission of the Sino-Vietnamese is like that of Korea, differing from the situation in Japan, where two or three traditions have been kept apart but in parallel. In sporadic cases the more archaic forms than the T'ang forms, such as /nghia⁴/ for 義 and /đia⁶/ for 地 can be observed, but the tradition is in general unilineal.

As Vietnamese is a monosyllabic and isolating language like Chinese, unlike Japanese and Korean, the archaic Sino-Vietnamese readings had possibility of being assimilated to Vietnamese. In this case the earlier forms conceded the characters to the new forms, and they themselves were absorbed into the genuine Vietnamese vocabulary. Such a phenomenon cannot be found in Japanese or Korean from their structure. It is the reason why the Sino-Vietnamese words have persisted even after the abolition of the Chinese characters.

The Use of the Chinese Characters in Ancient Korea

Just as in Japan and Vietnam, situated within the Chinese Cultural Zone, Korea was affected by the overwhelming influence of Chinese in her language and has employed the Chinese characters even to-day after the invention of her national script. At present, in the Republic of the Korean People in the northern Korea the Chinese characters have already been abolished, and even in Southern Korea the abolition will be put in force in near future, though the Chinese characters are still used in parallel with the Hangŭl, the national script. The parallel usage of both writing is similar to the present Japan, but in Korea a Chinese character is never read with its Korean equivalent, but always with its Sino-Korean reading. This usage is the tradition from the preceding eras.

In Korea, when one reads a Chinese text, one does not read in the way as the Japanese do. When the Japanese read a Chinese text, they read certain words with the Sino-Japanese readings, but they read other words by immediately translating each character with its equivalent Japanese word, without pronouncing each character by its Sino-Japanese. Particles of the text are often omitted when reading aloud. This peculiar way of reading, which is totally visual, was seemingly the Japanese invention, which demands a particular psychological study (that is of course out of the scope of this article). Koreans read a Chinese text rather in normal way with the Sino-Korean readings. In interpreting the text one often interpolates Korean particles and suffixes after a phrase or a syntagma of the text. In this case, the Chinese characters of the phrase are pronounced with their Sino-Korean

readings, but the Koreans never read in the Japanese way of reading. Quoting one example, the first passage of the Ta-hsüeh 大學 is as follows:

大學之道 在明 明德 在親民 在止
 dai-hæg-ji-do-nvn jɛi-myəng-myəng-dəg-hv-myə, jɛi-cin-min-hv-myə, jɛi-ji
 於至 善
 'ə-ji-syən-i-ni-ra.

The particles and the suffixes underlined in the text are called 'tho' (吐).

The difference in the way of reading the Chinese text reflects the different attitude of adopting the Chinese culture. In Japan the Chinese characters have been wholly adapted to the Japanese language, while in Korea the Chinese characters are treated as somewhat heterogeneous from the proper language, without assimilating them to the Korean words. In other words, in Japan the Chinese characters have been so-to speak "tamed", so that they are now the characters for the Japanese words. Such a situation is the result of a gradual process of adaptation, having taken them in her own system. In contrast to this, as Korea is geographically nearer situated to China and was historically influenced more directly by China than in Japan, there was no enough room for adapting the Chinese character to her own language. For a long time the Chinese classical literary language was regarded as the orthodox medium of expression and the Chinese characters were treated as the legitimate writing. Moreover, it is worth noting that the Hangül did not originate directly from the Chinese system of writing like the Kana of Japan. It is the product from the entirely different principle quite apart from the Chinese tradition, though its syllabic unit is the imitation of the Chinese system. Therefore, the Chinese characters and the Hangül are in parallel position and no fusion or mixture of both the writings is seen as in Japan.

The Hangül, the national alphabet of Korea, which was formerly called 'Önmun (諺文)', is a comparatively new system of writing. It was invented by King Se-jong of the Ri Dynasty in 1443. Prior to it the Chinese characters were only graphic means of expression in Korea. Naturally in the official use the Chinese writing was employed according to its orthodox function, i.e. the function of representing Chinese words. But when there was a need to express a Korean word for a special purpose, efforts were paid to denote the word by means of Chinese characters.

One of these attempts is the *okurigana* for the interpretation of a Chinese text. The *okurigana* of this kind was called 'tho (吐)' in Korea, as mentioned above. And the interpolation of *tho* in the text was called *hyən-tho* (懸吐). There were three ways for indicating the *tho*. Firstly, a Chinese character was simply used for a Korean particle or a suffix. Secondly, the abbreviated form was used instead. The third method is 'ən-tho (諺吐), i.e. the Hangül letters used as the *tho*. Of course the 'ən-tho is the

practice after the invention of the Hŭngul. Now let us examine how to represent, quoting a passage from the T'ai-shih 泰誓 of the Shu-king. (Here examples of abbreviated forms are cited, their full forms being described in the explanation following the text).

王日嗚呼々 我西土君子阿 天有顯道ソ也 厥類惟彰ソヒ 今商王受々 狎侮五常ソ余
荒怠弗敬ソ也 自絶于天ソ余 結怨于民ソヒタ

Explanation:

- 1) 々 is the abbreviation of 羅; the Sino-Korean reading (abbrev. SK.) is /ra/; the final ending of a verb, here having an exclamatory sense.
- 2) 阿 is SK. /'a/; the vocative particle.
- 3) ソ is the abbrev. of 爲; the stem of the verb {hæ- "to do"}, the semantic use of the character; 也 is SK. /ya/; {hæya} (爲也) is the conjunctive form of the verb.
- 4) ソ is 爲; ヒ is the abbrev. of 尼 SK. /ni/, {hæ-ni} is a converbial form of the verb {ha-}, the meaning of which is to introduce a related clause.
- 5) 々 is the abbrev. of 是, denoting {i- "to be"}, but here is borrowed to indicate the subjective particle {-i}.
- 6) ソ is 爲; 余 is the abbrev. of 弥(彌), is read /myə/ (SK. mi), indicating a converbial form of the verb {hæ-}, which means to coordinate two propositions.
- 7) ソ is 爲; 亡 is the abbrev. of 飛, the semantic use of the character, the Korean equivalent {næ- "to fly"}, to denote {-næ-}, the suffix of the present stem of a verb; 夕 is the abbrev. of 多, its reading SK. /da/, 爲飛多 {hæ-næ-da}, the older form of the present {han-da} the final form of the present stem of the verb {hæ-}.

The characters 羅, 阿, 也, 尼, 多 used as the *tho* in this example are employed phonetically to denote Korean particles and suffixes. Thus, the phonetic reading is utilized. The characters 爲, 是, 飛 are semantically chosen for the indication of the forms of Korean words, thus the semantic use of them, or in the Chinese expression the examples of chia-chieh. The reading /myə/ for the character 弥 reflects the archaic form of the reading (cf. Ancient Chinese mię).

Unfortunately we have no authentic old specimens of the *tho*, but the *tho* is certainly the relics of the usage of the ancient time when Korean particles and suffixes were indicated by the semantic use of the Chinese characters. The archaic reading of 弥 supports this assumption.

The *tho* in the abbreviated form has the same origin either in its shape or in its function as the *katakana* in Japan. Both of them were originally used in indicating the *okurigana* which were interpolated in a Chinese text. Moreover, there are the instances of the identical form and

denote Japanese words throughout the whole sentence.

By the term *ri-tho* is understood the *tho* employed in documents in its narrow sense, but in Japan it denotes often the Chinese characters used for Korean suffixes and particles. The characters of the similar use in the old inscriptions of the Silla period are also termed with the same appellation.

Now, how did the Koreans represent their native language by means of Chinese characters? To know this we must examine the extant inscriptions and the old poems. Unfortunately, both inscriptions and books are not so rich as in Japan. Further, among the three kingdoms, Koguryŏ 高句麗, Paikche 百濟 and Silla 新羅, only the latter has left some monuments to the posterity. Koguryŏ has left the great monument of King Hothaiwang 好太王, but it is written in Chinese, the language of Koguryŏ being almost unknown. Also the language of Paikche, the country which gave the greatest influence to Japan, is not known except a few fragmentary words. If there had remained an inscription or a book in the Paikche language, the relations of Korea and Japan would have been made more clearly. To our great regret, no record has been found in the language. We are obliged to examine the problem only by means of scanty remains of the Silla inscriptions and songs.

Many inscriptions were written in Chinese. For instance, the Inscription of King Jin-hŭng 眞興. This used naturally Chinese characters by their proper function. In some cases, although Chinese characters are used, we cannot read with the Chinese syntax. There are also instances where Chinese characters cannot be apprehended with their proper meanings. Fusanoshin Ayugai 鮎貝房之進 called such a style as 'Pseudo-Chinese' (俗漢文). Chinese characters are used variously in the inscriptions of this style.

The most distinguished is the inscription of a stone monument which Prof. Suematsu calls "the Oath Stone of the Year Im-sin 壬申". The text runs as follows:

壬申年六月十六日二人并誓記天前誓今自三年以後忠道執持過失无誓若此事失
天大罪得誓若國不安大亂世叮嚀行誓之，又別先辛未年七月廿二日大誓 詩尚
書禮傳倫得誓三年

In this all characters are used with their proper meanings, but the method of combining the characters is entirely different from the Chinese syntax. For example, 過失无誓 cannot be comprehended by the normal construction of Chinese. If we read this phrase in the Korean syntax, it can be easily read: "I swear that I will not commit an error". This syntactical feature is found not only in this sentence, but it pervades the whole text of this inscription. The following is the contents based on the interpretation by Prof. Suematsu¹⁸⁾.

(18) Y. Suematsu, *Shiragishi no Shomondai* (The Problems of the History of Silla), Toyo-Bunko Ronso Vol. 36, Tokyo, 1954.

“On the 16th of June in the year of Im-sin, we two swear and state, we swear before heaven. Three years from now, we swear, we will keep the loyalty and will not commit an error. If we transgress this, we swear that we shall suffer a great heavenly punishment. Even if the country will be inquiet and fall in a great disorder, we swear that we will conduct faultlessly. And, besides, on the past 22nd of July in the year of Sin-mi 辛未, we swore greatly, we swore that we would learn the Shi-king, the Shu-king, the Li and the (Tso)-chuan in three years.”

The text runs wholly with the Korean word order and no *ri-tho* except the final particle at the end of the text is used. The character 之 is frequently used in the texts of “Pseudo-Chinese”.

This inscription is very peculiar, in that words are entirely disposed according to the Korean syntax and each word is represented by the corresponding Chinese character respectively without addition of any symbol indicating a suffix or a particle. The date of this inscription is not certain, but by the study of Prof. Suematsu it is supposed to be placed at the 31st year of King Səng-dəg 聖德 of Silla, i.e. in 732 A.D. If he is right, the inscription cannot be said to be older than other ones, and the thorough-going use of Chinese characters suggests us rather a later work, for it is fully conscious of the Korean syntax. But the neglect of the inflective forms of verbs may be an archaic method. The peculiar representation of this inscription is also found in the inscriptions of Archaic Japan and the style of this sort is called Fuhitoberyū 吏部流 or Shikanryū 吏官流 in Japan¹⁹⁾.

The style of this sort is rather rare. Normally the style of Pseudo-Chinese sentence or the style mixed with *ri-tho* is observed. The inscriptions of the nimbus of the Statues Amitābhā and Maitreyāna of Temple Kam-san-sa 甘山寺, dated in 719 A.D., are written for the most part in Chinese, but at the end of the inscriptions the expression of Pseudo-Chinese is used. In the inscription of the Amitābhā the text is as follows:

亡考仁章一吉淹年卅七古人成之東海欣支邊散也

Also at the end of the inscription of Maitreyāna

亡妣官肖里夫人年六十六古人成之東海欣支邊散之

Both of them have the sentence of identical meaning in the latter half. In the Amitābhā inscription the statement is about the deceased father, while in the Maitreyāna about the deceased mother. 散也 of the former corresponds to 散之 of the latter, of which 之 is a *ri-tho* particle of the final form of a verb, as already discussed. Therefore, 散也 is equal to 散之, the former being in accordance with the Chinese orthodox way of writing. The meaning of the sentence is probably: (He or she) became a deceased (and) was

(19) See below, p. 67.

buried in the vicinity of Hŭn-ji on the coast of the Eastern Ocean.” It seems somewhat farfetched to interpret the character 散 as the phonetic loan for 葬 “to bury”, but from the meaning “to scatter bones” the character 散 may have been applied to the Silla word meaning “to bury”. Another interpretation is that the phonetic loan of 散 (SK. san) for 葬 (SK. jang) is conceivable, for the name of the dedicator of this statue, Kim Ji-səng 金志誠 is spelt by 金志全 Kim Ji-Jən in the Amitābhā inscription. Here /s/ and /j/, /n/ and /ng/ are confounded. Therefore, the phonetic loan of /san/ for /jang/ is not to be wondered.

This text, too, makes use of Chinese characters by their meanings. Of course this text represents the Silla language, but particles and the morphological structure are hidden behind the Chinese characters, only the final suffix 之 /ji/ being indicated.

Such a use must have been an older usage of Chinese characters, for the oldest inscription of “Pseudo-Chinese”, the monument of the New Fort of Nam-san 南山 dated in 591 A.D., shows essentially the same pattern. The satisfying decipherment of this inscription cannot be made, as the grammar and the vocabulary of the Silla language are known only fragmentarily, but endeavouring its reconstruction as far as possible, we may be able to read as follows:

辛亥年二月廿六日 南山新城作 節 如法以 作, 後三年崩破 者
 jisen di'wi -ūro jiseni (heri)nen
 罪教 事 爲 聞 教, 令誓 事 之
 'isyar ir hē'ya dūd(?)'isya, heir 'ir(i)ji

“On the 26th of February in the year of Sin-hai 辛亥 when the new fort was built on Nam-san, it was built as prescribed. In three years, if there be anyone who dares to pull it down, he will be punished. So let it be heard and sworn.” I am not quite certain of this decipherment, but, how it might be deciphered, the characteristics of the text is that Chinese characters are used by their semantic values as much as possible and they are arranged according to the syntax of the Silla language. The characters 教, and 之 are used by their *ri-tho* readings, and these make use of their meanings except 之. The style of this old inscription is the same as observed in the “Im-sin Oath Stone” and the inscription of the statues of Temple Kamsansa.

In this way Chinese characters represented the Silla language by their logographic use, but this method could not describe sufficiently the structure of the language of agglutinative character. Especially a verb having a morphologically complicated structure could not be indicated by a single Chinese character. Thus, it had gradually tended to represent suffixes of a verb with certain characters. The process may be said to be identical with the transition from the non-analytical representation of the archaic Japa-

nese inscriptions and the Kojiki to the style of the Semmyô²⁰. As mentioned above, the final particle {ji} was already expressed.

Now, let us quote the text of "the Account of the Stone Stupa of Temple Gar-hang-sa 葛項寺 at Gai-nyōng 開寧" dated in 758 A.D.

二塔天寶十七年戊戌中立在之
 甥姊妹三人業以成在之
 甥者零妙寺言寂法師在弥
 姊者照文皇太后君姊在弥
 妹者敬信大王姊在也

We shall examine the underlined parts. These characters must represent the Silla words. Among them, 在 is read as {gyən} in *ri-tho* and was originally a verb meaning "to exist". Even to-day it is fossilized in the honorific verb {gyesi- "to exist"}, which was apparently the combination of the old stem {gyə-} and the honorific suffix {-si-}; hence it is quite clear that the stem {gyə-} was the stem of the verb {"to exist"}. Moreover in the dialects or Jōlla-do 全羅道 the {gyə-} is still employed as the honorific suffix. The 在 of the inscription also denotes the honorific suffix. The present use of this suffix in the dialects of Jōlla may be the remnant of the old Silla usage.⁽²¹⁾

The reading of 立在之 is probably {syəi-gyən-ji}, meaning "(he) elected". Likewise 成在之 will be read as {'iri-gyən-ji}: "(he) performed". Both of them are the final form of the verbs. 在弥 is read in *ri-tho* as {-gyəni-myə}, a converbial form of {-gyə-} stem, before which the verb {-i- "to be"} is omitted. 在也 is read in the same way as {(i)-gyən-ji}, the final form of the honorific stem {-gyə-}.

The peculiarity of the inscription is that the structure of a verbal complex is somewhat analytically represented. The representation of {-myə}, a converbial ending, and the honorific suffix {-gyən} are the examples.

This method had gradually developed into the *ri-tho* style of the later times. One more example will be cited. It is the inscription of the bell of Temple Gyu-hūng-sa 竅興寺 (856 A.D.). In this inscription the structure of a verb is considerably well represented in graphs and becomes nearer to the later *ri-tho*.

成内矣={i-ro-dəi}. /ro/ is indicated by the character 内 (SK. nəi). Probably its older reading was /*noi/, the /no/ of which is used. {i-ro-dəi} is an introductory converb {-odəi} of the verb {'ir- "to be performed"}.

願爲内等者={hən-dən}: "it is to be hoped that—". The character 内 represents the ending of the adnomial form {-n}. 等者 denotes {-dən}, a

(20) See below, p. 70 ff.

(21) Cf. Simpei Ogura, *Kyōka oyobi Ritō no Kenkyū* 郷歌及び吏詠の研究 (The Studies on the Hyangga and the Ritho), Seoul, 1929, pp. 437-439.

conditional form, by the phonetic loan of the semantic value {dər} of the character 等, the character 者 strengthening the ending {-n}. The same character is used for the Japanese conditional particle {-ba}.

The case of 賜 is very interesting, for the character denotes the adnominal form {-syan} of the honorific suffix {-si-} by means of its older reading /*sya/, though the semantic affinity is also taken into consideration. The same character was used in Japan to denote the honorific auxiliary verb {tamafu}, in the inscription of a statue of Temple Yakushiji and in the Semmyô.

Hitherto the adaptation of Chinese characters to Korean in the inscriptions has been described. Now let us turn our eyes to the use of Chinese characters in the old songs of the Silla Dynasty.

In Korea there are a very few records transmitted from the antiquity. Nothing is comparable to the Kojiki nor the Mannyôshû of Japan. In the Sam-gug-yu-sa 三國遺事 and the Sæg-haing-gyun-jøn 釋行均傳, 25 songs are recorded that are said to be of the Silla Period. In these old songs Chinese characters are used in so complicated manner that their decipherment is most difficult. If they had been phonetically employed, as in the Kojiki or the Nihonshoki, the difficulty would have been diminished by half. Anyway, as it is only since the middle of the XVth century that the linguistic structure of Korean has become clear, it is now too late to consider the real linguistic features of the Silla language. Moreover, the Chinese characters are read either with their phonetic values or with their semantic function, what disturbs our deciphering. Therefore, in spite of the great efforts of many scholars the old songs of Silla have not yet been fully deciphered. Here we shall examine the problem chiefly by referring to the work of the late Prof. Ogura, "the Study of the Hyangga and the Ritho"⁽²²⁾ and "the Study of the Korean Old Songs"⁽²³⁾ by Mr. Yang Judong 梁柱東.

We shall take the simplest song, the song of Ce-yong 處容, which is quoted from the account concerning Ce-yong-nang 處容郎 in Vol. II of the Sam-gug-yu-sa. The text is:

東京明期月良	東京 bər-gən dər-ai	In the clear moon (light) of Dong-gyöng
夜入伊遊行如可	bam dūr-i noni-da-ga	I went out to amuse myself till night
入良沙寢矣見昆	dūr-ə-sa jari bo-gon	And then entered and saw the bed.
脚烏伊四是良羅	garor-i nài-hi-rə-ra	The legs were found four.
二脩隱吾下於叱古	dubūr-hŭn nai-hai-əs-go	"Two are my own,
二脩隱誰支下焉古	dubūr-hŭn nui-hai-ən-go	Whose are (the other) two?

(22) op. cit.

(23) J. D. Yang. Josŏn Goga Yöngu 朝鮮古歌研究 (The Studies of the Korean Old Songs).

本矣吾下是如馬於隱 bon-dæi nai-hai-i-da-mar-ən They are properly my own,
 奪叱良乙何如爲理古 a-s-a-nær 'əsdə-hæ-ri-go What if I were robbed of
 them?"

The above decipherment is naturally far from being perfect, but the general gist may be grasped. When we look carefully at the method of writing, the attempt will be perceived to represent the language as much faithfully as possible. In the inscriptions we can trace the development of the method to represent the form of a word, but still Chinese characters play their orthodox roles, and at least they behave themselves as they ought to be. On the other hand, in the old songs Chinese characters are nothing but the means for the representation of the Silla words. It is natural from the nature of a song. But the adaptation had advanced farther than that of the inscriptions. The representation of a word structure is fairly exact. The Chinese characters used for denoting particles and suffixes make use of their phonetic as well as semantic values. In the phonetic use of Chinese characters it is noteworthy that in Korean the kind of syllables is far more numerous than in Japanese, Korean having closed syllables besides open ones. Moreover, as there are syllables which are not allowable in Chinese, it is impossible to represent all the possible syllables of Korean by Chinese characters. Therefore, the phonetic representation is not so simple as in Japanese. Thus, a tremendous effort was exerted. In the songs the values of /ga/ for 可, of /i/ for 伊, of /gon/ for 昆, and of /ra/ for 羅 are the examples of the phonetic use of Chinese characters; in these cases there is no problem. But the representation of /-gen/ of {bergen} by the character 期 (*ge), of /hai/ of {nui-hai} by the character 下 (SK. ha), and of {as-a-nær} by 奪叱良乙 ('a-s-a-[n]ær) are not adequate. Especially in the last example, at first the stem {'as-} is denoted by the character 奪 in its semantic use, then the consonant /s/ of the stem final is represented by the character 叱. The application of 叱 to the consonant /s/ is attested elsewhere. The character 𪛗 is a character made in Korea for the Korean word {sbun "only"} and the composite of 叱 (s) plus 分 (bun).

The indication of the adverbial form of a verb {-a} by the character 良 is very curious. The character is used also for the combination of the stem final consonant /r/ of the word {dær "moon"} and the particle {-ai} in {dær-ai "in the moon"}. Again the 良 denotes another ending {-ə} of the adverbial form of a verb as in 入良 which represents {dūr-ə}, of the verb {dūr- "to enter"}. The 良 denotes also the /rə/ of {nəih-i-rə-ra}. The Sino-Korean reading of the character 良 is /ryang/. So it was used for the value /ra/ as well as for the adverbial ending {-a/-ə} and the particle {-ai}. This complicated representation of the character 良 will be explained in the following way. The character had presumably the older Sino-Korean value /*rang/, hence the new value /ran/, as seen in one of the old Silla

songs, e.g. {jas-*ɛ*-ran “the fortress (accusative case)”}. From /ran/ it was transferred to denote the syllable /ra/, which abounds in examples. The representation of Nara, the ancient capital of Japan, by the characters 奈良 might be a case that the Japanese imitated the Koreans. The value /ra/ could be utilized to represent the adverbial form of a verb ending in -r; e.g. 知良 {’ara} from the stem {’ar- “to know”}.⁽²⁴⁾ There were many basic verbs, the stem of which ended in -r, and so the character 良 became to be regarded as the symbol of the ending of the adverbial form. The 良 for /a/ of 奪叱良乙 {’as-a-[n]ɛr} is an example. The more distant we go back in the history of Korean, the clearer the phenomenon of “vowel harmony” becomes. So the character 良 which denoted the masculine vowel /a/ of the adverbial ending was changed to indicate the feminine counterpart of the vowel, i.e. /ə/. 入良 for {dūr-ə} of the verb {dūr- “to enter”} is the example. On the other hand, the character 良 was used for the locative particle {-ai}, and this may be considered to be due to the following process. First, the particle of the noun stem ending in -r, just as 月良 {dɛr-ai} in this song, was the starting point from which the character 良 came to be used to indicate the particle in general. From these examples we can infer that the various phonetic representations of the character 良, either in case of the ending of the adverbial form or in case of the locative particle, was not a pure phonetic representation, but once the indication of a certain grammatical form was fixed, the representation became determined for a specific morpheme and thus here also the logographic nature of the Chinese character is observable.

The character 乙 was employed for the ending /-r/ of 奪叱良乙 {’a-s-a-[n]ɛr}. Its SK. value was /’ür/ and, as the vowel was the feeblest vowel in the Korean vocalism, it was often used to represent the single consonant /r/. As a result, there arose the characters invented by the Koreans, e.g. 耆 (nor) or 亨 (dor). The character 耆 is a compound of 老 (no) plus 乙 (r), while the character 亨 detotes the Korean equivalent of 石, i.e. {dor}, the final consonant of which is emphasized by adding the character 乙. The SK. value /’ür/ of the character 乙 comprizes the feminine vowel /ü/ in the system of the vowel harmony, but as it was used freely for every variant {-ür~-ɛr~-rür~-rɛr} of the accusative particle, it was possible to indicate the form {-ɛr}, too.

The 乙 in 奪叱良乙 does not indicate the syllable /nɛr/, but only the final /ɛr/ or /r/. Then, no character is seen to indicate the /n/ of {-anɛr}. Like the representation of the syllable /gen/ by the character 期 (*gɛ) or of the syllable /hai/ by the single character 下 (ha), these instances are defective in regard to the phonetic representation. How did such a method come to existence? It is imaginable that the contemporary people

(24) Cf the song “Je-bur-wang-saing-ga 諸佛往生歌” (S. Ogura, op. cit.).

could easily recognize the whole form even by its part. They could realize the form {*asaner*} even when the defective representation was given. The same holds with the case of nouns. 海等 {**bader*} “sea”, 心音 {**meseṃ*} “heart”, 秋察 {**geser*} “autumn” and others enabled the contemporary to imagine the full forms by the suggestion of only the latter half. The characters 海, 心 and 秋 represent the respective Korean words, and the addition of the latter half suggests easily their full forms. It is the same process as found in the Egyptian hieroglyphs or the Sumerian cuneiforms. The graphs used in the process are called phonetic determinatives. The characters 叱, 良 and 乙 of 奪叱良乙 are the phonetic determinatives, but in this case they are disjunctive in representing the phonetic form, and as it concerns a verbal complex, the suggestion of word form becomes complicated. In general, the use of the phonetic determinative is an extended use of the logographic principle and it may be considered to be the transition from the non-analytical representation to the analytical one. The use of Chinese characters in the Silla old songs can be said to draw near to the analytical representation, but it could not be entirely detached from the yoke of logography of Chinese characters and it ended in a very insufficient phonetic representation.

From the Silla period only 14 songs are preserved in the *Sam-gug-yu-sa* compiled in XIIIth century and 11 songs in the *Sæg-haing-gyun-jøn* dated in 1075. The Song of Che-yong, explained above, is quoted from the *Sam-gug-yu-sa*, and its current text is not certain whether it shows the usage of Chinese characters at the Koryŏ Period when the text was compiled, or the usage of the Silla Period. According to the opinion of the late Prof. Ogura that it might have been based on the tradition of the Silla usage, it is chronologically somewhat later than the inscription of the Bell at Temple Gyu-hŭng-sa. From the use of Chinese characters the representation of the old songs appears to have advanced farther than that of the inscription. However, as the old songs belong to a special genre, the representation might be of a different origin. The method taken in the inscription is nearer to the *ri-tho* style. The characteristics of the *ri-tho* style is that Chinese words occupy the essential parts, not the Korean. Among Chinese words the *ri-tho* indicates chiefly formal elements, and thus the function is different between the Chinese words and the *ri-tho*. The situation is at variance with the old songs where the substantial parts are occupied by Korean words, while in the *ri-tho* style the *ri-tho* serves only as a subordinate means. The state of things is near to the Chinese text with the *tho*. Further, it may be said that the method of the *ri-tho* style and of the old inscriptions was the result of having abandoned the representation of Korean by Chinese characters. Of course, in the *ri-tho* morphological elements are indicated by Chinese characters, but it was an unavoidable means. The dominant direction is to represent Chinese words by Chinese

characters. From the stage of the old songs it was clearly a regressive phenomenon, but from the custom of the later period it can be said that the foundation had been set down in the documents of the *ri-tho* style. And this usage of Chinese characters became the stronger, as the Chinese literature had fixed its root in Korea, and the tendency had paralysed the adaptability of Chinese characters to Korean. As seen above, some characters had attained at the phonographic stage where a single phoneme was represented by a character, e.g. 叱 indicating /s/, 乙 /r/ and 隱 /n/. But the fact that a new alphabet was not invented from such a condition will be ascribed to the obstinate habit to represent a Chinese word by a Chinese character. The possibility of the alphabetic representation prepared for the future creation of the Hangül. The invention of Hangül, however, was realized after the introduction of the alphabetic principle to Korea through the Mongols.

The Use of the Chinese Characters in Archaic Japan

In Japan at present, there are two methods of using Chinese characters, namely the phonetic use (音) and the semantic use (訓). The former is to represent a Sino-Japanese word by a Chinese character. This is the orthodox use of a Chinese character. In the latter case, which we call *kun* (訓), we employ Chinese characters to indicate Japanese words. Two kinds can be distinguished. The one is to denote an equivalent Japanese word, generally a noun, by a Chinese character. The other method is to indicate a Japanese word likewise, but by adding *okurigana*. This is the case for the representation of verbs. These two kinds of the use of Chinese characters are the adaptations of Chinese characters to the Japanese language by making good use of the logographic nature of the Chinese writing. The reading of the character 人 for the Japanese word {hito} is the semantic use of the character by replacing the Chinese word by the Japanese equivalent, but the logographic function of this character is not changed. In case of noun, the independent quality of a Japanese noun is comparatively strong, and so the replacement is easy. On the contrary, it is not easy to represent a verb by a single character, for a Japanese verb has the morphologically complicated structure. When one represents the verb {miru} "to see" by a single character 見 the agglutination of suffixes or particles cannot be indicated. Thus only a root or a stem is represented by a Chinese character, and its inflective elements are denoted by the *okurigana*, e.g. 見る <MI-ru>, 見られる <MI-ra-re-ru>, etc. In general, particles are expressed by the *kana*. Thus, the substantial parts of a word, a noun or the stem of a verb, are represented by Chinese characters, and other formal parts are denoted by the *kana* so that the division of work is practised. This division of work together with the visual contrast between a Chinese character of many

strokes and a *kana* of simple form is considerably effective in reading a Japanese text. This situation is the product of the efforts exerted for a long time.

The method of using Chinese characters was very complicated. It was very hard thing to represent a Japanese word of entirely different structure by means of Chinese characters. Ōno Yasumaro, the compiler of the Kojiki, had made a very great effort for this. In his introduction to the Kojiki he stated:

“Now in remote antiquity speech and thought were both simple. (Therefore, in this work) the arrangement of sentences and the structuring of clauses are difficult to be represented by characters.”⁽²⁵⁾ Again, “if one describes (words) by the semantic use of characters, the words do not fit close to the thoughts; if one expresses by characters in their phonetic use, the expression will be prolonged to excess.”⁽²⁶⁾ Motoori Norinaga commented this passage as follows:

“When we examine the old records, they are written by the *kun*, i.e. the semantic values of characters, and among them there are many characters borrowed for other words, which cannot express their real meanings, as their meanings are different in the context.” “If one writes the words only by the *kana*, the number of characters will be enormous, and compared to the expression only by the *kun*, the sentence will be very much prolonged.” Yasumaro continues to say,

是以今或一句之中，交用音訓，或一事之內，全以訓錄，即辭理叵見，以注明意，況易解更非注，亦於姓日下謂攻沙詞，於名帶字，謂多羅斯，如此之類，隨本不改。

Thus, both the phonetic and semantic readings of a character are employed, and when the meaning is unclear by using the semantic value, the commentary is given.

What is inferred from this introduction, is that, when Yasumaro compiled the Kojiki, he solved the problem of the representation by means of Chinese characters in utilizing both the phonetic and semantic functions of characters in mixture, not limited exclusively to either of the both possibility. From the linguistic point of view, if they had adopted the method of phonetic representation as in songs or in proper names, the features of the Archaic Japanese would have been clearer. But if so, there would have been many instances of incomprehensible meaning. Anyway, the very complicated graphic representation was resulted by mixing the phonetic and the semantic use of characters. Let us examine some cases of this complexity.

(25) 然上古之時，言意並朴，敷文構句，於字即難。

(26) 已因訓述者，詞不逮心，全以音連者，事趣更長。

It is doubtful whether the original Japanese text was in reality as is reconstructed by Motoori Norinaga. However, it might be after all not so revolutionally revised even if some emendations are added. So we may suppose the reconstructed text by Norinaga as the original text and on this supposition we shall examine how the text is represented by Chinese characters.

故 是 以 其 速 須佐之男 命 宮 可造作之 地
 kare koko-wo-mote sono hayasusanowo-no-mikoto miya tukuru-beki tokoro-wo
 求 出雲 國 爾 到坐 須賀 地 而
 idumono kunini magi-tamafiki. kokoni sugano tokoroni itari-masi-te
 詔 之 吾來 此地 我 御 心 須賀須賀斯 (?)
 nori-tamafaku: are kokoni ki-masi-te, aga mi-kokoro sugasugasi to nori-
 而 其地 作 宮 坐 故 其地 者於今
 tamafi-te, soko-ni-namo miya tukuri-masi-masikeru. kare soko-wo-ba ima-
 云 須賀 也 茲 大 神 初 作須賀 宮 之 時
 ni suga to-zo ifu. kono ofo-kami fazime suga-no-miya tukura-si-si toki-ni,
 自 其地 雲 立 騰 爾 作御 歌 其
 soko-yori kumo tati-nobori-ki. kare mi-uta-yomi-si-tamafu. Sono mi-
 歌 曰 夜久毛 多都 伊豆毛 夜幣賀岐 都麻 碁微 爾 夜幣賀岐 都久流 曾能
 uta fa: yakumo tatu, idumo yafegaki, tuma gomi-ni, yafegaki tukuru, sono
 夜幣賀岐 表 於是 喚 其 足名椎 神 告言
 yafegaki wo. koko-ni kano asinaduti-no-kami-wo mesi-te, nori-tamafi:
 汝 者任我 宮 之 首 且 負名 號 稻田 宮主 須賀
 imasi-fa aga miya-no obito tare to, mata na-wo inadano-miyanusi suga-
 之 八耳 神
 no-yatumimi-no kami to ofose-tamafi-ki.

In this one section we can find several types of representation are mixed.

(1) The phonetic representation is used in proper names as 須佐 for /Susa/ of 速須佐之男命, 須賀 for /Suga/ of 須賀宮. This phonetic method is completely adopted in the famous song beginning with "Yakumo tatu...". So the Japanese word forms are clearly shown by Chinese characters. Besides proper names and songs the expression by this method is incidentally interpolated in the text of different types of representation as 須賀須賀斯 {suga-suga-si} in which the Archaic Japanese form may be said to crop out. Such a representation is quite valuable from the linguistic point of view.

(2) The phonetic representation is not a dominant current except in proper names and songs. Even in proper names the phonetic method is not always adopted. 速須佐之男 is represented by the semantic method except 須佐 /su-sa/, which is also prevalent in such examples, as in 足名椎 (Asinaduti), 稻田宮主 (Inada-no Miyanusi) etc. In the text except the song, this so-called *kun* reading is predominant. The *kun* reading is the term made from the viewpoint of the Chinese writing, but from the standpoint of the representation of Japanese it should be called the logographic use of the character. As one character denotes as a rule one word, the representation of a Japanese noun by this method is quite natural and easy.

In the text cited here, the instances 今 {ima}, 初 {fazime}, 時 {toki}, 雲 {kumo}, 歌 {uta}, 神 {kami}, 首 {kubi}, etc., besides the examples mentioned above, may be quoted. A Japanese noun has a strong independence, so that it was easily grasped as a unit.

(3) The logography of a noun is very simple, but a pronoun is somewhat difficult to be denoted. The readings of {are} for 吾 and {imasi} for 汝 follows the same pattern as a noun, but the representation of {aga} by 我, of {sono} or {kano} by 其, and of {kono} by 茲 are due to the fact that these characters were used in Chinese adnominally (especially the character 其 was employed only adnominally). The compound of two characters is applied to a Japanese word, e.g. {soko} by 其地, {koko} by 此地. The readings of {kare} for 故, {kokoni} for 爾, {kare} for 爾, {mata} for 且, are the adaptations from the functions of these characters which are used in Chinese as conjunctions. The readings {koko-wo mote} of 是以 and {koko-ni} of 於是 might be the translations from Chinese already fixed in Japanese. Norinaga said: “是以 should be read as {koko-wo mote}; the term seems not to have been the original Japanese. It might be the phrase established for the reading of a Chinese text, but the reading was a very old one, for to say {koko-wo} instead of {kore-wo} is the old practice.”⁽²⁷⁾

(4) The verb becomes the subject of discussion most of all. While a Japanese verb has a very complicated system and it shows a peculiar conjugation, Chinese has nothing of such kind. In this text, except the examples where the words are represented phonetically by characters, as in 須賀須賀斯 {suga-suga-si}, 多都 {ta-tu}, and 都久流 {tukuru}, the inflection of a Japanese verb is entirely neglected in the graphic representation, and one or two characters are employed to indicate the whole word form. 作 is used for {tukuri} (the adverbial form), 立 for {tati} (adverbial), 到 for {itari} (adverbial), 造作 for {tukuru} (final). A single character might be used not only for a simple verb, but also for a verbal complex: 求 for {magi-tamafi-ki}, 來 for {ki-masi-te}, 坐 for {masi-masi-keru}, 作 for {tukura-si-si}, 騰 for {nobori-ki}, 喚 for {mesi-te}, 告言 for {nori-tamafi-ki}, 負 for {ofose-tamafi-ki}, etc. A verbal complex comprizing suffixes is represented by a character or two. Of course, the argument developed here is based on the text by Norinaga, but suffixes must be taken into consideration in the Japanese text anyway. The honorific suffix {-masu} is neglected in the example {ki-masi-te}, but there is also the case in which it is explicit as in 到坐 for {itari-masi-}.

(5) There is an example where the neglect of inflective forms seemingly is compensated. The character 之 in 可造作之地 (tukuru-beki tokoro) and in 作須賀宮之時 (Suga-no-miya tukura-si-si toki) indicates nothing corresponding in the Japanese text and seems to denote the adnomial form. The same

(27) Kumpô no Koto (訓法の事), Kojikiden 古事記傳 I.

character 之 appears to indicate the final form of {nori-tamafa-ku} in 詔之, and the character 也 in 云須賀也 {Suga to ifu} seems to suggest the final form. In reality, these examples do not indicate directly the adnominal or the final form, but only the functions of the respective syntagmas.

(6) In case of nouns, too, the omission of particles is frequent. E.g.

速須佐之男 命 可 造作之 地 其地 其地 者
 hayasusanowo-no-mikoto, tukuru-beki tokoro-wo, soko-ni-namo, soko-wo-ba,
 作須賀 宮 之 時 足名稚 神 稻田 宮 主 須賀
 suga-no-miya tukura-si-si toki-ni, asinaduti-no-kami, inada-no-miyanusi suga-
 之 八 耳 神
 no-yatumimi-no-kami

The omission of the particle {no} is seen universally, but there is also an instance where the character 之 is used, as seen above. The locative particle {ni} is indicated by the character 於, e.g. 於今 {ima-ni}. It is also expressed by the order of words. 求出雲國 {Idumo-no kuni-ni magitamafiki}. In this case, the position of 出雲國 after the verb 求 indicates the function of the particle. Similarly, 到坐須賀地而來此地. The particle {wo} is indicated by its position e.g. 喚其足名稚負名號…….

The particles {to}, {namo}, and {zo} also are graphically not represented: 云須賀也 (Suga to-*zo* ifu), 其地 (soko-ni-namo), etc. But it is doubtful whether there were really these particles in the original or not.

The prefix {mi-} is represented by 御 as in 御心 and 御歌, but there is also the case where it is omitted: 其歌曰 (sono *mi*-uta-fa).

(7) The representation of particles is generally neglected, but sometimes they are denoted by the Chinese particles. The character 者 of 其地者 (soko-wo-ba), 汝者 (imasi-fa). The characters 之, 於, and 自 which is used as in 自其地 {soko-yori}. And suffix {-te} succeeding a verbal stem is represented by the character 而 denoting a Chinese conjunctive particle; e.g. 到坐須賀地而 (Suga-no tokoro-ni itari-masi-te). It is omitted in 來此地 (koko-ni ki-masi-te).

(8) The above concerns the representation of words, but that of a combination of words is very curious. Chinese characters are not distributed according to the word order of Japanese, and they seem to follow the Chinese syntax, but the distribution is not faithful to the Chinese syntax. The word order of 吾來此地 (are koko-ni ki-masi-te) or of 喚其足名稚神 (kano Asinaduti-no-kami-wo mesi-te), is Chinese, but the expression of 到坐須賀地而 (Suga-no tokoro-ni itari-masite) is not conceivable unless Japanese is presupposed, though the position of 到 before 須賀地 is conform to the Chinese syntax. The position of the character 坐 after 到 is purely Japanese. 宮可造作之地求出雲國 {miya tukuru-beki tokoro-wo Idumo-no kuni-ni magi-tamafi-ki} is as a whole dependent upon the Japanese syntax, although the positions of 可 and 求 follow after the Chinese fashion. In short, Chinese characters to

represent Japanese verbs and verbal suffixes are forced to be put in the positions that the Chinese equivalent words represented by these characters take normally, and thus in the positions that are not suitable to the Japanese syntax. However, it is observable only in the immediate contact of a verb with its object or an adverb of place, and the manner of combining words is not purely Chinese. The idea underlying the composition is entirely dependent on the Japanese syntax.

In summing up the analysis carried out above, we may say that there are two types of representation. The one type is the phonetic representation as in proper names, songs and in a word or a phrase "exposed" amidst the quasi-Chinese sequence of characters. The other type is the logographic method forming the keynote of the text. This logographic representation is to represent a word or a complex as a whole, without analyzing its structure. Such a synthetical representation is seen especially in a verb or a verbal complex denoted by a single character, the morphological structure being absorbed into the character. The same can hold with a noun. The omission of particles shows that a particle is incorporated in the synthetical representation of a noun or a nominal complex after all.

While in general the unanalytical representation is observed, sometimes the structure of a word happens to be suggested by means of Chinese particles and the Chinese word order. But it is in reality not the analytical indication of the morphological structure, but rather it remains to suggest the function of combining words. For instance, the use of 之 for the genitival junction or of 也 for the final is not to indicate the adnominal or the final form of a verb, but only the function of adnominality or conclusion of a discourse. In the same way the Chinese positions in the order of words occupied by a verb or a verbal suffix denote functionally the junction with a word governed by it, by making use of the syntactical function of Chinese. In general, the representation of Chinese characters in the Kojiki is not idiomatic, but functional in most parts.

The text discussed above is only a part of the Kojiki, but it may be said to represent well the peculiarities of the Kojiki. This method of representing Japanese words by Chinese characters was not the invention of the compilers, but the result of the adaptation of Chinese characters in Archaic Japan. Now we must cast a glimpse at the usage of Chinese characters before and after the Kojiki.

Japan did not know the writing before the importation of Chinese characters. Therefore, the Japanese people tried their best to express their language by means of Chinese characters. But the adaptation of the characters was the most difficult task, as the Chinese language, for which Chinese characters were invented, is structurally entirely different from Japanese.

It is clear that, when one wants to use Chinese characters, the most natural way was to write a Chinese text with them. Therefore, the oldest record ever known in Archaic Japan is written in the classical Chinese or in the Pseudo-Chinese. The inscription of the monument of the Hot Spring at Dôgo in Iyo (596 A.D.) is the good example. Of course, the place name Iyo is spelt by the characters 夷與. The author of the inscription is ascribed to Esô 慧聰, the Paikche priest, whose name is found in the inscription. It is very natural to suppose that records were taken in charge by the immigrant intellectuals from the Korean Peninsula, who were versed in the classical Chinese.

As we have already seen above, when we discussed about the inscription of "the Oath Stone of the year Im-sin", Korea had once tried to dispose Chinese characters totally according to the Korean syntax. The same attempt can be found also in Japan. The style of the so-called Fuhitobe-ryû or Shikanryû is wholly identical with that of the Im-sin Stone. The typical example is the inscription of the monument of Yamanoue in Gumma Prefecture, assumed to have been erected in 681 A.D. The text runs:

辛巳歲某月三日記，佐野三家走賜健守命孫黑賣刀自，此新川臣兒斯多多彌足
尼孫大兒臣娶生兒長利僧，母爲記走文也，放光寺僧

Especially the graphic expressions like—大兒臣娶生 長利僧 or 母爲記定文也 are nothing but the arrangement of Chinese characters according to the Japanese syntax.

Among the old inscriptions there is also the phraseology that cannot be admitted to be pure Chinese. The most remarkable is the inscription of the nimbus of Yakushi Statue of Temple Hôryûji.

池邊大宮治天下天皇大御身勞賜時，歲次丙午年，召於大王天皇與太子而誓願
賜，我大御病太平欲坐故，將造寺藥師像作仕奉詔。然當時崩賜造不堪者，小
治田大宮治天下大王天皇及東宮聖王大命受賜而歲次丁卯仕奉。⁽²⁸⁾

In the inscription we can find the expressions complying with the Chinese syntax as 治天下 or 歲次丙午, but as a whole the language of the inscription cannot be said to follow the Chinese syntax. The use of characters is near to that of the Kojiki. We shall compare it with the representation of the Kojiki.

(1) The phonetic use of characters are not discovered even in the representation of proper names. The sporadic "exposed" phonetic representation is totally absent.

(2) Also in proper names like 池邊大宮 and 小治田大宮 is seen the semantic use of Chinese characters. The two character compounds as

(28) Tôru Ôya, Kana Genryû Kô 假名源流巧 (The Study on the Origin and the Development of the Kana), pp. 34-35. The explanations of other inscriptions cited hereafter are based also upon the interpretation of the late Dr. Oya.

天皇, 太子, 東宮, etc. are used to represent the Japanese words respectively, but their semantic values are utilized. Likewise 藥師, 聖王, 大命, etc. The characters 寺 and 像 are no doubt for the nouns and read with the Japanese word forms. The Japanese syntagmas or combinations of elements as 大御身 and 大御病 are denoted by the Chinese characters.

(3) The examples of pronoun are few, the representation of 我 as {aga} being the same as in the Kojiki. The application of 當時 to {sono toki-ni} is the case where the semantic identity of the characters is utilized.

(4) As in the Kojiki, the representation of a verb is made by a single character, neglecting the morphological structure, e.g. 勞 {itatuki}, 召 {mesi}, 誓 {ukefi}, 願 {negafi}, etc. There are instances where a verbal complex is represented as a whole by one character: 治 {sirosi-mesi-si}, 不堪 {afe-tamafazari-kere-ba}, 太平 {tafiragi-masa-maku}, etc. The character 詔 has itself the the honorific meaning and is used for {nori-tamafi-ki}. The most characteristic is the denotation of a verbal suffix. 勞賜 {itatuki-tamafi-si} 誓願賜 {ukefi-negafi-si-ku}, 作仕奉 {tukuri-tukafe-maturu}, 崩賜 {kamusari-tamafi-te}, 欲坐 {omofosi-masu}, etc. In these cases the character 賜 is to indicate the honorific suffix and the character 奉 for the humble suffix, but their inflective devices are neglected. This is the same with the Kojiki.

(5) The representation of the function of inflection by means of Chinese particles is illustrated by the the examples 不 and 者 in 造不堪者 {tukuri-afe-tamafazari-kere-ba}. The use of 者 for {ba} is Japanese. In almost all cases it is the symbol of the particle {ba}. If the character 將 in 將造寺藥師像作仕奉 is interpreted as {(tukuri-tukafe-matura-) maku omofosu to} according to the late Dr. Ôya, it represents the function of the Japanese conjugational form.

(6) The omission of particles that are to be added to a noun in the graphic representation is frequent. 天下 {ame-no sita}, 故 {yuwe-ni}, 年 {tosi-ni} 像 {mikata-wo}, etc. There are instances where the functions of particles are indicated by the word order: 次丙午 (-ni), 追寺 (-wo).

(7) The character 與 in 大王天皇與太子 denotes the particle {to}. This is the imitation of the Chinese syntax. The use of 而 in 召於大王天皇與太子而 is found in the Kojiki, too.

(8) The syntax is the most characteristic in this inscription.

我大御病太平欲坐故 {aga ofo-miyamafi tafiragi-masa-maku omofosi-masu-ga yuwe-ni}

大命受賜而 {ofo-mikoto uke-tamafa-ri-te}

In these cases characters are arranged according to the Japanese syntax. The most interesting is the following sentence:

將造 寺 藥師 像 作 仕 奉
fotoke-no miya-wo tukuri, kusurisi-no mikata-wo tukuri-tukafe-matura-
詔
maku omofosu to nori-tamafi-ki.

造寺 is the expression complying with the Chinese language, while 藥師像作 in the same construction is Japanese, which is accompanied by 仕奉 in the Japanese style. Then, the character 將 that is to represent {-maku omofosu to} which follows {tukafe-matura-} in the Japanese syntax, is situated at the top of the sentence. Finally, the character 詔 is in its turn located at the end of the sentence and at the same time functions to conclude the sentence grammatically. In short, the Chinese syntax was mixed with the Japanese syntax in the mind of the author and the mixture is expressed in this one sentence.

By having compared the use of Chinese characters in the inscription of the nimbus of the Yakushi Statue of Temple Hôryûji with that of the Kojiki, we have found that the principles are practically the same. Only, in case of the inscription, the method of graphic representation seems to be adopted not so intentionally as in the Kojiki and the technique of representing appears rather awkward.

The method of this kind is partly recognized in other inscriptions. The inscription of the nimbus of the Statue of Śākyamuni of Temple Hôryûji is in the main in the Chinese style, but there is a passage like the following:

若是 定業以 背世 者
 kakusitemo -nite kamusari-masi-masa-masika-ba

The indication of {ba} by 者 is already mentioned in the discussion about the Yakushi Inscription (造不堪者). The position of 以 in 定業以 digresses from the Chinese syntax. This usage is also found in Korea, as stated above. We find the passage in the inscription on the pagoda of Temple Gangôji 元興寺: 聞食之宜善哉. 聞食之 {kikosi-mesi-te} is evidently not Chinese. 聞食 is frequently seen in the Semmyô and the Norito to represent {kikosi-mesu}.

The proper names in the Gangôji inscription are already represented by the *kana* style. For example, the name of Prince Shôtoku 聖徳太子 is rendered in the following way:

有麻移刀 等巳刀彌彌乃彌己等
 u-ma-ya-do-(no)-to-yo-to-mi-mi-no-mi-ko-to

The *kana* style of representation is of course the phonetic use of Chinese characters. The example shows that the Chinese character had already been well adapted to Japanese syllables and they were sufficiently "tamed" in Japanese. This adaptation can be explained in this way. In contrast to Korean, the Japanese structure of syllable was very simple, so that the adaptation of Chinese characters was easy. But the establishment of the *kana* writing was the result of the experiment of long year. It is noteworthy that, while the knowledge of *kana* was already acquired, it was used only

in proper names or songs, but not employed in other cases. This peculiar situation may be explained by another tradition of the usage of Chinese characters, different from that of proper names and songs. In the Kojiki also proper names are often written in *kana* and the songs are all in the *kana* style of representation. This may have been derived from the same tradition.

Hitherto we have cast a glimpse at the use of Chinese characters of the Kojiki and the records of the period of Empress Suiko, but both of them are essentially identical. The same method of representing a word integrally with an equivalent character, without paying attention to the morphological structure, is seen in both. The neglect of inflective suffixes in the representation of a verb is the extension of the logographic function of the Chinese writing, and the adaptation of the writing to Japanese is still imperfect.

The representation of word from advanced a little in the so-called Semmyô style. We shall quote one example from the edict of the enthronement of Emperor Mommu.²⁹⁾

現 御 神 止 大 八 島 國 所 知 天 皇 大 命 良 麻 止
 akitu-mi-kami to ofo-ya-sima-guni sirosi-mesu sumera-ga ofo-mikoto-rama to
 詔 大 命 乎 集 侍 皇 子 等 王 等 百 官
 notamafu ofo-mikoto-wo ugonafareru miko-tati ofokimi-tati momo-no tukasa-
 人 等 天 下 公 民 諸 聞 食 止 詔
 no fito-tati ame-no sita-no ofomitakara moro-moro kiki-tamafe to notamafu.
 高 天 原 爾 事 始 而 遠 天 皇 祖 御 世 中 今 至
 takama-no fara-ni koto fazime-te towo-sumeragino miyo, naka ima-ni itaru-
 麻 氏 爾 天 皇 御 子 之 阿 禮 坐 牟 彌 繼 繼 爾 大 八 島 國
 ma-de-ni sumera-ga miko-no are-masa-mu iya-tugitugi-ni ofo-ya-sima-guni
 將 知 次 止 天 都 神 乃 御 子 隨 母 天 坐 神 之
 sirasamu tugite to ama-tu-kami-no mi-ko nagara-mo ame-ni masu kami-no
 依 之 奉 之 隨 此 天 津 日 嗣 高 御 座 之 業 止
 yosa-si-maturi-si mani-mani kono ama tu-fi-tugi taka-mi-kura-no waza to
 現 御 神 止 大 八 島 國 所 知 倭 根 子 天 皇 命
 akitu-mi-kami to ofo-ya-sima-guni sirosimesu yamato-ne-ko-sumera-mikoto-no
 授 賜 比 負 賜 布 貴 支 高 支 廣 支 厚 支 大 命 乎
 saduke-tama-fi ofose-tama-fu. tafuto-ki taka-ki firo-ki atu-ki ofo-mikoto-wo
 受 賜 利 恐 坐 氏 此 乃 食 國 天 下 乎 調
 uke-tamafa-ri kasikomi-masi-te ko-no wosu kuni ame-no sita-wo totonofi-
 賜 比 平 賜 比 天 下 乃 公 民 乎 惠 賜 比 撫
 tama-fi tafirage-tama-fi ame-no sita-no ofomitakara-wo megufi-tama-fi nade-
 賜 牟 止 奈 母 隨 神 所 恩 行 佐 久 止 詔 天 皇
 tamafa-mu to na-mo kamunagara omofosime-sa-ku to notamafu sumera-ga
 大 命 乎 諸 聞 食 止 詔
 ofo-mikoto-wo moromoro kiki-tamafe to notamafu.

(29) The reconstructed texts of this Semmyô and of the following Semmyô are quoted from Takeo Kaneko, *Shokunihongi Semmyô Kô* (續日本紀宣命講).

The logographic method is conspicuous even in this Semmyô. 天皇 {sumera}, 公民 {ofomitakara}, 皇子 {miko} and others are the applications of Chinese characters in set formulas to the equivalent Japanese words. 所知 {sirosi-mesu}, 將知 {sirasamu}, 隨神 {kamu-nagara}, and 所恩行 {omofosimesu} are in the Chinese arrangement. Except these, Chinese characters are disposed entirely in the Japanese order. In this respect, the representation of the Semmyô is more conform to Japanese than the inscriptions and the Kojiki. What draws our attention is the phonetic representation, i.e. the *kana* representation, of particles and inflective endings. The indication of a particle following a noun, however, is very arbitrary in general. There are instances where a particle is explicit, for example, 天下乃公民, but the same phrase is shown by omitting the particle: 天下公民. The /no/ of {kono} is not expressed in 此天津日嗣高御座, but it is explicit in 此乃食國. Further, in 天坐神之依之奉之隨 the particle 之 is shown, while it is represented by the character 乃 indicating its phonetic form in 天都神乃御子. Similarly, the particle {ni} is clearly indicated in 高天原爾, while it is neglected in 天坐神 and 今至麻氏爾. The indication of a verbal ending is found: 高支 (taka-ki), 廣支 (firo-ki), 厚支 (atu-ki); 依之 (yosa-si), 奉之 (maturi-si); 調賜比 (totonofi-tama-fi), 平賜比 (tafirage-tama-fi), 撫賜牟止奈母 (nade-tamafa-mu to na-mo), and 所恩行佐久止 (omofosime-sa-ku to), but the indication is not consistent. While the ending {-fu} of {tamafu} is explicit in 負賜布 (ofosetama-fu), it is omitted in 詔 (notamafu). The omission of endings is attested in other instances: 詔大命 {notamafu ofo-mikoto}, 集侍皇子 {ugonafareru miko tati}, 聞食止詔 {kiki-tamafe to notamafu}, 調賜比平賜比 {totonofi-tama-fi tafirage-tama-fi}, etc. Likewise, as to the representation of {tamafu}, the ending of the adverbial form is indicated in 惠賜比 {megufi tama-fi} while the ending of the future form (未然形) is implicit in 撫賜牟 (nade-tamafa-mu). Thus, the unanalytical representation of a verb was still powerful. Nevertheless, the indication of endings was a progress of representing the word form. Besides, it is to be noted that 阿禮 of 阿禮坐牟 (a-re-masa-mu) is clearly represented by the phonetic use of Chinese characters.

There is a somewhat different specimen in the Semmyô. For example, the Edict of the Punishment of Prince Wake, dated on the 1st of August in the first year of Tempyô-jingo:

今 和氣仁敕 久先爾奈良麻呂我謀反乃事起天
 ima wa-ke-ni notamafa-ku saki-ni na-ra-ma-ro-ga mu-fon-nô koto okosi-te
 在之時仁方仲麻呂伊忠 臣止之天侍都然後仁
 ari-si toki-ni-fa naka-ma-ro-i tadasiki omi to si-te haberi-tu. sikaru-noti-ni
 逆 心乎以天朝廷乎動 傾 止之天
 sakasima-no kokoro-wo moti-te mikado-wo ugokasi-katabukemu to si-te
 兵乎備 流時仁和氣伊申 天在此爾依天官
 ikusa-wo sonafu-ru toki-ni wa-ke-i mawosi-te ari. kore-ni yori-te tukasa

位 乎 昇 賜 治 賜 都 可 久 方 阿 禮 止 毛 仲 麻 呂 毛
 kurawi-wo age-tamafi wosame-tamafi-tu. ka-ku-fa a-re-do-mo naka-ma-ro-mo
 和 氣 毛 後 仁 方 猶 逆 心 以 天 在 家 利 復
 wa-ke-mo noti-ni-fa nafo sakasima-no kokoro-wo moti-te ari-ke-ri. mata
 己 我 先 靈 仁 祈 願 弊 流 書 乎 見 流 仁 云 天 在 良 久 己
 ono-ga oya-no mitama-ni kofi-nega-fe-ru fumi-wo mi-ru-ni ifi-te a-ra-ku ono-
 我 心 仁 念 求 流 事 乎 之 成 給 天 波 貴 靈 乃
 ga kokoro-ni omofi-motomu-ru koto-wo-si nasi-tamafi-te-fa tafutoki mitama-no
 子 孫 乃 遠 流 天 在 乎 方 京 都 仁 召 上 天 臣 止 成 无
 suwe-no towoku nagare-te aru-wo-ba miyako-ni mesi-age-te omi to nasa-mu
 止 云 利 復 己 怨 男 女 二 人 在 此 乎 殺 賜 弊
 to ife-ri. mata onoga ata wotoko womina futari ari. ko-wo korosi-tam-fe
 止 云 天 在 是 書 乎 見 流 仁 謀 反 乃 心 阿 禮 止 方 明 爾
 to ifi-te ari. kono fumi-wo mi-ru-ni mu-fon-no kokoro a-ri to-fa akiraka-ni
 見 都 是 以 天 法 乃 末 仁 末 仁 治 賜 止 宣
 mi-tu. kokowo moti-te nori-no ma-ni-ma-ni wosame-tamafu to notamafu.

The most remarkable point in this Semmyô is that an ending or a particle is more extensively represented in graphs than in the edict of the ascension of Emperor Mommu. Of courses, it is not consistent. The inflective endings and suffixes as in 在 (ari), 宣 (notamafu), 動傾止 (ugokasikatabukemu to), 昇賜治賜都 (age-tamafi wosame-tamafi-tu), 治賜止 (wosame-tamafu to) etc., are omitted. The same honorific {tamafu} sometimes expresses its ending as in 殺賜弊止 (korosi-tama-fe to). It is impossible to say that the representation of a word form was fully practised, but the Chinese syntax is found almost nowhere. This shows that there was a progress in the use of the Chinese writing among the Semmyô. There is also an example where the whole clause is represented by *kana*: 可久方阿禮止毛 (ka-ku-fa a-re-do-mo).

We have observed the development of the adaptation of Chinese characters in Archaic Japan by means of a few examples from the Kojiki, the inscriptions and the Semmyô. It may be very dangerous to infer any conclusion from such a few examples, but we can grasp the general tendency. When the Chinese writing was introduced in Japan, the method was adopted to use the Chinese written language as it was. As the Chinese writing is properly the script with which Chinese is written, it is the most natural to make the Chinese writing fulfill its proper function. In the meantime, as the Japanese people were forced to adapt it to their own language of heterogeneous type, they attempted to represent their language by making use of the logographic quality of the Chinese writing, as it was impossible to put it down in writing all of a sudden. Thus, at first they neglected the morphological structure of Japanese and omitted the formal parts (particles, verbal suffixes and inflecting endings). The condition of the inscriptions and the Kojiki can be said to reflect this stage. But there was another custom of using Chinese characters phonetically. This method was employed

for the representation of proper names, and then it was adopted in expressing songs. Why was it not adopted in the inscription or in the Kojiki? The reason is that they hesitated to use a Chinese character phonetically, by taking no account of its meaning, since the Chinese character was by nature a logographic writing. In this way, the representation of words remained unanalytically for the time being, but this method was insufficient for describing Japanese. Especially, they could not dispense with the morphological structure, as the language had a complicated verbal system. The auxiliary verbs such as {tamafu}, {masu}, {maturu}, etc., were already represented by the characters of synonymous meaning, and the use of characters which were in Chinese the so-called "empty words" (虚辭) were employed to denote their functions, but these methods could not satisfy them. Gradually they came to take up the method of representing particles or endings of verbal complexes by the phonetic readings of Chinese characters. This was taken in the Semmyô style. Here the fusion of the logographic and phonetic uses of Chinese characters was established and the foundation of the visual contrast between the substantial and the formal part that has been used up to the present time was laid.

In the syntactical aspects, the writing became to adopt the Japanese word order, in proportion as it deserted from the Chinese style. In the inscription of the Śākyamuni Statue of Temple Hôryûji the whole text follows the Chinese syntax, mingling with the constructions of Japanese syntax, while the reverse can be detected in the inscription of Yakushi Statue of Temple Yakushiji which follows in the main the Japanese syntax, though it comprizes the Chinese set phrases. In case of the Kojiki, in individual phrases a Chinese character was compelled to take its normal position in Chinese, and so it appears to follow the Chinese syntax, but the phrases are distributed along the line of the Japanese syntax. Therefore, sometimes the Chinese style is apt to collapse in the Japanese fashion. But such a style is evidently unnatural. Thus the Japanese writing took the direction towards the arrangement of words represented by Chinese characters along the Japanese syntax. The style of the Semmyô is just the example.

Now, was the process of the adaptation of Chinese characters to the Japanese language the result of the experiment of the Japanese people by themselves? If we take the historical fact into consideration that at the earliest time when the Chinese writing was brought to Japan, those who were engaged in writing records were chiefly the immigrants from Korea, the attempts of adapting the Chinese script are assumed to have begun not in Japan, but it is more probable that the experiments conducted in Korea had affected in some measure the use of the Chinese characters in Japan.

In order to examine the influence of Korea on Japan we should compare the conditions of the use of Chinese characters in both countries. Having

observed the general outline of the use in the archaic period of Korea and Japan, we have found that in both countries the Chinese writing went through the same process of adaptation and got applied to the native language. First of all, the Chinese characters were applied to their equivalent words of the native language by means of the logographic quality of the characters. On this stage all the structures of word were disregarded. Then, not satisfied with his unanalytical representation, they commenced to show the substantial part of a word by the logographic use of a Chinese character and the elements describing the grammatical structure of a word by means of the phonetic use of a character, so that the morphological composition might be represented. This was, however, not so rapidly accomplished. They began to represent the most necessary elements, for instance, an ending or a particle. Yet at the beginning the representation was not consistent, sometimes a form was indicated, but sometimes it was not. Especially in Korea, the phonetic representation was imperfect and often omitted. The imperfection was also due to the principle of logography. Even when the structural elements were indicated, the indication was nothing but complementing the logographic function of a Chinese character. In the mean time, there came the time when Korea and Japan bade farewell to each other in the process of adapting the Chinese writing to the native language. Japan went on along her way of adaptation. As a result, keeping the logographic function of the Chinese writing, they succeeded in inventing the method of logographic representation of Japanese by means of Chinese characters, i.e. the so-called "*kun*" method (訓讀). On the other hand, having attained the limit of the phonetic representation of Chinese characters, they finally created the *kana*, the phonographic system of writing, with which they came to indicate clearly the structure of a word. In other words, Japan has completely Japanized the Chinese script by making use of its logographic function and its phonetic use. In contrast to this, in Korea the process of adaptation advanced in certain degree, but disturbing factors appeared on the way, so that the use of Chinese characters proceeded in another direction. In Korea, the influence of the Chinese culture was more direct than in Japan. As the Chinese literature was the sole source of intellectual refinements, the literature in Korean could not develop sufficiently. Therefore, the Chinese character could not depart from its own function to represent a Chinese word, and so it went on in the direction of being read only with its Sino-Korean value, having abandoned the possibility to be read with the semantic value. The *ri-tho* and the *tho* were still in use, but only as the auxiliary means of interpreting documents and the Chinese classics. With the invention of the Hangŭl these measures became useless, though in reality they were used conventionally thereafter. As already mentioned, there were instances where several Chinese characters were phonetically used in the *ri-tho* and in the *tho*, and among them even the

monophonic use was found, but the writing of Korea did not proceed in this direction and thus it did not attain the stage of creating a new indigenous system of writing, as the *kana* of Japan. The Hangŭl has inherited the framework of syllabic unit from the Chinese writing, but the element letters which fill the framework were newly invented by the alphabetic principle that was known through the Mongols. The Korean alphabet is not the development of phonemic letters in embryo which could be found in the *ri-tho* and the *tho*.

As touched above, it may be imagined from the cultural historical facts that the use of Chinese characters in Japan presupposes an experiment in Korea, but it has been discovered that it is difficult to verify this hypothesis by documentary evidences, though nevertheless the hypothesis is in all probability valid.

First, the lack of materials is decisive. When we examine the extant sources of both countries, the materials of Japan are generally older than those of Korea. The dates of the inscriptions of Japan are: 元興寺露盤銘 (596 A.D.), 同丈六釋迦佛光背銘 (605 A.D.), 法隆寺金堂藥師光背銘 (604 A.D.), 同釋迦佛光背銘 (623 A.D.), 群馬縣八幡村山ノ上碑 (681 A.D.). And the dedication of the Kojiki was 712 A.D. On the contrary, the dates of the Korean inscriptions are: 南山新城碑 (519 A.D.), 甘山寺彌勒阿彌陀佛像後記 (719 A.D.), 開寧葛項寺石塔記 (758 A.D.), 壬申誓記石 (792 A.D?), 竅興寺鐘銘 (856 A.D.). Except that of the Nam-san New Fort the Korean inscriptions are of younger date. All the records belong to Silla, nothing of Paikche or Imna 任那. Probably, as Silla also cultivated the Chinese culture through Paikche, the tradition of Paikche might have been preserved in the Silla inscriptions. If this argument be allowed, it might be of no use to stick to the chronological order. And yet, it is probable that the use of Chinese characters was transported to our country, when they remained yet at the unanalytical stage of representation. The reason is that the process of adaptation of Chinese characters began at this stage of unanalytical representation in both countries. At this stage the most noteworthy method might have been the neglect of the word structure and the arrangement of words by the syntax of the native language. We have not so many concrete examples in which the same character represents the word of identical meaning in Korean and Japanese, but some cases may be ascribed to the importation of the Korean method, e.g. 賜 for the honorific suffix, 以 for the instrumental particle and 者 for the conjunctive particle. In Japan, there was the usage to use Chinese characters phonetically in proper names or songs, but such a fact is not found in Korea. In the old Silla songs the method of representing Silla words is very complicated and the pure phonetic representation of characters cannot be seen.

Conclusion

We have seen how the peoples in the Chinese Cultural Zone showed their reactions against the Chinese writing, since they came in contact with it. Further, we have examined how they came to create their own scripts, when they awakened to the writing through the knowledge of the Chinese writing. If we now summarize concisely what we saw about the contact of the native language with the Chinese script, we can discern several stages in the process. Of course, a stage has a logical connection with each other, but it had not always any temporal sequence, sometimes chronologically in a reverse order. In the development the significance may be appraised in the sense that we can detect some important suggestions about the destiny of the Chinese writing.

(I) The first step is the stage in which the Chinese character was used as it was. Every people began to employ the Chinese script when they advanced considerably in the acculturation of the Chinese culture. Naturally many subdivisions may be classified.

(1) At the beginning, Chinese characters were used with their functions in the Chinese classical language. In other words, one wrote in the same capacity as a Chinese intellectual. In this phase a great gap was between the native language and the Chinese language in cultural level, and so Chinese characters were used only in Chinese. The people had not yet attained at representing the native language.

The Chinese system of writing is technically difficult to learn and cannot be acquired without special knowledge and training. Therefore, in this condition those who commanded the use of Chinese characters were the Chinese or their descendants, otherwise entirely sinified intellectuals such as Choi Chi-wən 崔致遠 of Silla or Yeh-lü Ch'u-ts'ai 耶律楚材 the Khitan. These intellectuals belonged to the ruling class, and the door of the writing was naturally closed to the common people. The Chinese script itself had been engendered and developed from this haughty atmosphere among the ruling class. It symbolized the exclusiveness of the Chinese culture.

The logograph like the Chinese script is by nature very unflexible and inefficient, as one graph represents one word. On the contrary, an alphabetic writing has an infinite possibility of combination and does not presuppose intellectual refinements and hard training, though it is prosaic and businesslike. In this sense it may be said to be open and 'democratic'.

The Chinese script could display its power over the people, kept aloof from the native language, owing to its inaccessible dignity. The rulers who adopted the Chinese writing took advantage of it in strengthening their power, by showing off to the people the script of 'theocratic' character, incomprehensible to the mass. The monument of King Hotaiwang 好太王 of Koguryō is a good example of the ostentation of a powerful monarch who would display the authority of the kingdom.

The distance of the Chinese script and the native idiom was not only be found in Korea or Vietnam, but it might have been also the case with the non-Chinese aborigines from the bank of the Yangtse up to South China. The nations of Wu and Yüeh are such examples. These peoples, however, were sinified and accordingly their languages were absorbed into Chinese. Thus, the relation of gap between the Chinese script and the native idiom was replaced by that of superposition of the Chinese script and the Chinese patois.

On this stage where Chinese characters were distant from the native language, the most interesting is that among a people there appeared a small group of men who could conceive an idea by means of a Chinese character and communicate his thoughts by writing in the classical Chinese. These men were probably completely bilingual. It may be said that they must have been not different from Chinese intellectuals at all.

(2) Next came the stage in which the intellectuals of each people in the Zone of the Chinese Culture appropriated the knowledge of Chinese and expressed their thoughts and feelings in Chinese characters and language. Here, too, the distance between the Chinese script and the native language was maintained, but the characters and the language were no more pure Chinese. The corruptions caused by the native language are detectable here and there. This stage is historically speaking the period when each people could acquire some political independence, but as yet could not fully get free from the yoke of the Chinese culture. In a country that subordinated culturally to China, like Korea or Vietnam, the stage continued for a very long time. At present, when we look for the historical sources of these countries, the documents of the first rank are not written in the native language, but in Chinese. That also in Japan a historical record as the *Nihonshoki* was written in Chinese, shows that Japan was on that stage when it was compiled.

The important thing on this stage is that the natives had acquired the capacity of writing with Chinese characters. To acquire the capacity of writing is a striking development as compared with the preceding stage. The necessity and facility of official records was strongly felt and was indispensable for diplomatic negotiations. On the other hand, the native intellectuals at that time made verses between them after the Chinese model as the cultural requirement of a gentleman. Thus, the necessity of representing with Chinese characters was augmented, and as a result, the way of native thinking was made explicit in poems and proses as it were as the substratum. Particularly, when the structure of the native language is considerably different from that of Chinese, there must have happened to incur grammatical mistakes of the Classical Chinese. Nevertheless it was still the stage in which one wrote records in Chinese anyway.

(3) When one happened to record something domestic, one was forced to

represent the names of places, persons and official titles phonetically by Chinese characters. The next stage began probably at the representation of proper names. Perhaps the origin of the Japanese "kana" can be looked for in this stage. The specific representation of Japanese place names, e.g. 信濃 (Sina-no), 愛宕 (Wo-tagi), 播摩 (Fari-ma) and the like, appeared on this stage, and this may be the result of the phonetic representation, considerably suggestive, that was obliged from the difference of phonetic and syllabic structure of both the languages. Especially, in the native language of non-monosyllabic nature, such as Korean and Japanese, when one wrote native words in the context of Classical Chinese, one must have been restricted in representing with two or three characters following the Chinese pattern, and so one must have abbreviated them suggestively.

I shall quote one example illustrating the efforts made in Archaic Korea. The name of the first official rank of Silla was written in various ways in the old Korean literature: 伊伐濇, 伊罰干, 一伐濇, 角干, 角榮, 舒弗郡, 舒發翰, etc. These di- or trisyllabic graphic representations are the variants of the name of the same official rank *sye-bur-ti-han-gi or *i-sye-bur-ti-han-gi, which is attested in comparatively full form in the Nihonshoki as 助富利智干, and meant "the great lord of the capital".

(4) When one made a step more, the syntax of the native language began to appear on the surface. The typical example is the style of the inscription of "the Oath Stone of the year Im-sin" in Korea or the Fuhitobe style of Japan. As discussed above, in this style Chinese characters are arranged almost completely according to the syntax of the native language.

Such a case is rare, but the mixture of the syntaxes of Chinese and the native idiom, as seen in the inscriptions of Japan, which might be the primitive stage. The construction of 將造寺藥師像仕奉詔 which is found in the inscription of the Yakushi Statue of Temple Hōryūji is quite typical.

(5) On this stage, though the syntax can be discerned on the surface, the grammatical structure of a word had not yet been represented. In other words, the indication of particles or verbal suffixes was not encountered. One more step, and then their indication could become manifest. In the inscription of the New Fort of Namsan (591 A.D.), we saw an instance of 以 for the particle {-ro}, just like the example 定業以 for Japanese {-nite} in the inscription of Śākyamuni of Hōryūji. In the same inscription we also find the use of 者 for {-ba}. But in both cases the structure of a verbal complex was not yet faithfully represented.

In the mean time the indication of morphological elements was attempted. In the Memory of the Stone Stupa of Temple Garhangsa of Gainyōng (758 A.D.), there are indications of an honorific suffix and a final ending. The 彌 and 也 shows the converbial ending {-myə} and the final ending respectively. However, the character 在 is not certain whether to read as {-gyə} or {-gyən}.

Thus, the finer discrimination of the structure of the suffix was not considered. That the stress was laid on the suggestion of elements rather than the elaborate analysis, shows clearly that the logographic and non-analytical aspect of the Chinese script is recognizable also in this respect.

As the analytical mind was developed, the way of representing words or forms became finer and the style mingled with the *okurigana* was produced. The *ri-tho* in Korea and the Semmyô style of Japan are the examples. Even on this stage, from the phonographical point of view all the morphological structure of a word was not completely represented. The suggestiveness of structural analysis in the preceding stage remained as yet. The *okurigana* is essentially that which functions to suggest the whole form of a native word by indicating the final part of the structure of the word with the addition of characters. Therefore, it is suggestive by nature. The situation has not changed even at present. When we write 明るい, we read it as /AKA-ru-i/. When we write 明らか, we read it as /AKI-ra-ka/. It does not simply represent the final of the word phonetically, but it determines the reading of the character by adding *okurigana*. The difference between the present usage and the archaic custom is this. In the present use a Chinese character and a *kana* have the same status. As the *kana*, if used exclusively, cannot accentuate the visual contrast clearly, we make contrasts in the graphic expression as a whole by means of the division of work to show the substantial part by a character and the formal part by a *kana*. On the contrary, in Archaic Japan the Chinese character was dominant, while the *kana* functioned only as its auxiliary sign.

Anyway, this method of *okurigana* enabled one to represent a part of morphological structure of a word. Here, too, Korea and Japan went the different ways. In Korea, besides the *ri-tho* they used the *tho* which was employed in reading a Chinese text. This *tho* was used at the end of one syntagma. It denoted the necessary particles or suffixes. If the syntagma is verbal, the Chinese word is made a verb by the addition of the verb {he- "to do"} to the word, and then the form of the syntagma is denoted by the *tho*. The *tho* was originally the same thing as the *ri-tho*. Later, the *tho* and the *ri-tho* became different, and the former was much more refined and more systematic than the *ri-tho*. The essential nature of the *tho* or the *ri-tho* is identical with the *okurigana* in Japanese. But hereafter the development became different in the two countries. While in Japan the *katakana* was derived from the *okurigana*, the *tho* remained as it was. The national alphabet of Korea is not the development of the *tho*.

(6) Now, we are on the new stage of the relation between the Chinese characters and the native language. The stage of the semantic utilization of Chinese characters was commenced. To write native words with Chinese characters means to represent native words by means of Chinese characters. As seen in the style of the inscription of the Oath Stone of Im-sin, each Chinese character was employed to denote a native word of the same meaning, by the

logographic nature of the Chinese script. And this is the advantage of the Chinese logography.

When the application of a character to a native word by the logography of the Chinese character became conventionalized, there appeared the so-called "kun" reading of the character. This "kun" use of a Chinese character has remained essentially unchanged up to the present time in Japan. In Korea the practice is now found nowhere. But in the remote past the usage seems to have been in vogue, for the character 角 of 角干 could represent the form *syē-bŭr in Silla, since it was firmly associated with the Silla word *sx-bŭr "horn".

The semantic transfer of a Chinese character to a native word is to separate the Chinese character from the corresponding Chinese word. Here is the real cause that engendered the curious method of reading a Chinese text prevalent in Japan. The "kun" reading of a Chinese text in Japan is an extraordinary kind of translation, in that, only by looking down the characters of the text with eyes, without pronouncing the words, one translates directly the words into Japanese one by one. In the process of the reading, the sounds of Chinese do not come in play, just as the deafmutes read the letters. It is a visual language. In short, our ancestors not only isolated each character from its Chinese base, but also cut off the whole sentence from the Chinese sounds. This method originated probably in the circumstances where with the urgent need of absorbing the Chinese culture in the short span of time, they made haste to know the contents of as many books as possible.

In Korea, it is not certain that this method was adopted in the ancient time. At least in later times the method was not current. A Chinese character is always read phonetically with its Sino-Korean reading, and the text is read according to the Chinese syntax.

(7) On the other hand, the phonetic representation of the native language advanced in Japan from the proper names to other spheres. The songs in the Kojiki and the Nihonshoki, and the Song of Buddha's Footprint 佛足石歌 represent the whole Japanese text solely with Chinese characters. This practice might have had some relations with the magic nature of primitive songs.

(II) When the Chinese writing was completely associated with the native language, the writing was separated from its foundation. The "kun" reading of a Chinese text in which the Chinese sound does not participate, is the typical example. Thus, Japan has succeeded in "taming" the Chinese writing, and on the contrary she cannot now be easily detached from it. In contrast to Japan, in Korea the "taming" of Chinese characters was unsuccessful and the attempt was given up. As a result, it was possible to create a new writing, as it had not penetrated so much as in Japan. Many peoples of this kind are found. It seems to be probable that, when the contact of the Chinese script and the native language attained to a certain degree, a new writing was created.

In other words, the people gave up the application of Chinese characters to the native language and invented a new system of writing well adapted to the language. But the new writing could not completely be emancipated from the influence of the Chinese script, since it was within the Zone of Culture. Having alienated the Chinese script, it was forced to have recourse to the principles of the Chinese writing after all. Under such circumstances new systems of writing were invented in various countries, but the fact does not mean their complete emancipation from the Zone.

(8) The beginning of the creation of a script is the modification of Chinese characters. The Japanese *kana* is the typical example, but it was by definition the “informal letter” (假名) against the “true letter” (真名), i.e. the Chinese character, and was not created consciously as the national script. Even at present, the *kana* cannot be said to occupy the authoritative position of the national writing.

(9) The method of making use of the principles of the Chinese script and of creating characters by a new combination was invented. For example, the word meaning “tiger” in the Ch’u 楚 language was spelt by 於兔, the latter of which is also spelt by 麤 that consists of the signific 虎 (tiger) and the phonetic 兔. The hui-i characters newly created are found also in Japan: e.g. 杜 “a wood”, 峠 “a mountain pass”, etc.

The characters of this kind are found also in Vietnamese *chu-nom*. The character 三 denotes {“three”}, and the character 面 denotes {“face”}, and like. The *chu-nom* also is the writing that utilized the Chinese system of writing, but created new combinations by the Chinese constructive principles, hsieh-shêng and hui-i, to compensate vacancies in the Chinese system. Therefore, it did not depart from the Chinese script. Like the Japanese *kana* it was unconsciously generated in the process of using Chinese characters.

The characters invented in Japan, the so-called “*kokuji*” (national character), e.g. 榊 (sakaki), 峠 (tauge), 杜 (mori), etc., are the developments of the hui-i characters. The character 焔 of a Korean place name appearing in the Nihonshoki is an instance of interesting Korean characters. The grapheme 火 represents the native word {*būr “community, fort”} by borrowing the equivalent form of the Korean word {būr “fire”}, and the the grapheme 本 denotes the phonetic form /*būr/ of the word. It resembles the Ch’u 楚 and the Vietnamese 三. In Korea there are the newly created characters: 耆 (nor), 疋 (dor), 𪛗 (sbun).

(10) In stead of creating new characters for native words, i.e. the “*kokuji*”, a new method was devised by abbreviating or adding other signs. Some Nüchên characters are of this kind: <日> for {inenggi}, <月> for {biya}, which were made by adding a point to the respective Chinese characters. The 忝 for {abka} is of the same sort. But in general, the Nüchên script shows not so clear examples as these, and rather it suggests us that it might conceal purposely the similarity with the Chinese script.

The Khitan Great Letters are probably produced from the modification of Chinese characters, and the Nüchên characters are the imitations of them. It is easily supposed that the Khitan or the Nüchên people followed in all probability the example of the Chinese script. Therefore, it is quite natural that they took a direction for the creation of a new writing by modifying the Chinese writing. Nevertheless, the ambiguity of connection with the Chinese character on the surface may be ascribed to their inferiority complex against the Chinese culture that obliterated the external affinity. The same holds with the Hsi-hsia script. It is to be noted that the Khitan or Nüchên script is from the beginning the conscious modification of the Chinese script and not the natural product of the development as in Japan. In the Khitan or Nüchên script, the stage of the complete logography had not been attained and in Khitan a certain method of phonographic representation was adopted, resulting in the Small Letters, while in Nüchên a syllabic writing was brought to existence.

In this respect, the Hsi-hsia script was created consciously as the national script, but the principles of construction were based on the logographic nature of the Chinese characters. In the Hsi-hsia system, the hsieh-shêng principle also was utilized, as stated above, but the stress was laid upon the semantic aspect and can be said to have enforced the logographic function. It may be said to have developed one possibility of the Chinese script. The origin of the external form of the Hsi-hsia characters is not clear.

(11) The Lolo script is the script that may be supposed to imitate the pictographic principle of the Chinese writing. The difficulty of deriving it from the Chinese system shows that it obtained only the logographic function from the Chinese writing and it was created independently from the Chinese script. At the present stage it has become a syllabic letter.

(12) Another stage is the case where a new writing of another origin was created under the disguise of the Chinese writing. The Khitans at first invented the Great Letters, but realized the impossibility of devising a complete logographic system of writing and turned to a phonographic writing. The phonography was fulfilled by the phonetic use of the Great Letters and by the introduction of the principle of the Turkish runes. But, as the Great Letters had the one-character-one-word principle, in the Small Letters the principle of one-graph-complex-one-word seems to have been adopted. In the text of the inscription of the Small Letters one graph complex appears to correspond to one word. Here was opened the way to adopt the writing of different origin under the disguise of the Chinese character. Strangely enough this principle of the Khitan Small Letters was not followed by the Nüchên writing.

Another example is seen in the ḥPhags-pa script. This script is a kind of alphabet, nothing but the Tibetan writing in square forms, after the model of the Chinese writing just like the Khitan Small Letters.

The Korean Hangŭl also is an instance of a writing having the external

aspect resembling the Chinese script. As stated above, the Hangül has two origins, the one being the Chinese writing and the other being the alphabet which was known through the Mongols. The Chinese script offered the principle of monosyllabic unit as a phonographic framework, having abandoned its logographic nature. The alphabet gave the principle of monophonic letter which supplied the elementary graphemes filling in the framework. The formation of a unit by an assemblage of elements might be modelled after the Khitan Small Letters, in which the unit represents a word or a word complex, not a syllable. In this respect, it kept the logography. On the contrary, in the Hangül the level of unit changes from a word to a syllable, i.e. the logography was replaced by the phonography. It is astonishing that the Koreans who had cherished so much admiration for the culture of the Chinese language and script, and had paid so much vain efforts to the adaptation of Chinese characters to their language, should have created an entirely new writing. And that the Khitan script worked indirectly behind the formation of the Hangül, is a very interesting fact, the more so as the fact has not been noticed.

(III) (13) After the period when new scripts were created by emphasizing or developing various elements or functions of the Chinese script against the influence of the Chinese writing, a new stage came in which an entirely different writing was adopted without taking any consideration of the Chinese character. The first case was the Mongol alphabet. The Khitans, a branch of Mongols, failed in creating the logographic Great Letters after the Chinese script, and then introduced the Small Letters through the idea of the Turkish runes, but the efficiency of phonography was not great, as one sound was represented by many letters and it was not practicable in public use. The Mongols who would not be captured and drowned in the Chinese culture dared to adopt an alphabet that was more appropriate to their nomad life. They modified the Uighur alphabet and adapted it to their native language. The alphabet was used for a very long time, until the Russian alphabet was adopted in the Republic of the Mongol People.

The Mongol alphabet was taken up by the Manchus. The Manchus also did not adopt the inefficient system of writing of Nüchên and adapted the simple alphabet to the Manchu language and created the Manchu letters. The Manchu people have buried themselves in the Chinese culture in the long run, but when they adopted the alphabet, they had still the feeling of reaction and warning against the Chinese culture.

(14) Vietnam, cultivated in the Chinese culture, was early affected by the Western culture, and as a result, she created her own alphabet on the basis of the Roman alphabet that had had no connection with the Chinese culture. The introduction of the European alphabet is not only restricted to Vietnam, but the Republic of Mongol People and other minor peoples in U.S.S.R. have come to adopt the Russian writing. Even in China, the cradle of Chinese characters, at one time the movement of latinization of writing was brought

in under the rule of the Republic of Chinese people. At present we are faced to the critical moment of the destiny of the Chinese script, from which many peoples are doing their best to emancipate themselves.