

wen) is understood as representing the distinction of the underlying phonemes. These distinctions cover both initials and finals (cf. i~viii, pp. 149~157), but it seems that Chang Shou-chieh intentionally avoided referring explicitly to those distinctions that were neglected in the northern dialects only, the reason for which might be that the reading pronunciation of the Imperial family to whom he dedicated the book was also affected by the northern provincialism.

From the above mentioned statement by Chang Shou-chieh, we know that at his time the corruption of reading pronunciation was already in a considerably advanced stage, but at the same time we are informed of the fact that the effort to preserve the traditional norm of reading pronunciation was still maintained by the highly learned minority. In the phonetic glossaries in the *Shih-chi-chêng-i* proper, we find some instances of violation of his own insistence that the distinctions must be kept rigidly. Most of these instances of violation, however, would be attributed either to the difference in the reading of individual characters, or to the modifications made in the course of transmission of the text. Finally the author of this article points out some resemblances between the import of the *ch'ing-cho* in the *Lun-in-li*, and the import of the *ch'ing-ch'ing chung-cho* 輕清 重濁 in the *Pien-sū-shêng-ch'ing-ch'ing-chung-cho-fa* 辯四聲輕清重濁法 supplemented to the *Kuang-yün* 廣韻, the latter being analyzed by T'ang Lan 唐蘭 in 1948.

A Phonological Study of the *Chin-shu-yin-i* 晉書音義

by Shōji ÔSHIMA

The present paper is the report of a part of the investigation on the *Chin-shu-yin-i* (the Phonetic Glosses to the Chronicle of the Chin Dynasty) by Ho Ch'ao 何超 (ca. 740 A.D.). This investigation forms a part of the writer's main study on the phonology of Chinese of the T'ang Dynasty together with the previous studies of the writer on the phonetic glosses in the *Han-shu* 漢書, the *Chi-chiu-p'ien* 急就篇, and both the *So-yin* 索隱, and the *Chêng-i* 正義 Commentaries of the *Shih-chi* 史記 which were already published, including a study on the *Hou-han-shu-yin-i* 後漢書音義 (the Phonetic Glosses to the Chronicle of the Later Han Dynasty) which will appear soon.

After having made clear the phonological peculiarities on the basis of the

analysis of the phonetic glosses, the writer has pointed out in this paper that the *Chin-shu-yin-i* has incorporated some phonetic modifications which had been produced or were in progress during the T'ang Dynasty into the basic system of the *Ch'ieh-yün* 切韻 (601 A.D.) that is supposed to have remained as the authority of the reading of the Chinese characters throughout the reign of the T'ang Dynasty. Further, the writer corroborates his hypothesis that besides the norm of the *Ch'ieh-yün* another tradition of reading was maintained exclusively among the T'ang scholars (cf. S. ÔSHIMA, "A Phonological Study on the *So-yin* and the *Chêng-i* Commentaries to the *Shih-chi*", the Tôyō-Gakuhō Vol. 55, No. 3, 1972), since the phonological peculiarities reflected in the *Chin-shu-yin-i* are identical in nature with those found in the *So-yin* Commentary (between 719 and 736 A.D.) and the *Chêng-i* Commentary (736 A.D.), both of which were compiled practically at the same time as the *Chin-shu-yin-i* was written. It can be added that the phonological peculiarities reflected in Yen Shih-ku 顏師古's *Han-shu-yin-i* 漢書音義 (641 A.D.) and *Chi-chiu-p'ien-chu* 急就篇注 (between 627 and 644 A.D.) support this supposition. (cf. S. ÔSHIMA, "A Study on the Finals of Yen Shih-ku's Phonetic Glosses to the *Han-shu*", the Gengo-Kenkyū Vol. 59, 1971; S. ÔSHIMA, "A Study on the Phonetic Glosses in Yen Shih-ku's Commentary on the *Chi-chiu-p'ien*", the Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters of the Hokkaidō University Vol. 22, No. 1, 1974).

The writer also touches in this paper on the methodology of a phonetic history based on fragmentary sources like the phonetic glosses. According to the writer, aberrant readings appearing in fragmentary sources such as found in the phonetic glosses do not always reflect the results of real phonetic changes, but may show the traditional readings as they were orally transmitted from teachers to their disciples. Therefore, these two should be clearly distinguished for a careful observation. For the purpose, the writer believes, a comparative study between all the phonetic commentaries is necessary besides the "projection" method in the treatment of phonetic glosses in one phonetic commentary, (i.e. the method intended to find out divergences between the system of the *Ch'ieh-yün* and that of the phonetic commentary in question, by projecting the reading of a certain character on the system of the *Ch'ieh-yün*). The writer pays attention to this idea by citing concrete examples and waits for a further study in future.