Jin Guangping and His Studies of Large and Small Scripts in Khitai and Jurchen Languages

AISIN GIORO Hualiyasun

Both the Khitai and Jurchen scripts belong to ancient Chinese ethnic writing system. Different from other branches, these two ones are composed by "large scripts"and "small scripts." "Large scripts" and "small scripts" were originally named by Khitais, and later followed by Jurchens, as was recorded by some relevant historical materials "the Jurchens writing was modeled after the Khitais." But the *Liaoshi* did not account for the difference between "large script" and "small script." Accordingly, the *Jinshi* also did not explain the difference. So ever since their finding over one century ago, Jurchen and Khitai scripts have been masked with a mysterious veil by the various speculations of scholars from different countries. Chinese scholar Jin Guangping was a leading pioneer in this academic field.

In 1957, by comparing the "epitaph of Xiao Xiaozhong" excavated from Jinxi, Liaoning province and "Aice of the Liao Emperor" unearthed from Qingling, Jin Guangping pointed out that in Khitai scripts of Qingling there were both single scripts and compound ones and the latter were mostly composed by two to sever singles ones. Therefore we can conclude that the Khitai was a multi-syllable language and the number of syllables determines the complexity of character forms. Contrary to the Khitais characters found in Qingling, the Khitais characters found in Jinxi were simple and regular in form, sharing similarity with the Jurchen. The methods of character making include loan words from the Chinese and some adaptation of Chinese strokes. According to the *Qidanguozhi*, the Khitai large scripts were coined in imitation of *Lishu* which was the same with the Khitai scripts of Jinxi, whereas the Khitai scripts of Qingling was modeled after *Huihu* which shared similarities with the Khitai small scripts, which was supported the *Liaoshi*. The *Jinshi* recorded that the Jurchen large

scripts was made in 1119 and Jurchen small scripts in 1138, and the two script types had been coexisting. But the Jurchen stone-carved scripts that still remained and the Jurchen scripts in the *Nüzhen Yiyu* were different from the Khitais of Qingling while similar to that of Khitais of Jinxi. So it is naturally inferred that the remaining Jurchen scripts were large scripts imitating Khitai large scripts and the Jurchen small scripts was a kind of language coping the Khitai small scripts (included in the *Kaogu* 1957.2).

In 1962, Jin Guangping made a further study on the difference between and characteristics of Khitai large and small scripts and their Jurchen counterparts and the results of the research had been universally accepted (the *Neimenggudaxuexuebao* 1962.2.)

In spite of the untimely death in Cultural Revolution, by keen academic vision Jin Guangping had pointed out the right direction for further researches on the difference between Khitai large and small scripts and Jurchen ones.

In the half century ever since Jin's conclusion on Khitai large scripts, the researches in this field had been at a standstill. In contrast, the researches on Khitai small scripts have made breakthroughs in the 21st century. With more Khitai small scripts in epitaphs interpreted and more grammatical irregularities explained, the researches on Khitai large scripts gained a solid footing. Though different in type, large scripts and small scripts belonged to the same language. So a greater part of the sound and meaning of Khitai large scripts could be identified in a short time with the study of Khitai small scripts as the basis and Aisin Gioro Ulhicun, the granddaughter of Jin Guangping, inherited his academic cause and engaged intensively in the study of Khitai and Jurchen scripts. She found 1,002 Khitai large scripts (not including variants) from the Khitai large scripts epitaphs. These Khitai large scripts provide a brand new source for the later research on the Khitai large scripts. Hitherto the researches on Khitai large scripts had one common conclusion. That is "Khitai large scripts are ideogram." This thesis was misled by the sentence "Emperor Taizu of the Liao dynasty coined 3,000-odd Khitai words after the unity of Bohai area" which was quoted from the first volume of the *Qidanguozhi*. In brief, the Khitai large scripts was "ideogram and phonogram language." In this language, one syllable corresponded to several characters. In other words,

the same syllable may take different forms of character. The typical form of "ideogram-phonogram" language is that the root meaning is represented by ideogram and the root syllable is represented by phonogram. Succeeding the tradition of Khitai large scripts, the Jurchen large scripts followed the "ideogram and phonogram language" and their syllables were more concise and appropriate than the Khitai large scripts. According to the *Nüzhenwen Dacidian* co-compiled by Jin Qizong and Aisin Gioro Ulhicun, the Jurchen large scripts amounted to 1,307 which, by means of "phonogram-ideogram pattern" and "the combination of the plural phonograms," could designate all Jurchen words. Since the Jurchen large scripts were inspired from the Khitai large scripts, these Jurchen phonogram must come from Khitai ones.

Jin Guangping's assumption on Jurchen's small scripts were verified by the unearthed relics ten years later.

From 1972 to the early of 1980s, four-sided character-coined gold and silver tablets were unearthed in succession in Hebei, Heilongjiang and Jilin. At the top of these tablets were engraved with the mark similar to the Chinese character " 主." It was recorded as "Aguda Hua Ya" in Song dynasty historical materials and identified as the relics of the Jin dynasty. The characters on these tablets were once regarded as Khitai small scripts. But Aisin Gioro Ulhicun argued that the six characters fell into two groups and were not found in Khitai small scripts. Every three characters of the six characters were made into one set which was the same to the Khitai small scripts. It could be inferred that the characters on these tablets were Jurchen small scripts created by Emperor Xizong of the Jin Dynasty.

The Jurchen small scripts were made in 1138 and put into use in 1145. Up to now all Jurchen materials were written in large scripts except for the six characters on the tablets. Jin Qizong once made accurate explanation on the unpopularity of the Jurchen small scripts. He pointed out that the Jurchen small scripts kept the triviality and encumbrance of Khitai small scripts. The difference between Khitai small scripts and large ones lies in the fact that Khitai small scripts used 300-odd phonograms to spell the sound of words by certain order. The initial purpose of making Jurchen small scripts was to adapt to the multi-syllable

agglutination-oriented Khitai language but the result was more complex and trivial than the strokes of Khitai large scripts. For the beginners, the Khitai small scripts possessed the advantages of clear phonograms and easy reorganization. But from the practical point of view, they were less handy than the large scripts. The Jurchen large scripts inherited both the advantage of the Khitai large scripts in ideograms and the strong point of Khitai small scripts in phonogram, so within 20 to 30 years, it developed into a new language possessing the advantages of both Khitai large scripts and small ones. While the Jurchen small scripts made by Emperor Xizong was purely modeling the Khitai small scripts and accordingly having its disadvantages. The function of Jurchen small scripts was far inferior to that of Khitai small script which could make up the deficiency of Khitai large scripts. So after the murder of Emperor Xizong, the Jurchen small scripts was abandoned by history for its far less value than the Jurchen large scripts.

春秋紀年表

吉本　道雅

西周期・戦国期に比較した場合、春秋期の紀年はよほど確実である。それでもなお、『史記』十二諸侯年表は時に春秋経伝と矛盾する。本表は十二諸侯年表の体例を踏襲しつつ、その錯誤を正したものである。踰年改元に基づく年次を記しているが、実際にそうであった保証はない。西周後期から春秋期のおよその年代観を提供する以上のものではない。春秋期の王侯の諡号は基本的に陳厚耀『春秋世族譜』に拠っている。

	周	魯	斉	晋	秦	楚	宋	衛	陳	蔡	曹	鄭	燕	呉
878	厲王元	献公10												
866	13	22						頃侯元						
864	15	24						3			夷伯元		恵侯元(1)	
863	16	25						4		武侯元	2		2	
859	20	29	献公元					8		5	6		6	
858	21	30	2	靖侯元			釐公元	9		6	7		7	
857	22	31	3	2	秦侯元		2	10		7	8		8	
856	23	32(2)	4	3	2		3	11		8	9		9	
855	24	真公元	5	4	3		4	12(3)		9	10		10	
854	25	2	6	5	4		5	釐侯元	幽公元	10	11		11	
851	28	5	9(4)	8	7		8	4	4	13	14		14	
850	29	6	武公元	9	8		9	5	5	14	15		15	
848	31	8	3	11	10(5)		11	7	7	16	17		17	
847	32	9	4	12	公伯元	熊勇元	12	8	8	17	18		18	
845	34	11	6	14	3(6)	3	14	10	10	19	20		20	

(1)　燕の年数は『史記』十二諸侯年表に従っておくが、『竹書紀年』で確認できる桓公の年代（前482～前471）以前については不明とせざるを得ない。拙稿「戦国紀年考」（本誌所収）参照。
(2)　『史記』魯世家「献公三十二年卒」に拠る。以下、十二諸侯年表に拠らないものについては逐条注記する。
(3)　『史記』衛世家「頃侯十二年卒」。
(4)　『史記』斉世家「九年、献公卒」。
(5)　『史記』秦本紀「秦侯立十年、卒」。
(6)　『史記』秦本紀「公伯立三年、卒」。