A Southern Min Word

in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*

by
Tim Miller

A Southern Min Word in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*

In this paper, I present my hypothesis that at least some of the occurrences of 惣 in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* 祖堂集 serve as a way to write the Southern Min equivalent of Mandarin 要, and then I go on to explain how it should have come about that a Southern Min expression would appear in this text.

惣 appears in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* in at least the following places: once in the second of the two sections of the text that have been both annotated by Liu Chien 劉堅 and translated into Japanese by Yanagida Seizan 柳田 聖山 and at least twice in the first of the two sections which have been translated into French by Paul Demiéville.[1]

----

[1] See Liu Chien 劉堅, *Chin-tai Han-yü tu-pen* 近代漢語讀本 (Shanghai: Shanghai chiao-yü ch'u-pan-she, 1985), pp. 70-80; Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, trans., *Sodôshû* 祖堂集 (Tokyo: Chûô Kôronsha, 1990); and Paul Demiéville, "Le recueil de la salle des partriarches", *T'oung Pao* 56.4-5 (1970): 268-286. In addition to the two sections that Yanagida and Liu have both worked on, Yanagida has also translated many other sections (primarily early in the book), and Liu has annotated in addition two sections later on. An earlier annotation of a section of the book -- Liu states that he based himself on this for the third of his four sections -- also exists, in [not seen:] Ôta Tatsuo 太田辰夫, *Chûgoku rekidai kôgobun* 中国歴代口語文 ([Tokyo: Kônan-

According to the *Han-yü ta tzu-tien*, 惣 is a graphic variant of 總.[2] And that is exactly how the graph seems to me to be functioning and how one of Liu's notes indicates it to be functioning in the following:

其兒子在家時並不曾語又不曾過門前橋直到十六有一個禪師來纔望見走

出過門前橋迎接禮拜通寒喧父阿孃眷屬遠近鄰舍惣來驚訝[3]

Yanagida's Japanese for the pertinent last sentence of this leaves the character untranslated (and uses the simple past tense), which suggests that he also took the graph to be a variant of 總, and by no means as equivalent to Mandarin 要:

子供のころ家にいて、およそ	In childhood, [he] remained at home,
口をきくことなく、さらに門	never spoke at all, and never even
前の橋をわた（って外に出）	crossed the footbridge leading to [his]
ることがなかった。そのまま	gate (and left his house). When he had
十六歳になって、一人の禅僧	thus reached the age of sixteen, a Zen

----

shoin], 1957), [pp. 120-129]. Also translated, aside from the body of the text, both by Yanagida and by Demiéville, have been a notice by the "controller-general" in charge of the Korean edition of 1245 and the preface to the work.

[2] Or, to be more exact, the dictionary says that 惣 is a miswriting of 揔 and that the latter is a graphic variant of 總. See *Han-yü ta tzu-tien* 漢語大字典 (Wu-han: Hu-pei tz'u-shu ch'u-pan-she, 1986-1987), 4:2311 & 3:1922.

[3] See Liu, p. 74, note no. 5 and, for the passage in its original characters, Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, ed., *Tsu-t'ang chi* (Kyoto: Chung-wen ch'u-pan-she, 1984), p. 57.

がやってきた。その姿をみる
やいなや、門前の橋を渡って
出迎え、礼儀ただしく時候の
あいさつをした。父と母、眷
属と隣近所、遠方の人まで集
まって、あっけにとられた。[4]

monk came. As soon as he caught sight [of the monk], he crossed the footbridge leading to the gate, received [him], and politely offered the seasonal greeting. His parents, relatives, and people from near and far gathered in amazement.

In the two places where 惣 was encountered by Demiéville, however, he translates using in the first case *si* [= Mandarin 要 (是)] and in the second case the conditional tense [= Mandarin 要 or 會], though he does not explain what led him to do so:

古人個中惣似你与麼容易何處更有今日事也 Si les anciens avaient pris les choses aussi facilement que vous les faites, comment en serions nous où nous en sommes aujourd'hui? [5]

and

明眼人笑你久後惣被俗漢弄 Les gens à l'œil clair se riraient de vous et, à la longue, vous seriez liquidés par les gaillards profanes.[6]

----

[4] Yanagida (1990), p. 150.

[5] See Demiéville, p. 275 and, for the sentence in its original characters, Yanagida (1984), p. 310.

[6] See Demiéville, p. 276 and, for the sentence in its original characters, Yanagida (1984), p. 310.

Probably, Demiéville had no knowledge of the vocabulary of Southern Min and came to this interpretation based purely on context, helped by the fact the character 捴, another variant of 總, appears later in the same section, which hints that 惣 here has some other use.[7]

In truth, if one wanted to invent a character for the Southern Min equivalent of 要, one could not come up with a more apt graph than 惣. The 心 is a reasonable significant, and the 物 is the best one can do in the way of a phonetic. The pronunciations of 物 and of the word itself at Zayton and in nearby places (arrayed as much as possible from north to south) are today:

Lungki 龍溪	Amoy 廈門	Tungan 同安	Zayton	Tehwa 德化	Putien 莆田
/8mĩ/	/8mĩ/	/8mɜ̃/	/8mɜ̃/	/8mɜ̃/	/8muĩ/
/7mue/	/7me/	/7mɜ/	/7mɜ/	/7mɣ/	/7puoŋ/ [8]

----

[7] More precisely, 捴 is a variant of 惣, which in turn is a variant of 總. See *Han-yü ta tzu-tien*, 3:1902 & 3:1922. The location of this 捴 in the passage is Yanagida (1984), p. 312.

[8] By virtue of two phenomena very similar to what people term eclipsis and lenition when talking about Irish Gaelic, the pronunciation of /7puoŋ/ optionally

Now, as to why Southern Min expressions should appear in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, we can divide this question into two parts: (1) why the compilers of the book chose to use them in the first place and (2) why these expressions

----

becomes [mũõʔ], [mũõk], [mũõl], [mũõp], or [mũõt] when preceded by an [m] and [βuoʔ], [βuok], [βuol], [βuop], or [βuot] when preceded by a vowel (with the [ʔ], [k], [l], [p], or [t] being determined by what sound -- if any -- follows). These phenomena differ from Gaelic, however, in that they neutralize the distinction between aspirated and unaspirated initials, so that /7puoŋ/ only remains distinct from /7pʰuoŋ/, as [puoʔ], [puok], [puol], [puop], or [puot], when these phenomena have not applied. Forms for Lungki come from Douglas (who labels these "C." for Changchow 漳州, the name of the prefecture of which this town is the governmental seat), forms for Putien (more specifically, for Hsüeh-ch'uan-hsiang 雪川鄉) come from Chang, and all others come from my personal knowledge (corroborated by Douglas, except for Tehwa, which he fails to mention). I have altered Chang's and Douglas's orthographies and phonemicized all forms to make them as comparable with one another as possible (in the process following the convenient practice of numbering dialectal tones in such a way as to show their approximate equivalence to the traditional tone-names: 陰平 = 1, 陰上 = 3, 陰去 = 5, & 陰入 = 7, being the upper register, while for the lower 陽平 = 2, 陽上 = 4, 陽去 = 6, & 陽入 = 8). In translating the tone-names into English:

"陰" (pronounced *yin*[1]	in Pekingese) = "upper-register"	or	"upper",
"陽" (pronounced *yang*[2]	in Pekingese) = "lower-register"	or	"lower",
"平" (pronounced *p'ing*[2]	in Pekingese) = "even"	or	"level",
"上" (pronounced *shang*[3/4]	in Pekingese) = "ascending", "raised",	or	"rising",

5

were not replaced by later editors with expressions standard throughout China. To each of these questions, there seems to be both a basic answer and a further one.

The basic answer as to why the compilers would have written using dialectal expressions is that much of the book consists of the aphorisms of various Buddhist masters,[9] which gain in pithiness from being expressed in colloquial language.

One has more difficulty, however, explaining why the compilers would

----

"去" (pronounced $ch'ü^4$ in Pekingese) = "departing", "going", or "sinking", "入" (pronounced $ju^{4}*$ in Pekingese) = "entering". The relationship of these eight traditional tones to Pekingese tones is (for the benefit of interested readers): $1xxx > xxx^1$; $3xxx > xxx^3$; $5xxx > xxx^4$; $7xxx > xxx^{1}*, xxx^{2}*, xxx^{3}*, xxx^{4}*$; $2xxx > xxx^2$; $4xxx > xxx^3, xxx^4$; $6xxx > xxx^4$; $8xxx > xxx^{1}*, xxx^{2}*, xxx^{3}*, xxx^{4}*$. See Chang Yü-hung 張裕宏, "The Hinghwa Dialects of Fukien" (Ph.D. Diss., Cornell, 1972), p. 8; pp. 16-21; p. 165, *s.v.* "kõng^3 : puòk^{7b} :" [at end of second line] & "kõng^3 : muòk^{7b} :" [near end of fourth line]; p. 173, *s.v.* "muìN^{8b} nŏ^6" [sic for muìN^{8a} nŏ^6] & "muòk^{7b}"; p. 176, *s.v.* "puòk^{7b}"; etc. and C. Douglas, *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy, with the Principal Variations of the Chang-chew and Chin-chew Dialects* (London: Trübner, 1873), pp. 15-16, *s.v.* "beh"; p. 25, *s.v.* "boeh", "boh", & "bŏh"; p. 330, *s.v.* "míh^n"; & p. 331, *s.v.* "mñgh".

[9] Demiéville, p. 264.

6

have drawn colloquial expressions particularly from Southern Min. Some might say that the fact the compilers lived and did their work in the Southern-Min-speaking city of Zayton (present-day 泉州市) suffices to explain this, however, in my opinion, it to an extent does not.

There is a passage in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* which indicates that the year was 952 A.D. at the time the compilers last revised it (or else, possibly, when printers copied the passage onto wooden blocks):

> 自如來入涅般壬申之歲至今唐保大十年壬子歲得一千九百一十二年教流漢土迄今壬子歲凡經八百八十六年矣 [Counting] from the *jen-shen* year in which the Buddha entered Nirvana up to the present *jen-tzu* year which is the tenth of the Pao-ta [regnal era] of the [Southern] T'ang [952 A.D.], one gets 1,912 years. And, if [one counts from when] the doctrine spread into China up until this *jen-tzu* year, roughly 886 years have elapsed.[10]

In the opinion of Yanagida Seizan, who has studied the *Tsu-t'ang chi* more than any other scholar, its compilation would have begun as many as 25 years before this date.[11]

----

[10] For the passage in the original characters, see Yanagida (1984), pp. 13-14 and, for the Japanese translation, Yanagida (1990), p. 36.

[11] See Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, "Sodôshû no shiryôkachi" 祖堂集の資料価値 *Zengaku kenkyû* 44 (1953): 43 [not seen], as quoted by Demiéville, p. 268, note no. 1.

Now, during these years, migrants from other parts of China were numerous and powerful in Fukien -- at least up until 945. This was because a family, surnamed Wang 王, had come south with a troupe (numbering in the low thousands) from their native Kuang-chou 光州 (today the County of Hwangchuan 潢川 in southernmost Honan), conquered Fukien during the years 884-892, and then welcomed generously other migrants from outside the province.[12] In 944-945, however, Southern T'ang invaded Fukien and overthrew the Wangs, after which, at Zayton, a warlord from a local family took power and ruled until 962.[13] So, at the time the *Tsu-t'ang chi* was being compiled, there would have been many people at Zayton -- included those in a position to be arbiters of cultural taste -- who spoke dialects other than Southern Min.

Members of a non-local family though the rulers of Fukien from 892 to 944-945 were, from 904 onwards, however, those of them ruling at Zayton were at least born within Fukien. And these Wangs who ruled at Zayton may well have promoted local dialect with an eye to ensuring local

----

[12] Yanagida (1990), p. 319.

[13] For a full account of these historical facts, see H. Clark, *Consolidation on the South China Frontier* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981), pp. 130-141.

support against their cousins at Foochow.

About the two compilers of the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, we know nothing save their monastic names, 靜 and 筠.[14] However, we do know that Zayton's highest-ranking Buddhist cleric around the time they finished the book (who also wrote the preface to it) was a native of the County of Sienyu 仙遊.[15] And, since Sienyu (and Putien) remained politically subject to Zayton up until 979, when they became Hsing-hua Commandery 興化 郡,[16] this Buddhist leader would probably have considered the speech of Zayton a dialect of some status and not discouraged his monks from using it.

Turning now to the question of why Southern Min expressions in the *Tsu-*

----

[14] Yanagida conjectures that one or both of them might have been Korean. See Yanagida (1990), p. 321 and Demiéville, p. 268, note no. 2, which states that Yanagida made public this conjecture in his article of 1964 [not seen].

[15] For the fact that, by this time, he had become the highest-ranking cleric at Zayton, see Yanagida (1990), p. 319, note no. 1. And, for the fact that he was from Sienyu, see his biography in the *Tsu-t'ang chi*, at Yanagida (1984), pp. 254-258.

[16] See H. Clark, *Community, Trade, and Networks: Southern Fujian Province from the Third to Thirteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 7.

t'ang chi would not have been replaced by later editors, the simple answer is that a text such as this gains a certain measure of inviolability from its religious nature. We can tell that people added some material to the text, from a placename in it that did not exist until the Sung,[17] but none of the scholarship I have read mentions any evidence of intentional changes in the original material. Actually, very few people probably ever had access to the text, since three years after 952, the Latter Chou launched the persecution of Buddhism which Chinese Buddhists call the "Fourth Catastrophe of the Law"[18] and since, 52 years after 952, a Buddhist lineage in competition with that which produced the *Tsu-t'ang chi* came out with their equivalent of it, the *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* 景德傳燈錄, after which they undoubtedly sought to suppress the former.[19] In any

----

[17] Liu, p. 70.

[18] Demiéville, p. 268.

[19] On this last point, compare Demiéville, p. 262, especially note no. 2. The *Ching-te ch'uan-teng lu* (which people often refer to simply as the *Ch'uan-teng lu*) was so named because it came out in the first year of the Ching-te regnal era (1004) of the Northern Sung. See Yanagida (1984), intro., p. 2. The name has been rendered into English as *The Records of the Transmission of the Lamp*, by a Buddhist clergyman and Korean scholar of the *Tsu-t'ang chi*. See Sô Kyông-bo, *A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached through the Chodangjip* (Seoul: Poryôngak, 1973), p. 3, note no. 1.

10

case, the text of the *Tsu-t'ang chi* has remained fixed at least since 1245, when the wooden blocks on which it comes down to us were cut in Korea.

As to the correctness of the hypothesis I presented at the beginning of the paper, I hope that I and ideally also native speakers of Southern Min will find the opportunity in future to study the *Tsu-t'ang chi* further, to verify or refute the hypothesis, and to identify other Min expressions in the text.[20]

References

Chang Yü-hung 張裕宏. "The Hinghwa [興化] Dialects of Fukien: A Descriptive Linguistic Study". Ph.D. Diss., Cornell, 1972.

Clark, Hugh Roberts. *Community, Trade, and Networks: Southern Fujian Province from the Third to the Thirteenth Century*. Cambridge Studies in Chinese History, Literature, and Institutions. Cambridge,

----

[20] The editor has brought it to my attention that additional Min expressions in the *Tsu-t'ang chi* have been identified by Mei Tsu-lin 梅祖麟, "*Tsu-t'ang chi* ti fang-yen chi-ch'u han t'a ti hsing-ch'eng kuo-ch'eng" 《祖堂集》的方言基礎和它的形成過程, as pp. 49-63 of Sun Ch'ao-fen 孫朝奮, ed., *Studies on the History of Chinese Syntax* ([Berkeley]: [Journal of Chinese Linguistics], 1997).

New York, Port Chester, Melbourne, Sydney: Cambridge University Press, 1991; 2002.

Clark, Hugh Roberts. *Consolidation on the South China Frontier: the Development of Ch'üan-chou 699-1126*. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1981.

Demiéville, Paul. "Le recueil de la salle des patriarches: *Tsou-t'ang tsi*". *T'oung Pao* 56.4-5 (1970): 262-286.

Douglas, Rev. Carstairs. *Chinese-English Dictionary of the Vernacular or Spoken Language of Amoy, with the Principal Variations of the Chang-chew and Chin-chew Dialects*. London: Trübner, 1873. Rev. ed., London: Presbyterian Church of England, 1899. Rpt. of rev. ed. with supplement by Rev. Thomas Barclay, Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1923. Rpt. of ed. with supplement, Princeton, Taipei: Chinese Linguistics Project; Ku t'ing, 1970.

Han-yü ta tzu-tien pien-chi wei-yüan-hui 漢語大字典編輯委員會. *Han-yü ta tzu-tien* 漢語大字典. Wu-han, Ch'eng-tu: Hu-pei tz'u-shu ch'u-pan-she; Ssu-ch'uan tz'u-shu ch'u-pan-she, 1986-1987.

Liu Chien 劉堅. *Chin-tai Han-yü tu-pen* 近代漢語讀本. Shanghai: Shang-hai chiao-yü ch'u-pan-she; Hsin-hua shu-tien Shang-hai fa-hsing-so, 1985. Rev. ed., 1995.

Mei Tsu-lin 梅祖麟. "*Tsu-t'ang chi* ti fang-yen chi-ch'u han t'a ti hsing-

12

ch'eng kuo-ch'eng" 《祖堂集》的方言基礎和它的形成過程. As pp. 49-63 of Sun Ch'ao-fen 孫朝奮, ed. *Studies on the History of Chinese Syntax: Papers Presented at the Conference on Chinese Historical Syntax, Stanford, 17th-18th March 1995.* Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series, no. 10. [Berkeley]: [Journal of Chinese Linguistics], 1997.

Shen Kuo-mei 申國美, ed. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 祖堂集. 20 *chüan*. Chung-kuo Fo-hsüeh wen-hsien ts'ung-k'an. Peking: Ch'üan-kuo t'u-shu-kuan wen-hsien so-wei fu-chih chung-hsin; Hsin-hua shu-tien Pei-ching fa-hsing-so, 1993.

Sô Kyông-bo [徐京保]. *A Study of Korean Zen Buddhism Approached through the Chodangjip.* Ph.D. Diss., Temple University, 1968. Seoul: Poryôngak, 1973.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, trans. *Sodôshû* 祖堂集. Daijô butten Chûgoku-Nihon-hen, no. 13. Tokyo: Chûô Kôronsha, 1990.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山. "Sodôshû monogatari" 祖堂集ものがたり. *Zen bunka* 51 (1969): 24-32, 52 (1969): 31-40, 53 (1969): 26-36, 54 (1969): 67-?? [these pages missing from some copies], 55 (1970): 49-58, 56 (1970): 9-14, 57 (1970): 75-80, 58 (1970): 10-17, 59 (1971): 8-14, 61 (1971): 8-16, 62 (1971): 16-25, 64 (1972): 66-74, 65 (1972): 70-80, 66 (1972): 58-65, 67 (1972): 72-80, 72 (1974): 30-37, 74

(1974): 27-36, 76 (1975): 60-70, 77 (1975): 72-81, 78 (1975): 44-59, 80 (1976): 78-80, & 82 (1976): 29-41.

Yanagida Seizan 柳田聖山, ed. *Tsu-t'ang chi* 祖堂集. 20 *chüan*. Photographic reprint of the Korean wood-block print in the library of Hanazono University. Ch'an-hsüeh ts'ung-shu, no. 4. Kyoto: Chung-wen ch'u-pan-she [Chūbun Shuppansha], 1974; 1984.

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free. For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org