

The Chinese Language in Turfan with a special focus on the *Qieyun* fragments

TAKATA Tokio

Institute for Research in Humanities, Kyoto University

Introduction

Last year, Prof. Nishiwaki's Catalogue of non-Buddhist Chinese text fragments from Turfan finally saw the light of day¹. With regard to the Buddhist texts, two volumes of Catalogue have already been published, and the third one is reportedly now in preparation². Still, in the world of Sinology there remains a great demand for a catalogue of non-Buddhist Chinese texts in the German Turfan collection. Nishiwaki's new Catalogue is, then, a timely response to this demand. To be sure, it may include some minor errors and gaps, but it is beyond a doubt that many scholars will benefit from this Catalogue, using it as a standard reference work for a long time to come. In the course of the compilation of his Catalogue, Prof. Nishiwaki consulted me about the identification of linguistic texts, including the *Qieyun* 切韻 and other dictionaries. I am happy to have made some contribution to the Catalogue. This paper, too, derives from this work and could be considered a supplementary note for the section concerning the *Qieyun* and other dictionaries.

Historical Background

Chinese people penetrated into the region of Turfan from a very early period. In the Han period, they began to establish a military base after ousting their long-time rivals,

¹ *Chinesische und manjurische Handschriften und seltene Drucke*, Teil 3: Chinesische Texte vermischten Inhalts aus der Berliner Turfansammlung (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Band XII, 3), beschrieben von Tsuneki NISHIWAKI, übersetzt von Christian WITTERN, herausgegeben von Simone-Christiane RASCHMANN, 2001, Franz Steiner Verlag Stuttgart.

² Gerhard SCHMITT - Tomas THILO, *Katalog chinesischer buddhistischer Textfragmente*, Bd.1 (Berliner Turfantexte VI), Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975; Thomas THILO [Hrsg.], *Katalog chinesischer buddhistischer Textfragmente*, Bd.2 (Berliner Turfantexte XIV), Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1985; the third volume will soon be put in the printer's hand as a volume in the series VOHD. Cf. RASCHMANN's *Vorwort* to NISHIWAKI's Catalogue.

the Xiongnu 匈奴. Han colonial troops were permanently stationed there. Later on, Chinese kingdoms based in Liangzhou 涼州 found their way into the Turfan basin and instituted their system of administration. After that followed the period of an independent Chinese kingdom, Gaochangguo 高昌國, for almost two hundred years. After overthrowing the Gaochangguo in 640, the Tang dynasty brought a very developed administrative system and a sophisticated literary culture into Turfan, just as it did for other neighboring areas and countries. The influence of the Chinese language was so enduring and so strong that even non-Chinese inhabitants of the Turfan region acquired some knowledge of Chinese. Particularly in Tang times, because of a tendency toward cultural uniformity, the Chinese language increasingly took on an official character. A series of official documents dated the 2nd year of Kaiyuan 開元 (724), impressed with the seal of the Xizhou dudufu 西州都督府 (government office of Xizhou) and later discovered in Turfan, tells us that a certain number of foreign bandits were able to speak Chinese³ and that special caution was called for against them. Unfortunately, there is no more precise, direct material to tell us which kind of language those non-Chinese used.

Residents of the northwestern region, including the oasis cities along the Hexi corridor as far as Turfan, spoke dialects of the Northwestern type⁴. Therefore we could imagine, without contradiction, that some kind of northwestern dialect was spoken in daily life in and around Turfan, and that this was also the form of Chinese that the foreign bandits used. On the other hand, the official language of the Tang times was based on the dialect of Chang'an 長安, the capital of the dynasty. A number of scholars from such neighboring countries as Japan, Korea and Vietnam, went to Chang'an to study advanced aspects of Chinese culture, including Buddhism. They brought back the official Chinese pronunciation of the time to their own countries; consequently, the pronunciation of Chinese in each country is related closely to the Chang'an dialect. Japanese Kan-on pronunciation is no exception in this regard. The problem is that the dialect of Chang'an itself belonged to the great Northwestern dialect, although the official language was influenced by the strong tradition of the central dialect, of which the homeland had long been contemporary Henan 河南 province. We may contend, then, that the official Chang'an language of the Tang times was a somewhat refined

³ The term *hanyu* 漢語 is used here. Cf. HIBINO Takeo 日比野丈夫, "Tōdai Hoshōfu bunsho no kenkyū" 唐代蒲昌府文書の研究. *Tōhō Gakuhō* 東方學報 33 (1963), 301-2; CHEN Guocan 陳國燦 & LIU Yongzeng 劉永增, *Riben Ningle meishuguan cang Tulufan wenshu* 日本寧樂美術館藏吐魯番文書, Beijing: Wenwu chubanshe, 1997, 81-83.

⁴ I have previously proposed the name of Hexi 河西 as a generic term for this type of dialect. TAKATA Tokio, *Tonkō siryō ni yoru Chūgokugoshi no kenkyū*, 9-10 seiki no Kasei hōgen 敦煌資料により中國語史の研究 — 九、十世紀の河西方言, 1988, Tokyo; Sōbunsha.

version of this North-western dialect, while it still retained characteristics of the local Northwestern dialect. Thus, while the Hexi dialect and the Japanese Kan-on, which is derived from the Chang'an dialect, may resemble each other in certain regards, there are also many points of difference between them. We may adduce, for instance, the disappearance of the final -ng, which occurs throughout in all cases in Kan-on, while it does not occur in the *zeng* rime-group (*zengshe* 曾攝) in Hexi. It is true that the Hexi dialect extended as far as the Turfan basin. This distribution is very easy to understand, if we take into consideration that the Chinese families governing the area of Turfan had come from the Gansu 甘肅 region. We should also bear in mind, as I have just mentioned, that there were many powerful regional dynasties in the Gansu region for the several centuries preceding the unification of China under the Sui and Tang dynasties.

The above is the outline of the use of the Chinese language in the Turfan region to the beginning of the Tang period.

The place of the *Qieyun* in the Chinese literary tradition

The *Qieyun* was compiled by Lu Fayan 陸法言 in 601. It is considered to reflect the phonological system of literary Chinese of the sixth century, and the analysis of its *fanqie* 反切 system has led to the precise reconstruction of the Ancient Chinese phonological system. It also provides us with the invaluable starting point not only for the study of Archaic Chinese, for which we still lack sufficient materials for a complete reconstruction, but also for the study of the later phonological development of Chinese. However, historically speaking, what is much more important is that the *Qieyun* was adopted as the national standard for rhyming in poetical works. Although the rigid rhyme system of the *Qieyun* was abandoned as early as the early Tang, the *Qieyun* itself survived with an additional rule of moderation for many years. A number of different versions appeared, and these were repeatedly expanded by various authors. A medieval Japanese manuscript records revisions by thirteen different authors⁵. In order to meet the great demand for this text, a number of professional copyists were engaged to make manuscript copies of the *Qieyun* for commercial distribution. Famous manuscript copies, reportedly written by Wu Cailuan 吳彩鸞, are one of these commercial productions⁶. It

⁵ Thirteen authors of the *Qieyun* consulted by Sugahara Koreyoshi 菅原是善 (812-880) for the compilation of his *Tōkyū Setsuin* 東宮切韻 are enumerated in a Muromachi manuscript entitled *Sansōki* 三僧記. KAWASE Kazuma 川瀬一馬, *Kojisho no Kenkyū* 古辭書の研究, Tokyo: Kōdansha, 1955, 56.

⁶ Wu Cailuan's *Qieyun* is mentioned frequently in literature. We may cite as an extant example the famous manuscript copy kept in the Palace Museum of Beijing.

is only natural that the *Qieyun* was also one of the main objects to which the new method of block printing began to be applied in Tang times. Block prints of the *Qieyun* adapted themselves to the public's needs, incorporating various elements from calendars, divination manuals etc. Still, the *Qieyun* retained its position as an authority. The *Guangyun* 廣韻, an enlarged version of the *Qieyun*, achieved the position of official rhyme book at the beginning of the 11th century, and exercised a profound influence over the later literary framework of China.

Copies of the *Qieyun* discovered in Turfan

1. Manuscript editions of the *Qieyun*

If we consider the position occupied by the *Qieyun* and the literary activities that took place in Turfan, it is no wonder that we find some fragments of the *Qieyun* among the Turfan finds. We can divide the *Qieyun* fragments into two categories, from the viewpoint of their external form, viz. manuscript editions of the *Qieyun* and block print editions of the *Qieyun*. These two types are fairly different, both in their contents and in their date of compilation.

Cat. no.	Shelf-mark	Contents	SYHB	ZLB	HSZH
	Ryukoku 3327 R/V	<i>Shang ping</i> 1 dong 東 & 5 zhi 支			
	Ryukoku 8107 R/V	<i>Shang ping</i> 5 zhi 支 & 6 zhi 脂	○		○
27	Ch 2094 R/V (T IV K 75)	(R) <i>shang</i> 6 zhi 止 ~ 8 yu 語; (V) <i>shang</i> 10 mu 姥 ~ 14 hui 賄	○		○
	T IV K 75	four fragments, (1) <i>shang</i> 5 旨 & 6 止; (2) <i>shang ping</i> 9 魚 & 10 虞; (3) <i>shang ping</i> 11 模 & 12 齊; (4) <i>shang ping</i> 20 wen 文		○	○
	T IV 70+71	table of the <i>qusheng</i> tone rhymes		○	○
21	Ch 1577 R (T III 1192)	<i>shang</i> 10 mu 姥 ~ 11 ji 齊			
22	Ch 2917 R (T III T 408)	<i>shang</i> 12 xie 蟹			
23	Ch 343 R (T II T 1950)	<i>shang</i> 13 hai 駭			
24	Ch 323 R	<i>shang</i> 14 hui 賄			
25	Ch 1246 R (T III T 381)	<i>shang</i> 14 hui 賄			
28	Ch 79 R/V (T I D 1038)	(R) <i>qu</i> 12 ji 霽 & 14 tai 泰; (V) <i>shang</i> 36 yang 養, 48 gan 感 & 49 gan 敢			
26	Ch 1991 R/V (T IV K 95-100a)	(R) <i>qu</i> 21 zhen 震; (V) 23 wen 問~24 yuan 願	○		○
36	Ch 3605 R	<i>ru</i> 27 he 合			

Table 1: Ms. *Qieyun* from Turfan

We shall begin with the manuscript editions of the *Qieyun* (see Table 1)⁷. A fragment discovered in Toyok and brought back by the Otani expedition was included in *Saiiki Kōko Zufu*⁸ 西域考古圖譜 in 1915, and two studies based on it appeared in succession; one is by the Japanese scholar OKAI Shingo⁹ 岡井慎吾 and the other by WANG Guowei¹⁰ 王國維. Nevertheless, the study of the edition of the *Qieyun* in the Berlin collection began only much later. It was TAKEUCHI Yoshio 武内義雄 who first paid attention to the Berlin fragments of the *Qieyun*. He published an article in 1935, reporting the existence of the *Qieyun* with a short research note (Ch 2094 and Ch 1991)¹¹. He also reported on the fragments of the block print edition of the *Qieyun*. Photographs taken by TAKEUCHI were later sent to the editors of the *Shiyun huibian* 十韻彙編 (*SYHB*) through OGAWA Tamaki 小川環樹, who was resident in Beijing at that time, and used for its compilation¹². WEI Jiangong 魏建功 published a supplement to the *Shiyun huibian* in 1948 and gathered as many extant fragments as he could at that time (*ZLB*). In this project, XIANG Da 向達 offered WEI Jiangong the use of his handwritten copies, of which the original manuscripts are now lost (T IV K 75 and T IV 70+71).

These manuscript editions of the *Qieyun* are for the most part akin to Lu Fayan's original edition. We may postulate that they were brought to Turfan in the Tang period, sometime before the first half of the 8th century. Let us examine some examples (Plate 1). These three fragments are from one and the same manuscript. In spite of the difference of the size of each photograph, we can detect holes at even intervals in the

⁷ In the first column of the table are given the numbers of Nishiwaki's Catalogue; for the abbreviation of the works cited in the three right columns, see the list at the end of this article. A circle in the grid indicates that the manuscript was included in the work in question.

⁸ Today's Ryukoku 8107. Plate 8-2 and 8-3 of the part of Classics 經籍, *SKZ*, pars altera. Another small fragment of the *Qieyun* brought back by the Otani expedition, which has been so far unknown to the academic world, is now included in the *COD II*.

⁹ OKAI Shingo, "Saiiki Kōko Zuhu naru Tōshō Tōin ni tsukite" 西域考古圖譜なる唐鈔唐韻につきて, *Geibun* 藝文 7-7 (1916).

¹⁰ WANG Guowei, "Lu Fayan Qieyun zhi duanpian" 陸法言切韻之斷片, *Xueshu congbian* 學術叢編 fasc. 22 (1917); this article was later included in his collected essays *Guantang bieji* 觀堂別集, Ch.1., with minor change of title to "Lu Fayan Qieyun duanpian ba" 陸法言切韻斷片跋.

¹¹ TAKEUCHI Yoshio, "Tōshōhon insho to inpon Setsuin to no danpen" 唐鈔本韻書と印本切韻との斷片, *Bunka* 文化 2-7 (1935).

¹² WEI Jiangong 魏建功, one of the compilers of *SYHB*, says that, in 1932, he borrowed two photographs of a manuscript fragment of the *Qieyun* from ZHAO Wanli 趙萬里 and copied them by hand. Because they were both sides of a fragment beginning from the *zhi* 止 rime of *shangsheng* tone, the fragment in question must be today's Ch 1991. A little later he succeeded in acquiring one other fragment Ch 2094. See the preface of *SYHB*, 57-58; *ZLB* pp.50-51.

manuscript. The existence of these holes constitutes proof positive that this text was originally bound in a roll, which was a traditional book form in Medieval China. However, here there was an additional innovation. Some other manuscript fragments are filled with characters on both side of the paper, or in some cases, two thin papers are pasted into one sheet¹³ (for example, see Plate 2). In this case, the book is considered to have been made up in the so-called dragon scale binding (龍鱗裝 *longlin zhuang*)¹⁴, which is a transitional style from roll to booklet.

So far, scholars have not paid due attention to the external form or style of binding in the study of *Qieyun* fragments, so that very little is known about the specifics of dragon scale binding. Dragon scale binding was undertaken as follows. One prepares two sheets of paper of standard size and pastes them into one long sheet. Then one begins to write on one side, from the right extremity to the left. When one side is finished, one may continue to write on the reverse side, always starting at the right column. After both sides of the sheet are filled, one can start writing on another sheet. When the entire text has been completed, one piles up a dozen sheets or so, pasting them one by one on the right edge and rolling them up in the traditional style. Consequently, a book bound in the dragon scale style has the precise appearance of a standard roll. However, when the reader opens the roll, he or she can use it as a booklet. A complete set of the *Qieyun* in this dragon scale binding remains extant at the Palace Museum of Beijing¹⁵.

2. Block print editions of the *Qieyun*

Turning our attention to the fragments of the block print editions of the *Qieyun*, we find that they all derive from one and the same book, with one lone exception (T I D 1015). These were divided into pieces and used for the repair of other manuscripts. Some of these were first reported by TAKEUCHI in his above mentioned article and included later in the *SYHB* under the heading of *De san* 德三, “German no.3”. But other fragments also belonging to this same book came to be known only in comparatively recent years. (See Table 2.) This block print edition is worth our attention, because it is in a sense more developed even than the *Guangyun*. Its chief characteristics are as follows:

(1) The number of words contained in each *xiaoyun*¹⁶ 小韻 is often greater than in the *Guangyun*.

¹³ Ryukoku 3327 R/V, Ryukoku 8107 R/V, Ch 2094 R/V, Ch 79 R/V, Ch 1991 R/V.

¹⁴ Also called *xuanfeng zhuang* 旋風裝 “fluttering in the wind” binding.

¹⁵ Cf. LI Zhizhong 李致忠, “Gushu xuanfeng zhuang kaobian” 古書“旋風裝”考辨, *Wenwu* 文物, 1981-2, pp.75-78.

¹⁶ *Xiaoyun*, literally “small rhyme”, is in practical terms a distinctive syllabic unit. In other words, all the syllables belonging to a *xiaoyun* are homophones.

(2) Notes for each word are also often more detailed than in the *Guangyun*.

(3) Words in the notes are occasionally accompanied by glosses.

The former two characteristics are explained in detail in ZHOU Zumo's *TWYJ*. What deserves the bulk of our attention here is the final characteristic. We may observe in Plate 3 that a phonetic gloss *jiu-yu* 九玉 is given for the word *jiu* 臼 by way of *fanqie* spelling in smaller size, when one explains the components of the character *guan* 盥. This way of writing a gloss to a word in the notes is very particular and highly unusual. As far as we know, we may encounter the sole similar similar example in the *Shaoxing chongdiao Dazangyin*¹⁷ 紹興重雕大藏音 (1093), by Chu Guan 處觀. If this style of gloss represents an ephemeral fashion of the time, we could imagine that this edition dates approximately to the Song period, whereas other scholars have generally considered it to be a product of the Five Dynasties. In any event, it is interesting that this block print edition of *Qieyun* was brought to Turfan at a time when Chinese hegemony had already been swept away from Turfan and the Uighurs had come to power there.

Cat.no.	Shelf-mark	Contents	SYHB	ZLB	YDYJ	TWYJ	HSZH
	T I D 1015	<i>shangping</i> 25 寒 & 26 huan 桓, 13 lines			○	○	○
	T II D 1a1	<i>qu</i> 26 hun 恩 ~ 28 han 翰, 9 lines		○	○	○	○
	T II D 1a2	<i>qu</i> 28 han 翰, 9 lines and 3 frag. lines; the title <i>Qieyun</i> is seen in the center column of the folio.	○	○	○	○	○
	T II D 1a3	<i>qu</i> 28 han 翰, very small frag. (杆)		○		○	○
33	Ch 1106 V (T II T 1921)	<i>qu</i> 28 han 翰, 8 lines, only upper part of page; 29 huan 換, small fragment					
32	Ch 1072 V (T II D 1f)	<i>qu</i> 28 han 翰, 5 lines from left lower corner of page					
35	Ch 5555 V (TM46)	<i>qu</i> 29 huan 換, 7 lines					
30	Ch 3715 R (T II D 1b)	<i>qu</i> 33 xian 線, 8 lines		○	○	○	○
	T II D 1b'	<i>qu</i> 28 han 翰, very small fragment (賤)		○	○	○	○
34	Ch 1150 V (T II D 236)	<i>qu</i> 34 xiao 嘯, 3 lines [鈞]					
	T II D 1c1	<i>qu</i> 35 xiao 笑, 4 frag. lines (燒)		○		○	○
	T II D 1c2	<i>qu</i> 35 xiao 笑, 4 frag. lines (裊)		○	○	○	○

¹⁷ *Yingyin Song jisha zangjing* 景印宋磧砂藏經, case 48, p.57ff., Shanghai, 1936.

31	Ch 3533 R (T II D 1c3)	<i>qu</i> 35 xiao 笑, 8 lines from right lower corner of page (趨)		○	○	○	○
	T II D 1c4	<i>qu</i> 36 xiao 效, 9 lines from upper part of page (覺)		○		○	○
	T II D 1c5	<i>qu</i> 36 xiao 效, 8 lines from lower part of page (醇)		○		○	○
	T II D 1d	<i>qu</i> 36 xiao 效, 9 lines, only upper and lower part of page, center part is missing (兒)		○	○	○	○
29	Ch 2437 R	<i>qu</i> 37 hao 號, 2 fragments, 4 lines (燠、芼)		○	○	○	○

Table 2: Block print *Qieyun* from Turfan

As mentioned above, one block print fragment (T I D 1015) is of a different edition. In the 1930s, SHIGEMATSU Shunshō of Kyūshū University brought a photograph of this fragment back to Japan, on the basis of which OKAI Shingo wrote an article¹⁸. SHIGEMATSU stayed in Berlin between 1933 and 1934, a period slightly earlier than TAKEUCHI’s time there, but the publication of the fragment was delayed instead. This fragment is now lost, and all that is left is the photograph in *TWYJ*. Although the date of this edition is also unknown, it is beyond a doubt that the both block print editions are much later than the manuscript edition of the *Qieyun*.

Use of the *Qieyun* by the Uighurs

In the middle of the 9th century, the Uighur people penetrated into the Turfan basin and gradually solidified the basis of their rule there. Chronologically speaking, the block print editions of the *Qieyun* could belong to the time of this Uighur kingdom. Does this mean, then, that the *Qieyun* continued to be used by the Uighurs as well? In this regard, Ch 1538 is a very interesting example that demonstrates that the Uighurs used the *Qieyun*, too (Plate 4). This fragment is an excerpt from an enlarged edition of the *Qieyun*, which is considered to be one of the latest versions in the development of this text. Judging from the handwriting, there is no doubt that it was written by Uighurs. In this fragment, some *fanqie* spellings do not correspond with those of the *Guangyun*, and some entry words do not appear in the *Guangyun*. Some *xiaoyun* give the number of entry words, as is the case for the rhyme books of the *Qieyun* tradition. Here the fact that there are eleven entry words for the *xiaoyun* “ge” 哥 stands out prominently²¹,

¹⁸ OKAI shingo, “Shigematsu kyōju shōrai no Setsuin oyobi Gyokuhen no shashin ni tsukite” 重松教授將來の切韻及び玉篇の寫眞につきて, *Shibun* 斯文, 19-9 (1937), pp.33-43.

²¹ See the first column of the verso of Plate 4.

because the *Guangyun* includes only 4 entry words for this particular *xiaoyun*. Therefore, the original of this fragment must have been a considerably enlarged version. Of course, there is no proof that this fragment was copied from the above-mentioned Turfan block print edition of the *Qieyun*. But it is beyond doubt that this kind of *Qieyun* text had been transmitted in Turfan, as we can suppose from the above mentioned block print fragments of the *Qieyun*.

Still, it is not clear whether the Uighur used that *Qieyun* in the traditional way. It would appear that they hardly observed the phonological system provided by the *Qieyun*. Very carefully designed *fanqie* spellings of the *Qieyun* were often neglected, and when they used the *fanqie*, they must have read it employing the Uighur pronunciation. Even though the genuine phonetic value of the *Qieyun* thus deteriorated in the Uighur period, the *Qieyun* continued to be an authority even in the Uighur kingdom: Such was the influence of Chinese literary culture on Uighur society.

Now we have reached the issue of the Uighur pronunciation of Chinese characters. It is a striking fact that the Buddhist Uighur of the Turfan basin developed their own pronunciation, as did the Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese. However, if we take into consideration the fact that Turfan had long been under the influence of the Chinese literary tradition, this is by no means exceptional. I pointed out the existence of this Uighur pronunciation for the first time²² in 1985, and although the three-stratum theory of the Uighur pronunciation that I developed in a later article²³ has been challenged by some scholars²⁴, the very existence of a distinctly Uighur pronunciation now seems to be widely accepted. In the 1985 study, I made use of two fragments of homophonic phonetic glosses produced by the Uighurs and written entirely in Chinese characters: one now kept in Berlin, and one in Istanbul. Later, I was able to locate other small fragments of the same nature among the Berlin Turfan collection. Needless to say, these fragments supplement my earlier findings, proving that the Uighur pronunciation was widely in use. For each entry word, the pronunciation is given by means of a character of the same sound in these materials²⁵ (Plates 5-8).

²² TAKATA, “Uiguru Jion kō” ウイグル字音考, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學, 70, 1985, pp.134-150.

²³ TAKATA, “Uiguru join shi taigai” ウイグル字音史大概, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學報, 62, 1990, pp. 329-343.

²⁴ Yoshida Yutaka, “Sogudo moji de hyouki sareta kanji on” ソグド文字で表記された漢字音, *Tōhōgaku* 東方學報, 65, 1994, pp.271-380. SHŌGAITO Masahiro, “Uiguru moji onsha sareta kango butten danpen ni tsuite, Uiguru kanji on no kenkyū” ウイグル文字音寫された漢語佛典斷片について—ウイグル漢字音の研究—, *Gengogaku Kenkyū* 言語學研究, 14, 1995, pp.65-153.

²⁵ Takata, “Huihu ziyin buzheng” 回鶻字音補證, paper presented to the Conference of Dunhuang and Turfan studies held in Lanzhou 蘭州, 1996 (unpublished). SHŌGAITO

The sound system reflected by these phonetic glosses is basically in accordance with the Uighur transcription of Chinese words²⁶. This Uighur pronunciation must have been based on a Chinese conversational dialect that had long been used in daily life in the region of Turfan. In any event, the development of the Uighur pronunciation of Chinese characters is one of the most remarkable products of the Chinese language and Chinese literary tradition.

Conclusion

In this short article, I have tried to summarize previous studies of the Turfan fragments of the *Qieyun*, and to trace the outline of the use of the Chinese language through the reception of the *Qieyun*. The *Qieyun* was undoubtedly the premier symbol of the Chinese literary tradition. It spread even into the region of Turfan, and the Chinese language symbolized by the *Qieyun* exerted wide linguistic and social influence even into the later Uighur kingdom.

Abbreviations

COD II ODA Yoshihisa 小田義久 (ed.), *The Complete Otani Documents II, The Chinese Documents from Central Asia*, (*Otani bunsho shūsei* 大谷文書集成), Kyoto: Hōzōkan, 1990.

SKZ KAGAWA Mokushiki 香川黙識 (ed.), *Saiiki Kōko Zufu* 西域考古圖譜, Tokyo: Kokkasha, 1915.

SYHB LIU Fu 劉復 et al. (ed.), *Shiyun huibian* 十韻彙編, Beijing: Beijing University, 1937.

SSZH UEDA Tdashi 上田正, *Setsein shohon zankan hosei* 切韻殘卷諸本補正, Tokyo: The Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, 1973.

TWYJ ZHOU Zumo 周祖謨, *Tang Wudai yunshu jicun* 唐五代韻書集存, Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1983.

reports that there are also some fragmentary phonetic glosses of the same nature among the St. Petersburg collection. See SHŌGAITO, “Rosia shozō Uiguru go dampen no kenkyū 3” ロシア所藏ウイグル語断片の研究 3, *Kyoto Daigaku Gengogaku Kenkyū* 京都大學言語學研究, 20, 2001, chapter 3, pp.271-275.

²⁶ SHŌGAITO has recently devoted considerable energy to the study of transcription in Uighur script. See his “Uiguru moji onsha sareta kango batten danpen ni tsuite, Uiguru kanji on no kenkyū (zoku)” ウイグル文字音寫された漢語佛典断片について—ウイグル漢字音の研究—(續), *Seinan Ajia Kenkyū* 西南アジア研究, 46, 1997, pp.1-31.

YDYJ JIANG Liangfu 姜亮夫, *Yingya Dunhuang yunji* 瀛涯敦煌韻輯, Shanghai: Shanghai chuban gongsi, 1955.

YDYJXB PAN Zhonggui 潘重規, *Yingya Dunhuang yunji xinbian* 瀛涯敦煌韻輯新編, Hong Kong: Xinya yanjiusuo, 1972.

ZLB WEI Jiangong 魏建功, *Shiyun huibian ziliao bu bing shi* 十韻彙編資料補並釋, Beijing: Beijing University Press, 1948. (Guoli Beijing daxue wushi zhounian jinian lunwenji, 國立北京大學五十週年紀念論文集, Faculty of Letters Series, 15)