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1. Introduction (aim of the present article)

The Longkan shoujing 龍龕手鏡 (in subsequent periods also called Longkan shoujian 龍龕手鏡) is a Buddhist character dictionary in four juan, compiled by the monk Xingjun 行均 of the Liao 遼 dynasty.
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Although the exact date of its composition is unknown, there is a Preface written in the 15th year of the Tonghe reign (997) by Zhiguang, a monk from the Minzhong monastery in Yantai. Longkan (i.e. yiqiejing) in the title of the work indicates that this is a dictionary compiled with the purpose of reading Buddhist scriptures. At the same time, it is different from the Yupian and other traditional exegetical dictionaries in that it includes a large number of variant characters, classifying these using the terms ‘standard’ (zheng), ‘vulgar’ (su), ‘alternate’ (huo), ‘ancient’ (gu) and ‘modern’ (jin). In this respect, it is similar to the ziyang works that had been popular during the Tang.

The aim of the present paper is to explain and draw attention to the significance of the inclusion and classification of variant characters in the Longkan shoujing – and the terminology used in this connection – with respect to the Tang orthographic standard of the kai script. At the same time, I would also like to re-examine the concept of orthographic standard. The version of the text used here is principally the Koryo edition.

2. Variant characters in the Longkan shoujing

Until modern times, the Longkan shoujing has been in continuous use in Japan, China and Korea. The primary reason for this was that it makes an effort to assemble a large number of variant characters that are seldom seen in texts. Until modern times, this appears to have been the main value of the Longkan shoujing. Accordingly, this is the first thing we need to understand today if we would like to understand the Longkan shoujing.

The present paper adopts this standpoint and examines variant characters in the Longkan shoujing.

To begin with, the example below shows the way in which the Longkan shoujing collects and categorizes variant characters.

This examples is from the very beginning of the dictionary, the section “Jin bu di yi” 金部第一 under the category of Level Tone 平聲. Head entries with different meanings are displayed in a new line. Punctuation is added by the author of the present paper. The sign ⊗ marks sets of characters where variants are differentiated. Arabic numerals indicate the sequence of head entries within the dictionary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic Numeral</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>較 （玉篇七反色二反，鐵—馬口中鐵也，又思惑反]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>鐵 （魯反，一鐵也]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ⓡ銅 [二或作] 起 [正，音因，－擢戹也，又斤，斧柄孔也，又音恐，三]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ⓡ銅 [俗] 鐵 [或作] 鐵 [正，側持反，－銅也，三]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ⓡ鐵 [俗] 鐵 [正，七羊反，精也，二]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>鐵 [居依反，鈎名]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ⓡ銅 [俗] 鋼 [或作] 鋼 [正] 鋼 [今，芳容反，兵刃端也，四]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>鋼 [音容，鑄也]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>鋼銅 [音容，大鐘也，二]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>鋼 [昔胡反，－陳也，布也，又去聲]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is clear from the above example, from its very beginning the Longkan shoujing lists character sets with the intention of distinguishing variants (marked here with the sign ⮔). The Longkan shoujing is unique in that it lists most variants as head entries. This demonstrates the way in which the Longkan shoujing assembles and differentiates variant characters.

Each head entry in the Longkan shoujing is followed by a phonetic and a semantic gloss. In addition, intermixed are also head entries where no attempt is made to distinguish variants. From this perspective, although the Longkan shoujing is a dictionary in terms of its format, it is essentially a ziyang work. Ziyang is a general term for lexicographic works which were highly popular during the Tang and the aim of which was to distinguish between similar-looking character forms (zixing 字形) of characters written in the kai script (see below).

3. Questions concerning orthographic glosses in the Longkan shoujing

When looking at the situation of orthographic glosses, the following questions may arise:

1. What do the concise terms (e.g. ‘standard’, ‘popular’, ‘vulgar’, ‘modern’, ‘alternate’) used in orthographic glosses refer to?
2. What is the relationship between these terms?
3. Where do these terms come from?

These are simple questions of a researcher who is interested in Chinese lexicography and character variants.

Once we know the answers to the above questions, we will probably begin to gradually understand the main part of the Longkan shoujing. The following pages focus on these points. Nonetheless, since questions 1, 2 and 3 are interrelated, they will be discussed together.

4. Orthographic glosses in the Ganlu ziyang

What do the different kinds of orthographic glosses used in the Longkan shoujing refer to? In this respect the most important orthographic glosses are the terms ‘vulgar’ and ‘standard’. The reason for this is that today we have a very good understanding of what the terms ‘vulgar’ and ‘standard’ denote.

There are several Tang texts with orthographic glosses using the terms ‘standard’ and ‘vulgar’. Among these the most well-known is the Ganlu ziyang 千禄字様 (also called Ganlu zishu 千禄字書).

As it is well known, the Ganlu ziyang uses simple terms such as ‘standard’, ‘common’ and ‘vulgar’ to indicate the appropriateness of particular orthographies:

聰聰聰 [上中通, 下正, 諸從念者皆同, 他皆放此]
劒劒劒 [上俗, 下正]
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The head entries of the Ganlu ziyang also include examples where the aim is to differentiate distinct characters that look similar:

Having said that, the majority of the entries intends to distinguish the ‘standard’, ‘common’ and ‘vulgar’ variants of the same character.

If we gather together the types of glosses used in the Ganlu ziyang, we end up with the following list:

1. 上正  44 examples
2. 上中通，下正  7 examples
3. 上通，下正  303 examples
4. 上俗，中通，下正  32 examples
5. 上俗，中下正  5 examples
6. 上俗，下正  306 examples

As the above list shows, we can classify the orthographic glosses used in the Ganlu ziyang into six types.

The preface of the dictionary records the definitions of its author Yan Yuansun 颜元孙. As these are quite well-known, I shall only summarize them below:

- ‘Vulgar glyphs’ (suti 俗體) are easily understood characters that can be used for writing household records, draft compositions, bills, drug prescriptions, etc., where refined language was not needed.
- ‘Common glyphs’ (tongti 通體) are characters that had been in circulation for a long time and can be used for writing proposals, reports, letters, verdicts, etc., and for the use of which one will certainly not be blamed.
- ‘Standard glyphs’ (zhengti 正體) are characters based on a former authority that can be used for writing literary compositions, essays, answers at official examinations, stele inscriptions.

Accordingly, Yan Yuansun designated an appropriate use for each of the three terms:

Vulgar: household records, draft compositions, bills, drug prescriptions
Common: proposals, reports, letters, verdicts
Standard: literary compositions, essays, official examinations, stele inscriptions

What is important to note here is that when Yan Yuansun recorded the suitable application for each type of orthography, he did not use the terms ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ in reference to separate head entries but in each case combined these as a set with ‘standard’. In other words, ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ are used only in conjunction with ‘standard’, closely tied together. Since Yan Yuansun pointed out the appropriate use for each category, it would seem logical to display the categories ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ that correspond to those uses as individual head entries. Yet this is not the case.

Why is it so? Why are there no individual head entries identified as ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’? We can answer this question if we look at orthographic glosses in Tang works that came before the Ganlu ziyang.

Up to this point, there had been two types of sources with orthographic glosses: the Ganlu ziyang with
its minimalism and brevity intended for practical use, and the *Wujing ziyang* (alternatively known as *Wujing wenzi*), also re-carved as part of the Kaicheng Stone Classics, which upheld a self-acknowledged mission of representing the orthodox approach in Tang orthography. This latter is also known in its augmented version called *Jiujing ziyang*. (In the present paper, whenever *Wujing ziyang* is mentioned, it shall be understood as including the *Jiujing ziyang*.) Moreover, because they contain mutually incompatible approaches and each of them is peculiar in its format, these two types of orthographic sources could not have been understood in an integrated way.

Meanwhile, at the beginning of the twentieth century a manuscript scroll was discovered at Dunhuang. The first half of this manuscript, catalogued using the pressmark S.388, contains an unnamed *ziyang* work, whereas its second half has a new type of *ziyang* called *Zhengming yaolu* (this *ziyang* was subsequently identified as the long lost *Qunshu xinding ziyang*). These *ziyang* works predate the *Ganlu ziyang* and *Wujing ziyang*, and each of them has a unique definition of orthography. In particular, the Postscript to the *Qunshu xinding ziyang* includes a detailed definition, which is different from that in the *Ganlu ziyang* and turned out to be the “missing link” between the two types of *ziyang* represented by the *Ganlu ziyang* and the *Wujing ziyang*.

Although this clarified a number of interesting facts and concepts, in this place I will only introduce the most important one, which is essential to understanding the nature of the *Longkan shoujing*. Namely, that the notion of ‘orthographic standard’ that existed during the Tang surpassed the idiosyncrasies of individual *ziyang* works and functioned as a single underlying system of orthographic criteria.

5. The notion of orthographic standard existed during the Tang

Before describing its existence during the Tang, it is necessary to explain the term ‘orthographic standard’. A ‘standard’ is ‘a norm, model or convention that delineates things’, while ‘orthographic standard’ is the same with reference to orthography.

In other words, ‘orthographic standard’ as used here refers to the standard of orthography associated with the ‘this-is-how-it-should-be’ social force (an imperial decree is a force similar to this), which differs in its implication from both standard orthography desirable from the point of view of an equivocal sense of appropriateness and the de facto orthographic standard approved by society.

The existence of such standard during the Tang can be verified on the basis of the following two
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points:

1. The various orthographic principles recorded in the ziyang from this period all converge in a single system of orthographic criteria.

2. The norm behind this system was the Shuowen jiezi, which functioned as a unified benchmark of orthographic criteria.

The orthographic principles in the Ganlu ziyang have been mentioned above. In addition, there is also relevant information in the Qunshu xinding ziyang and the Zhengming yaolu in manuscript S.388, as well as the Wujing ziyang. These are described below:

Qunshu xinding ziyang

- Among the crude character forms, the ones unattested semantically are excluded.
- The main authorities for which character forms are considered ‘standard’ are the Shuowen jiezi, the Stone Classics and the Zilin.
- Character forms that are adopted from other dictionaries such as the Zigu jinwen and Zilin yinbiao are considered ‘commonly used’ (tongyong).
- Character forms which are not attested in dictionaries but have been in ordinary use for a long time are considered ‘shared through transmission’ (xiangcheng gongyong).

Zhengming yaolu

- ‘standard yet slightly unexpected’ 雖是正體稍驚俗 – ‘used for reference’ 消息用
- ‘standard’ 正體 – ‘corrupt and vulgar’ 詐俗
- ‘kai’ 样 – ‘slightly corrupt’ 稀詐
- ‘based on small script’ 依脚注

Wujing ziyang

- Head entries in the Shuowen jiezi are considered the primary authority for character forms; for other characters the authorities are the Zilin, the Stone Classics and ‘character forms transmitted with the Classics’, respectively.
These three sets of definitions, together with the one in the *Ganlu ziyang* mentioned above, represent the total amount of orthographic definitions that had survived from the Tang.

At first glance, the definitions and terminology seem to be different in each *ziyang*, and all of them are written in a unique way. Nevertheless, a careful examination reveals that they can be integrated into a table such as the one presented below:

Table of the correlation of terms used for orthographic standard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>attested or not</th>
<th><em>Shuowen</em>-type authorities (except the <em>Zhengming yaolu</em>)</th>
<th><em>Zhengming yaolu</em></th>
<th><em>Qunshu xinding ziyang</em></th>
<th><em>Ganlu ziyang</em></th>
<th><em>Wujing ziyang</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>attested</td>
<td><em>Shuowen</em>, Stone Classics, Zilin</td>
<td>standard glyphs</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>standard</td>
<td>(used)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>other dictionaries</td>
<td>(yet slightly unexpected)</td>
<td>commonly used</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(kai)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unattested</td>
<td>Character forms of habitual use</td>
<td>non-standard</td>
<td>shared through transmission</td>
<td>common</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(used for reference)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(corrupt and vulgar)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(slightly corrupt)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(not used)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>※ vulgar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>(not used)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The important thing in this table is that the terminology of orthographic criteria, which at first sight seems largely disconnected, can be integrated into a single framework. This would not have been possible if each text from this period had developed its own criteria for evaluating orthography. That is to say, there must have been a common notion of orthography behind these definitions.

Another important fact is that a common benchmark existed behind the seemingly disconnected terms of orthographic criteria. This benchmark was the *Shuowen jiezi*.

Every one of these *ziyang* uses the *Shuowen jiezi* as an authority for character forms. Each *ziyang* uses this benchmark to evaluate how much a particular character form deviates. As a result, the terminology reflects a range of possibilities, including ‘standard’, ‘standard yet slightly unexpected and vulgar’, ‘kai’, ‘slightly corrupt’, ‘common’, ‘commonly used’, ‘shared through transmission’, ‘used for reference’, ‘slightly vulgar’, and ‘vulgar’.

Based on this we can establish that in the Tang a common notion of orthographic criteria was in existence, and this notion neither determined the standard orthography desirable from the point of view of an equivocal sense of appropriateness, nor displayed the de facto orthographic standard approved by the community. Instead, it relied took a concrete work (i.e. the *Shuowen jiezi*) as a common benchmark and determined the practical norm.

Incidentally, when one discovers a notion like this, it becomes important to name it. This is where the term ‘orthographic standard’ comes into the picture.
6. The orthographic glosses of the *Ganlu ziyang* revisited

As shown above, the patterns of orthographic criteria in the *Ganlu ziyang* can be listed in 6 categories. There are no head entries with singular glosses beside the patterns of ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ vs. ‘standard’.

If we consider that the Tang orthographic standard existed as a system described above, we can easily explain why no head entry is listed in the *Ganlu ziyang* in itself as only ‘common’ or ‘vulgar’.

In the Tang orthographic standard, character images based on the *Shuowen jiezi* were designated as ‘standard’, whereas all other ones were considered ‘non-standard’. Different *ziyang* use a variety of terms in connection with orthographic standard and each of them is unique in how much deviation it allows with regard to character forms. However, Zhang Shen 張參, the compiler of the *Wujing ziyang*, criticizes the *Ganlu ziyang* in his Preface, and his criticism shows that the foundation of orthographic criteria lay in the two-fold distinction between ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’.

The criteria for the distinction between ‘vulgar’, ‘common’ and ‘standard’ in the *Ganlu ziyang* conforms to those in other *ziyang* (c.f. table above). In this light, Yan Yuansun concurs that the foundation of orthographic criteria are the two-fold categories of ‘standard’ and everything else (the opposition of ‘standard’ and ‘non-standard’). Furthermore, he also tolerated the non-standard categories of ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’, as an extension of ‘standard’ characters. In other words, ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ existed as dependents of the ‘standard’ category. He only allowed the existence of ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’ in juxtaposition with ‘standard’. This is the reason why no head entry in the *Ganlu ziyang* is listed by itself as only ‘vulgar’ or ‘common’.

7. Orthographic glosses in the *Longkan shoujing*

The orthographic glosses in the *Longkan shoujing* have a number of characteristics. One of the most important ones is that it does not specify the ‘standard – common – vulgar’ opposition (i.e. it flattens the hierarchy of their relationship).

This can be demonstrated with two observations. The first is that there are cases where ‘vulgar’, the use of which would not not have been permissible during the Tang, appears as a separate gloss. Below are some examples. (The head entry in question is marked with the sign ©. In order to show that ‘vulgar’ appears as a separate head entry, the entries before and after are also included.)

金色第一


B  ◎銅銅 [二俗, 上音軍, 下音持, 梵語, 此云雙口澡灌也]  銅 [胡男反, 銅別名也]  銅 [胡

The *Longkan shoujing* usually lists a set of variants by adding a number at the end of the gloss (i.e. “· · · · ·二”, “· · · · ·三”). For example:

銅 [俗] 釈 [正, 七羊反, 精也, 二]

銅銅 [音容, 大鐘也, 二]

This number obviously indicates the count of head entries, showing where a particular set of variants
begins and ends.

The head entries marked with ◦ in examples A and B above have no number, which means that they appear by themselves as ‘vulgar’ only head entries.

Now one thing we should be aware of here is that the orthographic gloss ‘vulgar’ is not limited to the Ganlu zishu. For example, both the Shuowen jiezi and the Kanmiu buqian Qieyun use the formula su zuo ~ (‘the vulgar glyph is written as ~’). Nevertheless, even if the gloss uses the same character (vulgar), their meaning in the Shuowen jiezi and Kanmiu buqian Qieyun is different from that in the Ganlu zishu. In the former case, it merely indicates that the character form in question is a vulgar character (suzi), whereas in the latter case, as defined by Yan Yuansun (俗者，例皆渾近，唯籍帳文案券契藥方非涉雅言，用亦無爽，儒能改革善不加 ‘vulgar [glyphs] are the ones the examples of which are all crude and recent, and which can only be used for household records, draft compositions, bills, drug prescriptions, where refined language was not needed’), it is ‘a glyph called vulgar glyph’, that is, ‘a glyph that is an extension of the standard glyph, yet barely permitted’, where the vulgar glyph is understood from the point of view of the orthographic standard. It is important to realize the fact that a vulgar glyph (suti) is not a vulgar character (suzi), and a vulgar character is not a vulgar glyph.

The gloss ‘vulgar’ in the Longkan shoujing does not simply identify a vulgar character but is a technical term during the Tang used in the context of the orthographic standard, and it is evident that there are many examples when it is used as a set with ‘standard’. For example:

錶 [俗] 錶 [正，七羊反，精也，二]
銡 [俗] 銙 [正，音亡，刃端也，二]

Thus we have seen why there are no head entries solely with ‘common’ or ‘vulgar’ glosses in the Ganlu ziyang. From the point of view of this principle, the existence of a ‘vulgar’ gloss by itself would violate the ‘standard – common – vulgar’ opposition, that is, the breach of the systematic terminology used in connection with the orthographic standard.

The second observation is that terminology that should not have existed in the Tang orthographic standard appear as terms used in connection with the orthographic standard. For example:

D 鍼 [今] 鐛 [正，音針，一線也，割也，又巨炎反，人名也，二]

While in C and D ‘modern’ is bundled together with three other head entries using the “・・・” format, it is treated as if relying on a concept of orthographic standard that contrasts ‘modern’ with ‘vulgar’ and ‘standard’.

To be sure, the concept of ‘modern’ appears in the Zhengming yaolu in contrast with the concept of ‘ancient’:

E「右字形雖別，音義是同，古而典者居上，今而要者居下」

Yet shortly after this, there is the following note:

F「右本音雖同，字義各別例」

These two notes are in opposition, and merely describe, along with differentiating between variants, the distinction between what is the same and what is a different character – which in fact is one of the main
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functions of *ziyang* works. (E distinguishes between variant forms of the same character [*yixing tongzi* 異形同字], whereas F does the same for homophonous words [*tongyin bieci* 同音別字].) That is, ‘modern – ancient’ are not used to express the orthographic standard.

‘Modern’ appears in the *Longkan shoujing* as a standard corresponding to standard glyphs of the Tang orthodox standard.

Beside ‘modern – standard’, in the *Longkan shoujing* contains terms that were not allowed in the Tang orthographic standard, as well as a combination of these. For example (each of these head entries ends with a number ranging from two to five in the “・・・二” format):

| 誤・正・今 | 誤・正 | 俗通・正 | 俗・古・通 | 正・今 | 今・古 | 篆文・今 | 古・篆文 | 今・正 | 作・正 | 相承 |

The term ‘erroneous’ (*wu* 誤) seen here means an ordinary mistaken character, whereas ‘Zhou script’ (*Zhouwen* 篆文) merely signifies the type of script (*shuti* 書体) used in this case. Once again, ‘alternatively written as’ (*huo zuo* 或作) only points out that in addition to this character there was also a variant in existence. As for the term ‘vulgar and common’ (*sutong* 俗通), which merges the incompatible definitions of vulgar and common, it is an impossible combination with regard to the Tang orthographic standard. It is only the term ‘transmitted’ (*xiangcheng* 相承), which should be understood as ‘transmitted in the Classics’ (*jingdian xiangcheng* 經典相承), that exists as part of the terminology used in the Tang orthographic standard.

8. The implications of orthographic glosses in the *Longkan shoujing*

Seen in this light, we can get answers to the three simple questions raised at the beginning of the present paper, i.e.:

1. What do the concise terms (e.g. ‘standard’, ‘popular’, ‘vulgar’, ‘modern’, ‘alternate’) used in orthographic glosses refer to?
2. What is the relationship between these terms?
3. Where do these terms come from?

To start with, we can approach question 1 the following way:

- Glosses such as ‘vulgar – standard’ and ‘common – standard’ that appear as combinations with ‘standard’ can tentatively be understood as Tang dynasty terminology of orthographic standard, quoted or copied over in its original form.
- When appearing by themselves as independent glosses, ‘vulgar’ and ‘common’, as well ‘vulgar and common’ (*sutong* 俗通), are meaningless as glosses.

With regard to question 2, we can make the following observation:

- Apart from the glosses ‘vulgar – standard’ and ‘common – standard’ that appear in combination with ‘standard’, head entries marked with a number are not mutually related.
The reason for this is that, as seen from the table above, the Tang orthographic standard existed as a unified consensus of that period, and the compilers of orthographic works were not allowed to establish their own standards.

With regard to question 3, we can observe the following:

- Regardless of the fact whether through direct quotation or not, at least conceptually we can accept that glosses such as ‘vulgar – standard’ and ‘common – standard’ that appear in combination with ‘standard’ came from the Ganlu ziyang.

The reason for this is that it was Yan Yuansun who invented vulgar glyphs as glyphs that were permitted in their capacity of being the extension of standard glyphs, and ‘vulgar glyph’ (suti 俗体) is a concept that appears only in the Ganlu ziyang (marked in the table with the sign ※). There is no other ziyang apart from the Ganlu ziyang which sanctions the use of ‘vulgar glyphs’. Other ziyang, as a rule, exclude the vulgar on grounds of being non-standard.

9. Characteristics of the orthographic glosses in the Longkan shoujing (Conclusions)

As seen above, in contrast with the Tang kai standard which represented a fully formed system, the terminology of orthographic glosses used in the Longkan shoujing was not systematic. This is evident from the fact that while Tang-type terminology is used, it is not used in a way that can be understood as referring to the Tang orthographic standard. What is the reason for this?

The Tang orthographic standard was a consistent system which persisted as a single normative system, owing to the existence of the public examination system called imperial examinations (keju 科舉).

Since the Tang government implemented the examination system as a criterion for bureaucratic advancement, the texts that formed the subject matter of the exams (i.e. the Five Confucian Classics) had to be regulated. Without this, the examiners and candidates could not have had a common forum. The government appointed Yan Shigu 顏師古 for the task of editing the Classics. Yan Shigu, in the course of editing the texts, collected up to six hundred character variants that appeared in those, and made these public under the name of Gan shi ziyang 頓氏字樣. The extant texts known as the Qunshu xinding ziyang, the Zhengming yaolu, the Ganlu ziyang, the Wujing ziyang and the Jiujing ziyang are all later versions of Yan Shigu’s work. In other words, the orthographic standard recorded in these ziyang was conceptually sought to be regularized for the purpose of imperial examinations, even if terminology varied. This is the reason why the different terminology used for orthographic standard converge in a single system, largely through relying on the Shuowen jiezi as a common authority. Moreover, this is also the reason why the standard has such a compelling force.

In contrast with this, the Longkan shoujing which was compiled in the Khitan (Mongolic) Liao state shared no continuity with Tang-style bureaucracy. The Liao model was the Buddhist ideal of a peaceful state, which required the reading and understanding of large numbers of Buddhist scriptures (Tripitaka, i.e. Longkan 龍鑣). Unlike the Confucian classics, the Buddhist canon was not the subject of examinations. For this reason the Longkan shoujing shows no sign of wanting to continue the Tang notion of orthographic standard (there was no need for this), but simply assembled a large number of character
The Longkan shoujing in view of the Tang orthographic standard of the kai script (西原一幸)

variants and tried to identify these. This is probably how the Longkan shoujing was compiled.
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(附記) 本稿は、以下の会場で行った講演に依る。
○ International symposium on the History of normative glyphs and their variants 東京外国語大学アジア・アフリカ言語文化研究所 漢字字体規範史研究国際シンポジウム「字体規範と異体の歴史」2011.12.16-18
○ International Conference on the Reasech of yonggam sugyong 龍龎手鏡 at the Reseach Institute of Korean Studies, Koria University 2012.5.25 高麗大校民族文化研究院 国際学术会議「東アジア文字語言 交流와 高麗本 <龍龎手鏡>」