

沉冤大白 (The Great Vindications)

--- 為 “紅樓夢” 與 “漢語文” 平冤



龔天任 著

Tienzen (Jeh-Tween) Gong

沉冤大白 (The Great Vindications)

--- 為 “紅樓夢” 與 “漢語文” 平冤

Copyright © January 2013 by

Tienzen (Jeh-Tween) Gong

Published by Chinese Etymology Institute

Contact address:

P.O. Box 4794

Diamond Bar, CA 91765

Web addresses:

<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/>

<http://www.chineseetymology.com/>

<http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/>

<http://www.prebabel.info/>

目錄 (Table of Content)

自序 (Preface)

(Part one) 沉冤大白 --- 為 “紅樓夢” 平冤

- 第一章：評 “紅樓夢” 的 三大原則 (page #)
- 第二章：普世價值一 (宿命與自由意志)
- 第三章：普世價值二 (性事、愛情 與 儒家神學)
- 第四章：先評 “中國的三大奇書”
- 第五章：“紅樓夢” 的宗旨 --- 三綱
- 第六章：原書 與 續集
- 第七章：“紅樓” 的仙佛世界 與塵世的因果報應
- 第八章：色、情、淫與 意淫 (一)
- 第九章：色、情、淫與 意淫 (二)
- 第十章：色、情、淫與 意淫 (三)
- 第十一章：紅樓中的儒家禮教
- 第十二章：紅樓中的仙佛因果與緯識
- 第十三章：高鶚的續集 與 老紅學

(Part two) 沉冤大白 --- 為“漢語文”平冤

第十四章：百年沉冤 “漢語文”

第十五章：語言學的理想

第十六章：“一二三萬” 的語文

第十七章：丟死人的 “沉冤”

第十八章：最偉大與完美的 “語法”

第十九章：最偉大的語文

(Part Three) 沉冤大白: The new Chinese Etymology

Chapter 20 ---- The background history before this new Chinese etymology

Chapter 21 ---- The claims of this new Chinese etymology

Chapter 22 ---- The only axiomatic human language

Chapter 23 ---- About 形聲(phonetic loan) and 會意(sense determinators)

Chapter 24 ---- Accommodating a verbal universe by the written system

Chapter 25 ---- The evolution of Chinese etymology and the verifications of four premises

Chapter 26 ---- The Conceptual Language and Super Unified Linguistics paradigm

Chapter 27 ---- Wrong to the young students! (誤人子弟)!

Chapter 28 ---- 500 examples of this new Chinese etymology

(Part one) 沉冤大白 --- 為 “紅樓夢” 平冤

自序 (Preface)

一輩子，從未想過要寫，評 “紅樓夢” 的文章。但若 “命裡註定”，又如何能夠逃過？

王紅波 (Hongbo WANG) 在 LinkedIn 寫了一些有關 “紅樓夢” 的帖子。一時興起，隨意的與她討論了幾回。也就把隨意寫來的幾篇評論，以 “評 紅樓夢” 為題，貼在網上 (<http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/small-story/topic-t219.html>)。仍然沒想到，要寫本 “評紅樓” 的書。

紅波 來信云，她將以 評紅樓，作為她的博士論文。她希望能更詳細的了解，我對 紅樓 的看法。我也就不好隨意評論了。硬著頭皮，把 “老紅學” 查閱了一番。結果是大吃一驚。如此的 “顯學”，幾乎是 “全部” 文不對題。“老紅學” 大致可分為下列數派。

- a. 索隱派 —— 認為 “紅樓夢” 的目的，是政治的。它影射一些 康熙 至 乾隆 時期的政治人物。此派的重要人物，為 王夢阮 與 蔡元培。在 胡适 的 (红楼梦考证, <http://www.ccler.com/hlm/40/>) 中，對此學派，已給予了公正的批判。而近人 刘心武 的 (揭秘《红楼梦》, <http://www.ccler.com/hlm/27/>)，仍有 “日月双悬之谜” 的討論。如果，紅樓 果如 此派所云，那它就没有太大的 “普世” 價值了。所以，此派 紅學，是對是錯，都不重要。

- b. 原型派 —— 它與 索隱派 小同大異。大異者， 它的重點， 不在政治。小同者， 它仍在為書中的角色， 追尋其 “原型”。似乎是， 沒有原型， 紅樓 就沒有價值了。以 原型為主的， 是傳記。不是 “創作”。所以， 研究書中角色的 原型， 對 紅樓 的普世價值， 是沒有任何意義的。

- c. 傳記派 —— 它以研究作者（曹雪芹）的身世為主。它的重點是， 沒有這個 身世， 就寫不出這本書。或許， 這本書是 “襲人” 或 “茗烟” 寫的呢！ 總之， 紅樓 的普世價值， 與誰是作者， 沒有太大的關係。

- d. 版本派 —— 它研究不同的版本。這倒是很重要的。 不過， 當通行版已經 選定。版本派 的作用， 也就功德圓滿了。

那麼， 這些 紅學， 對 “紅樓” 的普世價值， 是完全 文不對題的。基本上， 紅樓的偉大， 已經 沉冤數百年。然而， 我本無意為它平冤。

二〇〇五年， 我發現了 “中文字根學” (Chinese Etymology)。那時， 並不知道 蔡元培、魯迅、 胡適等人的， 力促廢除 “漢字” 之議。所以， 當時寫的書， 對 漢字的 百年沉冤， 未寫隻字。到 二〇一一年， 才在網上 (<http://chineselanguageetymology.blogspot.com/2011/04/new-chinese-etymology.html>) 寫了一些， 為 漢字平冤的文章。但未整理成書。

現在才知道， 那些污蔑 漢字的人， 也都是 紅學大家。那麼， 一切都不同了。對那一批人的愚昧與無知， 禍國與殃民， 我若不挺身而出， 不但對不起世人， 更對不起我自己了。 我本無意 評 紅樓。卻是 命中註定。夫復何言。

本書以評紅樓為引子， 再為沉冤百年的 漢字平冤。

第一章：評“紅樓夢”的三大原則

每位作者寫書，都有一個過程。從初稿，二稿，…到定稿。只有“定稿”，才代表作者的真實意。初稿等，基本上就進了擲紙桶。但是，“紅樓夢”似乎沒有寫完。也就是說，作者沒有自己定稿。不過，經過百餘年“版本學”的研究。現在市面上已經有了“通行版”。基本上，它是程偉元的考訂版（程乙版）。把通行版做為“定稿”是合理的。有了定稿之後，再沒有與其它版本糾纏的必要。所以，版本學，已經功德圓滿。它與評紅樓，不再有任何的關連。所以，第一原則，就是“確定評論的對象”。網路上的“紅樓夢 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/01/>)”，基本上就是程乙版。故事的情節，大致相同。文字倒是有些差異。不過，這就是我評“紅樓”所用的版本。

程乙版，是120回本。前80回，確定是“原本”。後40回，確定是高鶚所“補”。如何補，是有爭議的。高鶚自稱是得“遺卷”，整理而補之。但許多研究，都認為，它是高鶚寫的。對這個問題，我也會做些討論。不過，在評紅樓的原則上，我把前80回，訂為“定稿”。也就是說，所有的“評論”，全以定稿為對象。後40回，當成“另書”評論之。“另書”的內容，不可成為評“定稿”的證據。如此，評論的對象，就很明確了。

古今中外，以試取士。考生的姓名，在答卷上，都是密封的。當然，這是為了防止作弊。但重點是，以文論文，才是公正的論文方法。評書，也是一樣。以書論書，才是公正的評書方法。所以，我對“曹學”沒有任何的興趣。紅樓是張三寫的也好，李四寫的也罷。若有普世的價值，就是評論的重點。所以，第二原則，就是“以書評書”。

任何“書”中沒有的，就不可評它。也不能把它當成，做為評論其它的證據。最近，冒出來一個“秦學”。研究秦可卿的身世，她的婚姻，她的原型，…等。書中的說法如下：

“他父亲秦业现任营缮郎，年近七十，夫人早亡。因当年无儿女，便向养生堂抱了一个儿子并一个女儿。谁知儿子又死了，只剩女儿，小名唤可儿，长大后，生的形容袅娜，性格风流。因素与贾家有些瓜葛，故结了亲，许与贾蓉为妻。”

任何超過這幾句話的研究，都是鬼扯蛋。這就是“以書評書”的原則。

評書的理由，至少有兩種。當一本濫書，浪得虛名，卻能廣為流傳。其毒害是可怕的。寫書評以導正視聽，是正義之士的責任。當一本書，有很高的價值。但不能被市井小民，完全理解。寫書評以闡明之，也是學者的義務。“紅樓夢”是一本有“普世”價值的文藝創作。而“老紅學（索隱派，原型派，曹學派，等）”，對它的“普世”價值，全是文不對題的。這是促使我，寫這本書的最大動力。為沉冤百年的紅樓“普世”價值，平冤。所以，第三原則，就是“只評普世價值”。

紅樓的語言，是漢語文。它文字的優美，當然是重要的價值。但對西方人來說，中文文字的優美，是無法為他們所感受的。如果翻譯得好，譯文的優美，並不代表中文的優美。所以，文字的優美，不包含在這普世的價值中。

普世，代表古今與中外。那麼，它在“今日”與“西洋”的認知下，必須仍有價值。所以，除了將其與中國的一些奇書相比較之外，也會以西方今日的認知，做為評書的依據。

第二章： 普世價值一（宿命與自由意志）

“紅樓夢”的時代，沒有汽車、飛機。沒有電腦、網路（Internet）。古今的物質文明，是不同的。但，人們最根本的心靈活動，只有一個。人生命的意義，究竟是什麼？這個議題，是古今中外，都相同的。即如此，我們就從“今日西方”的認知，做為討論的起點。即使中、西的表達方式不同，它們確實有著共同的議題。應該陳述著相似的內涵。

人的出生，是個錯誤？是個偶然？還是背負著上天的使命？這個問題，在三千年前，就是人們心中的中心議題。基本上，它有两个答案。

- a. 人的出生，即使是錯誤的、偶然的，他“自身”的努力，仍然可以為他的“生命”創造意義。這就是，“自由意識（free will）”學派。人的生命意義，由人的自由意識來決定，來創造。
- b. 人的出生，是上天的“恩典（God's Grace）”。這就是，“宗教（Religion）學派”。那就是，人的上面是有“神、仙、佛”的。雖然，人在世上，有“自由”活動的“空間”。但，人生命的意義，基本上是天賦的。這就是“宿命”的基本內涵。

今天，世界上的宗教，至少可分為兩大“類”。

- i. 我是派 —— 上帝的真善美，不是人類的“智慧”能理解的。任何以智慧的方式，來追尋上帝，不但是徒勞的、愚昧的，更是對上帝的污蔑。唯一之“途”，就是“信”我所言。聖經云：I am I（我就是我）。我說了算。信我者得救。其它全是廢話。基督教、回教等，屬於此類。
- ii. 尋覓派 —— 上帝是可被“尋覓”的。“尋覓”的方法，是“排除法（negation）”。這蘋果是上帝嗎？不是，扔出去。很快，整個房間就扔“空”了。很快，家、社會與宇宙都被“空”掉了。佛教，認為佛陀找到了。那就是“大智慧、大慈悲”。找到的人，得個學位，叫做“佛”。佛是人，不是上帝。是找到上帝的人。一般普羅大眾，最好請佛為嚮導。

尋覓派的“空”法，是“懷疑”。懷疑所有的“存在”都是“短暫”的，“虛無”的。這“懷疑”法，成為西方“哲學（philosophy）”思考的重要議題。一切的“存在”都不可靠，就沒有了“懷疑”的“立足點”。要懷疑它事、它物，這“懷疑者”必須是真實的。這就是，René Descartes (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ren%C3%A9_Descartes) 的“我思，即我

在 (Cogito Ergo Sum)”。我對一切的一切, 都可以懷疑它們的真實性。但不可懷疑我這“懷疑者”的存在。所以, “我思, 即我在”。

佛家, 是不贊成這個論點的。“我思”, 仍是空的。總之, Descartes 成了“存在主義 (existentialism) 的始祖。到了 Arthur Schopenhauer (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arthur_Schopenhauer), 提出了, 生命的存在, 完全受到“求活意志 (Will to live)”的驅使。永遠在掙扎; 永遠無法自拔。Schopenhauer 成了“悲觀主義 (pessimism)”的始祖。即使再“悲觀”, 生命的“存在”是真實的。

到了 Søren Kierkegaard (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S%C3%B8ren_Kierkegaard), 他認為, 人的存在, 不但是真實的, 被驅使的 (宿命的), 仍然是有“選擇”的。他的名著“Either/Or (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Either/Or>)”, 成為“存在主義”的根本。首次, 把“宿命”與“自由意識 (選擇)”統一起來了。

到了 沙特 (Jean-Paul Sartre, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jean-Paul_Sartre), 把人“存在”的意義, 推到了頂峰。更對“自由意志”有了全新的闡述。基本上, “自由意志”是人存在的“困境”。他最著名的劇本 “No exit (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/No_Exit)”, 對此有深刻的描述。以簡單的例子說明如下。

父母之命的婚姻(無自由), 原則上, 不會造成問題。在“自由”之前, 二選一, 是痛苦。為何必須“捨一”。未被選上的, 也是痛苦的。基本上, Sartre 說明了, “自由”是上天對人類的詛咒。是困死人類的枷鎖。只要有“他人”存在, “人”的存在, 是痛苦的。解決之道, 在於接受他人。人永遠面臨“選擇”。“選擇”是人們逃脫不了的宿命。這, 基本描述了, 西方從處事到待人的理論發展過程。門口那塊大石的存在, 與“人”的存在, 是完全不同的。人, 是要處事與待人的。人更需要在“宿命”的困境中, 以自由的選擇, 來創造他個人生命的意義。自由意志, 即是創造生命意義的動力, 也是造成生命困境的最大原因。生命的意義, 基本上是由 宿命 (上天的意志) 與人的自由意志的互相激盪, 來決定的。

存在主義, 討論了下列這些議題。

- a. 存在的本質, 被驅使的 (宿命的)。
- b. 存在的環境, 有選擇的。有自由意志。除了“我”的存在, 也有“他”的存在。當然, 邪惡 (evil) 也就存在了。
- c. 宿命 與 自由, 雖可為存在創造意義與價值, 它們同時是造成, 存在困境的最大原因。

以上,簡述了古遠的神學,直到今日的“存在主義”。這就是西方對“生命意義”看法的簡介。許多世界“小說”名著,都或多或少的闡述著這些議題。當然,我也會以這個為標準,來檢驗“紅樓夢”的價值。它是否討論了人類的“根本”議題。人“生命”與“存在”的價值與意義。

如果,“紅樓夢”只是如索隱派所云,影射了一些歷史上的政治人物;只是如原型派所云,描繪了一些原型人物,那,它就沒有太大的價值了。謝天謝地的是,那些索隱派與原型派,只是一些無聊的廢話罷了。欲知“紅樓夢”的偉大,請看下回分解。

第三章： 普世價值二（性事、愛情 與 儒家神學）

上章簡介了，西方對 生命意義與價值的看法。 它包括神學與哲學。 西方的文學名著， 必須或多或少的闡述這一議題。那麼， 中國的文學名著， 又是什麼情況呢？

其實， 神學有三大類。 除了前述的 “我是派” 與 “尋覓派” 之外， 另有 “參與派” 。

“參與派” --- 對上帝的認知， 不是教條似的 “我說了算” 。 也不為著追尋 “真上帝” ， 把現有（但短暫）的存在， 全扔了， 全否定了。 而認為， 現有（但短暫）的存在， 是上帝 “自我” 表達的一種方式。 故云： “天命” 之謂 “性” ， 率性之謂 “道” 。 即然， “性、道” 是上帝的自我表達， 有 “性、道” 者， 就可以 “參與” 上帝的 國度了。

所以， 這三 “類” 宗教， 它們的起始點， 立足點， 是不同的。 我是派， 立足於 “信” 字， 信祂就是。 尋覓派， 立足於 “空” 字， 要能放得下。 參與派， 立足於 “參” 字， 積極的修養 “氣質” ， 以參天地之造化。 當然， 它們對生命意義的看法， 也就略有不同了。 不過， 存在主義的結論， 仍然是普世的。 對三派都 適用。

近世的中國人 與許多的西方神學家， 都不把 “儒家” 看成一個宗教。 對此， 我在 “Confucianism: A great religion of mankind (<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/Confuciu.htm>)” 一文中， 有詳細的討論。 在此， 略談一下 “儒家” 與 “道家” 的神學吧。

我把儒家神 學， 取名為 “命、命神 學” 。 它包括五個 “步驟” 。

- a. 天命 --- 這是 儒家的上帝。 祂是有 “意志 (will)” 的， 有 “法規 (law)” 的。 堯曰： 天之數命在爾躬。 顏回死後， 孔子嘆曰： 天不我予， 天不我予。
- b. 道 --- 天命 法規的 “展現 (expression)” ， 就是 “道” ， 天理也。 天命之謂 “性” ， 率性之謂 道。
- c. 氣 --- 法規的 “運行 (operation)” ， 就是 “氣” 。 以 牛頓 (Newton) 力學為例， 它的方程式是 “道 (law)” 。 方程式內的 “質量” ， 就是 “氣” 。

d. 數 --- 它是“氣”的量。量多，跑得快，跑得遠。量少，則反之。

e. 人命 --- 人生命的意義，是由“天命”、“氣”與“數”來決定的。“道”是普世的。

儒家神學 與其它二類，是不同的。我是派，只有一個教條，信我得救。所以，有沒有“宿命”，都不是議題。好事壞事做盡，在最後一刻，“信”了，必然得救。

尋覓派，只有一個法門，空了再空，終至極樂世界。但，人是有“根性(karma)”的。這不是天命的宿命，而是自造的。不過，它是可以被“空”淨的。但是，放不下的人，終究無法擺脫那宿命。

參與派，是唯一完美的神學理論。它不是一個教條。也不是一個法門。它是一個步驟。一個讓人們參與上帝國度的步驟。一個唯一明確的，把“人命(人生命的意義)”與“天命”聯繫在一起的神學理論。一方面，它是宿命論。另一方面，人可修養“氣、數”，而創造自我的生命意義與價值。它和諧的消除了“宿命”與“自由意志”的對立與矛盾。它是最完美的“開放宿命論”。

在儒家，“人命”有兩種“氣”，元氣與氣質。元氣為天命所賦，不得增減。氣質，秉天命之“性”，是可以修養的。反之，道家排除天命之說，以“道”為最大。元氣是可由後天修補的。老子云：專氣(元氣)致柔，能嬰兒乎。那就是，可以返老還童。最終可以成“仙”。所以，有沒有宿命，在道家也不是問題。命運再壞，成了神仙，全都無妨了。道家神學，只有“道、氣、數”。沒有天命與人命(宿命)。基本上，道家是不能算“命”的。算命的道士，基本上，並不了解道家神學。因它截頭砍尾，在“封神榜”，它被稱為“截教”。

對儒、道神學有了瞭解後，我們就可以談“性”了。在儒家，性是天命的自我表達。孔子曰：食色，性也。對古人而言，“性”是“心生”。人心中，生出來的就是性。心是天命的代言者。於是，孟子就提出了“四端”說。端是立端。端是新“芽”。立端，就是新芽的尖尖。從人心中生長出的四棵芽，是率天命，順天理的。但，我們必須一再的“參與”天命的國度，來保證“四端”的成長。參與的方法，就是以“豐”富的祭品，向上天求“示”。示豐，就是求天理。所以，禮同理，音同義同。至此，禮成為儒家的根本大法(憲法)。

性, 有了非常明確的定義。情, 是什麼? 它是“青心”。青是純潔的意思。情又如何“運作”? 它有多大的 法力? 《牡丹亭》云: “情不知何所起, 一往而深。生者可以死, 死可以生。”基本上, 沒有這種“起死回生”法力的情, 雖是真情, 也不精采。所以, 執子之手, 與子偕老的真情, 不易成為賣座的作品。只有那執不了手, 偕不了老的; 或是不該執手, 不該偕老的愛情奮鬥, 才成為震撼人心的篇章。所以, 在西方, Romeo and Juliet (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romeo_and_Juliet) 與 Twilight (人妖戀 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twilight_%28series%29), 成為大眾喜愛的作品。在中國, 白蛇傳 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E7%99%BD%E8%9B%87%E5%82%B3>), 聶小倩 (<http://baike.baidu.com/view/47262.htm>) 與 孔雀東南飛 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%AD%94%E9%9B%80%E6%9D%B1%E5%8D%97%E9%A3%9B>) 等, 都成為大眾熱愛的故事。

我會從此章所論的角度, 來檢驗“紅樓夢”對“性”與“情”的處理方式。

第四章： 先評 “中國的三大奇書”

我已把 評紅樓的平台與標準架設好了。不過， 還是先用其它的一些古典名著， 來檢驗檢驗這個平台與標準吧。 看看它， 是否太嚴， 是否太鬆。不但需把 紅樓與其它的名著， 做個比較。或許， 它們之間， 還互有關聯。 俞平伯 的 “红楼心解”，就討論了“《红楼梦》的传统性 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/31/mydoc002.htm>)”。下面，就是他的評論。

“《红楼梦》以“才子佳人”做书中主角，受《西厢》的影响很深。书上称为《会真记》，有名的如二十三回黛玉葬花一段，宝玉说“看了连饭都不想吃”。以后《西厢记》几乎成为宝玉、黛玉两人对话时的“口头语”了。本书引用共六七次之多，而且用得都很灵活，如四十九回引“是几时孟光接了梁鸿案”一段，宝黛借《西厢》来说自己的话，非常自然。

“再说《水浒》。这两书的关连表面上虽不大看得出，但如第二十四回记倪二醉遇贾芸，脂砚斋评云：“这一节对《水浒》记杨志卖刀遇没毛大虫一回看，觉好看得多矣。”这可以想见作者心目中以《水浒》为范本，又本书第二回贾雨村有“正气”、“邪气”一段演说，跟《水浒》第二回“误走妖魔”意思相同。《红楼》所谓“一丝半缕误而逸出”，实即《水浒》的“一道黑气滚将出来”。

“《红楼梦》开首说补天顽石高十二丈，方二十四丈，共有三万六千五百零一块，原合十二月，二十四气，周天三百六十五度四分度之一，跟《西游记》第一回说花果山仙石有三丈六尺五寸高，二丈四尺开阔，说法略异，观念全同。这点有人已经说过。而且，这块高十二丈、方二十四丈的顽石，既可缩成扇坠一般，又变为鲜明莹洁的美玉，我觉得这就是“天河镇底神珍铁”（金箍棒）塞在孙猴子的耳朵里呵。

“《金瓶梅》跟《红楼梦》的关连尤其密切，它给本书以直接的影响，近人已有专书论述，这儿不能详引。如《红楼梦》的主要观念“色”、“空”（这色字读如色欲之色，并非佛家五蕴的“色”），明从《金瓶梅》来。又秦可卿棺殓一节，几全袭用《金瓶梅》记李瓶儿之死的文字。脂砚斋本评所谓“深得《金瓶》壶奥”是也。”

上面幾段，確實點出了紅樓作者，讀過一些前期的名著。但，這些關聯，與紅樓的價值沒有太大的關係。也不是紅樓與其它名著的比較。與前所設定的評書平台，沒有任何關聯。那麼，還是自己來評吧。

首先，來談“西遊記”。它的主旨，究竟是什麼？只是一個談神怪與荒誕的，娛樂性小說？還是，它另有深意？西遊記的主題，是完完全全的，宣揚儒家的倫理教條（禮）。雖然打著佛教的幌子，全書沒有觸及佛教的任何教義。儒家的倫理教條是完完全全的圍繞在一個字上，“性”。儒家最根本的經書，“中庸”，開宗明義就說：“天命之謂性，率性之謂道，…”。開頭兩句，“性”字就用了兩次。一般人，把仁愛禮義，做為儒家的根本。是馬屁拍到馬蹄上了。西遊記，就是要力挽狂瀾，拉回正題。在每章每回中，西遊記都一再一再的，重複了這一主題。每個章回，都提供了許多的暗示。

- a. 大聖是齊天的。是無人管得了的。二郎神不行；太上老君不行。連玉皇大帝都沒轍。但是大聖是沒有“地位”的。只是個弼馬溫。管撒尿的。
- b. 當大聖吃了蟠桃，偷了丹藥，就得立刻關入八卦爐中。蟠桃代表女性。古人以陽精煉丹。在大聖到了性成熟之際，必須立刻以八卦純火（儒家禮教）熏烤。逃了出來，立刻壓在五指（儒家）山下。直到落了冠（上了緊箍圈），才能再入塵世。
- c. 大聖自小，揀了個“如意”金箍棒。它能粗能細，能長能短。它是一把量天尺。度量天地規矩的標準。其實，它就是男人的陽具。在儒家，“禮”由“性”來，已如前述。

有了上面的認知，西遊記的主題，就很明確了。四個主角，代表了中國人的四項人格特質。

- i. 唐僧 --- “性”的最高道德標準。吃了他的肉，會長生不老的。由“性”，規劃出一切的道德標準。
- ii. 大聖 --- 凡夫俗子。尊守儒家對性的規範。終究，是被熏烤過的。
- iii. 豬八戒 --- 對儒家的規範，常有越矩之想。當元精要被蜘蛛精吸走之時，總被大聖救走。
- iv. 沙僧 --- 代表了中國人的任勞任怨。

這四個角色，是每個中國人，都具有的四種人格。全書只講了一個人，中國人。它明確的闡述了儒家禮教思想。以我們的評書標準，它當然是奇書了。

其次,來談“封神榜”。不懂最高“神學”,是讀不懂“封神”的。兩千年來,“神學”只圍繞了一個議題在爭論。我的作為,是“宿命”,還是我的“自由意識”。

- a. “宿命”,我的一切作為,都是“上天(帝)”早安排好的。
- b. “自由意識”,我的一切作為,完全是由我自己決定的。與“上天”完全無關。

如前所述,到了現在的“存在主義”,仍然圍繞了這個議題在打轉。我正在寫這本書。是我的自由意識呢?還是在宇宙洪荒之前,就定下了。我只是在完成那劇本罷了!看“封神”如何回答這問題。

話說:女媧受紂王侮辱後。駕起祥雲,來殺紂王。只見皇宮,紫氣沖天。殺不了紂王。掐指一算,紂王還有28年的“氣數”。無可如何,回女媧宮,找來三妖。開始“導演”封神榜。

- i. 雖是正神,有無邊的法力,女媧終究無法改變“宿命”。
- ii. 女媧也沒有回去睡覺。仍需有所“作為”,才能耗盡紂王氣數。

這個議題,在書中反覆闡述。哪吒廟被李靖砸後,一縷冤魂去了乾元山。見了太乙真人。籍蓮花還魂,練成法力功夫。要去殺李靖報仇。李靖逃無可逃時,遇燃燈道人。把哪吒關入一金塔。哪吒終於再認父親。此段有兩重點。

- A. 儒家的孝道:一命還一命,還不了孝道。玲瓏金塔,實為祖廟骨灰塔。它唯一的法力,在於“孝”。只對哪吒有效。
- B. 李靖、哪吒都是“榜上”人物。在任務未完成之前,只得勞駕二仙化解問題。不能因哪吒不孝,而將他正法。他的角色,還未完成呢。

到了七十七回,一切都寫明了。元始天尊曰:賢弟[通天教主]為何設此惡陣?...當時共議“封神榜”...賢弟為何出乎反乎。...

至此始知,“封神榜”是在宇宙洪荒之前,由三教[闡教(儒家),截教(道家)與佛教]教主,共同擬定的劇本。連女媧正神,也只是照本演出。

如果,“封神”至此打住。那就不是奇書了。以後的章回,三教教主,從編劇,成了演員。“宿命”不再。一切現場“自由”演出。“宿命”不再是封閉的,而是開放的。開放的“宿命論”,是神學家,不可想像的。而“封神”做到了。

宿命(上帝的意志)與人的自由意志,是神學的第一議題。厚厚的一本聖經,比封神厚了三、四倍。還是吱吱喳喳的講不清楚。終究淪落到教條的暴力。信我得救。不信者,滾入地獄,永遠不得超生。“封神榜”卻輕而易舉的,調和了宿命與自由意志的矛盾。它是世界上,第一偉大的神學奇書。

第三,來談“水滸傳”吧。近來,有人把“水滸”概括為,對暴力的崇拜。如此的污蔑這千古奇書,真是令人心痛。拜託了。饒饒讀者吧。就來看看,水滸的宗旨與範疇吧。

- a. 背景:太平盛世。有包拯、范仲淹等千古名臣。因鬧瘟疫,愛民仁宗,遣洪太尉去召虛靖天師下山,拯救萬民。
- b. 演變:洪太尉見到“遇洪而開”石碣。強行打開,被封石洞。結果,一道黑氣冒出,散作百十道金光,望四面八方去了。
- c. 結果:被鎮住的108“魔”,來到人間。直使,宛子城中藏虎豹,蓼兒洼內聚蛟龍。

很明顯,又是宿命論。這是中國文化,一貫的脈絡。由上三點,已明確的標明了全書的宗旨與範疇。

- i. 不談官逼民反。仁君賢臣嘛。
- ii. 不談對抗倫理。來的是“魔”嘛。

只談,中華文化,是如何的來“包容”這魔道。這是多麼重要的議題。這是多麼難寫的題目。

林冲 是八十萬禁軍教頭, 不是小老百姓。被逼上 梁山, 不算官逼民反。除了 晁蓋 是有計劃的, 劫了 蔡大師壽禮。沒有其他好漢, 有計劃的做了什麼 犯法的事。大好人, 大英雄 宋江, 只因稍有姿色的 閻婆惜, 被逼上 梁山。基本上, 這 108 好漢 (不包括 晁蓋), 都是,

- A. 好人。
- B. 有好本事。

只因機緣巧合, 無法在太平盛世, 容身於正常社會。雖在 梁山, 他們仍把倫理道德, 列為最高標的。大堂高掛“忠義”。

全書的重點, 在闡述一個至高的哲理。

好人(不包括 晁蓋), 好本事。仁君、賢臣, 太平盛世。這些都不能保證, 人們不需面對“生存”的困境。沙特 (Jean-Paul Sartre) 的“存在主義 (Existentialism)”, 受到“二戰 (World War II)”的啓發。好好的人們, “突然”的, 面臨了空前的災難。蘇聯, 死了三千萬人。中國, 犧牲了六千萬人。他們自己的意志與作為, 與他們的命運, 沒有直接的關係。他們只是面臨“存在”的困境, 悲慘的接受了, 邪惡同時“存在”的結果。

不但 祝家莊的人, 在太平盛世, 躲不過“魔”的存在。“魔”的本身, 仍然戰勝不了, 正義的存在。比 現今的“存在主義 (Existentialism)”, 水滸 早了將近一千年。就把 存在主義的三大宗旨, 講全了, 講透了。

1. 人的存在, 是自由的。有自由意志。
2. 邪惡的存在, 也是自由的。
3. “自由”, 是人的“存在”, 必須面臨的困境。

水滸, 把以上三點, 重複了 108 次。它是世界上, 第一偉大的, 存在主義巨著。

紅樓夢, 能與這三大奇書, 相比嗎?

第五章：“紅樓夢” 的宗旨 --- 三綱

“紅樓夢” 的宗旨究竟是什麼？

蔡元培 在《石头记索隐》 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/38/>) 寫到：“书中红字，多影朱字。朱者，明也，汉也。宝玉有爱红之癖，言以满人而爱汉族文化也；好吃人口上胭脂，言拾汉人唾余也。”

萨孟武 在《红楼梦中国旧家庭》 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/44/>) 認為：“宝玉是代表玉玺，即天子之玺。所谓“金玉良缘”、“木石前盟”（第五回），依五行学说，金指西方，木指东方，所以《红楼梦》一书乃暗示东宫与西宫之争宠或皇子与东宫太子之争夺帝位。”

如果，“紅樓夢” 只是一本反清的文宣，或只是影射宮庭內的鬥爭，它就沒有太大的 普世價值了。周汝昌 在“红楼艺术” (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/22/index.htm>) 一書中，提出了《红楼》文化之三綱：一曰玉，二曰红，三曰情。節錄如下：

“这块石头，经女娲炼后，通了灵性—即石本冥顽无知之物，灵性则具有了感知能力，能感受，能思索，能领悟，能表达，此之谓灵性。此一灵石，后又幻化为玉，此玉投胎入世，衔玉而生—故名之曰“宝玉”。宝玉才是一部《石头记》的真主角。一切人、物、事、境，皆围绕他而出现，而展示，而活动，而变化，……一句话，而构成全部书文。

如此说来，玉若非《红楼》文化之第一綱，那什么才够第一綱的资格呢？

次讲红綱。

《石头记》第五回，宝玉神游幻境，饮“千红一窟”茶，喝“万艳同杯”酒，聆《红楼梦曲》十二支—全书一大关目，故尔《石头记》又名《红楼梦》。在此书中，主人公宝玉所居名曰“怡红院”，他平生有个“爱红的毛病”，而雪芹撰写此书，所居之处也名为“悼红轩”。

“此书大旨谈情。”石头投胎，乃是适值一种机缘：有一批“情鬼”下凡历劫，它才被“夹带”在内，一同落入红尘的。所以《红楼梦曲》引子的劈头一句就是“开辟鸿蒙，谁为情种？”甲戌本卷首题诗，也说“漫言红袖啼痕重，更有情痴抱恨长！”（“红”与“情”对仗，叫做“借对”，因为情字内有“青”也。诗圣杜甫有“步月清宵”、“看云白日”之对，正是佳例。）

而人之中，女为美，少女最美。于是红就属于女性了，这真是顺理成章之极。于是，“红妆”、“红袖”、“红裙”、“红颜”、“红粉”……都是对女性的代词与赞词。宋词人晏几道，在一首《临江仙》中写道是：“靓妆眉沁绿，羞脸粉生红。”这红奇妙，又有了双重的意味。

三曰情綱。

“情，人之灵性的精华也。”“言情小说”，这原是相对“讲史”、“志怪”、“传奇”等等名目而言的。

鲁迅首创《中国小说史略》时，他将第二十四章整个儿专给了《红楼梦》，而其标题，不但不是“爱情小说”，连“言情”也不是一用的却是“人情小说”！

刘鹗作《老残游记》，在自序中早已解明：雪芹之大痛深悲，乃是为“千红”一哭，为“万艳”同悲。

既然如此，雪芹写书的动机与目的，绝不会是单为了一男一女之间的“爱情”的“小悲剧”（鲁迅语也）。他是为“普天下女子”（金圣叹语式也）痛哭，为她们的不幸而流泪，为她们的命运而悲愤。

如果，“红楼梦”只是 寶玉（玉綱）為 千紅（紅綱）一哭（情綱），那也只是本，上好的愛情小說。絕對達不到，我們的評書標準（闡釋人，生命的意義）。我的分析，它確有三綱（石，塵，淫）。雖然，我將它們分開討論，其實它們是糾結（entangled）在一起的。

一. 石綱

前面，已經談到了 神學與存在主義。這裡，需要談談“宇宙論”。宇宙是如何產生的。近代物理學，提出了“大爆炸（Big Bang）”論。至今，它是不完善的。在此，也不需要討論它。基督的是“神說論”。上帝“說”造，宇宙就出現了。上帝“說”好，宇宙就完美了。什麼是“說”？那就不用問了。反正不是，你我能說的。佛教，是尋覓派。從面前的事務摸索起，對宇宙的源頭，是沒有興趣的。對宇宙的架構，只以概數來表達。如，三千大千世界為宇。八萬四千劫為宙。

只有 儒家，有非常明確的宇宙論，“一劃開天”。今天，大、大、大、大…部分的中國人，都已經不知道，這是什麼玩意了。聽過的人，也都把它當成是，愚昧的代表了。其實，“一劃開天”論比“大爆炸 (Big Bang)”論更為精確。不過，這不是本書的議題，就不多談了。只說，什麼是“一劃開天”？

當你在沙漠裡迷了路，弄不清東南西北。你就面對了一個“洪濛”宇宙。如果你有一個小碗，裡面有點水。謝天謝地，你手中又有一根磁針。又有把磁針浮在水面的本事（需要練幾次），那，你就能把這“洪濛”宇宙定出方向了。這就是一劃（磁針）開天（定出方向）。如果把這小碗水放在洪濛之前，它就有個特別的名字，“無極”。一劃破無極為二，成“太極”，含“兩儀”，…。然後，由八卦而萬物。細節，我就不談了。老子，把這簡化為“無生有”。石頭，是無生命的，代表“無”。從石頭裡蹦出來（如孫猴子），就逃脫不了儒家的桎梏。從天命、性到禮。

石綱，就是儒家的“天綱”（命、命神學）。從“天命”到“人命（運）”。它代表的是儒家的開放宿命論。封神榜的劇本，是三教教主寫的。而女媧是導演，由她拉開劇幕。“紅樓夢”是女媧遺忘的一塊頑石，蹦到警幻仙子處，勾出了許多風流冤家。警幻為此，編寫了紅樓夢仙曲。然後，這頑石（蠢貨），被一僧一道帶入世間。故事的發展，必照警幻的劇本演出。不過，全書（前80回）成為一本猜謎書。誰是十二金釵？

石綱（儒家的天綱，神學與倫理）是全書之“經”。與其它二綱，一再一再的交織者。書中對此，是反覆的闡述者。如，

“冤冤相报实非轻，分离聚合皆前定。欲知命短问前生，老来富贵也真侥幸。看破的，遁入空门；痴迷的，枉送了性命。（第五回）”。

“警幻忙携住宝玉的手，向众姊妹道：“你等不知原委：今日原欲往荣府去接绛珠，适从宁府所过，偶遇宁荣二公之“灵（魂）”，嘱吾云：‘吾家自国朝定鼎以来，功名奕世，富贵传流，虽历百年，奈运终数尽，不可挽回者。故遗之子孙虽多，竟无可以继业。其中惟嫡孙宝玉一人，禀性乖张，生性怪谲，虽聪明灵慧，略可望成，无奈吾家运数合终，恐无人规引入正。幸仙姑偶来，万望先以情欲声色等事警其痴顽，或能使彼跳出迷人圈子，然后入于正路，亦吾兄弟之幸矣。’如此嘱吾，故发慈心，引彼至此。先以彼家上中下三等女子之终身“册籍”，令彼熟玩，尚未觉悟；故引彼再至此处，令其再历饮饌声色之幻，或冀将来一悟，亦未可知也。（第五回）”

二. 塵綱

石綱，代表塵世之“上”的力量與真理。故事卻是在塵世演出的。蔡义江在“解读红楼 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/32/>)”寫到，“…又另有批说：“红楼，梦也。”“红楼梦”是富贵生活的象征，则书名《红楼梦》其实也就是“繁华成空”的意思。所以，故事的结局是“家亡人散各奔騰”，是“树倒猢猻散”，是“好一似食尽鸟投林，落了片白茫茫大地真干净”。”

聂鑫森在“《红楼梦》性爱解码目录 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/36/>)”說，“袭人要宝玉改去“爱红的毛病儿”，其实，这哪是一种对颜色的偏好呢。在古代，凡与女子接近的或亲近的事物，多冠以一个“红”字，如“红妆”、“红颜”、“红袖”、“红轿”、“红楼”、“红粉佳人”等等。因此，宝玉的爱“红”，不过是爱与之密切相关的女性，并将其极端化，成为一种移情的象征性行为，欲要其改可说是难乎哉！”

當然，還有把“紅”，解釋為影射明朝的“朱”姓。儘管這些說法，看來都是言之成理，卻都是猜測之理。不是書中“直接”的話語。

“紅樓”即以“天(石)綱”為經，就必須以“紅塵”為緯。即以“天”為真，則“塵”必為夢也。紅樓夢即紅塵夢也。書中對此，有“直接”的說明：“…乘此昌明太平朝世，意欲下凡造历幻缘，已在警幻仙子案前挂了号。警幻亦曾问及，灌溉之情未偿，趁此倒可了结的。…因此一事，就勾出多少风流冤家来，陪他们去了结此案。

…”那道人道：“趁此何不你我也去下(塵)世度脱几个，岂不是一场功德？”那僧道：“正合吾意，你且同我到警幻仙子宫中，将“蠢物”交割清楚，待这一干风流孽鬼下(塵)世已完，你我再去。如今虽已有一半落塵，然犹未全集。”道人道：“既如此，便随你去来。”(第一回)。”

儒家的命、命神學，人命(運)雖由天定，人在塵世的善惡行為，是由“禮”法管束的。若漏網者，正法之前已經死去，只能“鞭屍”或子承父過。佛教的靈魂、地獄理論，彌補了儒家神學的漏洞。不過，前述三大奇書，對這一“超塵世”的正義法治，幾乎沒有論及。“封神”談的是，百分之百的“開放宿命論”。“西遊”雖打著佛教的幌子，談的全是儒家的禮教。“水滸”雖以道教為引子，討論的卻是儒家的存在主義。

“紅樓”的塵綱，卻討論了兩大主題。

- a. 儒家的禮教。
- b. 塵世之上的“仙、佛”正義。

我會舉許多書中的例子，來印證這兩點。

三. 淫綱

“紅樓”作者，對書的主旨，有詳細的說明。並再三重複。不似“封神”的大談大仁大義，與大奸大惡。也不似“水滸”的，大談存在的困境。只談幾個“女子”與幾首“歪詩”。作者的自白如下：

“子兴见他说得这样重大，忙请教其端。雨村道：“天地生人，除大仁大恶两种，余者皆无大异。若大仁者，则应运而生，大恶者，则应劫而生。… 大仁者，修治天下；大恶者，挠乱天下。… 清明灵秀，天地之正气，仁者之所秉也；残忍乖僻，天地之邪气，恶者之所秉也。今当运隆祚永之朝，太平无为之世，… 清明灵秀之气所秉者，上至朝廷，下及草野，比比皆是。

所馀之秀气，漫无所归，遂为甘露，为和风，泠然溉及四海。彼残忍乖僻之邪气，不能荡溢于光天化日之中，遂凝结充塞于深沟大壑之内，偶因风荡，或被云催，略有摇动感发之意，一丝半缕误而泄出者…。故其气亦必赋人，发泄一尽始散。使男女偶秉此气而生者，在上则不能成仁人君子，下亦不能为大凶大恶。… 若生于公侯富贵之家，则为情痴情种；… 此皆易地则同之人也。（第二回）”。

“空空道人遂向石头说道：“石兄，你这一段故事，据你自己说有些趣味，故编写在此，意欲问世传奇。据我看来，…；第二件，并无大贤大忠理朝廷治风俗的善政，其中只不过几个异样女子，或情或痴，或小才微善，亦无班姑蔡女之德能。…”石头笑答道：“我师何太痴耶！… 历来野史，或讪谤君相，或贬人妻女，奸淫凶恶，不可胜数。更有一种风月笔墨，其淫秽污臭，屠毒笔墨，坏人子弟，又不可胜数。至若佳人才子等书，则又千部共出一套，且其中终不能不涉于淫滥，…。故逐一看去，悉皆自相矛盾，大不近情理之话，竟不如我半世亲睹亲闻的这几个“女子”…；也有几首“歪诗”熟话，可以喷饭供酒。至若离合悲欢，兴衰际遇，… 不比那些胡牵乱扯，忽离忽遇，满纸才人淑女、子建文君红娘小玉等通共熟套之旧稿。我师意为何如？（第一回）”。

作者，更進一步的，對“情”字有明確的闡述。其定義如下：

“忽警幻道：‘尘世中多少富贵之家，那些绿窗风月，绣阁烟霞，皆被淫污纨绔与那些流荡女子悉皆玷辱。更可恨者，自古来多少轻薄浪子，皆以‘好色不淫’为饰，又以‘情而不淫’作案，此皆饰非掩丑之语也。好色即淫，知情更淫。是以巫山之会，云雨之欢，皆由既悦其色，复恋其情所致也。吾所‘爱’汝者，乃天下古今第一淫人也。（第五回）’”。

寫“情”而不涉及“淫”，是很困難。也沒有個對照。以“淫”字統一色與情，這是最明智的作法。

在儒家，過“正”為淫。任何事，只要“正”，就合乎禮。性愛是夫妻的正事。不合禮的性事，為淫。情，是人心魂。但，太多太過的“情”，也是淫。所以，以“情”為綱者，完全誤解了作者的深意。

“紅樓夢”的三大主題，是天、塵與淫。

第六章： 原書 與 續集

“紅樓”即以天綱為經，紅塵一夢，就必須依照“仙界”編定的劇本，照本演出。作者在第五回，以燈謎（判詞與曲文）的方式，對劇情做了透露。讀者必須以猜謎的方式，來理解劇情的發展。

今天，公認的謎底如下：

一．林黛玉 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%9E%97%E9%BB%9B%E7%8E%89>)

圖識 兩株枯木，懸一玉帶，雪埋金簪。

判詞： 可嘆停機德，堪憐詠絮才。玉帶林中挂，金簪雪裏埋。

曲文（枉凝眉）： 一個是閨苑仙葩，一個是美玉無瑕。若說沒奇緣，今生偏又遇著他；若說有奇緣，如何心事終虛話？一個枉自嗟呀，一個空勞牽挂。一個是水中月，一個是鏡中花。浪想眼中能有多少淚珠兒，怎經得秋流到冬，春流到夏！

二．薛寶釵 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%96%9B%E5%AE%9D%E9%92%97>)

判詞： 可嘆停機德，堪憐詠絮才。玉帶林中挂，金簪雪裏埋。

曲文（終身誤）： 都道是金玉良姻，俺只念木石前盟。空對著，山中高士晶瑩雪；終不忘，世外仙姝寂寞林。嘆人間，美中不足今方信。縱然是齊眉舉案，到底意難平。

三．賈元春 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%B4%BE%E5%85%83%E6%98%A5>)

圖識 弓上有一香櫞（芸香科柑橘屬的植物）

判詞： 二十年来辨是非，榴花开处照宫闈；三春争及初春景，虎兔相逢大梦归。

曲文（恨無常）：喜榮華正好，恨無常又到。眼睜睜，把萬事全拋；蕩悠悠，把芳魂消耗！望家鄉，路遠山遙。故向爹娘夢裡相尋告：兒命已入黃泉，天倫呵，須要退步抽身早！

四. 賈探春 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%B4%BE%E6%8E%A2%E6%98%A5>)

圖識 大海船中，女子泣。

判詞： 才自精明志自高，生于末世運偏消。清明涕送江邊艦，千里東風一夢遙。

曲文（分骨肉）： 一帆風雨路三千，把骨肉家園齊來拋閃。恐哭損殘年。告爹娘，莫把兒懸念。自古窮通皆有命，離合豈無緣？從今分兩地，各自保平安。奴去也，莫牽連。

五. 史湘雲 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%8F%B2%E6%B9%98%E4%BA%91>)

圖識 飛雲、逝水。

判詞： 富貴又何為，襁褓之間父母違；展眼吊斜暉，湘江水逝楚雲飛。

曲文（樂中悲）： 襁褓中，父母嘆雙亡。縱居那綺羅叢，誰知嬌養？幸生來，英雄闊大寬宏量，從未將兒女私情略繫心上。好一似，霽月光風耀玉堂。廝配得才貌仙郎，博得個地久天長，準折得幼年時坎坷形狀。終久是雲散高唐，水涸湘江。這是塵寰中消長數應當，何必枉悲傷？

六. 妙玉 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E5%A6%99%E7%8E%89>)

圖識 美玉落污泥。

判詞： 欲潔何曾潔，云空未必空！可憐金玉質，終陷污泥中。

曲文（世難容）： 氣質美如蘭，才華阜比仙，天生成孤癖人皆罕。你道是啖肉食腥膻，視綺羅俗厭；卻不知太高人愈妒，過潔世同嫌。可嘆這，青燈古殿人將老，辜負了，紅粉朱樓春色闌。到頭來，依舊是風塵骯髒違心願，好一似，無瑕白玉遭泥陷；又何須，王孫公子嘆無緣。

七. 賈迎春 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%B4%BE%E8%BF%8E%E6%98%A5>)

圖識 惡狼撲美女。

判詞： 子系中山狼，得志便猖狂；金閨花柳質，一載赴黃梁。

曲文（喜冤家）： 中山狼，無情獸，全不念當日根由。一味的，驕奢淫蕩貪還構。覷着那，侯門艷質同蒲柳；作踐的，公府千金似下流。嘆芳魂艷魄，一載蕩悠悠。

八. 賈惜春 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%B4%BE%E6%83%9C%E6%98%A5>)

圖識 美人廟讀經。

判詞： 勘破三春景不長，緇衣頓改昔年妝；可憐繡戶侯門女，獨臥青燈古佛傍。

曲文（虛花悟）： 將那三春看破，桃紅柳綠待如何？把這韶華打滅，覓那情淡天和。說什麼，天上天桃盛，雲中香蕊多，到頭來，誰見把秋捱過？則看那，白楊村里人嗚咽，青楓林下鬼吟哦。更兼著，連天衰草遮墳墓。這的是，昨貧今富人勞碌，春榮秋謝花折磨。似這般，生關死劫誰能躲？聞道說，西方寶樹喚婆娑，上結着長生果。

九. 王熙鳳 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E7%8E%8B%E7%86%99%E5%87%A4>)

圖識 雌鳳冰山前。

判詞： 凡鳥偏從末世來，都知愛慕此身才；一從二令三人木，哭向金陵事更哀。

曲文（聰明誤）： 機關算盡太聰明，反算了卿卿性命。生前心已碎，死後性空靈。家富人寧，終有個，家亡人散各奔騰。枉費了，意慙慙半世心；好一似，蕩悠悠三更夢。忽喇喇如大廈傾，昏慘慘似燈將盡。呀！一場歡喜忽悲辛。嘆人世，終難定！

十. 賈巧姐 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E8%B4%BE%E5%B7%A7%E5%A7%90>)

圖識 美人荒村紡績。

判詞： 事敗休云貴，家亡莫論親。偶因濟劉氏，巧得遇恩人。

曲文（留餘慶）： 留餘慶，留餘慶，忽遇恩人；幸娘親，幸娘親，積得陰功。勸人生，濟困扶窮；休似俺那銀錢上，忘肉肉的狠舅奸兄！正是乘除加減，上有蒼穹。

十一. 李紈 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%9D%8E%E7%BA%A8>)

圖識 鳳冠霞帔女人，立於茂蘭旁。

判詞： 桃李春風結子完，到頭誰似一盆蘭？如冰水好空相妒，枉與他人作話談。

曲文（晚韶華）： 鏡裡恩情，更那堪夢裡功名！那美韶華去之何迅！再休提綉帳鴛衾。只這戴珠冠，披鳳襖，也抵不了無常性命。雖說是，人生莫受老來貧，也須要陰騭積兒孫。氣昂昂頭戴簪纓，光閃閃腰懸金印；威赫赫爵位高登，昏慘慘黃泉路近。問古來將相可還存？也只是虛名兒與後人欽敬。

十二. 秦可卿 (<http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E7%A7%A6%E5%8F%AF%E5%8D%BF>)

圖識 美人高樓，懸梁自盡。

判詞：情天情海幻情身，情既相逢必主淫；謾言不肖皆榮出，造孽開端實在寧。

曲文（好事終）：畫梁春盡落香塵。擅風情，秉月貌，便是敗家的根本。箕裘頹墮皆榮玉，家事消亡首罪寧。宿孽總因情。

我對上面的“公論”，是有意見的。首先，猜謎的原則，是一謎一底。黛玉與寶釵，不該共一判詞。再說，作者很明確的點出，寶玉沒有讀完“正冊”的全部。原文如下：

“宝玉还欲看时，那仙姑知他天分高明，性情颖慧，恐把仙机泄漏，遂掩了卷册，笑向宝玉道：‘且随我去游玩奇景，何必在此打这闷葫芦！’（第五回）”。

那麼，至少有一個謎題（一金釵的判詞），是沒有透露的。作者的本意，很有可能不直接提供謎底。由讀者“各自”去領會。就是，激發讀者心“佛”的悟性。更進一步的表達了，作者以“仙、佛”做為“天、塵”的橋樑。但是，高鶚續了後四十回。硬生生的，自編了謎底如下：

“宝玉忽然想起：“我少时做梦曾到过这个地方。如今能够亲身到此，也是大幸。”恍惚间，把找鸳鸯的念头忘了。便壮着胆把上首的大橱开了橱门一瞧，见有好几本册子，心里更觉喜欢，想道：“大凡人做梦，说是假的，岂知有这梦便有这事。我常说还要做这个梦再不能的，不料今儿被我找着了。但不知那册子是哪个见过的不是？”伸手在上头取了一本，册上写着“金陵十二钗正册”。宝玉拿着一想道：“我恍惚记得是那个，只恨记不得清楚。”便打开头一页看去，见上头有画，但是画迹模糊，再瞧不出来。后面有几行字迹也不清楚，尚可摹拟，便细细的看去，见有什么“玉带”，上头有个好像“林”字，心里想道：“不要是说林妹妹罢？”便认真看去，底下又有“金簪雪里”四字，诧异道“怎么又像他的名字呢。”复将前后四句合起来一念道：“也没有什么道理，只是暗藏着他两个名字，并不为奇。独有那‘怜’字‘叹’字不好。这是怎么解？”想到那里，又自啐道：“我是偷着看，若只管呆想起来，倘有人来，又看不成了。”遂往后看去，也无暇细玩那图画，...”（第一百十六回）。

高鶚也改寫了香菱的故事。判詞是，“根并荷花一茎香，平生遭际实堪伤。自从两地生孤木，致使香魂返故乡。”但是，在高鶚筆下，夏金桂倒比香菱先死了。不過，高鶚基

本上是瞭解“紅樓”的“天、塵、淫”三綱的。續的故事情節，也還有趣。唯一的敗筆，是把秦可卿改寫為上吊死的。原文如下：

“谁知此时鸳鸯哭了一场，想到“自己跟着老太太一辈子，身子也没有着落。…倒不如死了干净。但是一时怎么样的个死法呢？”一面想，一面走回老太太的套间屋内。刚跨进门，只见灯光惨淡，隐隐有个女人拿着汗巾子好似要上吊的样子。鸳鸯也不惊怕，心里想道：“这一个是谁？和我的心事一样，倒比我走在头里了。”便问道：“你是谁？…仔细一看，…是了，这是东府里的小蓉大奶奶啊！他早死了的了，怎么到这里来？必是来叫我来。他怎么又上吊呢？”想了一想道：“是了，必是教给我死的法儿。”鸳鸯这么一想，…就在身上解下一条汗巾，按着秦氏方才比的地方拴上。…便把脚凳蹬开。可怜咽喉气绝，香魂出窍，…”第一百十一回。

這一段，就把秦可卿的死，改成上吊了。這對原書的宗旨，破壞極大。所以，原書（前80回）與續集（後40回），就必須分開了。評論原書，不得“引”續集為引證了。

第七章：“紅樓”的仙佛世界 與塵世的因果報應

除了“索隱派”之外，老“紅學”另有“愛情派”與“反封建派”。

聂鑫森在《红楼梦》性爱解码目录 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/36/>) 中寫到，“爱情这个主题，在中国文学史上最先把它提到理性的高度，并把它充满了政治性的内容，却只有曹雪芹笔下的《红楼梦》)。

周思源在《正解金陵十二钗, <http://www.ccler.com/hlm/35/>) 中說，“曹雪芹通过写藕官、药官的爱情，表现出他对封建的人身依附制度的深刻批判和对合理的婚姻制度的呼唤。... 《红楼梦》表现了对封建专制社会包括对文化专制的强烈批判，其中也表达了一些反满情绪。”

每位讀者，都有評書的權力。發表個人對某書的喜好。但是，討論作者“宗旨”，就不再是喜好的問題。基本上，它根本與讀者無關。作者“宗旨”，必須完全由作者“自己”的話語來定義。任何多加的字句，都是不恰當的。所以，上列兩段，與作者的宗旨，全無關係。

一般而言，寫書的目的，就在表達作者的中心思想(宗旨)。不但不會隱隱藏藏，還會再而三的重複再重複。如果沒有重複幾次，它鐵定不是宗旨。

第四章提到的三大奇書，“封神”雖然大談三教，講的全是儒家的神學。“西遊”雖然打著佛教的幌子，講的全是儒家的倫理教條。“水滸”雖以道教天師開場，全書沒有宣揚釋道的教義。“紅樓”的宗旨，就在“補”三書之不足。以宣揚釋道教義為宗旨。其大綱如下：

一.“仙佛”世界為“真”，塵世種種為“夢”。作者云：“假作真時真亦假，無為有處有還無。”書中，提供了三種“仙、塵”往返的通道。

a. 下世(從仙界入塵世) --- “那僧道：“正合吾意，你且同我到警幻仙子宫中，將蠢物交割清楚，待這一干風流孽鬼下世已完，你我再去。如今雖已有一半落塵，然猶未全集。”第一回。

b. 入夢(從塵世入仙界) --- “... 廟旁住着一家鄉宦，姓甄，名賈，字士隱。一日，... 不覺朦朧睡去。夢至一處，不辨是何地方。忽見那廂來了一僧一道，且行且談。... 忽聽一聲霹靂，有若山崩地陷。士隱大叫一聲，定睛一看，只見烈日炎炎，芭蕉冉冉，所夢之事便忘了大半。”第一回。

c. 魂歸(從塵世回仙界) --- 那尤二姐原是個花為腸肚雪作肌膚的人，... 夜來合上眼，只見他小妹子手捧鴛鴦寶劍前來說：“姐姐，... 你依我將此劍斬了那妒婦，一同歸至警幻案下，聽其發落。第六十九回。

唯一的例外，為全書的“導演(一僧一道)”。他們可在夢中走，也可在塵世行。他們不但為“書”開場，並在情節需要時，隨時出現。

在甄士隱夢中出現後，又立即與他在塵世照面。第一回：“... 方欲進來時，只見從那邊來了一僧一道：那僧則癩頭跣腳，那道則跛足蓬頭，瘋瘋癲癲，揮霍談笑而至。及至到了他門前，看見士隱抱着英蓮，那僧便大哭起來，...”

第二十五回：“... 只聞得隱隱的木魚聲響，念了一句：“南無解冤孽菩薩。有那人口不利，家宅顛傾，或逢凶險，或中邪祟者，我們善能醫治。”賈母，王夫人聽見這些話，那里還耐得住，便命人去快請進來。... 原來是一個癩頭和尚與一個跛足道人。... 那僧道：“長官你那里知道那物的妙用。只因他如今被聲色貨利所迷，故不靈驗了。你今且取他出來，待我們持頌持頌，只怕就好了。”

二. 儒家倫理管塵世的行為，為全書之“背景”。仙佛正義掌因果報應，為全書之主軸。

上述兩點，在書中一再的重複著。開宗明義的，就是寶玉的“夢”回仙境，與秦可卿的“魂”歸仙界。這一段的描述，點出了全書的主旨。

秦可卿 是警幻仙姑的仙子。

第五回：“秦氏笑道：“我这屋子大约神仙也可以住得了。”

第五回：“警幻道：“... 再将吾妹一人，乳名兼美字可卿者，许配于汝。今夕良时，即可成姻。不过令汝领略此仙闺幻境之风光尚如此，何况尘境之情景哉？而今后万万解释，改悟前情，留意于孔孟之间，委身于经济之道。”说毕便秘授以云雨之事，推宝玉入房，将门掩上自去。... 那宝玉恍恍惚惚，依警幻所嘱之言，未免有儿女之事，难以尽述。至次日，便柔情缱绻，软语温存，与可卿难解难分。... 只听迷津内水响如雷，竟有许多夜叉海鬼将宝玉拖将下去。吓得宝玉汗下如雨，一面失声喊叫：“可卿救我！”... 却说秦氏正在房外嘱咐小丫头们好生看着猫儿狗儿打架，忽听宝玉在梦中唤他的小名，因纳闷道：“我的小名这里从没人知道的，他如何知道，在梦里叫出来？”

結果, 一次云雨, 可卿就有了“仙胎”。

第十回：“旁边一个贴身伏侍的婆子道：“... 。如今我们家里现有好几位太医老爷瞧着呢，都不能的当真切的这么说。有一位说是喜，有一位说是病，这位说不相干，那位说怕冬至，总没有个准话儿。求老爷明白指示指示。”那先生笑道：“大奶奶这个症候，可是那众位耽搁了。... 如今既是把病耽误到这个地位，也是应有此灾。依我看来，这病尚有三分治得。”

第十一回：“王夫人道：“... 蓉哥儿媳妇儿身上有些不大好，到底是怎么样？”尤氏道：“他这个病得的也奇。上月中秋还跟着老太太，太太们顽了半夜，回家来好好的。到了二十后，一日比一日觉懒，... 经期又有两个月没来。”邢夫人接着说道：“别是喜罢？”... 秦氏拉着凤姐儿的手，强笑道：“... 就是婶娘这样疼我，我就有十分孝顺的心，如今也不能够了。我自想着，未必熬的过年去呢。”宝玉正眼瞅着那《海棠春睡图》...，不觉想起在这里睡晌觉梦到“太虚幻境”的事来。正自出神，听得秦氏说了这些话，如万箭攒心，那眼泪不知不觉就流下来了。... 秦氏笑道：“任凭神仙也罢，治得病治不得命。婶子，我知道我这病不过是挨日子。”凤姐儿说道：“你只管这么想着，病那里能好呢？总要想开了才是。况且听得大夫说，若是不治，怕的是春天不好呢。如今才九月半，还有四五个月的工夫，什么病治不好呢？... 尤氏道：“你冷眼瞧媳妇是怎么样？”凤姐儿说道：“这实在没法儿了。你也该将一应的后事用的东西给他料理料理，冲一冲也好。”尤氏道：“我也叫人暗暗的预备了。...”

第十三回：“凤姐方觉星眼微朦，恍惚只见秦氏从外走来，含笑说道：“婶子好睡！我今日“回”去，你也不送我一程。... 还有一件心愿未了，非告诉婶子，别人未必中用。秦氏道：“... 眼见不日又有一件非常喜事，真是烈火烹油，鲜花着锦之盛。要知道，也不过是瞬息的繁华，一时的欢乐，万不可忘了那‘盛筵必散’的俗语。此时若不早为后虑，临期只恐后悔无益了。”凤姐忙问：“有何喜事？”秦氏道：“天机不可泄漏。只是我与婶子好了一场，临别赠你两句话，须要记着。”因念道：三春去后诸芳尽，各自须寻各自门。

凤姐还欲问时，只听二门上传事云板连叩四下，将凤姐惊醒。人回：“东府蓉大奶奶没了。... 宝玉... 到晚间便索然睡了。如今从梦中听见说秦氏死了，连忙翻身爬起来，只觉心中似戳了一刀的不忍，哇的一声，直奔出一口血来。”

秦可卿的故事，作者用了四個章回來描述。那鐵定是有“重點”的。“老紅學”卻把重點放在“爬灰”與“上弔”上。因受公公姦污，羞愧而上弔。爬灰的典故，來自媳婦在香爐，給公公留了兩句詩：“願與公公彈一曲，肥水不入外人田。”所以，爬灰的定義是，媳婦是自願的。並且，全書只提到“爬灰”一次：“... 焦大越发连贾珍都说出来，乱嚷乱叫说：“我要往祠堂里哭太爷去。那里承望到如今生下这些畜牲来！每日家偷狗戏鸡，爬灰的爬灰，养小叔子的养小叔子，...”(第七回)。有人說，“由于畸笏叟的权威性干预，曹雪芹对与秦可卿有关的故事，作了重大删节和修改，包括许多技术性处理，因此人物形象有了重要改变。”即使真有爬灰這回事，它也與作者寫這四個章回的主旨不合。

作者費了很大的力氣，來強調秦可卿活不長了。完全没有上弔的影子。又一再的暗示，她的症狀與“有喜”相似。她的停經，也是與寶玉在仙界圓房之後。她托夢鳳姐云，我今“回”去。毫無不捨之情。並有天機的“喜”事。那，元春將省親，當然就不是天機了。也就“明示”了。天機，終究沒有說出。並且，寶玉在夢中得知噩耗，當場吐血。表現出，真是神仙夫妻。

秦可卿的故事，作者只想表達一個重點：仙界是“真”。仙佛正義，因果報應，毫不含糊。又怕讀者無法領悟這個重點，作者另外舉了三個例子。

第十二回：“那贾瑞此时要命心甚切，... 忽然这日有个跛足道人來化齋，口稱專治冤業之症。贾瑞偏生在内就听见了，直着声叫喊说：“快请进那位菩萨来救我！”... 那道士叹道：“你这病非药可医。我有个宝贝与你，你天天看时，此命可保矣。”说毕，从褡裢中取出一面镜子来---两面皆可照人，镜把上面鑿着“风月宝鉴”四字---递与贾瑞道：“这物出自太虚幻境空灵殿上，警幻仙子所制，专治邪思妄动之症，有济世保生之功。... 千万“不可照正面”，只照他的背面，要紧，要紧！三日后吾來收取，管叫你好了。”说毕，佯常而去，众人苦留不住。

贾瑞...拿起“风月鉴”來，向反面一照，只見一个骷髅立在里面，唬得贾瑞连忙掩了，骂：“道士混帐，如何吓我！---我倒再照照正面是什么。”想着，又将正面一照，只見凤姐站在里面招手叫他。贾瑞心中一喜，荡悠悠的觉得进了镜子，与凤姐云雨一番，凤姐仍送他出来。到了床上，哎哟了一声，一睁眼，镜子从手里掉过来，仍是反面立着一个骷髅。贾瑞自觉汗津津的，底下已遗了一滩精。心中到底不足，又翻过正面來，只見凤姐还招手叫他，他又进去。如此三四次。到了这次，刚要出镜子來，只見两个人走來，拿铁锁把他套住，拉了就走。贾瑞叫道：“让我拿了镜子再走。”---只说了这句，就再不能说话了。

旁边伏侍贾瑞的众人，... 上来看，已没了气。身子底下冰凉渍湿一大滩精，这才忙着穿衣抬床。代儒夫妇哭的死去活来，大骂道士，“是何妖镜！若不早毁此物，遗害于世不小。”遂命架火来烧，... 只见那跛足道人从外面跑来，喊道：“谁毁‘风月鉴’，吾来救也！”说着，直入中堂，抢入手内，飘然去了。”

第十五回：“秦钟求道：“好人，我已急死了。你今儿再不依，我就死在这里。”智能道：“你想怎样？除非等我出了这牢坑，离了这些人，才依你。”秦钟道：“这也容易，只是远水救不得近渴。”说着，一口吹了灯，满屋漆黑，将智能抱到炕上，就云雨起来。那智能百般的挣挫不起，又不好叫的，少不得依他了。”

第十六回：“茗烟道：“秦相公不中用了！”宝玉听说，吓了一跳，忙问道：“我昨儿才瞧了他来，还明明白白，怎么就不中用了？”茗烟道：“我也不知道，才刚是他家的老头子来特告诉我的。”...

此时秦钟已发过两三次昏了，移床易箒多时矣。... 那秦钟早已魂魄离身，只剩得一口悠悠余气在胸，正见许多鬼判持牌提索来捉他。那秦钟魂魄那里肯就去，... 又记挂着智能尚无下落，因此百般求告鬼判。无奈这些鬼判都不肯徇私，反叱咤秦钟道：“亏你还是读过书的人，岂不知俗语说的：‘阎王叫你三更死，谁敢留人到五更。’我们阴间上下都是铁面无私的，不比你们阳间瞻情顾意，有许多的碍处。”

賈瑞念淫人妻, 自淫而死。 秦鍾污蔑佛門 (雖然, 智能兒是自願的), 無疾而終。

第十六回：“正闹着，那秦钟魂魄忽听见“宝玉来了”四字，便忙又央求道：...，众鬼道：“又是什么好朋友？”秦钟道：“不瞒列位，就是荣国公的孙子，小名宝玉。”都判官听了，先就唬慌起来，忙喝骂鬼使道：“我说你们放了他回去走走罢，你们断不依我的话，如今只等他请出个运旺时盛的人来才罢。”众鬼见都判如此，也都忙了手脚，一面又抱怨道：“你老人家先是那等雷霆电雹，原来见不得‘宝玉’二字。依我们愚见，他是阳，我们是阴，怕他们也无益于我们。”都判道：“放屁！俗语说的好，‘天下官管天下事’，自古人鬼之道却是一般，阴阳并无二理。别管他阴也罢，阳也罢，还是把他放回没有错了的。”众鬼听说，只得将秦魂放回，...”。

寶玉是仙界“下世”的, 連勾魂鬼也怕。

作者對仙佛世界 與因果報應, 是重複了再重複。強調了再強調。它是全書之“經”。蔡义江在 解讀紅樓 (<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/32/>) 談到, “《紅樓夢》其實也就是“繁華成空”的意思。所以, 故事的結局是“家亡人散各奔騰”, 是“樹倒猢猻散”, 是“好一似食盡鳥投林, 落了片白茫茫大地真乾淨”。這是比較好的評論, 但仍未看出作者的主旨。

第八章：色、情、淫與意淫(一)

聂鑫森在“《红楼梦》性爱解码目录”中寫到，“爱情这个主题，在中国文学史上最先把它提到理性的高度，并把它充满了政治性的内容，却只有曹雪芹笔下的《红楼梦》）。

又云：“淫”的含义，一般有五种，即：过多，过盛，故有“淫雨”之说；邪恶，比如“淫威”；过于沉溺某一个情境或事件；惑乱，“富贵不能淫”，即是一例；漫漫，又称之为“浸淫”，为“积渐而扩及；渐进”之意。

“意”者，指思想、意识(包括下意识)、情感、感觉。

警幻所说的“意淫”，是这样界定的：“如尔天分中，生成一段痴情”，对娇美妩媚的女性，尊重、爱恋、痛惜，把她们视为知己，与她们心心相印，肝胆相照，“虽悦其色，复恋其情”，而且施情不吝，痴而不返，这“淫”字作“沉溺”解，作“过多、过盛”解，作“惑乱”解。同时“意淫”，又内含一种主动性，即全方位地让自己的思想、意识、情感、感觉积极地深入地，向女性世界漫漫，去领悟此中的种种“柔情私意”。就宝玉自身而言，“意淫”是一种境界，就大观园众多姊妹的冰清玉洁来说，又造成了宝玉“意淫”的氛围，二者缺一不可。”

似乎，只要把“紅樓”評為，是對“情”的完美表達，就能成為重要的“紅學”家了。上面的評論，對“紅樓”的主旨，是完全的誤解。“紅樓”的第二宗旨，為闡述，“人性，究竟是什麼？”這是一個很深，也很難的議題。“水滸”描述了 108 好漢的個性與人格。讀者，或許能多多少少的，總結出一個概念，“人性，究竟是什麼？”但，每個人的結論，或有不同。“水滸”的作者，終究沒有直接的回答，“人性，究竟是什麼？”的議題。

“紅樓”的偉大，在於它發明了一個全新的“模式”，來討論“人性”的議題。此模式，有兩大組成部分。

a. 對色、情與淫的新定義。好色即淫，知情更淫。癡情為意淫。在儒家，食色性也。只要名正，則合禮。過正則為淫。

b. 作者創造了一個“新人”，不是凡胎。他是一塊頑石，一個蠢貨。他沒有心機心術。他心，直指“人性”。在儒家的四善端之外，是否另有淫端。

當然，作者先從“凡人”之淫談起。首先，是賈璉。

(第二十一回) 那个贾璉，只离了凤姐便要寻事，独寝了两夜，便十分难熬，便暂将小厮们内有清俊的选来出火。不想荣国府内有一个极不成器破烂酒头厨子，名叫多官，人见他懦弱无能，都唤他作“多浑虫”。因他自小父母替他在外娶了一个媳妇，今年方二十来往年纪，生得有几分人才，见者无不羡慕。他生性轻浮，最喜拈花惹草，多浑虫又不理论，只是有酒有肉有钱，便诸事不管了，所以荣宁二府之人都得入手。因这个媳妇美貌异常，轻浮无比，众人都呼他作“多姑娘儿”。如今贾璉在外熬煎，往日也曾见过这媳妇，失过魂魄，只是“内惧娇妻，外惧妾宠”，不曾下得手。那多姑娘儿也曾有意于贾璉，只恨没空。今闻贾璉挪在外书房来，他便没事也要走两趟去招惹。惹的贾璉似饥鼠一般，少不得和心腹的小厮们计议，合同遮掩谋求，多以金帛相许。小厮们焉有不允之理，况都和这媳妇是好友，一说便成。是夜二鼓人定，多浑虫醉昏在炕，贾璉便溜了来相会。进门一见其态，早已魄飞魂散，也不用情谈款叙，便宽衣动作起来。谁知这媳妇有天生的奇趣，一经男子挨身，便觉遍身筋骨瘫软，使男子如卧绵上，更兼淫态浪言，压倒娼妓，诸男子至此岂有惜命者哉。那贾璉恨不得连身子化在他身上。那媳妇故作浪语，在下说道：“你家女儿出花儿，供着娘娘，你也该忌两日，倒为我脏了身子。快离了我这里罢。”贾璉一面大动，一面喘吁吁答道：“你就是娘娘！我那里管什么娘娘！”那媳妇越浪，贾璉越丑态毕露。一时事毕，两个又海誓山盟，难分难舍，此后遂成相契。

(第四十四回) 凤姐... 便摄手摄脚的走至窗前。往里听时，只听里头说笑。那妇人笑道：“多早晚你那阎王老婆死了就好了。”贾璉道：“他死了，再娶一个也是这样，又怎么样呢？”那妇人道：“他死了，你倒是把平儿扶了正，只怕还好些。”贾璉道：“如今连平儿他也不叫我沾一沾了。平儿也是一肚子委屈不敢说。我命里怎么就该犯了‘夜叉星’。”

凤姐听了，气的浑身乱战，... 一脚踢开门进去，也不容分说，抓着鲍二家的撕打一顿。又怕贾璉走出去，便堵着门站着骂道：“好淫妇！你偷主子汉子，还要治死主子老婆！平儿过来！你们淫妇忘八一条藤儿，多嫌着我，外面儿你哄我！”说着又把平儿打几下，打的平儿有冤无处诉，只气得干哭，骂道：“你们做这些没脸的事，好好的又拉上我做什么！”说着也把鲍二家的撕打起来。贾璉也因吃多了酒，进来高兴，未曾作的机密，一见凤姐来了，已没了主意，又见平儿也闹起来，把酒也气上来了。凤姐儿打鲍二家的，...

其次，就是賈蓉。

(第六十三回) 贾蓉且嘻嘻的望他二姨娘笑说：“二姨娘，你又来了，我们父亲正想你呢。”尤二姐便红了脸，骂道：“蓉小子，我过两日不骂你几句，你就过不得了。越发连个体统都没了。还亏你

是大家公子哥儿，每日念书学礼的，越发连那小家子瓢坎的也跟不上。”说着顺手拿起一个熨斗来，搂头就打，吓的贾蓉抱着头滚到怀里告饶。尤三姐便上来撕嘴，又说：“等姐姐来家，咱们告诉他。”贾蓉忙笑着跪在炕上求饶，他两个又笑了。贾蓉又和二姨抢砂仁吃，尤二姐嚼了一嘴渣子，吐了他一脸。贾蓉“用舌头都舔着吃了”。众丫头看不过，都笑说：“热孝在身上，老娘才睡了觉，他两个虽小，到底是“姨娘家”，你太眼里没有奶奶了。回来告诉爷，你吃不了兜着走。”贾蓉撇下他姨娘，便“抱着丫头们亲嘴”：“我的心肝，你说的是，咱们谗他两个。”丫头们忙推他，恨的骂：“短命鬼儿，你一般有老婆丫头，只和我们闹，知道的说是顽，不知道的人，再遇见那脏心烂肺的爱多管闲事嚼舌头的人，吵嚷的那府里谁不知道，谁不背地里嚼舌说咱们这边乱帐。”贾蓉笑道：“各门另户，谁管谁的事。都够使的了。从古至今，连汉朝和唐朝，人还说脏唐臭汉，何况咱们这宗人家。谁家没风流事，别讨我说出来。连那边大老爷这么利害，璉叔还和那小姨娘不干净呢。凤姑娘那样刚强，瑞叔还想他的帐。那一件瞒了我！”

至於，寶玉之淫，則從“同性戀”談起。

(第七回) 那宝玉自见了秦钟的人品出众，心中似有所失，痴了半日，自己心中又起了呆意，乃自思道：“天下竟有这等人物！如今看来，我竟成了泥猪癞狗了。可恨我为什么生在这侯门公府之家，若也生在寒门薄宦之家，早得与他交结，也不枉生了一世。...”秦钟心中亦自思道：“果然这宝玉怨不得人溺爱他。可恨我偏生于清寒之家，不能与他耳鬓交接，可知‘贫窶’二字限人，亦世间之大不快事。”二人一样的胡思乱想。忽然宝玉问他读什么书。秦钟见问，因而答以实话。二人你言我语，十来句后，越觉亲密起来。

(第九回) 原来薛蟠自来王夫人处住后，便知有一家学，学中广有青年子弟，不免偶动了“龙阳”之兴，因此也假来上学读书，不过是三日打鱼，两日晒网，白送些束脩礼物与贾代儒，却不曾有一些儿进益，只图结交些契弟。谁想这学内就有好几个小学生，图了薛蟠的银钱吃穿，被他哄上手，也不消多记。

更又有两个多情的小学生，亦不知是那一房的亲眷，亦未考真名姓，只因生得妩媚风流，满学中送了他两个外号，一号“香怜”，一号“玉爱”。...如今宝，秦二人一来，见了他两个，也不免缱绻羡慕，...香，玉二人心中，也一般的留情与宝，秦。因此四人心中虽有情意，只未发迹。每日一入学中，四处各坐，却八目勾留，或设言托意，或咏桑寓柳，遥以心照，却外面自为避人眼目。不意偏又有几个滑贼看出形景来，都背后挤眉弄眼，或咳嗽扬声，这也非止一日。

...因此秦钟趁此和香怜挤眉弄眼，递暗号儿，二人假装出小恭，走至后院说梯己话。...只听背后咳嗽了一声。二人唬的忙回头看时，原来是窗友名金荣者。香怜有些性急，羞怒相激，问道：“你咳嗽什么？难道不许我两个说话不成？”金荣笑道：“许你们说话，难道不许我咳嗽不成？我只问你们：有话不明说，许你们这样鬼鬼祟祟的干什么故事？我可也拿住了，还赖什么！...”

... 金荣只一口咬定说：“方才明明的撞见他两个在后院子里亲嘴摸屁股，一对一禽，撇草根儿抽长短，谁长谁先干。”金荣只顾得意乱说，却不防还有别人。谁知早又触怒了一个。你道这个是谁？

... 这里茗烟先一把揪住金荣，问道：“我们禽屁股不禽屁股，管你<毛几><毛巴>相干，横竖没禽你爹去罢了！

(第十五回) 谁想秦钟趁黑无人，来寻智能。刚至后面房中，只见智能独在房中洗茶碗，秦钟跑来便搂着亲嘴。... 说着，一口吹了灯，满屋漆黑，将智能抱到炕上，就云雨起来。那智能百般的挣扎不起，又不好叫的，少不得依他了。正在得趣，只见一人进来，将他二人按住，也不则声。二人不知是谁，唬的不敢动一动。只听那人嗤的一声，掌不住笑了，二人听声方知是宝玉。秦钟连忙起来，抱怨道：“这算什么？”宝玉笑道：“你倒不依，咱们就叫喊起来。”羞的智能趁黑地跑了。宝玉拉了秦钟出来道：“你可还和我强？”秦钟笑道：“好人，你只别嚷的众人知道，你要怎样我都依你。”宝玉笑道：“这会子也不用说，等一会睡下，再细细的算帐。”一时宽衣安歇的时节，凤姐在里间，秦钟宝玉在外间，满地下皆是家下婆子，打铺坐更。凤姐因怕通灵玉失落，便等宝玉睡下，命人拿来手帕按在自己枕边。宝玉不知与秦钟算何帐目，未见真切，未曾记得，“此是疑案，不敢纂创”。

(第二十八回) 少刻，宝玉出席解手，蒋玉菡便随了出来。二人站在廊檐下，蒋玉菡又陪不是。宝玉见他妩媚温柔，心中十分留恋，便紧紧的搭着他的手，叫他：“闲了往我们那里去。还有一句话借问，也是你们贵班中，有一个叫琪官的，他在那里？如今名驰天下，我独无缘一见。”蒋玉菡笑道：“就是我的小名儿。”宝玉听说，不觉欣然跌足笑道：“有幸，有幸！果然名不虚传。今儿初会，便怎么样呢？”想了一想，向袖中取出扇子，将一个玉玦扇坠解下来，递与琪官，道：“微物不堪，略表今日之谊。”琪官接了，笑道：“无功受禄，何以克当！也罢，我这里得了一件奇物，今日早起方系上，还是簇新的，聊可表我一点亲热之意。”说毕撩衣，将系小衣儿一条大红汗巾子解了下来，递与宝玉，道：“这汗巾子是茜香国女国王所贡之物，夏天系着，肌肤生香，不生汗渍。昨日北静王给我的，今日才上身。若是别人，我断不肯相赠。二爷请把自己系的解下来，给我系着。”宝玉听说，喜不自禁，连忙接了，将自己一条松花汗巾解了下来，递与琪官。二人方束好，只见一声大叫：“我可拿住了！”只见薛蟠跳了出来，拉着二人道：“放着酒不吃，两个人逃席出来干什么？快拿出来我瞧瞧。”二人都道：“没有什么。”薛蟠那里肯依，还是冯紫英出来才解开了。于是复又归坐饮酒，至晚方散。

(第三十三回) 那长史官先就说道：“下官此来，并非擅造潭府，皆因奉王命而来，有一件事相求。看王爷面上，敢烦大人作主，不但王爷知情，且连下官辈亦感谢不尽。”... 那长史官便冷笑道：“也不必承办，只用大人一句话就完了。我们府里有一个做小旦的琪官，一向好好在府里，如今竟三五日不见回去，各处去找，又摸不着他的道路，因此各处访察。这一城内，十停人倒有八停人都说，他近日和衔玉的那位令郎相与甚厚。... 王爷亦云：‘若是别的戏子呢，一百个也罢了，只是

这琪官随机应答，谨慎老诚，甚合我老人家的心，竟断断少不得此人。’故此求老大人转谕令郎，请将琪官放回，一则可慰王爷谆谆奉恳，二则下官辈也可免操劳求觅之苦。” ...

贾政一见，眼都红紫了，也不暇问他在外流荡优伶，表赠私物，在家荒疏学业，淫辱母婢 [金釧] 等语，只喝令“堵起嘴来，着实打死！”小厮们不敢违拗，只得将宝玉按在凳上，举起大板打了十来下。贾政犹嫌打轻了，一脚踢开掌板的，自己夺过来，咬着牙狠命盖了三四十下。众门客见打的不祥了，忙上前夺劝。贾政那里肯听，说道：“你们问问他干的勾当可饶不可饶！素日皆是你们这些人把他酿坏了，到这步田地还来解劝。明日酿到他弑君杀父，你们才不劝不成！”

(第三十四回) 薛蟠道：“你只会怨我顾前不顾后，你怎么不怨宝玉外头招风惹草的那个样子！别说的，只拿前儿琪官的事比给你们听：那琪官，我们见过十来次的，我并未和他说一句亲热话，怎么前儿他见了，连姓名还不知道，就把汗巾儿给他了？难道这也是我说的不成？”

這一個議題，作者以六個章回，反覆的描述著。評“紅樓”，怎能不談它。作者對女子的“同性戀”也有一段描述。

(第五十八回) 芳官笑道：“你说他祭的是谁？祭的是死了的葯官。”宝玉道：“这是友谊，也应当的。”芳官笑道：“那里是友谊？他竟是疯傻的想头，说自己是小生，葯官是小旦，常做夫妻，虽说是假的，每日那些曲文排场，皆是真正温存体贴之事，故此二人就疯了，虽不做戏，寻常饮食起坐，两个人竟是你恩我爱。葯官一死，他哭的死去活来，至今不忘，所以每节烧纸。后来补了蕊官，我们见他一般的温柔体贴，也曾问他得新弃旧的。他说：‘这又有个大道理。比如男子丧了妻，或有必当续弦者，也必要续弦为是。便只是不把死的丢过不提，便是情深意重了。若一味因死的不续，孤守一世，妨了大节，也不是理，死者反不安了。’你说可是又疯又呆？说来可是可笑？”宝玉听说了这篇呆话 ... 说：“天既生这样的人，又何用我这须眉浊物玷辱世界。”

第九章：色、情、淫與意淫(二)

一般的公論，認為寶玉與黛玉的愛情，是純潔的。描述這一真誠的愛情，是“紅樓”的第一主旨。它的成功，也是“紅樓”的偉大之處。這實在是，完全誤解了作者的真意。還是看看，作者的自白吧。

(第五回)“警幻道：“...好色即淫，知情更淫。...吾所‘愛’汝者，乃天下古今第一淫人也。”

寶玉听了，唬的忙答道：“仙姑差了。我因懶于讀書，家父母尚每垂訓飭，豈敢再冒‘淫’字。況且年紀尚小，不知‘淫’字為何物。”警幻道：“非也。淫虽一理，意则有別。

如世之好淫者，不過悅容貌，喜歌舞，調笑無厭，云雨無時，恨不能盡天下之美女供我片時之趣興，此皆皮膚淫濫之蠢物耳。

如尔则天分中，生成一段痴情，吾輩推之為‘意淫’。‘意淫’二字，惟心會而不可口傳，可神通而不可語達。汝今獨得此二字，在閨閣中，固可為良友；然于世道中未免迂闊怪詭，百口嘲謗，萬目睚眦。今既遇令祖寧榮二公剖腹深囑，吾不忍君獨為我閨閣增光，見棄于世道，...不過令汝領略此仙閨幻境之風光尚如此，何況塵境之情景哉？而今后萬萬解釋，改悟前情，留意于孔孟之間，委身于經濟之道。”

作者在此，把他的“真意”主旨寫得非常清楚。共有三點。

- a. 色淫 --- 悅容貌，云雨無時。
- b. 意淫 --- 天分(宿命)中，一段痴情。
- c. 正道 --- 留意于孔孟之間，委身于經濟之道。

所以，寶、黛的愛情，只是照著宿命的劇本演出。請看下面“幾個”章回。

(第一回) 那僧笑道：“此事说来好笑，竟是千古未闻的罕事。只因西方灵河岸上三生石畔，有绛珠草一株，时有赤瑕宫神瑛侍者，日以甘露灌溉，这绛珠草始得久延岁月。后来既受天地精华，复得雨露滋养，遂得脱却草胎木质，得换人形，仅修成个女体，终日游于离恨天外，饥则食蜜青果为膳，渴则饮灌愁海水为汤。只因尚未酬报灌溉之德，故其五内便郁结着一段缠绵不尽之意。恰近日这神瑛侍者凡心偶炽，乘此昌明太平朝世，意欲下凡造历幻缘，已在警幻仙子案前挂了号。警幻亦曾问及，灌溉之情未偿，趁此倒可了结的。那绛珠仙子道：‘他是甘露之惠，我并无此水可还。他既下世为人，我也去下世为人，但把我一生所有的“眼泪”还他，也偿还得过他了。’因此一事，就勾出多少风流冤家来，陪他们去了结此案。”

(第八回) “宝钗因笑说道：“成日家说你的这玉，究竟未曾细细的赏鉴，我今儿倒要瞧瞧。”

... 口内念道：“... 仙寿恒昌。”... 莺儿嘻嘻笑道：“我听这两句话，倒像和姑娘的项圈上的两句话是一对儿。”... 宝玉笑央：“好姐姐，你怎么瞧我的了呢。”... 宝玉忙托了锁看时，果然一面有四个篆字，... 芳龄永继。宝玉... 因笑问：“姐姐这八个字倒真与我的是一对。”莺儿笑道：“是个“癞头和尚”(宿命的导演)送的，他说必须镌在金器上...”。

(第二十八回) “林黛玉... 因说道：“我没这么大福禁受，比不得宝姑娘，什么金什么玉的，我们不过是草木之人！”宝玉听他提出“金玉”二字来，不觉心动疑猜，便说道：“除了别人说什么金什么玉，我心里要有这个想头，天诛地灭，万世不得人身！”林黛玉听他这话，便知他心里动了疑，忙又笑道：“好没意思，白白的说什么誓？管你什么金什么玉的呢！”宝玉道：“我心里的事也难对你说，日后自然明白。除了老太太，老爷，太太这三个人，第四个就是妹妹了。要有第五个人，我也说个誓。”

(第二十八回) “薛宝钗因往日母亲对王夫人等曾提过“金锁是个和尚给的，等日后有玉的方可结为婚姻”等语，所以总远着宝玉。昨儿见元春所赐的东西，独他与宝玉一样，心里越发没意思起来。幸亏宝玉被一个林黛玉缠绵住了，心心念念只记挂着林黛玉，并不理论这事。”

(第二十九回) “原来那宝玉自幼生成有一种下流痴病，况从幼时和黛玉耳鬓厮磨，心情相对；及如今稍明时事，又看了那些邪书僻传，凡远亲近友之家所见的那些闺英闾秀，皆未有稍及林黛玉者，所以早存了一段心事，只不好说出来，故每每或喜或怒，变尽法子暗中试探。那林黛玉偏生也是个有些痴病的，也每用假情试探。因你也将真心真意瞒了起来，只用假意，我也将真心真意瞒了起来，只用假意，如此两假相逢，终有一真。其间琐琐碎碎，难保不有口角之争。即如此刻，宝玉的心内想的是：“别人不知我的心，还有可恕，难道你就不想我的心里眼里只有你！你不能为我烦恼，反来以这话奚落堵我。可见我心里一时一刻白有你，你竟心里没我。”心里这意思，只是口里说不出来。那林黛玉心里想着：“你心里自然有我，虽有‘金玉相对’之说，你岂是重这邪说不

重我的。我便时常提这‘金玉’，你只管了然自若无闻的，方见得是待我重，而毫无此心了。如何我只一提‘金玉’的事，你就着急，可知你心里时时有‘金玉’，见我一提，你又怕我多心，故意着急，安心哄我。”

看来两个人原本是一个心，但都多生了枝叶，反弄成两个心了。那宝玉心中又想着：“我不管怎么样都好，只要你随意，我便立刻因你死了也情愿。你知也罢，不知也罢，只由我的心，可见你方和我近，不和我远。”那林黛玉心里又想着：“你只管你，你好我自好，你何必为我而自失。殊不知你失我自失。可见是你不叫我近你，有意叫我远你了。”如此看来，却都是求近之心，反弄成疏远之意。如此之话，皆他二人素习所存私心，也难备述。

如今只述他们外面的形容。那宝玉又听见他说“好姻缘”三个字，越发逆了己意，心里干噎，口里说不出话来，便赌气向颈上抓下通灵宝玉，咬牙恨命往地下一摔，道：“什么捞什骨子，我砸了你完事！”偏生那玉坚硬非常，摔了一下，竟文风没动。宝玉见没摔碎，便回身找东西来砸。林黛玉见他如此，早已哭起来，说道：“何苦来，你摔砸那哑吧物件。有砸他的，不如来砸我。”

(第三十二回) “林黛玉听了这话，不觉又喜又惊，又悲又叹。所喜者，果然自己眼力不错，素日认他是个知己，果然是个知己；所惊者，他在人前一片私心称扬于我，其亲热厚密，竟不避嫌疑；所叹者，你既为我之知己，自然我亦可为你之知己矣，既你我为知己，则又何必有“金玉之论”哉；既有金玉之论，亦该你我有之，则又何必来一宝钗哉！所悲者，父母早逝，虽有铭心刻骨之言，无人为我主张。况近日每觉神思恍惚，病已渐成，医者更云气弱血亏，恐致劳怯之症。你我虽为知己，但恐自不能久待；你纵为我知己，奈我薄命何！想到此间，不禁滚下泪来。待进去相见，自觉无味，便一面拭“泪”，一面抽身回去了。 ...

宝玉瞅了半天，方说道“你放心”三个字。林黛玉听了，怔了半天，方说道：“我有什么不放心的？我不明白这话。你倒说说怎么放心不放心？”宝玉叹了一口气，问道：“你果不明白这话？难道我素日在你身上的心都用错了？连你的意思若体贴不着，就难怪你天天为我生气了。”林黛玉道：“果然我不明白放心不放心的话。”宝玉点头叹道：“好妹妹，你别哄我。果然不明白这话，不但我素日之意白用了，且连你素日待我之意也都辜负了。你皆因总是不放心的原故，才弄了一身病。但凡宽慰些，这病也不得一日重似一日。”林黛玉听了这话，如轰雷掣电，细细思之，竟比自己肺腑中掏出来的还觉恳切，竟有万句言语，满心要说，只是半个字也不能吐，却怔怔的望着他。此时宝玉心中也有万句言语，不知从那一句上说起，却也怔怔的望着黛玉。两个人怔了半天，林黛玉只咳了一声，两眼不觉滚下“泪”来，回身便要走。宝玉忙上前拉住，说道：“好妹妹，且略站住，我说一句话再走。”林黛玉一面拭泪，一面将手推开，说道：“有什么可说的。你的话我早知道了！”口里说着，却头也不回竟去了。 ...

宝玉站着，只管发起呆来。原来方才出来慌忙，不曾带得扇子，袭人怕他热，忙拿了扇子赶来送与他，忽抬头见了林黛玉和他站着。一时黛玉走了，他还站着不动，因而赶上来说道：“你也不带了扇子去，亏我看见，赶了送来。”宝玉出了神，见袭人和他说话，并未看出是何人来，便一把拉住，说道：“好妹妹，我的这心事，从来也不敢说，今儿我大胆说出来，死也甘心！我为你也弄了

一身的病在这里，又不敢告诉人，只好掩着。只等你的病好了，只怕我的病才得好呢。睡里梦里也忘不了你！”袭人听了这话，吓得魄消魂散，只叫“神天菩萨，坑死我了！”便推他道：“这是那里的话！敢是中了邪？还不快去？”宝玉一时醒过来，方知是袭人送扇子来，羞的满面紫涨，夺了扇子，便忙忙的抽身跑了。”

作者，至少用了五個章回，反覆的來強調，這“宿命”的愛情（天分中，一段痴情）。純情也好，真心也罷，終究是一場“空”。這完完全全的是在宣揚佛教的教義。其主旨為“孽海情天”，紅塵一夢。情對孽。情就是孽。故，【红楼梦引子】云：... 因此，上演出这怀金悼玉的《红楼梦》。曲文更是如下：

（第五回）“【终身误】 都道是金玉良姻，俺只念木石前盟。空对着，山中高士晶莹雪；终不忘，世外仙姝寂寞林。叹人间，美中不足今方信。纵然是齐眉举案，到底意难平。”

【枉凝眉】 一个是阆苑仙葩，一个是美玉无瑕。若说没奇缘，今生偏又遇着他，若说有奇缘，如何心事终虚化？一个枉自嗟呀，一个空劳牵挂。一个是水中月，一个是镜中花。想眼中能有多少泪珠儿，怎经得秋流到冬尽，春流到夏！”

當然，作者並未忘記談談“正道”。原文如下：

（第三十二回）“湘云笑道：“还是这个情性不改。如今大了，你就不愿读书去考举人进士的，也该常常的会会这些为官做宰的人们，谈谈讲讲些仕途经济的学问，也好将来应酬世务，日后也有个朋友。没见你成年家只在我们队里搅些什么！”宝玉听了道：“姑娘请别的姊妹屋里坐坐，我这里仔细污了你知经济学问的。”袭人道：“云姑娘快别说这话。上回也是宝姑娘也说过一回，他也不管人脸上过的去过不去，他就咳了一声，拿起脚来走了。这里宝姑娘的话也没说完，见他走了，登时羞的脸通红，说又不是，不说又不是。幸而是宝姑娘，那要是林姑娘，不知又闹到怎么样，哭的怎么样呢。提起这个话来，真真的宝姑娘叫人敬重，自己讪了一会子去了。我倒过不去，只当他恼了。谁知过后还是照旧一样，真真有涵养，心地宽大。谁知这一个反倒同他生分了。那林姑娘见你赌气不理他，你得赔多少不是呢。”宝玉道：“林姑娘从来说过这些混帐话不曾？若他也说过这些混帐话，我早和他生分了。”

至於“色淫”，下章分解。

第十章：色、情、淫與 意淫(三)

儒家強調 慎獨。不可在 意念中，背離禮教。所以，從字面而言，意淫就是 念淫。但是，作者不是如此定義的。作者對“意淫”的定義是很明確的。云：“天分中，生成一段痴情，吾輩推之为‘意淫’”(第五回)。那麼，念淫 仍是世間之淫。即，好色即淫，知情更淫。這一意淫的新定義，是“紅樓”的新發明。但，作者也必須對 世間之淫有所闡述，尤其是念淫。如此，才能突顯 意淫之新義。

聂鑫森說：“‘意淫’，又内含一种主动性，即全方位地让自己的思想、意识、情感、感觉积极地深入地，向女性世界浸漫，去领悟此中的种种“柔情私意”。就宝玉自身而言，“意淫”是一种境界，就大观园众多姊妹的冰清玉洁来说，又造成了宝玉“意淫”的氛围，二者缺一不可。”這完全是 聂鑫森的鬼扯蛋。“紅樓”沉冤至此。只有作者的自白，能為他自己平冤。先看作者如何描述“念淫”吧。

(第十九回) “宝玉见一个人没有，因想“这里素日有个小书房，内曾挂着一轴美人，极画的得神。今日这般热闹，想那里自然无人，那美人也自然是寂寞的，须得我去望慰他一回。”

(第十九回) “宝玉 ... 乃笑问袭人道：“今儿那个穿红的是你什么人？”袭人道：“那是我两姨妹子。”宝玉听了，赞叹了两声。袭人道：“叹什么？我知道你心里的缘故，想是说他那里配红的。”宝玉笑道：“不是，不是。那样的不配穿红的，谁还敢穿。我因为见他实在好的很，怎么也得他在咱们家就好了。”袭人冷笑道：“我一个人是奴才命罢了，难道连我的亲戚都是奴才命不成？定还要拣实在好的丫头才往你家来。”

(第十五回) “宝玉怅然无趣。... 外面旺儿预备下赏封，赏了本村主人。庄妇等来叩赏。凤姐并不在意，宝玉却留心看时，内中并无二丫头。一时上了车，出来走不多远，只见迎头二丫头怀里抱着他小兄弟，同着几个小女孩子说笑而来。宝玉恨不得下车跟了他去，料是众人不依的，少不得以目相送，争奈车轻马快，一时展眼无踪。”

(第二十四回) “宝玉 … 回头见鸳鸯穿着水红绫子袄儿，青缎子背心，束着白绉绸汗巾儿，脸向那边低着头看针线，脖子上戴着花领子。宝玉便把脸凑在他脖项上，闻那香油气，不住用手摩挲，其白腻不在袭人之下，便猴上身去涎皮笑道：“好姐姐，把你嘴上的胭脂赏我吃了罢。”一面说着，一面扭股糖似的粘在身上。鸳鸯便叫道：“袭人，你出来瞧瞧。你跟他一辈子，也不劝劝，还是这么着。”袭人抱了衣服出来，向宝玉道：“左劝也不改，右劝也不改，你到底是怎么回事？你再这么着，这个地方可就难住了。”一边说，一边催他穿了衣服，同鸳鸯往前面来见贾母。

(第二十八回) “宝玉笑问道：“宝姐姐，我瞧瞧你的红麝串子？”可巧宝钗左腕上笼着一串，见宝玉问他，少不得褪了下来。宝钗生的肌肤丰泽，容易褪不下来。宝玉在旁看着雪白一段酥臂，不觉动了羡慕之心，暗暗想道：“这个膀子要长在林妹妹身上，或者还得摸一摸，偏生长在他身上。”正是恨没福得摸，忽然想起“金玉”一事来，再看看宝钗形容，只见脸若银盆，眼似水杏，唇不点而红，眉不画而翠，比林黛玉另具一种妩媚风流，不觉就呆了，宝钗褪了串子来递与他也忘了接。”

(第三十回) “金钏抿嘴一笑，摆手令他出去，仍合上眼，宝玉见了他，就有些恋恋不舍的，悄悄的探头瞧瞧王夫人合着眼，便自己向身边荷包里带的香雪润津丹掏了出来，便向金钏儿口里一送。金钏儿并不睁眼，只管噙了。宝玉上来便拉着手，悄悄的笑道：“我明日和太太讨你，咱们在一处罢。”金钏儿不答。宝玉又道：“不然，等太太醒了我就讨。””

任何人，認為上面這些，是對“理想”愛情的描述，或意淫的最高境界，他若不是文盲，就是睜著眼睛說瞎話。連不識字的 袭人都說：“再不可‘毀僧谤道’，调脂弄粉。还有更要紧的一件，再不许吃人嘴上擦的胭脂了，与那爱红的毛病儿。”(第十九回)。作者的主旨，我已提過很多次了。再重複一次吧。

作者把情定義為淫，為孽。“孽海情天”。

厚地高天，堪叹古今情不尽，

痴男怨女，可怜风月债难偿。

“分离聚合皆前定。

看破的，遁入空门；痴迷的，枉送了性命。

好一似食尽鸟投林，落了片白茫茫大地真干净！”(第五回)。

這不但是“紅樓”的全部重點，作者更認為，這是普世的真理。不僅僅“應”在寶玉一人身上。所以，作者另舉了許多例子。如，

小紅之於 賈芸。

彩霞之於 賈環。

智能兒之於 秦鍾。

萬兒之於 茗烟。

司棋之於 潘又安。

尤三姐之於 柳湘蓮。

作者擔心，他的真義仍被誤解。更作了直接的闡述如下。

(第三十六回)“宝玉道：... 趁你们在，我就死了，再能够你们哭我的眼泪流成大河，把我的尸首漂起来，送到那鸦雀不到的幽僻之处，随风化了，自此再不要托生为人，就是我死的得时了。”...

一日，宝玉因各处游的烦腻，便想起《牡丹亭》曲来，... 因闻得梨香院的十二个女孩子中有小旦龄官最是唱的好，因着意出角门来找... 不想龄官见他坐下，忙抬身起来躲避，正色说道：“嗓子哑了。”... 宝玉见他坐正了，再一细看，原来就是那日蔷薇花下划“蔷”字那一个。又见如此景况，从来未经过这番被人弃厌，... 宝官便说道：“只略等一等，蔷二爷来了叫他唱，是必唱的。”...

宝玉见了这般景况，不觉痴了，这才领会了划“蔷”深意。自己站不住，也抽身走了。贾蔷一心都在龄官身上，也不顾送，倒是别的女孩子送了出来。

那宝玉一心裁夺盘算，痴痴的回至怡红院中，... 就和袭人长叹，说道：“我昨晚上的话竟说错了，... 昨夜说你们的眼泪单葬我，这就错了。我竟不能全得了。从此后只是各人各得眼泪罢了。”袭人昨夜不过是些顽话，已经忘了，不想宝玉今又提起来，便笑道：“你可真真有些疯了。”宝玉默默不对，自此深悟‘人生情缘，各有分定’，... 此皆宝玉心中所怀，也不可十分妄拟。”

作者仍然擔心，這普世真理，仍被誤解。在 寶釵、黛玉 意淫(宿命)的主軸之外，把這主題，從另外的角度，再闡述了一遍。

(第二十回) “宝玉笑道：“咱两个作什么呢？怪没意思的，也罢了，... 我替你篋头罢。”... 只见晴雯忙忙走进来取钱。一见了他两个，便冷笑道：“哦，交杯盏还没吃，倒上头了！”宝玉笑道：“你来，我也替你篋一篋。”晴雯道：“我没那么大福。”说着，拿了钱，便摔帘子出去了。

宝玉在麝月身后，麝月对镜，二人在镜内相视。宝玉便向镜内笑道：“满屋里就只是他磨牙。”... 忽听唿一声帘子响，晴雯又跑进来问道：“我怎么磨牙了？咱们倒得说说。”麝月笑道：“你去你的罢，又来问人了。”晴雯笑道：“你又护着。你们那瞞神弄鬼的，我都知道。等我捞回本儿来再说话。”说着，一径出去了。”

(第三十一回) “晴雯道：“怪热的，拉拉扯扯作什么！叫人来看像什么！我这身子也不配坐在这里。”... 宝玉笑道：“我才又吃了好些酒，还得洗一洗。你既没有洗，拿了水来咱们两个洗。”晴雯摇手笑道：“罢，罢，我不敢惹爷。还记得碧痕打发你洗澡，足有两三个时辰，也不知道作什么呢。我们也不好进去的。后来洗完了，进去瞧瞧，地下的水淹着床腿，连席子上都汪着水，也不知是怎么洗了，笑了几天。我也没那工夫收拾，也不用同我洗去。”

... 宝玉笑道：“既这么着，你也不许洗去，只洗洗手来拿果子来吃罢。”晴雯笑道：“我慌张的很，连扇子还跌折了，那里还配打发吃果子。倘或再打破了盘子，还更了不得呢。”宝玉笑道：“你爱打就打，这些东西原不过是借人所用，你爱这样，我爱那样，各自性情不同。比如那扇子原是扇的，你要撕着玩也可以使得，只是不可生气时拿他出气。... 晴雯听了，笑道：“既这么说，你就拿了扇子来我撕。我最喜欢撕的。”宝玉听了，便笑着递与他。晴雯果然接过来，嗤的一声，撕了两半，接着嗤嗤又听几声。宝玉在旁笑着说：“响的好，再撕响些！”正说着，只见麝月走过来，笑道：“少作些孽罢。”宝玉赶上来，一把将他手里的扇子也夺了递与晴雯。晴雯接了，也撕了几半子，二人都大笑。麝月道：“这是怎么说，拿我的东西开心儿？”宝玉笑道：“打开扇子匣子你拣去，什么好东西！”麝月道：“既这么说，就把匣子搬了出来，让他尽力的撕，岂不好？”宝玉笑道：“你就搬去。”麝月道：“我可不造这孽。”

(第五十一回) “宝玉笑道：“... 你来把我的这边被掖一掖。”晴雯听说，便上来掖了掖，伸手进去渥一渥时，宝玉笑道：“好冷手！我说看冻着。”一面又见晴雯两腮如胭脂一般，用手摸了一摸，也觉得冰冷。宝玉道：“快进被来渥渥罢。”

(第五十二回) “宝玉因记挂着晴雯袭人等事，便先回园里来。到房中，药香满屋，一人不见，只见晴雯独卧于炕上，脸面烧的飞红，又摸了一摸，只觉烫手。忙又向炉上将手烘暖，伸进被去摸了一摸身上，也是火烧。”

(第七十七回) “晴雯呜咽道：“有什么可说的！不过挨一刻是一刻，挨一日是一日。我已知横竖不过三五日的光景，就好回去了。只是一件，我死也不甘心的：我虽生的比别人略好些，并没有私情密意勾引你怎样，如何一口死咬定了我是个狐狸精！我太不服。今日既已担了虚名，而且临死，不是我说一句后悔的话，早知如此，我当日也另有个道理。不料痴心傻意，只说大家横竖是在一处。不想平空里生出这一节话来，有冤无处诉。”…晴雯拭泪，就伸手取了剪刀，将左手上两根葱管一般的指甲齐根铰下，又伸手向被内将贴身穿着的一件旧红绫袄脱下，并指甲都与宝玉道：“这个你收了，以后就如见我一般。快把你的袄儿脱下来我穿。我将来在棺材内独自躺着，也就像还在怡红院的一样了。论理不该如此，只是担了虚名，我可也是无可如何了。”宝玉听说，忙宽衣换上，藏了指甲。晴雯又哭道：“回去他们看见了要问，不必撒谎，就说是我的。既担了虚名，越性如此，也不过这样了。”

(第七十八回) “用晴雯素日所喜之冰鲛縠一幅楷字写成，名曰《芙蓉女儿诔》，前序后歌。又备了四样晴雯所喜之物，于是夜月下，命那小丫头捧至芙蓉花前。先行礼毕，将那诔文即挂于芙蓉枝上，乃泣涕念曰：…窃思女儿自临浊世，迄今凡十有六载。…自为红绡帐里，公子情深；始信黄土垄中，女儿命薄！…呜呼！”

對一個 16 歲的少女而言 (一同與我洗澡; 快进被来渥渥罢; 伸进被去摸了一摸身上; 贴身穿着的一件旧红绫袄脱下, 并指甲都与宝玉; 快把你的袄儿脱下来我穿), 上面的描述, 是純情, 是真情。卻仍然躲不過, 一個“曲文”的宿命。

霽月難逢, 彩雲易散。

心比天高, 身為下賤。

風流靈巧招人怨, 壽夭多因毀謗生。

多情公子空牽念。

第十一章：紅樓中的儒家禮教

周思源 在(正解金陵十二钗) 中, 做了下列的評論:

“《红楼梦》表现了对封建专制社会, 包括对文化专制的强烈批判, 其中也表达了一些反满情绪。

曹雪芹通过写藕官、药官的爱情, 表现出他对封建的人身依附制度的深刻批判和对合理的婚姻制度的呼唤。

五十八回有交代: “凡诰命等皆入朝按爵守制。敕谕天下: 凡有爵之家, 一年内不得筵宴音乐, 庶民皆三月不得婚嫁。”贾府解散这个戏班子就是“守制”中的一项, “各官宦家, 凡养优伶男女者一概蠲免遣发”。可见京师官宦人家的戏班子也全都解散了。由此可见艺术对于皇权的依附是多么严重, 皇权对艺术生命的践踏是多么残酷, 崇高的艺术在皇权面前是何等渺小无力!”

五四運動以後, 大部分的中華固有文化, 都被定位為“封建專制”的毒瘤。要想褒揚“五四”之前的任何東西, 一定要把它定位為, 反封建, 反專制的急先鋒。上面評論, 全是鬼話。在民國之前, 有诰命, 需入朝按爵守制, 這是萬千人都得不到的榮耀。為守制而解散私家的戏班子, 就是皇權對藝術的殘害。那麼, 在平日, 鼓勵私家戲班, 又算是什麼? 藕官、药官的爱情, 是明顯的同性戀。怎麼可能是對合理的婚姻制度的呼唤。周思源也太超過了吧。“意淫”是紅樓最偉大的發明。它必須要有兩大基石。

a. 宿命 與仙佛世界。(第七章: “紅樓”的仙佛世界與塵世的因果報應; “仙佛”世界為“真”, 塵世種種皆“夢”)。

b. 塵世: (第五章, “紅樓”的塵網; a. 儒家的禮教。 b. 塵世之上的“仙、佛”正義)。

今天, 我們已經知道, 五四那批人(胡適、魯迅、錢玄同、陳獨秀、瞿秋白、郭沫若、蔡元培、吳玉章、林伯渠), 是中國文字的白癡(請閱“李敖與無知的魯迅”

<http://tienzengong.pixnet.net/blog/post/35566874>)。他們各自的愚昧無知事小。他們的禍國殃民, 仍然殘害著今日的中國。而他們, 也是污蔑“紅樓”的同一批人。為了救中國, 必須鬥垮那些人。必須為“紅樓”平冤。這是我寫這“評紅樓”的唯一原因。

以“淫”來統一“色”與“情”，是紅樓的新發明。但卻無法，由此建構一個新的神學、哲學體系。“意淫”的發明，改變了一切。它是兩大架構下的產物：‘宿命與自由意志(第二章：普世價值一)’與‘性事、愛情與儒家神學(第三章：普世價值二)’。“紅樓”建構了世界上最偉大的神學、哲學體系。

a. 它以儒家為主，成為全書的背景。意淫的根本，是宿命論。在“塵世”，儒家的禮教為行為的法則。

b. 它以釋、道為輔，倒成為全書的主軸。一再的強調，“仙佛世界為‘真’，紅塵種種皆‘夢’”。在儒家的禮教之上，更有仙佛正義，因果報應。歷史上，釋由“道”助，而傳入中國。紅樓，基本上，把釋道統合為一了。又是個新發明。

紅樓絕不反儒，但以宣揚釋道為宗旨。把儒家禮教做為背景。“背景”，就是無所不在。也就沒有特別的段落，來突顯了。基本上，紅樓對儒家禮教的讚揚有四。

i. “孝”：把賈母的“威而不虐”，把所有子孫對她的“孝”與“敬”，一再一再的，幾乎在每個章回中描述著。

ii. “禮”：不偷不淫。對“墜兒”小竊，“司棋”私會，都有詳細的描述。

iii. “丫鬟制”：在那個時代的社會經濟，當丫鬟，是窮苦人家女孩的最佳“職業”。即可享“半”富貴，成年又可配個好人家。

(第二十六回) 紅玉道：“也不犯着氣他們。俗語說的好，‘千里搭長棚，沒有個不散的筵席’，誰守誰一輩子呢？不過三年五載，各人干各人的去了。那時誰還管誰呢？”

(第四十三回) 賈母忙命拿幾個小杌子來，給賴大母親等幾個高年有體面的媽媽坐了。賈府風俗，年高伏侍過父母的家人，比年輕的主子還有體面，所以尤氏鳳姐兒等只管地下站着，那賴大的母親等三四個老媽媽告個罪，都坐在小杌子上了。

(第五十八回) 尤氏等又遣人告訴了鳳姐兒。一面說與總理房中，每教習給銀八兩，令其自便。凡梨香院一應物件，查清註冊收明，派人上夜。將十二個女孩子叫來面問，倒有一多半不願意回家的：也有說父母雖有，他只以賣我們為事，這一去還被他賣了，也有父母已亡，或被叔伯兄弟所賣的，也有說無人可投的，也有說戀恩不舍的。所願去者止四五人。王夫人听了，只得留下。將去者四五人皆令其干娘領回家去，單等他親父母來領，將不愿去者分散在園中使喚。

(第七十七回)“芳官自前日蒙太太的恩典赏了出去，他就疯了似的，茶也不吃，饭也不用，勾引上藕官蕊官，三个人寻死觅活，只要剪了头发做尼姑去。我只当是小孩子家一时出去不惯也是有的，不过隔两日就好了。谁知越闹越凶，打骂着也不怕。实在没法，所以来求太太，或者就依他们做尼姑去，或教导他们一顿，赏给别人作女儿去罢，我们也没这福。”

(第七十四回)入画听说，又跪下哭求，说：“再不敢了。只求姑娘看从小儿的情常，好歹生死在一处罢。”尤氏和奶娘等人也都十分分解，说他“不过一时糊涂了，下次再不敢的。他从小儿伏侍你一场，到底留着他为是。”谁知惜春虽然年幼，却天生成一种百折不回的廉介孤独僻性，任人怎说，他只以为丢了他的体面，咬定牙断乎不肯。

(第七十七回)周瑞家的听说，会齐了那几个媳妇，先到迎春房里，回迎春道：“太太们说了，司棋大了，连日他娘求了太太，太太已赏了他娘配人，今日叫他出去，另挑好的与姑娘使。”说着，便命司棋打点走路。迎春听了，含泪似有不舍之意，因前夜已闻得别的丫鬟悄悄的说了原故，虽数年之情难舍，但“事关风化”，亦无可如何了。那司棋也曾求了迎春，实指望迎春能死保救下的，只是迎春语言迟慢，耳软心活，是不能作主的。司棋见了这般，知不能免，因哭道：“姑娘好狠心！哄了我这两日，如今怎么连一句话也没有？”周瑞家的等说道：“你还要姑娘留你不成？便留下，你也难见园里的人了。依我们的好话，快快收了这样子，倒是人不知鬼不觉的去罢，大家体面些。”

iv. “大宅門”：是當時 經濟的一個支柱。也是合乎儒家禮教的。下人的家境，也是很富裕的。

(第四十七回)赖大的媳妇又进来请。贾母高兴，便带了王夫人薛姨妈及宝玉姊妹等，到赖大花园中坐了半日。那花园虽不及大观园，却也十分齐整宽阔，泉石林木，楼阁亭轩，也有好几处惊人骇目的。外面厅上，薛蟠，贾珍，贾琏，贾蓉并几个近族的，很远的也没来，贾赦也没来。赖大家内也请了几个现任的官长并几个世家子弟作陪。

(第五十六回)探春道“因此我心中不自在。钱费两起，东西又白丢一半，通算起来，反费了两折子，不如竟把买办的每月蠲了为是。此是一件事。第二件，年里往赖大家去，你也去的，你看他那一小园子比咱们这个如何？”平儿笑道：“还没有咱们这一半大，树木花草也少多了。”探春道：“我因和他家女儿说闲话儿，谁知那么个园子，除他们带的花，吃的笋菜鱼虾之外，一年还有人包了去，年终足有二百两银子剩。从那日我才知道，一个破荷叶，一根枯草根子，都是值钱的。”

第十二章：紅樓中的仙佛因果與緯識

马瑞芳 (Ma Ruifang) 對紅樓中的仙佛, 評論如下:

“这是曹雪芹对社会彻底绝望的情绪。”

曹雪芹借助如影随形的“一僧一道”，有意识地把现实生活中完全不同的佛教和道教扭结到一起，由他们共同营造出虚无飘渺的气氛。一僧一道，一个“茫茫”，一个“渺渺”，都到“太虚”，都进“幻境”，这是明明白白地表示：红尘中人对人生的一切追求：高官厚禄、娇妻美妾、亭台楼阁、锦衣玉食，人生一切物质享受，以及为追求这些享受导致的鸡争鹅斗，纷纷攘攘，都像镜中月水中花，是过眼烟云。只有清静无为，追求精神的安宁和解脱，才是重要的。这也是《红楼梦》的《好了歌》所表达的主要内容。这是曹雪芹对社会彻底绝望的情绪。

“曹雪芹那些咏佛咏道的话语，是有表面文章，戏谑文章，是假；他骨子里对深刻影响中国人思维的佛和道，是有清醒批判意识的，这才是真。”

“那么，曹雪芹到底是宗佛的，还是宗道的？曹雪芹既宗佛也宗道，既不宗佛也不宗道。说曹雪芹既宗佛也宗道，那是因为曹雪芹对佛道一律采取“拿来主义”，当他需要阐述某种思想时，他既可以从佛教教义中取一瓢饮，也可以从道教教义中取一箪食。这种游刃于佛道之间的精神境界，是深深参透了中华文化精的大境界，融会了儒释道的博大境界，是万物为我所用，万物在我脚下的境界。它给《红楼梦》创造了深远的意境，时而电光石火一般，发出璀璨的光芒。说曹雪芹既不宗佛也不宗道，那是因为，他对佛道一律用俯视的眼光，调侃的笔墨。那茫茫大士和渺渺真人不仅成为曹雪芹这位天才小说家结构小说的法宝之一，还被他创造成非圣非俗的形象，披上百衲破衣，顶上满头癞疮，说着疯疯癫癫的话语。更有甚者，《红楼梦》经常用挖苦的语气写僧、道、尼：馒头庵的老尼成了给王熙凤创造发财机会从而害死一对青年男女的“首犯”；水月庵的清静庵成了秦钟和智能儿幽会的场所；“国公爷”替身的张道长有点儿像世故的老滑头；道士王一贴是个“油嘴”……唯一洁净的修行人是妙玉，恰好因为“过洁世同嫌”而“终陷淖泥中”，落到了最不干净的地方。僧、尼、道如此不堪，信奉佛道的凡人如何？贾氏族长贾敬跑到道观跟道士们胡屌，最后因为炼丹送了命；《红楼梦》中经常吃斋念佛的是谁？王夫人。恰好是这位大善人，把服侍她多年的、所谓像女儿一样的金钏，一巴掌打到井里！行善就是这样的行法？善事就是这样的做法？曹雪芹在这些章节对“佛”、“道”，做了反讽。我们从曹雪芹“佛”、“道”的笔墨，也读出了“真假”。曹雪芹那些咏佛咏道的话语，是有表面文章，戏谑文章，是假；他骨子里对深刻影响中国人思维的佛和道，是有清醒批判意识的，这才是真。”

仙佛世界為“真”，紅塵種種為“夢”。這是“意淫”的必要條件。馬瑞芳明顯的不知，“意淫”是紅樓的中心主旨。“鐵檻寺”是賈府的私廟。“攏翠庵”是大觀園內的道觀。難道賈家還是基督徒，是反仙反佛的。馬瑞芳的鬼扯蛋，還是由紅樓的作者來反駁吧。

(第二十八回) “襲人又道：“昨儿贵妃打发夏太监出来，送了一百二十两银子，叫在“清虚观”初一到初三打三天平安醮，唱戏献供，叫珍大爷领着众位爷们跪香拜佛呢。还有端午儿的节礼也赏了。”

(第十三回) “择准停灵七七四十九日，三日后开丧送讣闻。这四十九日，单请一百单八众禅僧在大厅上拜大悲忏，超度前亡后化诸魂，以免亡者之罪，另设一坛于天香楼上，是九十九位全真道士，打四十九日解冤洗业醮。然后停灵于会芳园中，灵前另外五十众高僧，五十众高道，对坛按七作好事。”

(第十四回) “这日乃五七正五日上，那应佛僧正开方破狱，传灯照亡，参阎君，拘都鬼，筵请地藏王，开金桥，引幢幡，那道士们正伏章申表，朝三清，叩玉帝，禅僧们行香，放焰口，拜水忏，又有十三众尼僧，搭绣衣，鞞红鞋，在灵前默诵接引诸咒，十分热闹。”

(第四十一回) “当下贾母等吃过茶，又带了刘姥姥至栊翠庵来。妙玉忙接了进去。至院中见花木繁盛，贾母笑道：“到底是他们修行的人，没事常常修理，比别处越发好看。”一面说，一面便往东禅堂来。妙玉笑往里让，贾母道：“我们才都吃了酒肉，你这里头有菩萨，冲了罪过。我们这里坐坐，把你的好茶拿来，我们吃一杯就去了。”

(第十三回) “那贾敬闻得长孙媳死了，因自为早晚就要飞升，如何肯又回家染了红尘，将前功尽弃呢，因此并不在意，只凭贾珍料理。”

(第十回) “尤氏听了，心中甚喜，因说道：“后日是太爷的寿日，到底怎么办？”贾珍说道：“我方才到了太爷那里去请安，兼请太爷来家来受一受一家子的礼。太爷因说道：‘我是清净惯了的，我不愿意往你们那是非场中去闹去。你们必定说是我的生日，要叫我去受众人些头，莫过你把我从前注的《阴鹭文》给我令人好好的写出来刻了，比叫我无故受众人的头还强百倍呢。倘或后日这两日一家子要来，你就在家里好好的款待他们就是了。也不必给我送什么东西来，连你后日也不

必来，你要心中不安，你今日就给我磕了头去。倘或后日你要来，又跟随多少人来闹我，我必和你不依。”

(第二十二回) “---是一套北《点绛唇》，铿锵顿挫，韵律不用说是好的了，只那词藻中有一支《寄生草》，填的极妙，你何曾知道。”宝玉见说的这般好，便凑近来央告：“好姐姐，念与我听听。”宝钗便念道：

漫搵英雄泪，相离处士家。谢慈悲剃度在莲台下。没缘法转眼分离乍。赤条条来去无牵挂。那里讨烟蓑雨笠卷单行？一任俺芒鞋破钵随缘化！ ...

宝玉道：“什么是‘大家彼此’！他们有‘大家彼此’，我是‘赤条条来去无牵挂’。”谈及此句，... 不禁大哭起来，翻身起来至案，遂提笔立占一偈云：

你证我证，心证意证。

是无有证，斯可云证。

无可云证，是立足境。

黛玉便笑道：“宝玉，我问你：至贵者是‘宝’，至坚者是‘玉’。尔有何贵？尔有何坚？”宝玉竟不能答。三人拍手笑道：“这样钝愚，还参禅呢。”黛玉又道：“你那偈末云，‘无可云证，是立足境’，固然好了，只是据我看，还未尽善。我再续两句在后。”因念云：“无立足境，是方干净。”宝钗道：“实在这方悟彻。当日南宗六祖惠能，初寻师至韶州，闻五祖弘忍在黄梅，他便充役火头僧。五祖欲求法嗣，令徒弟诸僧各出一偈。上座神秀说道：‘身是菩提树，心如明镜台，时时勤拂拭，莫使有尘埃。’彼时惠能在厨房碓米，听了这偈，说道：‘美则美矣，了则未了。’因自念一偈曰：‘菩提本非树，明镜亦非台，本来无一物，何处染尘埃？’五祖便将衣钵传他。今儿这偈语，亦同此意了。只是方才这句机锋，尚未完全了结，这便丢开手不成？”黛玉笑道：“彼时不能答，就算输了，这会子答上了也不为出奇。只是以后再不许谈禅了。连我们两个所知所能的，你还不知不能呢，还去参禅呢。”宝玉自己以为觉悟，不想忽被黛玉一问，便不能答，宝钗又比出“语录”来，此皆素不见他们能者。自己想了一想：“原来他们比我的知觉在先，尚未解悟，我如今何必自寻苦恼。”想毕，便笑道：“谁又参禅，不过一时顽话罢了。”说着，四人仍复如旧。”

(第二十一回) “因命四儿剪灯烹茶，自己看了一回《南华经》。正看至《外篇·胠篋》一则，其文曰：

故绝圣弃知，大盗乃止，擿玉毁珠，小盗不起；焚符破玺，而民朴鄙；掊斗折衡，而民不争；殫残天下之圣法，而民始可与论议。擗乱六律，铄绝竽瑟，塞瞽旷之耳，而天下始人含其聪矣；灭文章，散五采，胶离朱之目，而天下始人含其明矣，毁绝钩绳而弃规矩，攮工倕頰之指，而天下始人有其巧矣。

看至此，意趣洋洋，趁着酒兴，不禁提笔续曰：

焚花散麝，而闺阁始人含其劝矣，戕宝钗之仙姿，灰黛玉之灵窍，丧减情意，而闺阁之美恶始相类矣。彼合其劝，则无参商之虞矣，戕其仙姿，无恋爱之心矣，灰其灵窍，无才思之情矣。彼钗，玉，花，麝者，皆张其罗而穴其隧，所以迷眩缠陷天下者也。”

以仙佛為“假”的人，大概不會費那麼多的筆墨，做上面的描述吧。並且，仙佛世界為“真”，則“魘魔”與“讖語”也不能假。

(第二十五回)“马道婆道：…又向裤腰里掏了半晌，掏出十个纸铰的青面白发的鬼来，并两个纸人，递与赵姨娘，又悄悄的教他道：“把他两个的年庚八字写在这两个纸人身上，一并五个鬼都掖在他们各人的床上就完了。我只在家里作法，自有效验。…”

这里宝玉拉着林黛玉的袖子，只是嘻嘻的笑，心里有话，只是口里说不出来。此时林黛玉只是禁不住把脸红涨了，挣着要走。宝玉忽然“噯哟”了一声，说：“好头疼！”林黛玉道：“该，阿弥陀佛！”只见宝玉大叫一声：“我要死！”将身一纵，离地跳有三四尺高，口内乱嚷乱叫，说起胡话来了。林黛玉并丫头们都唬慌了，忙去报知王夫人，贾母等。此时王子腾的夫人也在这里，都一齐来时，宝玉益发拿刀弄杖，寻死觅活的，闹得天翻地覆。贾母，王夫人见了，唬的抖衣而颤，且“儿”一声“肉”一声放声恸哭。于是惊动诸人，连贾赦，邢夫人，贾珍，贾政，贾琏，贾蓉，贾芸，贾萍，薛姨妈，薛蟠并周瑞家的一干家中上上下下里里外外众媳妇丫头等，都来园内看视。登时园内乱麻一般。正没个主见，只见凤姐手持一把明晃晃钢刀砍进园来，见鸡杀鸡，见狗杀狗，见人就要杀人。众人越发慌了。周瑞媳妇忙带着几个有力量的胆壮的婆娘上去抱住，夺下刀来，抬回房去。平儿，丰儿等哭的泪天泪地。贾政等心中也有些烦难，顾了这里，丢不下那里。”

(第二十二回)“忽然人报，娘娘差人送出一个灯谜儿，

能使妖魔胆尽摧，身如束帛气如雷。

一声震得人方恐，回首相看已化灰。

天运人功理不穷，有功无运也难逢。

因何镇日纷纷乱，只为阴阳数不同。

贾政道：“是算盘。”迎春笑道：“是。”

阶下儿童仰面时，清明妆点最堪宜。

游丝一断浑无力，莫向东风怨别离。

贾政道：“这是风筝。”探春笑道：“是。”

前身色相总无成，不听菱歌听佛经。

莫道此生沉黑海，性中自有大光明。

贾政道：“这是佛前海灯嘎。”惜春笑答道：“是海灯。”

贾政心内沉思道：“娘娘所作爆竹，此乃一响而散之物。迎春所作算盘，是打动乱如麻。探春所作风筝，乃飘飘浮荡之物。惜春所作海灯，一发清净孤独。今乃上元佳节，如何皆作此不祥之物为戏耶？”心内愈思愈闷，因在贾母之前，不敢形于色，只得仍勉强往下看。只见后面写着七言律诗一首，却是宝钗所作，随念道：

朝罢谁携两袖烟，琴边衾里总无缘。

晓筹不用鸡人报，五夜无烦侍女添。

焦首朝朝还暮暮，煎心日日复年年。

光阴荏苒须当惜，风雨阴晴任变迁。

贾政看完，心内自忖道：“此物还倒有限。只是小小之人作此词句，更觉不祥，皆非永远福寿之辈。”想到此处，愈觉烦闷，大有悲戚之状，因而将适才的精神减去十分之八九，只垂头沉思。

贾母见贾政如此光景，想到或是他身体劳乏亦未可定，又兼之恐拘束了众姊妹不得高兴顽耍，即对贾政云：“你竟不必猜了，去安歇罢。让我们再坐一会，也好散了。”贾政一闻此言，连忙答应几个“是”字，又勉强劝了贾母一回酒，方才退出去了。回至房中只是思索，翻来复去竟难成寐，不由伤悲感慨，不在话下。”

這些燈謎，與仙界的判詞，是成讖的。

元春 讖“散”。一张弓，弓上挂着香橼。弓上無箭，弓已散。

二十年来辨是非，榴花开处照宫闈。

三春争及初春景，虎兕相逢大梦归。

迎春 識“失算”。一个恶狼，追扑一美女，欲啖之意。

子系中山狼，得志便猖狂。

金闺花柳质，一载赴黄梁。

探春 識“離”。两人放风筝，一片大海，一只大船，船中有一女子掩面泣涕之状。

才自精明志自高，生于末世运偏消。

清明涕送江边望，千里东风一梦遥。

惜春 識“悟”。一所古庙，里面有一美人在内看经独坐。

勘破三春景不长，缙衣顿改昔年妆。

可怜绣户侯门女，独卧青灯古佛旁。

燈謎成“識”，是作者在強調，“天命(宿命)”至“人命(運)”的神學。而各人命運，又拉扯上了仙佛正義與存在的困境。元春的“散”，與迎春的“失算”，不是她們自己的作為所造成。這彰顯了“存在”的困境。探春的“離”與飄泊，反應了仙佛的因果。惜春的“悟”，表達了存在主義的“自由意志”。

(第三十回)“金釧兒睜開眼，將寶玉一推，笑道：你忙什麼！‘金簪子掉在“井里”頭，有你的只是有你的”

另外，仙佛正義，在賈瑞與秦鍾猝死的章回，已有詳述了。

第十三章：高鶚的續集 與 老紅學

前面已經談過，這裡再提一次。如果“紅樓”的主旨，只在影射幾個宮庭鬥爭的歷史人物，或只是為表達，對當時社會制度的憤怒與抗議，那它就沒有普世的價值。討論這種議題的紅學，不但沒有價值，實在的，它們是對“紅樓”最大的污蔑。紅樓是有普世價值的。它發明了前所未有的新東西，意淫。作者以這一新概念，建構了世界上最偉大的神學系統。它統一了儒釋道三家。這是一本比基督聖經，偉大了許多的神學經典。紅塵(樓)種種雖是“夢”，它究竟“參與”了天命(宿命)與仙佛世界的“真”。天命與仙佛世界，也必須借著紅樓(塵)夢，來完成祂的意志。

所以，今天以前的老紅學，全是廢話。不過，有另外一種紅學，倒是必須一提。它對“紅樓”沒有評論。只是把，一些未完結的故事，續完。它就是高鶚續的後40回。

本書的前面章節，完全沒有引用，後40回的隻言片語。而“紅樓”原書(前80回)，已表達了三大重點。

- a. 以“意淫”的概念，建構了世界上最偉大的神學理論。
- b. 作者創造了一個“新人”，不是凡胎。他是一塊頑石，一個蠢貨。他沒有心機心術。他心，直指“人性”。
- c. 他以謎題的方式，把故事情節與神學架構鋪張開來。

那麼，高鶚是否理解了這三點？基本上，高鶚確實意識到了這三點。就用他自己的語言來檢驗吧。

(第一百六回)“贾政叹气连连的想道：‘我祖父勤劳王事，立下功勋，得了两个世职，如今两房犯事都革去了。我瞧这些子侄没一个长进的。老天啊，老天啊！我贾家何至一败如此！我虽蒙圣恩格外垂慈，给还家产，那两处食用自应归并一处，叫我一人那里支撑的住。方才璉儿所说更加诌

异，说不但库上无银，而且尚有亏空，这几年竟是虚名在外。只恨我自己为什么糊涂若此。倘或我珠儿在世，尚有膀臂；宝玉虽大，更是无用之物。”

(第一百二十回) “这士隐自去度脱了香菱，送到太虚幻境，交那警幻仙子对册，刚过牌坊，见那一僧一道，缥缈而来。士隐接着说道：“大士、真人，恭喜，贺喜！情缘完结，都交割清楚了么？”那僧道说：“情缘尚未全结，倒是那‘蠢物’已经回来了。还得把他送还原所，将他的后事叙明，不枉他下世一回。”

任何人，若不知 寶玉是一“蠢物”，他就没有讀懂 紅樓。寶玉之“頑”、之蠢，是 紅樓的重中之重。那才是一塊“美玉無瑕”。才能直指“人性”。並且，‘情缘尚未全结’。如果全結了，那就是世界末日了。高鶚 對 開放的宿命論，還是理解的。

開放的宿命論，是 紅樓的重中之重。首先，它表現在“判詞”上。十二金釵，只有十一個判詞。

(第五回) “宝玉还欲看时，那仙姑知他天分高明，性情颖慧，恐把仙机泄漏，遂掩了卷册，...”

高鶚 對此，還算是尊重的。

(第一百十六回) “宝玉忽然想起：“我少时做梦曾到过这个地方。如今能够亲身到此，也是大幸。”恍惚间，把找鸳鸯的念头忘了。便壮着胆把上首的大橱开了橱门一瞧，见有好几本册子，心里更觉喜欢，想道：“大凡人做梦，说是假的，岂知有这梦便有事。我常说还要做这个梦再不能的，不料今儿被我找着了。但不知那册子是哪个见过的不是？”伸手在上头取了一本，册上写着“金陵十二钗正册”。宝玉拿着一想道：“我恍惚记得是那个，只恨记不得清楚。”便打开头一页看去，见上头有画，但是画迹模糊，再瞧不出来。后面有几行字迹也不清楚，尚可摹拟，便细细的看去，见有什么“玉带”，上头有个好像“林”字，心里想道：“不要是说林妹妹罢？”便认真看去，底下又有“金簪雪里”四字，诧异道“怎么又像他的名字呢。”复将前后四句合起来一念道：“也没有什么道理，只是暗藏着他两个名字，并不为奇。独有那“怜”字“叹”字不好。这是怎么解？”

高鶚 只是“暗示”，此判詞含二人。但終究以‘这是怎么解？’為答案。在第二十二回的燈謎中，作者已經以燈謎，暗示了“四春”的判詞。寶釵(有版本說是 黛玉的)的燈謎如下。

朝罢谁携两袖烟，琴边衾里总无缘。

晓筹不用鸡人报，五夜无烦侍女添。

焦首朝朝还暮暮，煎心日日复年年。

光阴荏苒须当惜，风雨阴晴任变迁。

謎底應為“時鐘”。但詩句“焦首朝朝还暮暮，煎心日日复年年”，明顯的與“誤終身”成讖。總之，原作者没有提供答案與暗示。高鶚也只做了暗示。

高鶚的40回續集，基本上，在為判詞做“答案”。没有任何的新義。那些答案，還算合理，也有趣。但有两點值得一談。

第一，高鶚強調了儒家的倫理，與仙佛的因果報應。

(第一百十二回)“都起来正要走时，只见赵姨娘还爬在地下不起。周姨娘打谅他还哭，便去拉他。岂知赵姨娘满嘴白沫，眼睛直竖，把舌头吐出，反把家人唬了一大跳。贾环过来乱嚷。赵姨娘醒来说道：‘我是不回去的，跟着老太太回南去。’”

(第一百十三回)“那人去了，这里一人传十，十人传百，都知道赵姨娘使了毒心害人，被阴司里拷打死了。”

(第一百十三回)“凤姐此时只求速死，心里一想，邪魔悉至。只见尤二姐从房后走来，渐近床前说：‘姐姐，许久的不见了。做妹妹的想念的很，要见不能，如今好不容易进来见见姐姐。姐姐的心机也用尽了，咱们的二爷糊涂，也不领姐姐的情，反倒怨姐姐作事过于苛刻，把他的前程去了，叫他如今见不得人。我替姐姐气不平。’凤姐恍惚说道：‘我如今也后悔我的心忒窄了，妹妹不念旧恶，还来瞧我。’”

(第五十五回)“忽见赵姨娘进来，李纨探春忙让坐。赵姨娘开口便说道：‘这屋里的人都踩下我的头去还罢了。姑娘你也想一想，该替我出气才是。’一面说，一面眼泪鼻涕哭起来。探春忙道：‘姨娘这话说谁，我竟不解。谁踩姨娘的头？说出来我替姨娘出气。’赵姨娘道：‘姑娘现踩我，我告诉谁！’探春听说，忙站起来，说道：‘我并不敢。’”

(第六十回) “豆官先便一头，几乎不曾将赵姨娘撞了一跌。那三个也便拥上来，放声大哭，手撕头撞，把个赵姨娘裹住。... 赵姨娘反没了主意，只好乱骂。蕊官藕官两个一边一个，抱住左右手，葵官豆官前后头顶住。四人只说：“你只打死我们四个就罢！”芳官直挺挺躺在地下，哭得死过去。

正没开交，谁知晴雯早遣春燕回了探春。当下尤氏，李纨，探春三人带着平儿与众媳妇走来，将四个喝住。问起原故，赵姨娘便气的瞪着眼粗了筋，一五一十说个不清。尤李两个不答言，只喝禁他四人。探春便叹气说：“这是什么大事，姨娘也太肯动气了！...”

赵姨娘无法，只得同他三人出来，口内犹说长说短。探春便说：“那些小丫头们原是个顽意儿，喜欢呢，和他说说笑笑，不喜欢便可以不理他。便他不好了，也如同猫儿狗儿抓咬了一下子，可怨就怨，不怨时也只好叫了管家媳妇们去说给他去责罚，何苦自己不尊重，大吆小喝失了体统。你瞧周姨娘，怎不见人欺他，他也不寻人去。我劝姨娘且回房去煞煞性儿，别听那些混帐人的调唆，没的惹人笑话，自己呆，白给人作粗活。心里有二十分的气，也忍耐这几天，等太太回来自然料理。”一席话说得赵姨娘闭口无言，只得回房去了。

这里探春气的和尤氏李纨说：‘这么大年纪，行出来的事总不叫人敬伏。这是什么意思，值得吵一吵，并不留体统，耳朵又软，心里又没有计算。这又是那起没脸面的奴才们的调停，作弄出个呆人替他们出气。’”

我第一次讀紅樓時，並不知趙姨娘是探春的生母。知道後，知探春必遭報應。母女雖在一處，心已分離。“分骨肉”的結局，實在太便宜了。失去生母的愛，才是最大的報應。高鶚對這一議題的表現，還不錯。

(第一百回) “却说赵姨娘听见探春这事，反欢喜起来，心里说道：“我这个丫头在家忒瞧不起我，我何从还是个娘，比他的丫头还不济。况且湊上水护着别人。他挡在头里，连环儿也不得出头。如今老爷接了去，我倒干净。想要他孝敬我，不能够了。只愿意他像迎丫头似的，我也称称愿。”一面想着，一面跑到探春那边与他道喜说：“姑娘，你是要高飞的人了，到了姑爷那边自然比家里还好。想来你也是愿意的。便是养了你一场，并没有借你的光儿。就是我有七分不好，也有三分的好，总不要一去了把我搁在脑杓子后头。”探春听着毫无道理，只低头作活，一句也不言语。赵姨娘见他不理，气忿忿的自己去了。

这里探春又气又笑，又伤心，也只不过自己掉泪而已。”

紅樓原本，以賈母的角色，來彰顯儒家的“孝”道倫理。又以探春來描述人性醜惡的另一面。在“二哥哥”面前，是個知書達禮的才女。在下人面前，是個強似鳳姐的將才。對生母，卻是個無心無肺的敗類。這是“紅樓”偉大的，另一個點。

第二，是關於 黛玉如何死的問題。 蔡义江 在《解读红楼》的“曹雪芹笔下的林黛玉之死”，<http://www.ccler.com/hlm/32/mydoc027.htm> 寫到，本文要探讨的“林黛玉之死”，正如题目所标明的是指曹雪芹所写的已散佚了的八十回后原稿中的有关情节，不是现在从后四十回续书中能读到的《林黛玉焚稿断痴情》、《苦绛珠魂归离恨天》等。当然，为了便于说明问题，也还得常常提到续书。

《红楼梦》后半部佚稿中宝黛悲剧的详情，我们是无法了解了。但只要细心地研究八十回前小说原文的暗示、脂评所提供的线索，以及作者同时人富察明义的《题红楼梦》诗，并将这些材料互相加以印证，悲剧的大致轮廓还是可以窥见的。

在佚稿中，林黛玉之死与婚姻不能自主，并无关系。促使她“泪尽夭亡”的是别的原因。

悲剧发生的经过大概是这样的：

宝黛爱情像桃李花开，快要结出果实来了，梦寐以求的理想眼看就要成为现实，不料好事多磨，瞬息间就乐极悲生：贾府发生了一连串的重大变故。起先是迎春被蹂躏夭折，探春离家远嫁不归，接着则是政治上庇荫着贾府的大树的摧倒，元春死了。三春去后，更大的厄运接踵而至，贾府获罪（抄没还是后来的事）。导火线或在雨村、贾赦，而惹祸者尚有王熙凤和宝玉。王熙凤是由于她敛财害命等种种“造孽”；宝玉所惹出来的祸，则仍不外乎是由那些所谓“不才之事”引出来的“丑祸”，如三十三回忠顺府长史官告发宝玉无故引逗王爷驾前承奉的人，琪官。如贾环说宝玉逼淫母婢之类。总之，不离癡僧、跛道所说的“声色货利”四字。

宝玉和凤姐仓皇离家，或许是因为避祸，竟由于某种意外原因而在外久久不得归来。贾府中人与他们隔绝了音讯，因而吉凶未卜，生死不明。宝玉一心牵挂着多病善感的黛玉如何熬得过这些日子，所谓“花原自怯，岂奈狂飊？柳本多愁，何禁骤雨”，他为黛玉的命运担忧时，甚至忘记了自己的不幸。

黛玉经不起这样的打击，急痛忧忿，日夜悲啼；她怜惜宝玉的不幸，明知这样下去自身病体支持不久，却毫不顾惜自己，终于把她衰弱生命中的全部炽热的爱，化为泪水，报答了她平生惟一的知己宝玉。那一年事变发生、宝玉离家是在秋天，次年春尽花落，黛玉就“泪尽夭亡”“证前缘”了。她的棺木应是送回姑苏埋葬的。

“金玉良缘”是黛玉死后的事。宝玉娶宝钗只是事态发展的自然结果，并非宝玉屈从外力，或者失魂落魄地发痴呆病而任人摆布。婚后，他们还曾有过“谈旧之情”，回忆当年姊妹们在一起时的欢乐情景（第二十回脂评）。待贾府“事败，抄没”后，他们连维持基本生活都困难了。总之，作者如他自己所声称的那样，“不敢稍加穿凿，徒为供人耳目而反失其真传者”，他没有像续书那样人为地制造这边拜堂、那边咽气之类的戏剧性效果。

何况，生活处境又使他们还得依赖已出嫁了的袭人和蒋玉菡（琪官）的“供奉”（第二十八回脂评），这一切已足使宝玉对现实感到愤慨、绝望、幻灭。而恰恰在这种情况下，一向人情练达的宝钗，又做出了一件愚蠢的事：她以为宝玉有了这番痛苦经历，能够“浪子回头”，所以佚稿中有《薛宝钗借词含讽谏》一回（第二十一回脂评）。以前，钗、湘对宝玉说：“你就不愿读书去考举人进士的，也该常常的会会这些为官做宰的人们，谈谈讲讲些仕途经济的学问，也好将来应酬世务，日后也有个朋友。”（第三十二回）还只是遭到反唇相讥。如今诸如此类的“讽谏”，对“行为偏僻性乖张”的宝玉，则无异于火上加油，所起的效果是完全相反的。这个最深于情的人，终于被命运逼成了最无情的人，于是从他的心底里滋生了所谓“世人莫忍为之毒”，不顾一切地“悬崖撒手”，离家出走，弃绝亲人的一切牵连而去做和尚了（第二十一回脂评）。”

上面的敘述，有三個重點。

- i. 《红楼梦》后半部佚稿中宝黛悲剧的详情，我们是无法了解了的。
- ii. 黛玉的死，是個悲劇。
- iii. 他的說法，是根據“脂評”與富察明义的《题红楼梦》诗。

即然明知，佚稿中的详情，是无法了解了的。又硬把，來源不明的東西，當成證據。這是完全不科學的。並且，把黛玉的死，看成是個悲劇，是完全誤解了原書的主旨。

（第一回）“只因西方灵河岸上三生石畔，有绛珠草一株，时有赤瑕宫神瑛侍者，日以甘露灌溉，这绛珠草始得久延岁月。后来既受天地精华，复得雨露滋养，遂得脱却草胎木质，得换人形，仅修成个女体，终日游于离恨天外，饥则食蜜青果为膳，渴则饮灌愁海水为汤。只因尚未酬报灌溉之德，故其五内便郁结着一段缠绵不尽之意。恰近日这神瑛侍者凡心偶炽，乘此昌明太平朝世，意欲下凡造历幻缘，已在警幻仙子案前挂了号。警幻亦曾问及，灌溉之情未偿，趁此倒可了结的。那绛珠仙子道：‘他是甘露之惠，我并无此水可还。他既下世为人，我也去下世为人，但把我一生所有的眼泪还他，也偿还得过他了。’”

以一生所有的眼泪还他。還完了，也就功德圓滿了。實為喜事。說它是悲劇，也太過份了吧。不過，把它當成另一種的續集，倒是可以的。

總之，續集没有添加新義。高鶚的續集，還算是不錯的“小說”。也未偏離原書的主旨。

(Part two) 沉冤大白 --- 為“漢語文”平冤

第十四章：百年沉冤“漢語文”

二〇〇四年，“中文的字根與文法：天馬行空的漢語”（Chinese Word Roots and Grammar, <http://books.google.com/books?id=JtSrAAAACAAJ&dq=inauthor:%22%E9%BE%94%E5%A4%A9%E4%BB%BB%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=XHzYT4GUGKnM2AXWysGTA&ved=OCDgQ6AEwAQ>）出版時，我向全世界宣稱，漢語文是全世界最偉大的語文。二〇〇八年，“Chinese Etymology”（<http://books.google.com/books/about/%E4%B8%AD%E6%96%87%E5%AD%97%E6%A0%B9%E5%9C%96%E4%BE%8B.html?id=G65JAQAAIAAJ>）出版。它的目的，是讓一個中文字，都不認識的十歲美國兒童，能在六個月內，以“自習（無教師）”的方式，學會三千個漢字。一個成功的個案，可在下址查閱，<http://www.chineseetymology.com/>。現在，成功的案例，已經很多了。一個在“哈佛大學（Harvard University）”附近的語言教學公司，正以這套新方法，發展出一套全新的語文教學方法。十年後，十歲的美國兒童，可在六個月內，學會三千漢字。而可憐的中國兒童，可能仍然受到“死記硬背”的摧殘與虐待。這不是件小事。這是禍國殃民。

二〇〇八年，我並不知道，“五四”時代，有“漢字不廢，中國必亡”的口號。為了推廣“中文字根學”，我開始瀏覽了一些，臺灣與大陸的網站。才發現了一系列，污蔑漢語文的論述。茲列舉數條如下。

a. 錢玄同在給陳獨秀的信中說:「...欲驅除一般人之幼稚的、野蠻的、頑固的思想, 尤不可不先廢漢文。.....此種文字, 斷斷不能適用於二十世紀之新時代。.....欲使中國不亡, ... 而廢 ...漢文, 尤為根本解決之根本。」見, “近现代文化名人对汉字的诅咒 (<http://www.tianya.cn/publicforum/content/worldlook/1/178259.shtml>)”。

b. 陳獨秀在《答書》中說道:「中國文字既難傳載新事新理, 且為腐毒思想之巢窟, 廢之誠不足惜。」

c. 胡適在《跋語》中說道:獨秀先生主張「先廢漢文, 且存漢語, 而改用羅馬字母書之」的辦法, 我極贊成。

d. 瞿秋白則提出「漢字落後論」, 痛罵漢字:「真正是世界上最齷齪、最惡劣、最混蛋的中世紀的茅坑。」

e. 魯迅則在《關於新文字的答問》一文中提出:「漢字不廢, 中國必亡。... ..漢字也是中國勞苦大眾身上的一個結核, 病菌都潛伏在裡面, 倘不首先除去它, 結果只有自己死。」見, “魯迅欲消灭汉字 (<http://www.kanzhongguo.com/news/12/04/14/447923.html?%E9%B2%81%E8%BF%85%E6%AC%B2%E6%B6%88%E7%81%AD%E6%B1%89%E5%AD%97%28%E5%9B%BE%29>)”。

f. 爾後, 郭沫若、蔡元培、吳玉章、林伯渠等著名的六百多位學者, 共同簽署宣言消滅漢字。他們在宣言中寫道:「漢字如獨輪車, 羅馬字母如汽車, ...。」見, 郭沫若、蔡元培等人的“消滅漢字宣言” (<http://www.cantonese.sheik.co.uk/phorum/read.php?4,73347>)。

這些人的愚昧無知事小。他們的禍國殃民, 可就是大事了。祖先給我們最偉大的遺產(漢語文), 竟被這些“笨豬”, 差一點葬送掉。若不把這些中國的敗類, 徹底的鬥臭鬥垮, 他們將繼續的, 做那禍國殃民的勾當。

在台灣, 倒是有幾篇, 批評那些敗類論述的文章。從 Google 搜尋, 下列三文是代表作。

1. 戲說簡體字之弊 (<https://psblog.name/2010/10/4295.html>) --- 細雨蒙蒙(濛濛)沒有水, 开(開)門关(關)門不見門; 烏云(雲)密布不下雨, 台(颱)風刮(颳)來哪有風? 戰鬥(鬥)英雄戰大斗, 難怪豪杰(傑)不算人; 听(聽)字有口沒有耳, 到底是說還是聽? ...

2. 陳雲: 香港文字學系列 (http://1in99percent.blogspot.com/2012/01/blog-post_4475.html) --- 簡體字道出中共粗疏急進的現代化策略。...通令全國行簡體, 禁制正體, 則是革命。中共強令推行簡體字, 禁制正體字, ... 有如一黨專政, 只留下民主黨派和政協做裝飾花瓶。

3. 漢字簡化得不償失 (<http://www.huanghuagang.org/hhgLibrary/year2009/2009-05/eBook-HanZiJianHua.pdf>)

- a. 簡化字無助於快速認字
- b. 簡化字無助於提高書寫效率
- c. 簡化字的弊端 --- 簡化字破壞漢字結構、割裂傳統文化。簡化方案中以一字合併多字易引發歧義。

不過, 上述批評, 都沒有提出駁倒他們的實證。要消滅這些敗類, 需要真正的證據。證明“漢語文”是世界上, “最偉大”的語文。然後, 再看看, 還有那些敗類, 敢繼續對偉大的祖先, 睜著眼睛“數典忘祖”, 睜著眼睛放屁。

要證據, 下章分解。

第十五章：語言學 的 夢想

任何語文，都有兩大層次。每層次，也有內部結構。

層次一：基本架構

1. 字法 —— 包括 字彙 及其組合建構邏輯， 約分三類。
 - a. 百分之百的 字根 組合建構邏輯法。
 - b. 百分之百的 單字（無組合建構邏輯）死記硬背法。
 - c. 前兩者之混合。

2. 文法 —— 規範 “句子” 。
 - a. 句子 的格式。 如， 英文的 主、述語結構。
 - b. 句子 的內涵（意義）。 如英文的 時式， 加 s 等。

層次二：上層架構

1. 篇章 —— 集句成篇。 篇中可有段落。
2. 圖書 —— 集 篇成書。 集書成圖書。

在這裡，我只討論層次一，字法與句法。語言學家心中，最“理想”的語言，如下：

A. 字法：

- i. 以有限的“字符”（如，字母 alphabets, 或 字根），造出無限的字（vocabulary）。
- ii. 每字的字音（Pronunciation），可由字面讀出。
- iii. 每字的字義（meaning），可由字面讀出。

B. 句法：以有限的法規，使得

- i. 句子的“定義”明確。
- ii. 句子的意義明確。

拉丁語系的語言，幾幾乎達到了“理想”的程度。唯一不足的是，只有百分之二十的字，可由字面讀出字義。但，至少 20% 的字彙，是有邏輯的。由字首、字根、字尾組成。學童在學字彙的同時，也學了邏輯與思考的方式。所以西方人是理性的、科學的。有創造性的。反之，中國的方塊字，全“被當成”是沒有邏輯關聯的象形字。學童無法以邏輯方法認字。每個字，都必須“死記硬背”。學漢字的兒童，必然缺少養成邏輯思考的機會。鐵定成為非常迷信的“阿 Q”。所以，就如魯迅等人所言，漢字當然是世界上最齷齪、最惡劣、最混蛋的中世紀的茅坑。

在二〇〇六年以前，漢字的齷齪是舉世公認的。

過去兩百年來，“每位”西方的大“漢學家”，學“會”了漢語文後，立刻把漢語文定位為狗屎。下面列出部分名單。更多資料，請查 <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/words-of-the-week/ww-039-the-proper-perspective-of-this-new-chinese-etymology-t194.html> .

1. John DeFrancis (August 31, 1911 - January 2, 2009, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_DeFrancis) was an American linguist, sinologist, author of Chinese language textbooks, lexicographer of Chinese dictionaries, and Professor Emeritus of Chinese Studies at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa.

2. F.S.C. Northrop (November 27, 1893 - July 21, 1992, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/F._S._C._Northrop)
3. Herrlee Glessner Creel [(January 19, 1905–June 1, 1994)
4. Paul Mulligan Thompson (10 February 1931 - 12 June 2007)
5. Joseph Needham (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Needham)
6. Peter Alexis Boodberg (April 8, 1903 - June 29, 1972)
7. Peter S. DuPonceau [(in 1930s), <http://www.jstor.org/pss/2718025>]
8. French sinologist J. M. Callery (in 1880)
9. J. Marshall Unger (linguistics professor of Ohio State University)

John DeFrancis 两年前才過世。他著的中文教材 與 中文字典，為美國大學教材數十年。他 及 上列諸人，持的全是 “齷齪” 的看法。

不學還好。一學全是如此。一兩位有病，是有可能的。全部是如此，可能，病的就不是他們了。何況，還有 600 位，中國的偉大學者，也持相同的看法（見前章）。“王安石”，他窮畢生精力，研究 “說文解字”，寫了一本 “字說，<http://baike.baidu.com/view/420769.htm>”，就是想從字面上，讀出字的字義。結果，那書成了笑柄。

最近，Dr. David Moser 寫了一篇文章，“Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard? (為何中文如此難學? <http://pinyin.info/readings/texts/moser.html>)” 那文章是他學中文的血淚史。當然是句句真實。他的經驗，更是西方人學中文的普遍體驗。誰是 David Moser? 他是 “最近” 才拿到 漢語文博士的美國人。他對三個檢驗項目，

- i. 以有限的 “字符” (如，字母 alphabets, 或 字根)，造出無限的字 (vocabulary)。
- ii. 每字的字音 (Pronunciation), 可由字面讀出。
- iii. 每字的字義 (meaning), 可由字面讀出。

基本上，給了漢語文 三個大鴨蛋。就是說，他的指導教授們，也一定有同樣的看法。

現在，問題的重點有二。

- a. 中文的本身，究竟是什麼東西？是世界上最偉大的語言，還是齷齪？
- b. 我們究竟知不知道 “a” 的答案？

我們也知道兩個事實 (facts) 。

- i. Dr. Northrop, Dr. John DeFrancis 和 Dr. David Moser 的中文程度，絕不比北大中文系的教授差。
- ii. 在 1000 位 孔子學院的教師中，99% 不會知道下面這些，非常平常的中文字的真正“字義”，{胡, 劉, 韋, 聿, 粵, 俞, 堯, 舜, 袁, 兪, 甫, 廖, 泉, 尙, 堯, 董, 蜀, 牟, …}。這在其它的語言系統，是不可想像的。

以上面的這些證據，看樣子，中文確是世界上最齷齪的語文。但，2006 年五月，「中文的字根與文法」一書在美國出版（美國版權登記證號 --- TX 6-514-465）。2008 年一月 (Chinese Etymology) 以英文出版（美國版權登記證號 --- TX 6-917-909）。此二書，提出了「漢字字根理論」。

- a. 所有 (全部) 漢字，都由 220 個「字根」組成。
- b. 由這 220 個「字根」，所有漢字之「字義」皆可由「字面」直接讀出。
- c. 由這 220 個「字根」，創造了 300 個「音根」。由此，所有漢字之「字音」，也都可由「字面」直接讀出。
- d. 只要學會 220 個「字根」，從此不需「死記硬背」數千個「單字」。孩童們可不再受「硬記死背」之苦。

上面這幾點，是語言學家不敢想像的夢想。只有漢語文，完全實現了。其實英文字彙的邏輯性，並不週全。大部份的字，都有字尾。而字首、字根所造的字，只佔全部的小部份，約百分之二十。百分之八十的英文字，全都需要“死記硬背”。相反的，漢字是“百分之百”的，完全由“字根”組成。沒有一個例外。也就是說，漢字系統比拉丁語系更有邏輯。漢語文的字法，是所有 (全部) 語文中，最好的文字。只是魯迅等人，對此是全然無知的。當然，空說無憑，我必須提出證明。

歸納證法，有三個步驟。

- a. 證明存在 (Existential introduction) --- 只要證明一個例子，就可以了。
- b. 證明不是特例 (Existential generalization) --- 只要證明，第二個例子存在。
- c. 證明是全面的 (Universal proof) --- 只要證明，任意隨機挑選的，都合格。

在此，先證明它的存在吧。

歪，不正。撒，手散。

我將證明，漢語文，是世界上“唯一”達到了“理想”的語文。是世界上最偉大的語文。

第十六章：“一二三萬”的語文

老子說：一生二，二生三，三生萬物。道德經在西方是很火熱的。但在西方哲學界，倒是乏人問津。老子的“一二三萬”理論，被定位為 not even wrong。Not even wrong 是 Niels Bohr（量子物理的開創者之一）的名言。比他的量子理論還有名。他指的是一些物理理論，表面上也沒毛病，實質上全是廢話。“一”是什麼？“生”是什麼？在這些沒有明確定義之前，“一二三萬”是空洞的，完完全全的廢話（not even wrong，它甚至是‘沒錯’的）。

在語言學上，“一二三萬”卻是語言學家的夢想。如果我們，能從“一”組字符（字根等），“生”出“萬”（一個完整的語言系統）來，我們兩三天，就可把它學會了。這種語言，叫做 oligosynthetic language。在二〇〇六年以前，它只是語言學家的夢想。有些電腦語言，倒也接近這個標準。但電腦語言是小兒科。不算數的。沒有任何一個人類語言接近這個夢想。當然，重點在於“生”的定義。如果只生字符，英文達到了。二十六字母，生出了所有的英文字。如果只生字音，英文也達到了。所有英文字的字音，都可從字面讀出。如果要生出字義，英文也達到了百分之二十。有百分之二十的英文字，是由字首與字根組成。只要學了這些字首與字根，那些字的字義，就可直接從字面讀出。英文語言學家的優越感，並不完全是自大自傲的結果。我把“所有”的英文字首與字根，都列在“釋字遊戲，<http://tienzengong.pixnet.net/blog/post/34007804>”裡。有興趣的讀者，可去玩玩。

上章提到，Dr. David Moser 寫了一篇文章，“Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard? (為何中文如此難學?)”。在中國大陸也引起了廣泛的討論。Dr. Moser 的看法，漢語文是狗屎，不是他個人的意見。而是所有學漢語文為第二語言人之經驗。在一“全美中教大會”的報告 (<http://www.chineseetymology.com/2009/12/08/the-methodology>)，列出兩點。

- i. 有位家長，花了六千美元。小孩只學了六個中文字。
- ii. 百分之八十的學生，一試即退。永遠不會再學中文。理由就是，中文是狗屎。

胡適, 錢玄同, 陳獨秀, 瞿秋白, 魯迅, 郭沫若、蔡元培、吳玉章、林伯渠 等, 著名的六百多位學者, 共同簽署宣言, 消滅漢字。今天的漢語文, 與胡適, 錢玄同, 陳獨秀, 瞿秋白, 魯迅, 郭沫若 的時代, 究竟有何不同? 我們究竟在教什麼?

百分之八十, 退學的。因為我們教的是狗屎。

百分之二十, 學成的。確認, 所學的是狗屁。

一個不出門的人, 對著幾十個鏡子 (平的、凸的、凹的) 照來照去, 要決定那個鏡像最醜, 是不容易的。中文最難學嗎? 從中文本身的角度, 是不容易討論的。這是一個非常主觀的問題。中國人認為, 它和吃飯一般的容易。美國人就認為, 它比坐牢還苦。還得從整個 語文學 的高度來看。中文在整個 語文學 的宇宙裡, 究竟坐在什麼位置? “中文最難學嗎?” 這是 語言學中, 重中之重的問題。但是拿著鏡子, 照來照去, 是照不出答案的。今天, 世界上有 5,000 個活語言。要一個一個的來比, 是不可能的。如何比法, 也還有爭議呢! 但是, 現在我們有了一個客觀的量尺。它離 “一二三萬” 有多遠? 這 “一二三萬” 的量尺, 有三個部份:

- a. 有一組符號 (字母 或 字根), 建構所有的字 (vocabulary),
- b. 每個字音, 可從字面讀出,
- c. 每個字義, 可從字面讀出。

如果漢字是, 互相無邏輯關係的方塊。那, 它就是最難學的語文。胡適、魯迅, 對此早已下了定論。漢字對中國人來說, 也都是很難學的。一般的美國大學畢業生, 至少認識十萬英文字。高中畢業生, 讀古英文 (莎士比亞 或 King James Bible) 也毫無問題。今天, 百分之九十九的中國大學畢業生, 是沒有能力讀古文的。康熙字典, 總共不過四萬八千字。翻開任何一頁 (每頁約四十字), 能認識超過三個字的人, 絕無幾人。認識個三、五千字, 能夠看看報紙, 就自認把中文學通了。這是自欺欺人。以西方的標準, 這是笑話。文化, 不是今天。它包含由古至今的智慧。把古人智慧完全拋棄的人, 還算是個文化人嗎?

用這量尺, 英文拿了 220 分 (100 + 100 +20)。錢玄同 與 David Moser 給了中文 0 分。王安石 想給個好分數, 卻成了笑柄。但是, 我, 給漢語文滿分; 300 分。滿分 與 299 分, 有著天壤之別。如果我們找到 “一個” 不合格的例子, 不會對 299 分構成威脅。但它立刻否定了 “滿分” 的陳述 (statement or claim)。

漢語文，它離“一二三萬”有多遠？它真的能得滿分嗎？它真有一組符號（字母或字根）“生”出“所有”的漢字嗎？每個漢字的字音，可從字面讀出嗎？每個漢字的字義，可從字面讀出嗎？這三項，就是檢驗的標準。勝敗由此定出。

首先，我們必須定義“一”，一組符號。它是 220 個漢字字根，明列在“Chinese Etymology,”書中。然後，由“一”生出 300 個“音根”。由此讀出每個漢字的字音。它們也列在 Chinese Etymology 書中。最後，定義出一組“生”的法則。由此讀出每個漢字的字義。人生子，也有一組生法。夫妻生，代孕母生，試管生，複製生，等等。所有的漢字生法(s)，在書中也有詳述。

有了上述“明確”訂下的規則，我們可把所有的漢字，一個一個的檢驗。只要有一個不合格，“滿分”的陳述，就破功了。漢字，就這麼五萬來個。一個一個的檢驗，是完全可行的。在“Chinese Etymology”，證明了 8000 個例子。詳細的證明，請查閱“中文的字根與文法：天馬行空的漢語，Chinese Word Roots and Grammar (US copyright TX 6-514-465)”與“Chinese Etymology (US copyright TX 6-917-909)”。本書，只提供邏輯的證明。它比全部檢驗，更為學者所接受。歸納證法，有三個步驟。

- a. 證明存在 (Existential introduction) --- 只要證明一個例子，就可以了。
- b. 證明不是特例 (Existential generalization) --- 只要證明，第二個例子存在。
- c. 證明是全面的 (Universal proof) --- 只要證明，任意隨機挑選的，都合格。

任意隨機挑選的，就由讀者來挑選吧。所以，我的證明，只用二、三個例子。

A. 證明漢字是“組合”的，由“一”生出來的。並且字義可由“字面”讀出。
瞎（目害），忘（亡心），撒（手散），等等。

B. 證明字音可由字面讀出。字音有許多“生”法。僅略談三法。

- i. 形聲字 --- 字音與聲符同音。如，鵬音朋，珠音朱，鱔音善。
- ii. 會意字 --- 聲符可“轉”韻。如，群，郡，裙為聲符“君”的轉韻。
- iii. 無聲符字 --- 以字義為字音。如：祭，請神即位，音即。贏者有盈，音盈。

從“萬”學萬，當然是很難的。從一二三，學出“生”萬的方法，就是最簡單的了。以現在大陸、台灣的教學法，中文是全世界最難學的語言。連中國人，都把古文看成外星語了。但是，漢語文系統，是最容易學的語言。下點功夫，三個月就可以認識“所有”的漢字了。

“一二三萬”語文，是語言學界，對語言學的梦想。尤其是拉丁語文系的梦想。最自豪的德、法、英文，也只達到一小部份。約百分之二十。入門矣，未入室也。而漢文字，已達到百分之百。這對西方語言學界，是驚天動地的。然而，今天的中國人，仍把漢語文，以最齷齪的語文，來學、來教。這是如何的數典忘祖，如何的摧殘學童，如何的禍國殃民。有識的，有良心的中國人，救救您們的學童吧！為您們的祖先，平平冤吧！

第十七章： 丟死人的“沉冤”

研究了一輩子的“說文解字”，王安石 仍然鬧了“字說”的笑話。康熙字典 集百餘大儒之力，近二十年之功。 未能發現，每個漢字的字義，可由字面讀出。那麼，胡適，錢玄同，陳獨秀，瞿秋白，魯迅，郭沫若、蔡元培、吳玉章、林伯渠等，這批人對漢字的愚昧與無知，是可以原諒的。畢竟，我的“中文字根學”，是二〇〇六年才出版的。

二〇一一年，我看到一本“漢語兒童教科書”。它把每個漢字，都賦予“詞類 (part of speech)”。如，“我”，名詞；“飛”，動詞。這真叫我大吃一驚。漢字居然有詞類！不知“漢字”系統的偉大，倒也罷了。如果，“漢字”系統是狗屎。漢語“語法”，鐵定好不到那裡去。可是，我已經證明了，“漢字”系統，是世界上“維一”的，完美的語文系統。那麼，漢語“語法”，鐵定就壞不到那裡去。我的漢字字根網 (<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/>)，已於二〇〇六年上網。累積的瀏覽人數，至今已超過二十萬人。到了今天，漢語“語法”，仍然受到如此的羞辱。五千年的老祖宗，會從地底爬出，天上飛下，被活活的再氣死一次。

五千年來，我們的祖先，不知 漢語文有“詞類”。是他們的愚昧與無知。還是，他們有了一群，不肖的敗類子孫？事實上，漢語“語法”，是世界上唯一完美的語法系統。空說無憑，還是來看證據吧。為簡單起見，就以 中、英文，來做比較吧。

中、英文主要的差別，在於“字法”不同。漢字是 non-inflectional (沒尾巴的)。英文字是有尾巴的；-ive (形容詞)，-ly (多為副詞)，-ness (抽象名詞)，-ize (動詞)，-ing (動名詞)，-ed (過去分詞)，等等。英文的文法，完全是由這些尾巴控制的。詞類 (part of speech)，完全是由字的尾巴來“定義”的。漢字沒有尾巴，怎麼可能會有詞類！

有人說：

- a. 汉语和英语词的不同，正在于它不通过[字]形变化，就可以实现基本的，和非常用的功能。
- b. 从教学而言，如果说汉语没有“词类”也行不通，很麻烦。
- c. 至于机器翻译就更不用说了。比如词汇表来个英译，还是有其基本的正确度和实用性的。

這完完全全，是對語言學的誤解。“功用 (function)”與“型式 (form)”是完全不同的。一個字在句中，發揮了“形容”的功用，並不表示它是形容詞。在英文中，有許多“名詞 (noun)”是做“形容”的功用。但它並沒有變成形容詞 (adjective)。如，

He is a “university” student.

“university”有形容的功用，但仍然是名詞。

“時式 (tense)”是英文文法中的一大重點。但，英文文法中，沒有“未來時式 (future tense)”。因為，英文動詞，只有四個尾巴。現在式 (+s)，過去式 (+ed)，進行式 (+ing)，過去分詞 (+ed)。但沒有表達“未來式”的尾巴。所以，英文是沒有“未來時式”的。對未來的表達，是“將就”的。借用 Modal verb (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modal_verb) 中的 will 或借用 “be going to”，來指出未來。

從這個例子，英文的文法 (grammar)，完全是由字法決定的。缺了一個尾巴，就無法以“文法 (grammatical)”表達。只能用其它的“將就”法了。在英文語言學中，每個“字彙 (terminology)”的定義，是非嚴密的。

- a. Syntax (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syntax>) --- 主要為 symbol and form。基本上，就是字法 (尾巴的變化)。
- b. Grammar (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Grammar>) --- 基本上，是受字法控制的。一些組合字的法規。
- c. Semantics (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Semantics>) --- 討論一組字 (句) 的“意義”，reference and meaning (a truth table)。中文譯為“語意”。
- d. Pragmatic --- 討論語意的“態”(時，地，人等)，Indexicality (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indexicality>)，有關 tense, pronouns, demonstrative。

基本上，英文文法有下列的結構。

- i. 主、述語 (Subject + Predicate) 結構。
- ii. 詞類 (part of speeches), 字尾巴的變化。
- iii. 字序 (word order)
- iv. 交通管理 (Indexicality), 規定 “時空” 在字、句中的變化。

西方語言學家，對上面的這些擺飾，是非常自豪與自敖的。一個沒有尾巴的系統，也能搞出上面這套擺設？那是，沒人會相信的。好在，他們之中，沒人真的瞭解中文。否則，所有的大牙，全會笑掉的。

語言的文法，完完全全是由 “字法 (syntax)” 決定的。不同的字法，必定有不同的文法。英文字是有尾巴的 (inflection)。也才能有 “詞類 (part of speeches)”。有了詞類，才能有 “主/述” 語。中文字，是沒有尾巴的 (non-inflectional)。怎麼可能有 “詞類 (part of speeches)”？沒有詞類，怎麼可能有 “文法 (grammar)” 上的主/述語。

習慣用法，不是文法 (grammar)。邏輯用法，不是文法。文法，完全是由字法 (syntax) 決定的。漢語在 “文法 (grammar)” 上，是不可能有的詞類的。沒有那個東西，怎能幹那個事？在語意上，有詞類的作用，倒是勉強說得過去的。但，終究是畫蛇添足，完全沒有那個必要。

中文與英文是絕然不同的語言系統。從英文文法的例子，我們可以得一 “定律”：句法 (文法) 完全由字法決定。不同的字法，鐵定有不同的文法。把英式文法，硬塞入中文中，是天大的笑話。老外不懂中文，也就只好偷笑了。

電腦語言，也有兩類。寫碼語言，如 Basic, C++ 等。運作語言 (operational system), 如 DOS, Windows, OS2 等。運作系統，基本上是個交通警察；控制那個程式 (program) 進，那個出，那個停。也就是打 “旗號”；綠旗進，紅旗出，等等。一個程式，沒有聖旨 (綠旗)，是進不了場的。是沒聲音的。

英文字尾巴，就是旗號。它進場（句子裡）後，能佔什麼位置，能有什麼份量，負有什麼責任？完全由那尾巴決定。漢字沒有尾巴；那如何判定它的角色呢？這對西方語言學家來說，還真是不可想像的奧秘。但是，我們自己懂嗎？重點只有一個：“五四”那批人，完全不知道中文是什麼東西。就像鯊魚一樣，不知道大海是什麼東西。

我們整天在講 語法、語法。我們曾經問過，“什麼是語法嗎？”現在我們懂了。語法就是“號誌”。由它來標明每個字，在句中的角色。

一位美國語言學家，說中文沒有文法。一位中國老師，立刻攤開了“中文九百句型”的教科書。把學生一腳踢進那山中，還有誰敢再問那山真面目？在語言學界，成了笑話。

“五四”以後，出現了一大批“中文文法”專著。若被“四庫全書”的編者看到，定會瞠目結舌，不知所云。西洋的一流語言學家看了，也會傳為笑話。這些人，硬生生的把牛頭(英式文法)當成馬嘴(中文文法)。西方的語言學家並不領情。他們深知，再怎麼搖，無尾熊是搖不出尾巴的。連“何謂語法？”都不知道。自己鬧笑話，也就罷了。誤人子弟，卻是千古罪過。

“五四”之前，有“中文文法”的專著嗎？嚴格說來，沒有。但讀通兩本書，對中文文法，也就心領神會了。

1. 文心雕龍 —— 基本上講的是，文章的章法。如，宗經、明詩、樂府、詮賦 等。其次，就是修辭學。如，神思、體性、通變、定勢、情采、鎔裁 等。
2. 古文辭類纂 —— 這是一本正式提到“文法”兩字的書。序言的第一句，“彙少聞古文法於…”。不過此書的方法，仍是“一腳踢入此山中”。它把漢語文，分為十三類。當然，缺了白話文類。基本上，也是一本“章法”書。不過它也提到一些作文之法。如，神理、氣味、格律、聲色 等。嚴格說來，這些都不是“號誌”系統。

有些語言，和中文一樣。其字彙，也是無尾熊。大部份的這類語言，都是部落語言。小部落，沒幾個人，沒什麼大事。汪汪兩句，就天下太平了。這種語言，都是不成熟的，很低俗的。所以，許多語言學家，把漢語文放入這個籃子裡。“五四”那些自認正直的學者，必須屈服於真理之前。也把漢語文定位為，最臭的茅坑了。

中文鐵定有文法；一個明確的“號誌”系統。一個圓 嘍 嘍的方塊字，滾進場（進入句中）；如何知道它的位份與責任？標點符號是個輔助號誌；但它是進口品。進場的次序（word order），是所有文法的大號誌。但古文常用“倒句”；字序在基本上，不是中文語法的大號誌。雖然漢字本身，沒有帶個明顯的號誌入場，中文句，是有號誌的。二〇〇六年，我出版了“中文的字根與文法”。有三章是談中文文法的。

1. 複詞 —— 中文常以詞（非單字）入場。詞有特別的文法位份。
2. 讀 —— 讀，比詞複雜。是中文句中的最重要組成部份。
3. 虛字 —— 這是最主要的號誌。基本上，是起詞、轉語詞、尾詞等。這些都是“虛字”。古來也有討論虛字的書。但從未指出它是中文文法的重點。

其實，這些，古人都東拉西扯的討論過。只是沒有把它們當文法來談。也從未同時談過。一九九〇年，我出版了“The Divine Constitution, (<http://books.google.com/books?id=8MMzPwAACAAJ&dq=inauthor:%22Gong+Jeh-Tween%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=9oDyT9z8E-PO2wWzmf2fAg&ved=0CDcQ6AEwAA>)”。它是討論科學與哲學的。一位密西根大學教授（原本不認識），寫了一篇書評（可在此查閱，<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-9744.t01-1-00248/abstract>）。其中一章，討論了上帝的語言（物理與數學）。基本的論點是：

- a. 英文是“時空”語言（perceptual language）。字後有個尾巴，搖著時空坐標。
- b. 上帝的語言，是“概念”語言（conceptual language）。它不需要時空坐標。是沒有尾巴的。

在章尾，我順口帶了一句：中文也是概念語言。

其實，“所有”的電腦語言，都是概念語言。都是沒有尾巴的。一個“指令”的進場，是按照先後秩序的。或者是由邏輯門（logic gates）控制的。所以，在我的“Linguistics Manifesto, (<http://books.google.com/books?id=Uh8EtwAACAAJ&dq=inauthor:%22Jeh-Tween+Gong%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=JIHyT-3sO8mA2wW90bz3AQ&ved=0CE4Q6AEwBA>)”書中，我提出了“語言學大統一論（Super unified linguistics theory）”。語言宇宙，是由“兩端”構成的。一端是概念語言；沒有尾巴，光溜溜的；可稱為 0-式語言。另一端是時空語言；是花枝招展的；可稱為 1-式語言。由這兩端，造成一個語言光譜（language spectrum）。所有的語言，就分布在這 0 與 1 之間。至此，無尾熊不再是低劣的語言。它與英式語言，有著相同的位份。

其實，概念語言 (conceptual language) 是比時空語言 (perceptual language) 更高層次的語言。每個字，可以當任何的“詞類”用。這是英文不可想像的事情。中文文法，是語言文法中的最高境界。是西方語言家，完全不可想像的。它們的那些擺飾，是醜陋的。完全沒有必要的。漢語文：

A. 不“需”要主、述語結構。虞兮，虞兮，奈若何！虞兮不是主語。“奈”、“若”、“何”都不是述語。那些，以英文文法，附會到中文上的，鐵定完全不懂英文文法。就亂講一通。

B. 漢字是沒有詞類的。沒有尾巴，怎麼耍那猴戲？有一中國教科書說：“回”，動詞，如，回家。那，玩了一回的回呢？“書”，名詞。那，“我書之”的書呢？

任何語言，都可分成兩個部分。

i. 字法。

ii. 句法。

完全瞭解漢語文的字法，就能完全瞭解它的句法（文法）。更進一步的說明，下章分解。

第十八章：最偉大與完美的“語法”

前章已經闡明，所有“文法”都包含兩部分，“字法”與“句法”。基本上，“句子”是一個“線性場”，由一群“字”滾進場，所“排列”造成。在這一群字中，誰是領隊，誰是主角，誰跑龍套？在“英式”語言中，它是非常明確的。每個進場的字，都帶有“旗號（生份證）”的。它們必須“對號”入座。

反之，漢字只有字形，字音與字義。沒有“旗號”。旗號的定義是，它不改變“字義”。只改變字的“性、格”。如，concept (conceptual, conceptive, 等)。英式文字，至少有三種旗號。

a. 尾巴 (suffixes): 它不改變字義。只改變字的“類別 (part of speeches)”或“時態 (tense, -ed, -ing, etc.)”或“數量 (numbers, -s, -es)”。

b. 面具 (mask, 變臉): 它沒有尾巴，但面貌不同。如 (I, me, my, mine), (buy, bought), (will, would) 等。它們是一個字，有不同的“字格”。與“同義字 (synonym)”是不同的。中文的 我、吾、余，是同義字。

c. 帽子: 有些字 (尤其是名詞)，已經無法再加尾巴。又無法變臉。只能戴個帽子進場。主要的帽子是“定詞 (article [the, a])”，“指示詞 (Determinants [this, there])”與“助動詞 (modal auxiliary verb)”。這些帽子，只做另外一字的“旗號”，而不改變其“字義”。一般來說，字首 (Prefixes) 都會改變字義。所以，它不是旗號。

讀者若想對“旗號”做更進一步的瞭解，請查閱下列網頁。

Agglutinative language (tails and masks are the same thing, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agglutinative_language).

Fusional language (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Fusional_language), such as, Sanskrit, (and the modern Indo-Aryan languages), Greek (classical and modern).

Declension (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Declension>) is the inflection of nouns, pronouns, adjectives, and articles to indicate number (at least singular and plural), case (nominative or subjective, genitive or possessive, etc.), and gender.

Genitive case (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genitive_case) marks a noun as modifying another noun, such as, Janet's jacket, doom's day.

這三種旗號，涵蓋了全部的英文字彙。每個英文字滾進場（句子），排排坐，吃果果，不會有任何的混淆。有了這旗號系統，英文的“句法”就很簡單了。只有一個法則。

主語 (subject) + 述語 (predicate)。

述語，代表或表達一個“事實 (fact)”。 “事實”是一個“動作 (action)”或一個“態 (state)”。所以，述語必須要有一個“動作動詞 (action verb)”或一個“狀態動詞 (linking verb)”。主語必須是名詞 或具有名詞功能者 (如，分詞，名詞子句，等)。當然，可以有許多形容詞 (adjective) 來美化主語。許多副詞 (adverb) 來形容述語。從這唯一的“句法”，又可變化出許多句型。

i. 問句：掉轉 主、述語的次序，並加問號 (?)。

ii. 被動語態 (passive voice): 把 動作動詞改成 狀態動詞 (be + 分詞)。受詞與主語對調。把“動作”改成“狀態”。搖搖動詞的“尾巴”，就成了。

iii. 假設語氣 (Subjunctive mood): 在 if “假設”子句後，以 would (or should) 後，加“完成式”。表示，並未完成。如, If I were you, I would have eaten it. 實際上，我並沒有吃它。把述詞加頂帽子 (modal verb, would)，文義就反過來了。

這些句型的變化，基本上，由“旗號”來達成。由這些基本句型，可再組合成更多的複雜句型。英文文法的全部，也就是這麼簡單的两點。

A. 句法：主、述語。

B. 旗號系統。

由此兩點，可以規範所有的英文句子。全部的英文文法，只在規範“如何成句？”那麼，中文如何“成句”？

漢字，只有形、音、義，不帶“旗號”。不過，中文“句”是有旗號的。句子有“起詞”，“轉詞”與“尾詞”。如，

兵者詭道也故能而示之不能用而示之不用近而示之遠遠而示之近利而誘之亂而取之強而避之怒而撓之卑而驕之攻其不備出其不意此兵家之勝不可先傳也

若把標點符號從莎士比亞的文章中拿掉，能幫它斷句的人，沒有幾個。漢語文，大概是唯一的文字，是不需要標點符號的。因為，它的旗號，不在“字”內，而在“句”中。把上文的旗號標出，文義就一目了然了。

兵(者) 詭道(也) (故)能(而)示之不能 用(而)示之不用 近(而)示之遠 遠(而)示之近 利(而) 誘之 亂(而)取(之) 強(而)避(之) 怒(而)撓(之) 卑(而)驕(之) 攻(其)不備 出(其)不意 (此)兵家之勝 不可先傳(也)

上文又用了“對仗”，使斷句更明確了。但是，在漢語文之內，來談漢語文法，似乎是對牛彈琴。只好，從英文的角度，來推導出，漢語文法了。

英文，是個很完善的“時空”語言。把宇宙看成一個“時空場”，則英文可以對整個宇宙，做明確的描述。漢字沒有“旗號”。那麼，是否“漢語句”的旗號，與英文的旗號系統，具有同等的“法力”？這就是我要討論的重點。如何來證明，這兩大不同的系統，有著相同的法力？

首先，我必須介紹一個詞彙，抽象（abstract）。每位讀者，都認識它。並且認為，對它有徹底的瞭解。不需再做說明了。那麼，抱歉了。我還是得在這裡，不厭其煩的，做詳細的說明。

抽象，有兩部分。一，它是一個“態”。二，要從“實體”轉換到“抽象態”，需要經過某種“運作 (operation)”，叫做“抽象運作”。只有完全了解了抽象運作的過程，才可能了解“抽象態”的內涵。就以數學為例子吧。

$$1 + 2 = 3,$$

$$3 + 4 = 7,$$

$5 + 6 = 11, \dots$ 。這是算術 (arithmetic)。

A. 每個方程式內，都是“真實”的數。

B. 有“無窮”多個，這種方程式。

然而，那“無窮”個方程式，可用一個代替之。 $a + b = c$ 。這是代術 (algebra)。就是以抽象符號來代替 (代表)，那些“真實”的數。 a 是什麼數？什麼都不是。卻又什麼都可以。

$$a + b = c,$$

$$a - b = d,$$

$$a \times c = f,$$

$$a / f = g。$$

除了這四種運算 (加，減，乘，除)，還有許多 (無窮多) 的函數。我們可以把“運算”也抽象化。 $a \# b = c$ 。 $\#$ 是什麼？什麼都可以 (加，減，乘，除， \dots)。這就是“抽象代數 (abstract algebra, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Abstract_algebra)”。

抽象化，其實就是“虛化”。把實數虛化，就是代數。把運算虛化，為抽象代數。

概念語言，就是把真實的時空“事、物”，提升到概念的層面。漢語文，至少做了兩次的提升。

一. “字”，砍掉了所有的“時空”旗號。沒有“詞類 (part of speeches)”了。

二. “句”，砍掉了所有的“主、述”語架構。

如何來“砍”，這就是抽象運作了。介紹之前，先說明幾點吧。首先，硬要把代數降回算術的層級，也死不了人的。但就不可能有電腦了。拿了紙和筆，拚命的算吧。

五千年來，中文沒有詞類（動詞，名詞，…），出了多少的大文豪。在教抽象代數的課堂裡，整天拿了算術來磨蹭。不是誤人子弟，是什麼？把最偉大的語文，當狗屎來教。情何以堪！

各種語言的“句子”，至少包含四種架構。

- a. 文法 (grammar) 架構。
- b. 語意 (semantics) 架構。
- c. 邏輯 (logic) 架構。
- d. 自然 (natural) 架構。

就以字序而言，中文自然有“自然”、“邏輯”與“語意”上的字序。但沒有英文文法式的字序。許多學者，對這幾種架構的差異，完全沒有概念。全部混為一談。

英文是“時空”語言系統。每個時空的“點”，都必須以旗號標明。中文經過兩次的抽象提升步驟，已把“時空”宇宙，轉換成“概念（抽象）”宇宙。從這個角度來說，英文是非常初級的語文系統。漢語文，是人類語言系統中，“唯一”完美的系統。

魯迅等人的侮蔑漢字。理由是，字與字之間，沒有任何邏輯的關聯。這個看法，到2005年，仍然表現在Dr. Moser的文章裡。但自從“Chinese Etymology”出版後，西方語言學界，已不敢再亂講話了。

並且，即使每個漢字，都是茅坑裡搓出來的臭石頭。漢語文的“語法(文法)”，仍是唯一完美的系統。多說無益，看證據吧。

我們已經談過，語言學的幾大定律。

a. 字法 (syntax) 決定 文法 (grammar)。不同的 字法，必定有不同的 文法。

英文字 是有尾巴的 (inflectional)。由此 “生出” 詞類 (part of speeches, 名詞、動詞 …等)。有 詞類，才可能有 主/述語結構 及其它 (tenses, voice, mood, …)

漢字，是沒有尾巴的 (non-inflectional)。是不可能 “有” “文法” 上的詞類。當然，也就不可能有 “文法” 上的 主/述語結構 及其它。但，我們可不可以，硬把它戴上這些帽子？做為高層次的語言，硬生生的被貶低，死是死不了的。只是，情何以堪。在 “語意 (semantics)” 與 “邏輯 (logic)” 上，要強行 搞個 “英式” 架構出來，還是 辦得到的。貶低容易，高攀就難了。

有人問：松樹 與 樹葉，“樹” 究竟有沒有 “詞性”？沒有 英文式的 詞類 (part of speeches)，如何來分辨兩者？古人，以虛實來分。松樹的 “樹” 是實字。樹葉的 “樹” 是虛字。正好用 紅樓夢 的說法。見第三十七回，寶釵 擬了十二 “菊花題”。菊為實字，其它都是虛字。“實、虛” 為概念語言，最重要的文法。

b. 代數定律：就是將 “實” 變 “虛”。我 已經談了它的原則。

英文的文法是非常嚴格的。沒有 主詞，不成句。沒有 述語，更不成句。在 “詩” 中，這些規矩，可以略有鬆動。但也不能離譜。我一生，少有詩興。2002 年，來了一次。當時，甚少中國朋友。又正參與 電腦語言的設計。將一詩，email 了幾位朋友。竟被他們收錄了。趁此，與大家分享 (Enter into it, we can. <http://comments.gmane.org/gmane.comp.python.education/347>)。總之，在英文文法裡，玩不了 “代數”，更別提 “抽象代數” 了。中文則不同。一個 裹腳布的白話句 (有主詞，有述語)，總是可以改成 “文言” 句的。大多數的短句，更可以，以詞 “代” 之。中國的 “成語”，基本上是 “句”。英文的 idiom，絕對不是 “句”。這方面，以後再詳論吧。

英式文法，是 “初級” 的文法系統。以它為基礎，向上做 “四” 次，代數化與抽象化的提升。就是 漢語文文法系統了。

壹， 格律化。

英文文法是很嚴格的、僵硬的。但在英文 “詩” 中，一些 “句法” 是可以放鬆的。Sonnet (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sonnet>) 是英文系統中，少有的 “格律句 (metered sentence, metrical structure)”。它的格律，包括，

- a. 每句字數的限制。
- b. 句數的限制。
- c. 音韻的要求。

它與中國的律詩很相似。在 sonnet 中，英文的句法（主/述語…等），幾乎可以“完全”放鬆。但字法，不能有錯。

以“格律”代替句“文法”，這是第一個提升。第一個語言“代數”。不過，格律句，在英系中，不是常態，而是例外。反之，中文雖有“散句”，如論語、孟子的語法。但，格律句，一直是中文語法的主流。略敘其發展過程。

i. 四言句，以詩經為主。字數為主，音韻次之。

ii. 騷賦體。這是中文“語法”發展上，最偉大的突破。基本上，它仍然是格律句。但句子的“標定”，不再以格律為主。而以一个特別的字，“兮”，做為“句號”。到了“九歌”、“天問”，這個“句號”，竟被移到“句中”去了。把英文的“句號 (period)”放到句子中間，可能嗎？能夠想像嗎？另外，騷體，打破了四言的格局。有了，五言、六言、七言與九言。騷體，不僅奠定了，中文語法的基礎。事實上，它已完善了，所有的中文文法。

iii. 十字句（四六文）。至此，古人認為，中文文法，已經完備。一字為字。二字為詞。四字為詩。五、六、七、八、九、十（言），全都成句了。

基本上，三言，就開始成句了。要“完全”學懂中文文法，學會“三言”，就夠了。只要學懂了“三字”句法，所有古文，都讀得懂了。可惜，一些有權力的白癡，把“三字”教學法，給廢了（見註）。現在的中國人，已是古文白癡。當然，就不可能懂得，中文文法是什麼了。還去搞什麼“詞類 (part of speeches)”呢！可悲呀！可嘆呀！

以“格律”代替英文式的句“文法”，是“小代數”。

中文“文法”，古人是懂的。但卻從未說清楚，講明白。“文心雕龍”、“古文詞類纂”及“桐城吳氏古语法”，講的都是文章的“章法”。不是如何造“句”的文法。近一百年來，“進口”了英語式文法。從此，就跳起了“牛頭對馬嘴”的猴戲。今天，上至北京大學中文系的教授們，下至幼兒園的老師們，仍然抱著這荒唐的猴戲，日歌夜舞。天天以誤人子弟為成就。日日把禍國殃民當偉業。被全世界的語言學家恥笑，也絲毫不以為意。最悲慘的是，已經無“藥”可救了。至少，“中文藥”是行不通的了。那就用“西藥”吧。從英文文法談起。盼能起死回生，救我中華。

貳，文法函數：

英文的文法，是很明確的，沒有爭議的。每個文法的“運作”，可以用“函數”的方式表達。如，下列。

- a. F(sp), 主/述語結構函數 (Subject + Predicate)。
- b. F(sub), 子句函數 (subordination)。
- c. F(ten), 時式 (tense)。
- d. F(vo), 時態 (voice)。
- e. F(mo), 語氣 (Mood)。
- f. F(nu), 人稱或多數 (numbers)
- g. 其它，還多著呢。

下面是個英文句子。

句A: He who is good looking and very funny is loved by many girls.

現在，把句A中的文法部分，以文法函數代替之。並寫成句B。

句B: He F(sub)F(nu) good looking and very funny F(sp)F(nu)F(vo) loved by many girls.

句A 與 句B 是完全相同的句子。只是，文法的 “實字”，用文法函數代替了。

A. who is = F(sub)F(nu), 子句, 第三人稱。

B. is loved = F(sp)F(nu)F(vo) loved, 第三人稱述語, 被動式。

句B, 由两大部仍組成。

一. 文法函數。五個函數。

二. 語意單位 (semantic fragment) 。三個 語意塊。

參, 抽象代數。

以一個 抽象 “運作” 來代替所有的 文法函數。給這 抽象 “運作”, 取個名字。叫, “逗 (comma)” 運作。每個 文法函數, 都以 “逗 (comma)” 運作 代替之。如此, 就是 句C。

句C: He ,, good looking and very funny ,,, loved by many girls.

句C, 是由 句B提升 (抽象化) 而來。與 句B, 仍然 同構 (isomorphic) 。現在, 再加入一 抽象代數定理。證明, 暫免。

(,,) = ,

即, 相鄰的兩 逗, 可合成一 逗。相離的 逗, 不得相合。那麼, 句C, 可以寫成 句D。

句D: He , good looking and very funny , loved by many girls.

現在, 句D 只剩下 三個語意塊, 加上兩個 “逗” 函數。經過兩次的抽象提升, 句D, 就是中文句了。

語意塊 + “逗” 函數 = “讀” 。就是中文的 “讀” 了。中文的 “文法”, 就是以 “讀” 造 “句” 。讀, 可以為句。但, “句” 常有多 “讀” 。見下例。

- a. 誰 (who)?
- b. 我 (I) 。
- c. 啥 (what)?
- d. 尿 (pee) 。

這是四句。每句一讀。每讀一字。當然，“讀”可有多字。句可有多讀。

中文文法，已從英文文法推導而出。

肆，句標。

“文法”的目的，是規範如何造“句”。能造一句，就能造無窮句。然後，集句成章。集章成書。

英文句，有三部分。

- a. 文法函數。
- b. 語意塊。
- c. 句號 (period) 。

英文在“文法”完“全”時，再加句號 (period)，即可成“句”。在英文，文法“全”時，語意也全了。

英文的 (a, b)，在中文，由“讀”取代。但，中文如何成“句”？金聖嘆云：義“全”、氣止，而成句。這是很正確的說法。但不實用。我們需要知道，標定義“全”、氣止的“符號”。英文有句號 (period)。中文就缺這麼個小圈圈。現在的句號，是進口的。如果，中文沒有“句”的標號。那，中文文法，是不完全的。讀、讀、讀、…的，沒完沒了。那，魯迅等的侮蔑漢語文，就不全是亂罵了。

不過，我們已經知道，中文有兩個“句標”。

- A. “格律標”，以七言為例，第八字，鐵定為下句之首。
- B. 在騷體，以一特別的字，“兮”，為句標。

那麼，散文（如，論語 或 孟子），有句標嗎？當然有。先看英文吧。

英文的文法函數，基本上，是不包含語意的。句號（period），更是個沒有語意的符號。那麼，中文的“句標”，也應該是不包含語意的。騷體的“兮”字，是個“氣詞”。確實不含語意。如果，中文只有一個“兮”字，做句標，那就太單調了。但，多造幾個，不含語意的“氣詞”，倒不是難事。如，之、乎、也、者…。其實，這些字，還是有字義的。所以，在用這些字，為“句標”時，必須把它們的“字義”虛化掉。基本上，任何字，虛化後，都可以當做“句標”。

在英文，句號（period）永遠放在句尾。中文的句標，可以放在三個位置。

- 一. 句首，為起詞。
- 二. 句中，為轉詞。
- 三. 句尾，為止詞。

有了句標後，連“讀”的逗標，都可以虛掉了。至此，中文不需要，任何的“標點符號（punctuation marks）”。“虛字”是中文獨有的。何為虛字，它就是中文的句標。白話文，也有虛字。如，了、的、呀、嗎、呢…。不過，這些句標虛字，與漢字的有“虛、實”，是完全不同的概念。

有了句標，漢語文系統，就是所有語言中，最完美的了。

這英、中文，轉換的抽象代數，不但說明了中文文法。其實可成為機器翻譯的邏輯基礎。不過，要達到百分百的轉換，需要再加一個抽象函數。在這裡，就不提了。

一百年前，胡適、錢玄同、陳獨秀、瞿秋白、魯迅、郭沫若、蔡元培、吳玉章、林伯渠等白癡，把漢語文法當狗屎。還情有可原。今天，從小學教師，到北京大學中文系教授，仍然在談漢字的“詞類”。這就罪該萬死了。“中文字根網”已經開通八年了。看樣子，對這一代的中國人，已經沒有期望了。此書就藏之於圖書館，傳諸後人了。

註：現在，大家都認為，“白話文”的推廣，是消除文盲的最大功臣。這是完全沒有科學根據的鬼話。“文言文”並不比工程或物理難。教育的普及，不再有“科學”文盲。以前的文盲，肇因於教育的不普及，與文言文毫無關係。“三字經”是最簡單的語文課程。能掌握“三字”句法，就能完全掌握“中文文法”。胡適等人的廢除“三字”文法，實為中華文化的千古罪人。中華民族的最大敗類。若不將他們的毒害，完全剔除，中國即使成為世界強權，仍將是文化奴才。

第十九章：最偉大的語文

前面章節，已經證明了下列幾點。

- a. 漢字是唯一的“一二三萬”文字系統。是其它文字不可想像的。
- b. 漢語文法與英文文法，有著同等的“法力”。
- c. 漢語文法把英文的“旗號”系統，從“字法”中，提升到“句法”中。但，更重要的，是把語言宇宙，從英式的“時空”宇宙，提升為“概念”宇宙。那麼，漢語文的法力，就比英式語文大了許多。在我提出“概念語言 (conceptual language)”之前，西方的語言學家，從不知有這玩意。簡言之，漢語文，比任何的其它語文，都要偉大。

Linguistic relativity or Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Linguistic_relativity) 的重點，就是在強調，拉丁語系的語言，是最優越的。但它所提出的論述，是不科學的。完全是愚昧優越感作祟的結果。但是，我的論述是不樣的。我證明了，語言是有“級別”的。在

“Linguistics manifesto

(<http://books.google.com/books?id=Uh8EtwAACAAJ&dq=inauthor:%22Jeh-Tween+Gong%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=JIHyT-3s08mA2wW90bz3AQ&ved=0CE4Q6AEwBA>)”，我證明了，只有漢語文能成為語言學上的“世界語言 (Universal Language)”。也就是說，所有的語言系統，都是漢語文的“子系統”。這是可以用數學證明的。它的證明，已在 Linguistics manifesto 中，有詳細的說明。在這裡，我就舉些“實例”。有許多漢語文的“法力”，不是任何其它語言系統具有的。

我已經說過很多次了。但它太重要了。只好再說一次。“字法”決定“句法”。其實，“字法”決定整個“語言宇宙場”。帶“旗號”的文字，它的“語言場”，必須要有對應的旗號系統。那麼，每個旗號，在那“語言場”的“自由度 (degree of freedom)”，一定受到一些限制的。反之，

一個沒有旗號的文字，它的“語言場”，應該是“平坦的 (Isomorphic and homogeneous)”。那麼，它就有了最高的自由度。真要瞭解語言的自由度，必須從“什麼是字？”談起。

“什麼是字？”在西方語言學，分得很細。

- a. Morpheme (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Morpheme>) is the smallest semantic unit in a language. A morpheme is not identical to a word, and the principal difference between the two is that a morpheme may or may not stand alone, whereas a word, by definition, is a freestanding unit of meaning. Every word comprises one or more morphemes. 最小的“語意”單位。有時，不能單獨存在，如“字根”。
- b. Bound morphemes (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bound_morpheme) is a morpheme that only appears as part of a larger word. 如，字首或字尾，不能單獨成字。
- c. Free or unbound morpheme can stand alone. 可成“字”的最小“語意”單位。
- d. Lexicon (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lexicon>): In most theories of linguistics, human languages are thought to consist of two parts: a lexicon, essentially a catalogue of a given language's words, and a grammar, a system of rules which allow for the combination of those words into meaningful sentences. The lexicon is also thought to include bound morphemes, which cannot stand alone as words (such as most affixes). In some analyses, compound words and certain classes of idiomatic expressions and other collocations are also considered to be part of the lexicon. Dictionaries represent attempts at listing, in alphabetical order, the lexicon of a given language; usually, however, bound morphemes are not included. 包括，字首、字根、字尾、字、複合字或詞。
- e. Word (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Word>) is the smallest element that may be uttered in isolation with semantic or pragmatic content (with literal or practical meaning). This contrasts with a morpheme, which is the smallest unit of meaning but will not necessarily stand on its own. A word may consist of a single morpheme (for example: oh!, rock, red, quick, run, expect), or several (rocks, redness, quickly, running, unexpected), whereas a morpheme may not be able to stand on its own as a word (in the words just mentioned, these are -s, -ness, -ly, -ing, un-, -ed). A complex word will typically include a root and one or more affixes (rock-s, red-ness, quick-ly, run-ning, un-expect-ed), or more than one root in a compound (black-board, rat-race). Words can be put together to build larger elements of language, such as phrases (a red rock), clauses (I threw a rock), and sentences (He threw a rock too but he missed). “字”，是在“句”中，能獨立存在 (stand alone) 的最小語意單位。Working 和 agenda 是字。(-ing) 和 (ag-) 是 bound morpheme, 不是“字”
- f. Vocabulary (<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vocabulary>) is commonly defined as "all the words known and used by a particular person".

基本上，所有的“旗號”及字首，都是 bound morphemes。英文中的“原字 (free morpheme)”，也是沒有“旗號”的。所以，

A. 將“原字 (free morpheme)”加旗號，就成了 英式語言系統。

B. “原字 (free morpheme)”不加旗號，而把旗號放在“句法”中，就成了 中式語言系統。

Free morpheme 的重點是 Free。它沒有枷鎖。它立刻可以展現三種“法力”。

一，以“詞”代字：如，蝴蝶，葡萄等。蝴蝶雖是兩個中文字，它在 文法上，只是一個“原字 (free morpheme)”。在 古文 (文言文)，是以“單字”為“原字 (free morpheme)”。必須知道單字的原義，才能讀懂古文。如，“底事周折”為何義，知道的人，就不多了。下面的字，{胡，劉，韋，聿，粵，俞，堯，舜，袁，僉，甫，繆，泉，尙，堯，董，蜀，牟，…}，人人都認識，但知道其原義的人，就很少了。

今天的白話文，大多以“詞”代字。如，蜀國、蜀道、董事、胡說、袁先生。即使不知蜀、董、胡、袁的單字字義，這些詞，人人都知其“義”。這種情況，在其它的語言系統，是幾乎沒有的。在漢語文，卻是普遍的現象。

二，以“詞”代句：英文也有 成語 (idiom) 與 片語 (phrase)。但與中文的，以“詞”代句，是不相同的。幾乎，中文的任何“句”，都可以，以“詞”代之。這是任何的其它語言，不可想像的。成語大全，有千、萬個例子。在此，僅舉數例如下。

中途先走說——失陪，	請人勿送說——留步，	送人遠行說——平安，	賓客來到說——光臨
等候別人說——恭候，	沒能迎接說——失迎，	需要考慮說——斟酌，	無法滿足說——抱歉
請人諒解說——包涵，	希望照顧說——关照，	贊人見解說——高見，	歸還物品說——奉還
老人年齡說——高壽，	身體不適說——欠安，	看望別人說——拜訪，	請改文章說——斧正
接受好意說——領情，	求人指點說——賜教，	向人詢問說——請問，	請人協助說——費心
請人解答說——請教，	與人相見說——您好，	問人姓氏說——貴姓，	問人住址說——府上
客人入座說——請坐，	陪伴朋友說——奉陪，	臨分別時說——再見，	言行不妥——对不起
慰問他人說——辛苦，	迎接客人說——歡迎，	請人赴約說——賞光，	對方來信說——惠書
自己住家說——寒舍，	請人接受說——笑納，	送人照片說——惠存，	歡迎購買說——惠顧
得人幫助說——謝謝，	祝人健康說——保重，	向人祝賀說——恭喜，	求人辦事說——拜托
麻煩別人說——打擾，	求人方便說——借光，	長期未見說——久違，	求人幫忙說——勞駕
仰慕已久說——久仰，			

註：此表由 楊川 (Ellen Yang) 提供。

三，基本上，漢語文是不需要 標點符號 (punctuation marks) 的。

如果我們把所有的標點符號，從沙士比亞的文章拿掉。他的文章，就句不成句了。每人都可讀出不同的句子了。反之，中國的古文(文言文)，是不用標點符號的。每篇文章，不會被讀出為不同的文章。那就是，中文的文法，不需要標點符號，也能明確的表達句義。這在英式語言中，是不可想像的。

在英文中，run-on sentence (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Run-on_sentence) [裹腳布的句子]，是最忌諱的。寫此種句子的人，立即成為文盲的代表。

Run-on sentence (A run-on sentence is a sentence in which two or more independent clauses (i.e., complete sentences) are joined without appropriate punctuation or conjunction. It is generally considered a stylistic error, though it is occasionally used in literature and may be used as a rhetorical device. An example of a run-on is a comma splice, in which two independent clauses are joined with a comma without an accompanying coordinating conjunction.) 它就是，兩句變成一句時，用錯了標點符號。如，

I went to school.

I ate my lunch.

錯 (run-on sentence): I went to school, I ate my lunch.

對: a. I went to school, and I ate my lunch.

b. I went to school; I ate my lunch.

c. I went to school and ate my lunch.

中、英文裡，句子的定義，就是義全。義不全者，為半句或子句，以逗點 (comma, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comma>) 與其它部份隔開。一句可有許多、許多的逗點。義全者為句子，以句點 (period [. or .] <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Period>) 結束。如果兩句混成一句，就成裹腳布句子 (run-on sentence) 了。

所以，中、英文文法的共同重點，就是要句成句。句中的逗點不能少。不能以逗號代句號。兩句連結的規矩不能錯。

一般人犯錯,倒也不是什麼。連李敖都不懂這些,就是大事了。就以“杂评鲁迅和他孙子“(李敖 1982.09.23, <http://leao.com.cn/zhawen/luxun.htm>)一文為例。

“我想我会在货色方面、努力方面,给中国做一个榜样。至于在人格方面的坚苦卓绝,孤军奋斗。那更无人能比了(鲁迅、胡适那时候,国民党对异己的压迫力量,远不如今天。鲁迅有租界和左联保护,胡适有帮口势力。他们都在尊敬知识分子的社会里,得到蔡元培等的支持。今天我的处境,的确比他们困难得太多了,大多了)。”

上文,應該只有兩句,而非三句。正確的標點如下。

“我想我会在货色方面、努力方面,给中国做一个榜样。至于在人格方面的坚苦卓绝,孤军奋斗,那更无人能比了(鲁迅、胡适那时候,国民党对异己的压迫力量,远不如今天。鲁迅有租界和左联保护。胡适有帮口势力。他们都在尊敬知识分子的社会里,得到蔡元培等的支持。今天我的处境,的确比他们困难得太多了,大多了)。”

沒改這個標點符號,那就句不成句了。

“我说:我们是现在的国民党的批评者,你可知道过去的国民党的批评者他们多安全吗?他们大都是在国民党刀枪拳头达不到的地方批评的,他们或在洋人保护的租界里批评国民党(如“新月杂志”),或在北方军人的宽厚里批评国民党(如“独立评论”),或在允许办报的局面里批评国民党(如“大公报”),或在民情汹汹的公理昭彰时代里批评国民党(如“观察”)。……可是我们呢?我们全身暴露在国民党空前大好的统治优势下,他们有高度集中的力量、有密集安打的环境、有四面是水的方便、有日本留下的被统治惯性、有现代的镇暴设备、有一党独大、有八号分机、有大量的喊万岁唱梅花的小市民。……这一切一切,都足以使国民党的批评者心灰意懒、胆战心惊的。我们没梁山可上、没出境证可拿、我们活象玻璃窗户上的苍蝇--“前途光明,没有出路”,随时都要被苍蝇拍子打下来。……可是,我们还是做了!还是头破血流,一做再做了!维桢啊,不要搞错了,我们是最有勇气的人!我们才是最 有勇气的人!”

上段的斷句,也是很糟的。改正如下。

“我说：我们是现在的国民党的批评者[，。]你可知道过去的国民党的批评者[，]他们多安全吗？他们大都是在国民党刀枪拳头达不到的地方批评的[，。]他们或在洋人保护的租界里批评国民党(如"新月杂志")，或在北方军人的宽厚里批评国民党(如"独立评论")，或在允许办报的局面里批评国民党(如"大公报")，或在民情汹汹的公理昭彰时代里批评国民党(如"观察")。.....可是我们呢？我们全身暴露在国民党空前大好的统治优势下[，。]他们有高度集中的力量、有密集安打的环境、有四面是水的方便、有日本留下的被统治惯性、有现代的镇暴设备、有一党独大、有八号分机、有大量的喊万岁唱梅花的小市民。.....这一切一切，都足以使国民党的批评者心灰意懒、胆战心惊的。我们没梁山可上、没出境证可拿、我们活象玻璃窗户上的苍蝇--"前途光明，没有出路"[，。]随时都要被苍蝇拍子打下来。.....可是，我们还是做了！还是头破血流，一做再做了！维桢啊，不要搞错了，我们是最有勇气的人！我们才是最 有勇气的人！”

該用句點的地方,用了逗點,那就句不成句了。但是, 亂用標點符號的中文文章, 被誤解的機會並不多。這就是漢語文文法, 偉大的地方了。

上敘三點, 都是 英式語文不可想像的。

自從我的“中文字根學”出版後, 許多人都認為, 它了無新義。“說文”早就有這種說法了。但, 他們忽略了一大事實。王安石 研究“說文”一輩子, 他的“字說”成了笑話。錢玄同 教了“說文”一輩子, 卻要廢掉漢字。更有 600 多位學者, 簽了“廢漢字宣言”, 都成了中華民族的敗類。“康熙字典”集二百餘當代大儒, 窮二十年之功夫, 並未發現, 漢字字義可由字面讀出。

“六書”確實是“中文字根學”的一部分。但是, “說文”完全不了解“六書”。它的解釋, 大部分都是錯誤的。“說文”與“六書”的關係如下。

- i. 它的本身, 並未以“六書”為架構。百分之八十的文字, 都歸類為 象形。段玉裁 的註還說, “指事之文絕少”。全“說文”只有少數數“文”歸類為 指事。全書 幾乎沒有歸類於“形聲”與“會意”者。
- ii. 在第十五卷, “說文”寫到, “依類象形謂之文, 形聲相益謂之字”。那麼“形聲”就不是字之一類, 而是通則了。

iii. 它又寫到,“周禮八歲入小學,保氏教國子,先以六書, ...其後諸侯力政不統於王, ...言語異聲,文字異形, ...”。也就是說,戰國時期,“六書”已被廢棄,不為學子學習了。

iv. “說文”對“六書”,有下面六句的說明。

指事者 (pointing or assigning), 視而可識, 察而見意。上、下是也。

象形者 (pictographic), 畫成其物, 隨體詰出。日、月是也。

形聲者 (phonetic loan), 以事為名, 取譬相成。江、河是也。

會意者 (sense determinators), 比類合誼, 以見指偽。誠、信是也。

轉註者 (synonymize), 建類一首, 同意相受。考、老是也。

假借者 (borrowing), 本無其字, 依聲托事。令、長是也。

現在,就有個大問題了。“說文”的六句話,與我的“中文字根學”是不合的。以“說文”的六書,是不可能發展出“中文字根學”的。它的說明,都是錯的。大概,“六書”在戰國時期失傳後,“說文”就自己胡謔了幾句。“六書”在我其它書中,已有詳細說明。在此,就只舉兩個例子,來說明“說文”的謬誤。

A. 形聲是“形符”+“聲符”。下面的字,為形聲字。

1. (鯉, 鯊, 鯨, 鯽, 鰭, 鱧, 鱣, 鱒, 鱈, 鱉 ...)

2. (鴿、鴨、鸚、鷓、鵬 ...),

魚、鳥為形符。形符在字內,不發聲。基本上,字與聲符同音。器、物有形,為形符。事與概念,無形,不可為形符。是以,“以事為名,取譬相成”是鬼扯。並且,江、河是會意字。首先,江不發工聲。河,也不音可。弓,是氣不通。可為弓之反,口氣通了。河為水可,即水氣通,未受堵塞。黃河行經高原、平原,未受大山堵塞,故名河。江是水工。工,工程也。長江被堵於“三峽”,經“大禹”施工打通,故名江。

B. 假借,基本上不造新字。借舊字,給新義。所以,“本無其字,依聲托事”是正確的。但“說文”所舉的例子不對。以“長”當“令”是用法。長、令都是會意字。令是“合卩”。卩是印信。印信合,則為令。長,上半為馬之上部。下半為化。從馬尾變長之象。

“說文”雖然記錄了“六書”，但對它沒有瞭解。那些，想以“說文”來詆毀“中文字根學”的人，只是又成了白癡與敗類。

(Part Three) 沉冤大白 --- The new Chinese Etymology

Chapter 20 ---- The background history before this new Chinese etymology

The Chinese Written language was and still is viewed as one of the most difficult languages in the world. Yet, in the Spring 2008 (from April 3 to June 17), Jason Tyler Gong openly showed the world (under public eyes, 5 Chinese newspapers and 6 Chinese TV stations) that Chinese written language can be mastered in 89 days from an initial state of knowing not a single Chinese character to a state of being able to read Chinese newspapers and passed the examinations from a dozen Chinese news reporters. This case study is available at <http://www.chineseetymology.com/> . This claim was also reviewed by Taiwan government (<http://www.chineseetymology.com/2009/12/08/taiwan-government>) and many great American universities (<http://www.chineseetymology.com/2009/12/08/us-universities>).

Yet, many still say that radicals are known for thousands years, and this new etymology is not new at all. They said, "It is widely known that characters are composed of parts and that parts of characters carry meanings and that other parts carry phonetic information." Well, let's review what the facts are --- the views of the Chinese philologists and of the Western sinologists on Chinese character system in the past 100 years were.

A. Views of the Chinese philologists:

The Chinese written language was always viewed as the most difficult language to learn, even for the Chinese people themselves. In 1920s, its illogical character structure was viewed as the culprit for China's demise at the time. The slogan at the time was "without abandoning the Chinese characters, the China as a nation will surely vanish." Finally, in 1958, a major effort to simplify the Chinese word system

was launched. That is, at that time, no one in China knew that Chinese written language is a 100% root word system which is the most logic and the easiest language to learn in the world.

1. Qian_Xuantong (錢玄同, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Qian_Xuantong), one of the greatest Chinese philologist in 1930s, even promoted the replacement of Chinese with Esperanto.

2. 魯迅 (lǔ xùn, the greatest Chinese linguist, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lu_Xun) wrote, 漢字不廢, 中國必亡 (without abandoning Chinese character system, China will surely vanish). See “魯迅欲消滅漢字 --- (<http://www.kanzhongguo.com/news/12/04/14/447923.html?%E9%B2%81%E8%BF%85%E6%AC%B2%E6%B6%88%E7%81%AD%E6%B1%89%E5%AD%97%28%E5%9B%BE%29>) .

3. 近現代文化名人對漢字的詛咒 --- The cursing of Chinese character system by Chinese scholars in the 1930s (<http://www.tianya.cn/publicforum/content/worldlook/1/178259.shtml>) .

4. 郭沫若、蔡元培 等人的 “消滅漢字宣言” --- the manifesto of abandoning and destroying the Chinese character system, signed by 600 Chinese scholars in the 1930s (<http://www.cantonese.sheik.co.uk/phorum/read.php?4,73347>) .

5. The ignorance of Chinese Scholars in 1958 is not an incidental case. During the past two thousand years, not a single Chinese scholar truly understands the structure of Chinese word system as an axiomatic system. During the 唐、宋 period (Tong and Song dynasties, from 650 a.d. to 1,150 a.d.), there were eight great Chinese scholars (唐宋八大家). 王安石 (Wang) and 蘇東坡 (Shu) are two of those eight. Wang was also the Prime Minister of Song dynasty for decades, and he was Shu's boss. As the leader of intelligentsia and of political hierarchy, Wang set out to decode Chinese word system. He wrote a book 字說 (Discussions on Chinese words, <http://baike.baidu.com/view/420769.htm>). That book soon became a laughing stock, and Wang burnt it. That book is no longer in existence today; only the name of the book and a few lines survived as quotations in other person's writing. The most important critic was Shu. Wang wrote, "波 (wave) 者, 水之皮" (Wave is the skin of water), 皮 as skin. Then, Shu asked, "滑 (slippery) 者, 水之骨乎?" (Is slippery the bone of water?) 骨 as bone. Unable to answer one laughing question, Wang burnt his book.

6. Around 1660s, the Emperor Kangxi (康熙) and his grandson (乾隆) launched a major effort of organizing the Chinese books with two major publications.

a. Kangxi dictionary (康熙字典) -- it lists about 48,000 words. It becomes the Bible of Chinese characters. It classifies all Chinese words with 214 部首 (leading radicals), the most scientific way of analyzing Chinese words at the time. Yet, each word is still treated as a blob which cannot give out its meaning from its face.

b. 四庫全書 (Four College of Encyclopedia) -- it consists of over 30,000 volumes of books. Over 1,000 books are dealing with Chinese characters. Yet, not a single book hinted that Chinese character set is an axiomatic set.

7. In 2005, I searched the Library of Beijing University. It had over 3,000 books on Chinese written characters. Not a single book describes Chinese characters as a root word set, let alone an axiomatic set.

8. 胡適 (Hu Shih, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Hu_Shih) and 林語堂 (Lin Yu Tang, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lin_Yu_Tang) agreed with Dr. Northrop that Chinese words are denotative and solitary -- no logical ordering or connection the one with the other.

All these above led to the 1920s movement of despising Chinese written language, especially accusing that the character set was the culprit for China's demise at the time. Those known radicals did not prevent those great Chinese philologists to despise Chinese character system. In addition to a despising feeling, they took action to abandon it, and it was the reason for the launching of the simplified system in 1960s.

B. Views of the Western sinologists:

I. School one --- Chinese characters are ideographs. The key members of this school are,

1. Portuguese Dominican Friar Gaspar da Cruz (in 1560s) --- The first Western account of the fascinatingly different Chinese writing was the comment made by the Portuguese Dominican Friar Gaspar da Cruz in 1569: "The Chinas [Chinese] have no fixed letters in their writing, for all that they write is by characters, and they compose words of these, whereby they have a great multitude of characters, signifying each thing by a character in such sort that one only character signifies "Heaven," another "earth," and another "man," and so forth with everything else." [Boxer 1953:161-162]

2. Father J. J. M. Amiot (in 1700s) --- Father J. J. M. Amiot in a longer article in which he described characters as “images and symbols which speak to the mind through the eyes -- images for palpable things, symbols for mental ones. Images and symbols which are not tied to any sound and can be read in all languages. ... I would be quite inclined to define Chinese characters as the pictorial algebra of the sciences and the arts. In truth, a well-turned sentence is as much stripped of all intermediaries as is the most rigorously bare algebraic demonstration.” [Mémoires 1776:282-285]

Thus, ideograph has the following attributes.

- a. It is symbol or image.
- b. It is not tied to any sound and can be read in all languages.
- c. It is an ideal algebra, which conveys thoughts by analogy, by relation, by convention, and so on.

This view was accepted by Dr. Northrop, 胡適 (Hu Shih) and 林語堂 (Lin Yu Tang) with the conclusion that Chinese written language (Chinese words) is denotative and solitary -- no logical ordering or connection the one with the other. And, the consequence of such a language is that there is no chance of any kind to formulate scientific, philosophical and theological objects.

3. Juan Gonzales de Mendoza (in 1600s)
4. Jesuit missionary Matteo Ricci (1552-1610)
5. Jesuit missionary Alessandro Valignani (in 1600s)
6. Herrlee Glessner Creel [(January 19, 1905-June 1, 1994)
7. Paul Mulligan Thompson (10 February 1931 – 12 June 2007)
8. Joseph Needham (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joseph_Needham)

II. School two --- Chinese characters are mainly phonological (or morphosyllabic) in nature. And, the “ideographic idea is a Myth”. The key members of this school are,

1. Peter Alexis Boodberg (April 8, 1903 - June 29, 1972)
2. Peter S. DuPonceau [(in 1930s), <http://www.jstor.org/pss/2718025>]
3. French sinologist J. M. Callery (in 1880)
4. John DeFrancis (August 31, 1911 – January 2, 2009, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/John_DeFrancis) was an American linguist, sinologist, author of Chinese language textbooks, lexicographer of Chinese dictionaries, and Professor Emeritus of Chinese Studies at the University of Hawaii at Mānoa.

Dr. John DeFrancis wrote, "Ideographic writing, however, requires mastery of the tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of symbols that would be needed for ideographic representation of words or concepts without regard to sound. A bit of common sense should suggest that unless we supplement our brains with computer implants, ordinary mortals are incapable of such memory feats. ... We need to go further and throw out the term itself. ... Chinese characters represent words (or better, morphemes), not ideas, and they represent them phonetically, for the most part, as do all real writing systems despite their diverse techniques and differing effectiveness in accomplishing the task. ... One reason for the pervasiveness and tenacity of the myth, I am now convinced, stems from the use of the word "ideographic." The term itself is responsible for a good deal of the misunderstanding and should be replaced, since its repetitious use, as in the big lie technique and in subliminal advertising, insidiously influences our thinking. ... Only the adoption of some such term as "morphosyllabic," which calls attention to the phonetic aspect, can contribute to dispelling the widespread misunderstanding of the nature of Chinese writing."

Dr. DeFrancis' conclusion, "The concept of ideographic writing is a most seductive notion. There is great appeal in the concept of written symbols conveying their message directly to our minds, ... Surely ideas immediately pop into our minds when we see a road sign, a death's head label on a bottle of medicine, a number on a clock. Aren't Chinese characters a sophisticated system of symbols that similarly convey meaning without regard to sound? Aren't they an ideographic system of writing?"

The answer to these questions is no. ... Here I would go further: There never has been, and never can be, such a thing as an ideographic system of writing."

In Dr. DeFrancis' writing, he did not mention about 康熙字典 (Kangsi dictionary) which is, indeed, centered in phonetic aspect of Chinese characters. Thus, his idea of morphosyllabic is correct but nothing new. In fact, there is a premise 3 for the Chinese characters, as follow,

Premise 3 --- all (each and every) Chinese characters carry a sound tag, either explicitly or implicitly.

This premise 3 plays a major part in this new Chinese etymology. However, Dr. DeFrancis' strong opposition on the concept of ideograph is wrong, as the three attributes of the ideograph are, indeed, correct for Chinese characters. These seemingly contradictory attributes are, in fact, the essence of this new Chinese etymology.

While Dr. DeFrancis was not all wrong, some of his followers have made a partial truth into a ridicules teaching material which is wasting many young people's life.

5. J. Marshall Unger (linguistics professor of Ohio State University) goes one step further with the following statement.

“Try this ‘thought experiment’: suppose a couple really smart little green guys from outer space showed up one night in a suburb of Tokyo, just like in a Japanese science-fiction movie. Would they instantly understand all those store-front Chinese characters as soon as they saw them?”

It's pretty obvious that cousins of E.T. would be as clueless about Chinese characters as you would be staring at street signs in Baghdad (unless, of course, you happen to be literate in Arabic). But that hasn't stopped generations of writers who really ought to know better from insisting that Chinese characters somehow convey meaning to brains through some mysterious process completely detached from language. Think about it: every normal human being naturally acquires a language just by going through infancy in the presence of normal, talking adults. It took hundreds of thousands of years for even one species with this extraordinary ability to evolve. Yet somehow, within the span of just a few rather recent centuries, the Chinese came up with a completely artificial writing system that can denote every thought you could ever express in any of the world's languages without any reference to human speech whatsoever! Something is obviously wrong with this story, and Ideogram explains what.” The “Ideogram” is Dr. Unger’s book on this ideograph issue, and more info on it is available at <http://people.cohums.ohio-state.edu/unger26/Ideogram.htm> .

Seemingly, Dr. Unger has redefined the term “ideograph” which must be readily understood by the uninstructed, that is, intuitively without any knowledge, such as a new born infant. In the American Heritage Dictionary, @, #, \$, %, &, *, {, } are ideograms. Can any of those ET green guys instantly understand all those ideograms as soon as they saw them? Those American Heritage ideographs can be known only with certain culture or knowledge stimuli. With enough such *erroneous* textbooks around, there is no chance for any student of Chinese language to avoid the suffering of humility and agony. We call this in Chinese “誤人子弟 (wrong to students)”.

誤 (wrong or wrong to someone) is 言 (speech or words) + 吳 (leaning the head on one side). So, 誤 is words not centered, being not upright or being wrong.

6. Victor Mair (University of Pennsylvania, <http://www.ceas.sas.upenn.edu/bios-Mair.shtml>) wrote, “There is probably no subject on earth concerning which more misinformation is purveyed and more misunderstandings circulated than Chinese characters (Chinese hanzi, Japanese kanji, Korean hanja) or sinograms.”

III. Dr. F.S.C. Northrop was one of the greatest Sinologist in the recent time. In his book, *The Meeting of East and West -- an Inquiry Concerning World Understanding* (The Macmillan Company, 1968 by Dr. F.S.C. Northrop), Dr. Northrop wrote, “The Easterner, on the other hand, uses bits of linguistic symbolism, largely denotative, and often purely ideographic in character, to point toward a component in the nature of things which only immediate experience and continued contemplation can convey. This

shows itself especially in the symbols of the Chinese language, where each solitary, immediately experienced local particular tends to have its own symbol, this symbol also often having a directly observed form like that of the immediately seen item of direct experience which it denotes. For example, the symbol for man in Chinese is 人, and the early symbol for house is 介. As a consequence, there was no alphabet. This automatically eliminates the logical whole-part relation between one symbol and another that occurs in the linguistic symbolism of the West in which all words are produced by merely putting together in different permutations the small number of symbols constituting the alphabet. (Page 316).

"In many cases, however, the content of the sign itself, that is, the actual shape of the written symbol, is identical with the immediately sensed character of the factor in experience for which it stands. These traits make the ideas which these symbols convey particulars rather than logical universals, and largely denotative rather than connotative in character.

Certain consequences follow. Not only are the advantages of an alphabet lost, but also there tend to be as many symbols as there are simple and complex impressions. Consequently, the type of knowledge which a philosophy constructed by means of such a language can convey tends necessarily to be one given by a succession of concrete, immediately apprehendable examples and illustrations, the succession of these illustrations having no logical ordering or connection the one with the other. ...

... Moreover, even the common-sense examples are conveyed with aesthetic imagery, the emphasis being upon the immediately apprehended, sensuous impression itself more than upon the external common-sense object of which the aesthetic impression is the sign. Nowhere is there even the suggestion by the aesthetic imagery of a postulated scientific or a doctrinally formulated, theological object. All the indigenously Chinese philosophies, Taoism as well as Confucianism, support this verdict." (page 322, *ibid*).

Dr. Northrop was not simply discussing Chinese culture but was giving a verdict. His verdict has the following two points.

1. About the Chinese written language (Chinese words): Denotative and solitary -- no logical ordering or connection the one with the other.
2. The consequence of such a language: No chance of any kind to formulate scientific, philosophical and theological objects.

Dr. Northrop's view was not his personal opinion. 胡適 (Hu Shih) and 林語堂 (Lin Yu Tang) who were the two greatest Chinese philologists at the time were Dr. Northrop's colleagues. And he quoted both of them many times in this book.

Hu Shih -- page 340, 364, 384, 426, 434, 506, 508

Lin Yu Tang -- page 318, 319, 323, 325, 327, 330, 339, 356, 391, 423, 424, 505, 507, 508

And, this book of Dr. Northrop was read by both of them.

IV. On the web page (Science and Civilisation in China, Volume 2, History of Scientific Thought, ISBN 9780521058001 at http://www.cambridge.org/gb/knowledge/isbn/item1118934/?site_locale=en_GB), it wrote, "The second volume of Dr Joseph Needham's great work Science and Civilisation in China is devoted to the history of scientific thought. Beginning with ancient times, it describes the Confucian milieu in which arose the organic naturalism of the great Taoist school, the scientific philosophy of the Mohists and Logicians, and the quantitative materialism of the Legalists. Thus we are brought on to the fundamental ideas which dominated scientific thinking in the Chinese middle ages. The author opens his discussion by considering the remote and pictographic origins of words fundamental in scientific discourse, and then sets forth the influential doctrines of the Two Forces and the Five Elements. Subsequently he writes of the important sceptical tradition, the effects of Buddhist thought, and the Neo-Confucian climax of Chinese naturalism. Last comes a discussion of the conception of Laws of Nature in China and the West."

That is, Dr. Needham wanted to know:

- a. Externally, did Chinese language have the capability to describe the logic of science?
- b. Internally, could the internal logic of Chinese language lead the Chinese people entering into the domain of science?

Thus, he analyzed 82 Chinese words in that book, and 77 of them are from two sources:

甲骨文 -- the words inscribed on bones after oracle sessions.

金文 -- the words inscribed on bronze vessels.

Both of these items were made before 2,000 b.c.. Here, I will show only a few his analyses and compare them to mine.

1. 不 (no, do not)

- a. Needham: pictograph of a fading flower.
- b. Tienzen: 不 is the word 下 (below, lower) touches or hangs on 一 (heaven) side way. It means "will not go lower from heaven."

2. 易 (change, simple, easy)

a. Needham: pictograph of a lizard, as its skin can easily change colors.

b. Tienzen: 易 is 勿 (pictograph of a flying flag) under 日 (Sun). A flag under Sun is flying with ease and is changing directions.

Note: 易 (open or opening) is 旦 (morning) over 勿 (pictograph of a flying flag), opening the day by putting up the flag in the morning. Thus, with the DNA inheritance,

湯 (soup) is 水 (water) + 易 (open or opening). Boiling (opening) water is soup.

3. 元 (at the beginning)

a. Needham: pictograph of side-view of a human head.

b. Tienzen: 元 is 一 (heaven) over 兀 (stillness or nothingness). Heaven over the stillness is the creation, the beginning.

4. 因 (the seed of cause)

a. Needham: pictograph of something on a bed sheet.

b. Tienzen: 因 is 大 (something great) inside 囗 (an enclosed boundary). Something great which is boxed up (囗) is 因 , the cause.

There are 82 examples and they are available at <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/cwr018.htm> .

However friendly to Chinese culture that Dr. Needham was, he was wrong about the Chinese word system, as he believed that most of Chinese words are pictographs. The truth is that there are only 70 pictographic words in the entire Chinese word universe which has about 50,000 words.

V. On page 112, "The Columbia History of the World, ISBN 0-88029-004-8", it states, "Structurally, the Chinese writing system passed through four distinct stages. No alphabetic or syllabic scripts were developed, but each word came to be denoted by a different character. The earliest characters were pictographs for concrete words. A drawing of a woman meant a woman, or of a broom a broom. Such characters were in turn combined to form ideographs. A woman and a broom became a wife, three women together treachery or villainy. The third stage was reached with the phonetic loans, in which

existing characters were borrowed for other words with the same pronunciation. The fourth stage was a refinement of the third: sense determinators or radicals, were added to the phonetic loans in order to avoid confusion. Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic method. Unfortunately, the phonetics were often borrowed for other than exact homophones. In such cases, the gaps have widened through the evolution of the language, until today characters may have utterly different pronunciations even though they share the same phonetic. The written language, despite its difficulties, has been an important unifying cultural and political link in China. Although many Chinese dialects are mutually unintelligible, the characters are comprehended though the eye, whatever their local pronunciation. One Chinese may not understand the other's speech, yet reads with ease his writing."

This passage does give a better description on Chinese characters than those previously discussed sinologists' works. However, there are still some big errors.

1. The second stage --- "A drawing of a woman meant a woman, or of a broom a broom. Such characters were in turn combined to form ideographs. A woman and a broom became a wife, three women together treachery or villainy."

a. A drawing of a woman meant a woman --- 女

b. Of a broom a broom --- 帚

c. A woman and a broom became a wife --- 婦

This process is, in fact, a composite inferring procedure (the sense determinators, 會意). Thus, the sense determinator is the second stage, not the fourth.

Furthermore, with this "read out" (composite inferring) procedure, 婦 is 女 (woman) + 帚 (broom). Thus, 婦 means a working woman, not a wife.

The word wife is 妻 which is composed of three radicals (roots). The top one is root 1 (一, [can mean heaven, earth, man, as one or a union]). At here, it means a union in accord with heavenly virtue. The second radical is root 46 (the shared radical of 聿, 事, 肅 which means crafty hand). The bottom root is 女 (girl or woman). Thus, 妻 is a crafty hand girl united with me under heavenly virtue.

The authors of "The Columbia History of the World" were almost having the idea of that the Chinese word set is a root based axiomatic system, but no cigar.

2. "Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic method," and this statement is wrong. "Unfortunately, the phonetics was often borrowed for other than exact homophones. In such cases, the gaps have widened through the evolution of the language, until today

characters may have utterly different pronunciations even though they share the same phonetic,” and this is also wrong. These two issues are very complicated, and I will discuss them soon.

Obviously those known radicals did not allow those great Western sinologists to know that the Chinese word set is an axiomatic system.

C. The canons on Chinese character system:

a. 說文 (So-Wen) was written around 140 a.d., about 1,900 years ago. It consists of three parts.

1. It listed about 9,000 Chinese words under 540 radicals (部首, leading radicals).

2. It discussed 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) --- that is, Chinese words were “constructed” with six ways. And, these six ways are as follow:

指事者 (pointing or assigning), 視而可識, 察而見意。上、下是也。

象形者 (pictographic), 畫成其物, 隨體詰出。日、月是也。

形聲者 (phonetic loan), 以事為名, 取譬相成。江、河是也。

會意者 (sense determinators), 比類合誼, 以見指偽。誠、信是也。

轉註者 (synonymize), 建類一首, 同意相受。考、老是也。

假借者 (borrowing), 本無其字, 依聲托事。令、長是也。

However, in 說文 (So-Wen), there is no further description and discussion on these six ways beyond these six sentences above. And, it did not use or apply these ways (except the pictograph and pointing) in its explanations of the words in the book. In the next 1,900 years, no one made any advancement beyond these six sentences. In 2005, I searched the Library of Beijing university. It had over 3,000 books on Chinese written characters. Not a single book used 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) as a part of a book title.

Furthermore, the description of these six ways are not exactly correct, and I will discuss this soon. The key point here is that the author of 說文 (So-Wen) did not truly understand these six ways although they must be developed before him.

3. Among 9,000 words in the book 說文 (So-Wen), 90% of them were classified as pictographic words, that is, the meaning of those words are mainly arising from their pictographic images. For the past 1,900 years, “all” Chinese believe that Chinese words are pictographic symbols. Of course, this is not true. Again, obviously, the author of 說文 (So-Wen) did not truly understand the 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) which is almost a precise description that Chinese words are root based axiomatic system, but again no cigar.

b. 韻書 (the rhyme book)

i. The oldest 韻書 currently known is the book 切韻 (check rhyme) which was published during the 隋朝 [Sui Dynasty (around 580 a.d.)]. While the original book of 切韻 is no longer exist, its contents are available as quotes from many other books.

ii. The next 韻書 (the rhyme book) is the book of 唐韻 which was published during the 唐朝 [Tang Dynasty, from 618 to 907 a.d.].

iii. The 韻書 of today is 廣韻 which was published during the 宋朝 [Song Dynasty, around 960 a.d.].

c. 康熙字典 (Kangsi dictionary)

康熙字典 was published around 1680s. It consists of two parts.

1. It reduced the 540 部首 (leading radicals) of 說文 (So-Wen) into only 214 and placed about 48,000 words under those 214 leading radicals.

2. While it did not dispute the claim of 說文 that most of Chinese words are pictographic symbols, it did not use that concept as a part to provide meaning for those 48,000 words. The meanings of words in the 康熙字典 are almost solely provided from the phonetic values of the words. In fact, almost all Chinese characters have more than one phonetic value, and the different value of that word points out the different meaning for that word. Again, the 康熙字典 did not apply the 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) in its editorial process. That is, 六書 did not play any part for providing the meaning for the words listed in the dictionary.

The 康熙 (Emperor Kangsi) leading radicals (部首) were known for two thousand years. The 康熙字典 was published in 1680s, that is, 330 years ago. Was anyone able to read out the meaning of Chinese characters by using the 康熙 radicals? The answer is, of course, a big No.

In 1920s (during the May 4th movement), the slogan in China was 漢字不廢、中國必亡 (if not abandon Chinese character system, China as a nation will disappear from the Earth). Chinese character

system was deemed as the culprit for China's backwardness and high illiteracy rate at that time. This was why Chinese characters were simplified in 1958. If 康熙 radicals showed that the Chinese character set is an axiomatic system, then it had no reason to do the simplification. In 1958, a major effort to simplify the Chinese word system was launched. That is, at that time, no one in China knew that Chinese written language is a 100% root word system. This is a historical fact. With 康熙 radicals, Chinese words can never be dissected correctly, and there is no chance to decode them correctly. Furthermore, 王安石 studied 說文 all his life, but his book 字說 turned out to be a joke. 錢玄同 taught 說文 all his life, yet he wanted to replace Chinese system with Esperanto.

If this someone knew this new etymology by knowing those known radicals, he knew something beyond the scope of these three canonic books, which did not provide an understanding of this new etymology to either those great Chinese philologists or those great Western sinologists.

Even with the above facts, one might still not get a sense of difference between this new etymology and the old schools. Someone might say that all those great Chinese philologists are now dead (DeFrancis passed away in 2009), and the movement of despising Chinese character system was in 1960s. So, all the above are history and valid no more. But, Dr. David Moser (University of Michigan Center for Chinese Studies) wrote a widely read article "Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard?" in 2005. He made the following points about the defects of Chinese system.

1. Because the writing system is ridiculous.
2. Because the language doesn't have the common sense to use an alphabet.
3. Because the writing system just ain't very phonetic.
4. Because you can't cheat by using cognates.
5. Because even looking up a word in the dictionary is complicated.
6. Then there's classical Chinese (文言文, wenyanwen).
7. Because there are too many romanization methods and they all suck.
8. Because tonal languages are weird.
9. Because east is east and west is west, and the twain have only recently met.

Although all his points are results of ignorance, it is a very fun article to read. If you have not read it yet, it is available at (<http://pinyin.info/readings/texts/moser.html>). Moser is now a highly respected Sinologist today both in the West and in China. Yet, his experience is universal for anyone (the Westerner or the native Chinese) who learned Chinese via the old school way. That is, by the year of 2005, all Moser's colleagues (in the West or in China) and his readers did not know about this new Chinese etymology used by Jason Gong.

Chapter 21 ---- The claims of this new Chinese etymology

This new Chinese Etymology (CE) claims that the Chinese character system can be mastered in 90 days for anyone (10 year old or older) who knows not a single Chinese character at the beginning. This new CE was presented at an Annual Conference of CollegeBoard (<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/cw8.htm>) . And, this claim is supported by a system which consists of four premises.

1. Premise one --- All (each and every) Chinese words (characters) are composed of from a set of word roots.
2. Premise two --- The meaning of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces.
3. Premise three --- The pronunciation of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces.
4. Premise four --- etymology memory algebra, with only 220 root words (R), it generates 300 commonly used compound roots (also as sound modules, M). Thus, $R + M = 220 + 300 = 520$. With these 520, all 60,000 Chinese written words are generated. That is,

Etymology memory algebra is $R + M = R \times M$

The premise 4 is the direct consequence of the first three premises. As long as the first three premises are valid, the premise 4 will be valid.

This claim can be physically tested, and some actual case study data were provided and were reviewed by the world. However, the four premises can also be proved logically. The first three premises can be inductively proved, which consists of the following steps.

- a. Existential introduction (it is true for, at least, one case), the same as the deduction proof.
- b. Existential generalization (it is true for “n” cases, $n > 1$), more precise than the deduction proof.
- c. Inductively proved if $n + 1$ (the next coming up case, not an arbitrary selected) is true.

Of course, I will provide the logic proofs for the above four premises. However, if a reader did not read Dr. Moser’s article “Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard?”, he might take this new claim for granted. Moser wrote, “Someone once said that learning Chinese is ‘a five-year lesson in humility’. I used to think this meant that at the end of five years you will have mastered Chinese and learned humility along the way.

However, now having studied Chinese for over six years, I have concluded that actually the phrase means that after five years your Chinese will still be abysmal, but at least you will have thoroughly learned humility.”

It takes about 7 to 10 “school” years for native Chinese person to become semi-literate, being able to read the “current” Chinese newspaper. In fact, 99.9% of Chinese college graduate is still unable to read the Chinese classic writing (文言文). For the past 3,000 years, it will take a lifetime (40 to 50 years) for a Chinese scholar to truly master the art of 文言文.

Thus, taking 10 to 20 years to learn Chinese written language to a state of being able to read the “current” Chinese newspaper for a Westerner becomes all reasonable. If one cannot endure the minimum of 10 years of humility and agony, he is not worthy to become a sinologist. In fact, both native Chinese and the Western sinologists are so proud of successfully passed the challenge of those humility and agony, and they view themselves as a special species, much more superior than the common folk. Thus, if one tells them that their 10 to 20 years of humility and agony are simply wasting of their life as that task which they were so proudly accomplished can be done in three to six months instead, they will be extremely outraged regardless of whether that claim is true or not. If it is not true, they will be outraged for that funny joke. If it is true, they will kill it with all their might in order to preserve their proud accomplishment.

For native Chinese, the Chinese language (verbal and written) is simply their living habit, and most of them do not know and not care about its linguistic structure. For Western linguists, the “difficulty” of Chinese written language becomes an important subject of research, and the conclusion from those researches of two competing schools is that Chinese words (characters) are ad hoc and chaotic. Their difference is centered on a term “ideograph.” I have discussed the views of two old schools in the previous chapter. I am reiterating it below for emphasis.

1. School one (Friar Gaspar da Cruz, Creel, etc.) – Chinese characters are ideographs which are composed of symbols and images, and that these symbols and images, not having any sound, can be read in all languages, and form a sort of intellectual painting, a metaphysical and ideal algebra, which conveys thoughts by analogy, by relation, by convention, and so on. Creel wrote, “The Chinese have specialized on making their writing so suggestive to the eye that it immediately calls up ideas and vivid pictures, without any interposition of sounds.”

However, Creel did not see Chinese as an axiomatic system, that is, the Creel’s ideographs are still ad hoc and chaotic, and each ideograph must be learned independently.

2. School two (DuPonceau, DeFrancis, J. Marshall Unger, etc.) – Chinese characters are logographs which are symbols with phonetic value.

DeFrancis wrote,

“a. For alphabetic writing, it requires mastery of several dozen symbols that are needed for phonemic representation.

b. For syllabic writing, it requires mastery of what may be several hundred or several thousand symbols that are needed for syllabic representation.

c. For ideographic writing, however, it requires mastery of the tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of symbols that would be needed for ideographic representation of words or concepts without regard to sound. A bit of common sense should suggest that unless we supplement our brains with computer implants, ordinary mortals are incapable of such memory feats. ... I believe it to be completely untenable because there is no evidence that people have the capacity to master the enormous number of symbols that would be needed in a written system that attempts to convey thought without regard to sound, which means divorced from spoken language.”

However great the difference between the two schools is, they both view the Chinese word system as ad hoc and chaotic, and the Chinese written language is the most difficult language to learn in the world. Of course, this is simply wrong.

With this new etymology, all “problems” of Dr. Moser disappear. This new etymology claims that Chinese written language can be mastered in 90 days from an initial state of knowing not a single Chinese word (both verbal and written) to a point of being able to read the current Chinese newspapers, because of two newly discovered facts.

Fact 1. All (each and every) Chinese words (characters) are composed of from only 220 word roots.

Fact 2. The meaning of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces.

In Moser’s article, he made a point related to this fact 1. He wrote, “Now consider the American undergraduate who decides to study Chinese. What does it take for this person to master the Chinese writing system? There is nothing that corresponds to an alphabet, though there are recurring components that make up the characters. How many such components are there? Don't ask. As with all such questions about Chinese, the answer is very messy and unsatisfying. It depends on how you define "component" (strokes? radicals?), plus a lot of other tedious details. Suffice it to say, the number is quite

large, vastly more than the 26 letters of the Roman alphabet. And how are these components combined to form characters? Well, you name it -- components to the left of other components, to the right of other components, on top of other components, surrounding other components, inside of other components -- almost anything is possible. And in the process of making these spatial accommodations, these components get flattened, stretched, squashed, shortened, and distorted in order to fit in the uniform square space that all characters are supposed to fit into. In other words, the components of Chinese characters are arrayed in two dimensions, rather than in the neat one-dimensional rows of alphabetic writing."

Of course, this is not his idea. It is shared by all Chinese philologists and all Western sinologists, as I have shown in the previous chapter. His article becomes so popular and is carried by hundreds websites. This again shows that this new Chinese etymology is not understood ever before by anyone.

Many of my American students commented, "I think that David Moser's experience is the universal experience of people whose mother tongue Indo-European when they try to learn Chinese and I think he has identified the main reasons why Chinese feels so discouragingly difficult."

It takes over 20 years for Moser to become a respected Sinologist on the Chinese written language. It will take 10 to 20 years for anyone who follows Moser's footsteps. That is, 10 years of life plus a lot of tuition, in tens or hundreds thousand dollars.

Moser wrote, "For most people, the first title to acquire is probably 'The Chinese Language: Fact and fantasy,' by John DeFrancis. This book has done more than any other to dispel misunderstandings about Chinese, especially those concerning Chinese characters, including the Ideographic Myth, ... I very much hope many of this site's visitors will seek out and read this work."

John DeFrancis, in the 1960s, wrote a 12-volume series of Mandarin Chinese textbooks and readers published by Yale University Press (popularly known as the "DeFrancis series"), which were widely used in Chinese as a foreign language classes for decades, and his textbooks are said to have had a "tremendous impact" on Chinese teaching in the West. He served Associate Editor of the Journal of the American Oriental Society from 1950 to 1955 and the Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association from 1966 to 1978.

One sample chapter of DeFrancis' book is available at http://pinyin.info/readings/texts/ideographic_myth.html . His key point is that Chinese words (characters) are ad hoc, that is, without any connection among words, and "each word has its own hieroglyphic character, that there are no fewer symbols than words, and that the great number of characters is in accord with the great number of things, though thanks to combining them the characters which do not exceed seventy to eighty thousand."

Thus, for learning Chinese written language, one must memorize all those ad hoc words with brutal effort. Then, taking 10 to 20 years becomes reasonable. As DeFrancis was the most respected Sinologist in the West, thousands of his students have wasted their youthful life and thousands more are still learning via his way.

Now, I will show a few examples that the meanings of Chinese words can be read out from their faces. That is, there is no reason to memorize those words as they are not ad hoc symbols but are composed of roots and radicals.

1. 盲 (blind) is 亡 (lost or dead) 目 (eyes)
2. 瞎 (blind) is 目 (eyes) + 害 (harmful or harmed)
3. 見 (see or seeing) is 目 (eyes) over 儿 (child), Child sees without intention.
4. 看 (looking) is 手 (hand) over 目 (eyes), putting a hand over eye is seeing with intention.
5. 孬 (useless, no good) = 不 (no, not) over 好 (good).
6. 睡 (sleep or sleepy) = 目 (eyes) + 垂 (droop or droopy).
7. 貨 (products, produces) = 化 (transform) + 貝 (treasure), money can be transformed into products.
8. 間 (gap) = 門 (door) over 日 (Sun), there is a gap when seeing Sunlight through the door.
9. 歪 (not straight) is 不 (not) 正 (straight).
10. 甬 (not be used) is 不 (not) 用 (using, used).
11. 掌 (palm) is 尚 (top, upper) 手 (hand), top side of the hand.
13. 我 (I, self) is 手 (hand) + 戈 (spear), with spear on hand; one can be a self, not a slave.
14. 成 (completion, success) is 成 (complete) + 丁 (rooted).

With these examples, they proved that Dr. DeFrancis was completely wrong and completely ignorant about Chinese word system. In the discussion thread “Chinese character set is pseudoscience, 汉字是伪科学!” (at <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/general-discussion/chinese-character-set-is-pseudoscience-t15.html>), I have showed the details of how wrong that DeFrancis’ group is. The above examples have showed the “Existential Introduction” for the first two premises.

Of course, the logic is more complicated than the examples above. There are many rules for the compositions. In "Lesson three" of the book "Chinese Etymology" (US copyright # TX6-917-909, issued on January 16, 2008) on the phonology and morphology of Chinese characters, it showed 4-dimensional growth paths for the Chinese characters.

Vertical growth,

Horizontal growth.

Silent growth

Phonetic growth

The details of this is available at,

<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/prl030.htm>

Here, I will only show a few simple examples below.

i. They grow horizontally, such as in words (孕, 秀), (悉, 釋).

ii. They grow vertically, with the example of (夕, 多, 夠).

iii. With fusion (雨 or 永)

孕 (pregnant) = 乃 (still going or not yet finish) over 子 (child), the child is not born yet.

秀 (youthful) = 禾 (grain) over 乃 (not yet ready), the grain is not yet ready to be harvest.

悉 (knowing) = 采 (animal’s footprint) over 心 (heart), with the animal’s footprint, the tracker knows in his heart.

釋 (explanation) = 采 (animal's footprint) + 睪 (watchful or surveillance), knowing the animal's footprint, something can be explained.

多 (many, unlimited) = 夕 (night) over 夕 (night), there are unlimited many "night after night".

夠 (enough) = 多 (unlimited many) + 句 (a completed sentence or to end), to end the unlimited many means enough.

雨 (rain) is the fusion of 天 (sky or heaven) 水 (water). In this case, both the shape of 天 and 水 have changed slightly. However, it becomes all clear when it is pointed out.

永 (long lasting or forever) is the fusion of root 97 (heaven or heavenly) with 水 (water). Only the heavenly water is forever. Root 97 is the shared radical of (亢, 六, 玄, 文, 亡, 亦), and it means "heavenly."

Again, I will show the law of DNA inheritance of this Chinese etymology.

a. 泳 (swim) is 水 (water) with 永 (long lasting or forever). In order to avoid sinking in water, only 泳 (swim) can stay floating.

b. 詠 (singing or reading poem) is 言 (speaking or words) with 永 (long lasting or forever). Before the invention of writing and printing, only the singing poem can last generation after generation.

If the Chinese language is your mother tongue, you have learned these words above without knowing the simple facts that the meanings of those words can be read out from their faces. By giving you those examples, you might be able to dissect and to decode the following words.

貨, 貸, 撒, 秋, ...

湯, 場, 暢, 湯, 湯, 傷, 腸, ...

因, 困, 圍, 國, 困, 回, 囿, ...

聿, 筆, 律, 津, 書, 畫, 妻, 事

But there is no chance for you to dissect and to decode the words of 用, 尚, 散, 畢, 乃, 垂, 子 etc.. For those words, you must learn them from this new Chinese etymology. The following words are teasers

for the reader to contemplate about this new Chinese etymology. Can you get some ideas from this list? These few words encompass the entire points of this new Chinese etymology. Do spend some time to contemplate them.

1. 乎, 呼
2. 姊, 弟, 第
3. 前, 慈, 首
4. 叔, 椒
5. 印, 迎、仰、抑、昂
6. 攸, 條、條、修、倏、悠、旻、筱、脩
7. 最
8. 鏡

Chapter 22 ---- The only axiomatic human language

The dream of linguistics is having a human language to be 100% axiomatic system. That is, the entire lexicon of the language has the following three attributes.

- a. All words are composed of from only a finite number of symbols.
- b. The pronunciation of each word can be read out from its face.
- c. The key meaning of each word can be read out from its face.

For every axiom (formal) system, it consists of the following parts.

1. Some members (in finite number or in infinity) -- they can be called as "symbols."
2. Some undefined terms.
3. Some definitions (including operations, function, etc.).
4. Some axioms (including inference rules, derivation procedure, etc.)

All the above are arbitrarily given and do not have any true-false value. The undefined terms are understood in the context of the entire system although not by any clear cut definitions. In a sense, the undefined terms are also defined, by the entire system. This is the four part expression (or nutshell expression) for a formal system.

From the above, something can be produced.

1. String or sentence -- the composite of symbols via some operations (or functions).
2. Theorem or law -- a sentence which is derived from definitions and/or axioms.

By proving every statement (sentence, theorem or law) is true, that entire axiom system will be true. Although the truthfulness of a system can be tested with a 100% testing, however, it is not a science. In science, the truthfulness of a system must be proved with either induction or deduction (universal) proof. The induction proof requires a three step procedure.

a) Existential Introduction --- to show that a statement (premise, sentence, theorem or law) is true, at least, on one instance.

b) Existential generalization --- to show that a statement is true on “more than one” instances.

c) Universal proof --- for an “arbitrarily” chosen word, that statement is true.

By showing a) and b), that statement is already true in a sub-domain of the system. Now, I will show that Chinese written language is the only 100% axiomatic system among the human languages. Yet, I must remind readers about two facts.

i. Chinese character system was viewed by all great Chinese philologists as dog turd in the past 100 years.

ii. Chinese language was viewed by all great Western Sinologists as an illogic and ad hoc language and is the most difficult language in the world.

Under these backgrounds, I am going to show that Chinese language is the only axiomatic system among human languages. I have showed that Chinese system consists of 220 word roots and 300 sound modules, and they are available in the books “Chinese Etymology (US Copyright TX 6-917-909)” and “Chinese Word Roots and Grammar (US Copyright TX 6-514-465)”.

Thus, in every theorem or law of this new Chinese etymology, I will show at least two examples. After every theorem and law is proved for this system, we can then compare this axiomatic system to the actual Chinese written word universe. If the system encompasses the entire universe, then it is a complete theory. If it does not encompass the entire Chinese word universe, it is still a partial theory, but more work is needed to enlarge the system.

I have showed that the two premises below are true with both Existential Introduction and Existential generalization.

i. Premise one ---- All (each and every) Chinese words are composed of from 220 roots.

ii. Premise two ---- The meaning of every Chinese word can be read out from its face.

Now, I will show more details about these two premises. From these two premises, the meaning of every Chinese word can be read out with the following four pathways.

a. Forward method --- from roots to modules to G1 (generation one word), ..., Gn. And, there are many ways of reading it in this pathway. This pathway accounts about 85% of all words. The most difficult part of this path is the "assignment".

b. Mutation --- this will be discussed later.

c. Backward method --- the meaning of a module is not from the composing roots but from a word. It is going to be a hard one. If Chinese etymology logic without a backward logic, it will not be a complete logic. The following is one example.

When Root C + root D + root E produce a word W-X with meaning of X. Yet, word Z = (root C + root E + something) could have two pathways.

a. Word Z = Y (root C + root E) + something.

b. word Z = (X-) + something.

For example,

贏 means win or plenty.

贏 is, in fact, coming from 贏 by removing 貝 (treasure) and replacing it with 羊 (cheap livestock). Thus, 贏 means not-plenty. Thus, the meaning of 贏 is derived not from the composing roots but from a word preexisted before it. There are many words must be decoded in this way.

d. Then, the wild card --- the borrowing. There are some rules on this. This will be discussed later.

The forward pathway consists of 6 step procedure.

1. Step A --- the word

2. Step B --- the dissection of the word. The word should be dissected to its semantic parts (roots, compound roots, radicals, etc.), not all the way to root level.

3. Step C --- read out a static scene. Those semantic parts form a static scene.

4. Step D --- decoding. Read out a meaning from this static scene. This is the original meaning for the word. A set of reading procedures is needed for this.

5. Step E --- the usage or the current meaning. The usage of a word can be quite different from its original meaning. The current meaning of a word can be looked up in a (any) dictionary.

6. Step F --- the inferring pathway from D to E. There are many pathways on this. The followings are the major ones.

- a. Direct --- D ~ E. There is not much difference between D and E.
- b. One step consequence --- D to E. This step is intuitive or easily understood.
- c. Many steps consequence --- D to and to E. These steps might involve culture (philosophy, history, etc.) knowledge.
- d. Phonetic loan --- the meaning of the word is anchored by a sound tag.
- e. Pointing or assignment --- the meaning of the word is pointed out by There are more details on this.
- f. Borrowing --- a word is borrowed to represent a different word. This is the most difficult issue.
- g. Compound step --- it consists of more than one pathway.

I will, now, show one example.

For the word 亥, it is composed of three roots.

Step B --- dissection

- i. Root 97 (一) is the shared radical of (亢, 六, 玄, 文, 亡, 亦), and it means "heavenly virtue or heavenly power." Note -- this root is not a standalone word.
- ii. root 100 which is 女, woman or girl.
- iii. root 96 which is 人, here means male man.

Please note that the top two roots are fused in the word 亥. The root fusion is an important issue in this Chinese etymology.

Step C --- static scene. A woman is on top of a man which is heavenly virtue. This scene is about woman/man copulation. (Note: a man over a woman can mean rape in the ancient time.)

Step D --- decoding. The woman/man copulation represents the essence of the heavenly virtue.

Step E --- the usage. It indicates the 12th of ... hour, day, month, year, etc..

Step F --- the inferring pathway. Pointing or assignment.

While the usage of a word can often quite different from its original meaning, its original meaning remains in the DNA inheritance. That is, in its descendant words, the original meaning remains. For example,

核 (the seed of a fruit) is 木 (tree) + 亥 (essence).

該 (should be or ought to) is 言 (speech or words) + 亥 (essence). The essential words are the words which should be obeyed.

With this one example, I have showed,

1. The dissection and decoding procedure.
2. The root fusion.
3. The DNA inheritance.

Now, you can try to dissect and decode the words of 刻, 孩, 駭.

While none of the Western sinologists knows that Chinese character set is a root-based axiomatic system, is any Chinese philologist who knows or knew that fact? The answer is Yes and No.

It is Yes because that the ancient Chinese knew that fact. In the chapter 15 of the book 說文[(So-Wen), published around 140 a.d.], the author wrote, “the teacher Mr. 保 [during the 周 (zhōu) dynasty, before Confucius, recorded in the book 周禮] taught kids with 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words). ... However, the 六書 was no longer taught during the 戰國 (the Warring States) period, as the written system was no longer unified.” For this reason, the author of 說文 did not truly know the substance of 六書 although he did write six sentences about them.

In fact, no one in the next 1,900 years made any advancement on the issues of 六書 before the publication of “Chinese Word Roots and Grammar” in 2006 (US copyright TX 6-514-465). Thus, the answer is No for the above question for the period of 2,000 years.

However, in the book 說文, it

1. listed 540 部首 (leading radicals),
2. listed 9,353 characters (1,163 were repeated).

For those 9,000 characters, 90% of them were classified as 象形 (pictographs), and we know, now, that it is wrong. The book also provided the phonetic value for each character by pointing out its sound tag. That is, 說文 did show the three dimensions of Chinese characters;

- a. the word form,
- b. the word meaning,
- c. the word sound.

Thus, I was greatly surprised by the fuss of those Western sinologists (such as, Dr. DeFrancis, Dr. Unger, etc.) on the phonetic dimension of Chinese characters. Seemingly, none of them read the book 說文.

Today, 99% of Chinese college graduates will not have used 康熙字典 (Kangsi dictionary) which was published around 1680 a.d., with 20 years of hard works of over 200 the best Chinese philologists at that time. In fact, most of those college graduates will not be able to comprehend the writing in the 康熙字典, let alone to use it. However, the 康熙字典 is the most comprehensive source for the Chinese etymology. It,

- i. listed 214 部首 (leading radicals),
- ii. listed over 48,000 characters,
- iii. listed the usages of each character (up to that point). This is the major difference between the 康熙字典 and the 說文. 說文 describes each character with its word form to derive its word meaning. 康熙字典 describes the meaning of each character from its sound(s) and usages.

In fact, the 康熙字典 is a thesaurus, dealing two of the most difficult issues of 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words),

- a. 轉註 (synonymize) is 異字同義 (different words with the same meaning),
- b. 假借 (borrowing) is 同字異義 (one word with different meaning). In this case, it is similar to homonyms [similar-sounding words (often with the same spelling) with different meaning].

Yet, Chinese characters go beyond the above. When a Chinese character is used in a way different from its original meaning, it, often, acquires a “new sound,” and this goes beyond the 六書. This is called 殊聲 (different sound for the same word) or 破音 (breaking the phonetic value). Thus, 康熙字典

provides more information than the scope of 六書 and is mainly based on the phonetic dimension of the Chinese characters.

However, 康熙字典 does not give its reader an impression that Chinese character set is a root-based axiomatic system. In fact, with its huge data base, it would give an impression similar to Dr. DeFrancis': "Ideographic writing, however, requires mastery of the tens of thousands or hundreds of thousands of symbols that would be needed for ideographic representation of words or concepts without regard to sound. A bit of common sense should suggest that unless we supplement our brains with computer implants, ordinary mortals are incapable of such memory feats."

While the essence of 康熙字典 is about the phonological aspect of Chinese characters (that word meaning arises phonologically), it lists all characters under 214 部首 (leading radicals), not via the phonetic arrangement. The book that lists Chinese characters phonetically is the 韻書 (the rhyme book). In an edition of the book 廣韻 (the unified rhyme book), it lists over 50,000 characters. However, no word meaning is giving in any 韻書. Again, the 韻書 is a huge data base and does not give an impression that Chinese character set is a root-based axiomatic system.

There is a school using the phonological reconstruction, with the rhyme books to reconstruct the phonetic evolution and to rediscover the original meaning of a character. In the West, the Pulleyblank's "Middle Chinese: a study in historical phonology" and the Baxter's "A handbook of Old Chinese" represent the key works of this school. However, this school did not rediscover the essence of 六書 that Chinese system is a root based axiomatic system.

With the above three books (說文, 康熙字典, 韻書), the entire Chinese character set is wholly described. Yet, no one before the year 2006 rediscovered that Chinese word set is a root-based axiomatic system. In 1920s, a movement in China to abandon the Chinese word system was started. With their pushes, the simplified Chinese system was launched in 1960s. That is, no one in 1960s in China knew that the Chinese word set is a root-based axiomatic system which is the easiest language to learn in the world.

Let me reiterate, from the past 2,000 years ago to the present, no one (including me) in China learns Chinese characters as a root based axiomatic system. In 2005, I searched the Library of Beijing University. It had over 3,000 books on Chinese written characters. Not a single book describes Chinese characters as a root word set, let alone an axiomatic set.

What I am talking about here is new. Thus, it is better for me to talk about what the book “說文解字” did talk about exactly. It did talk about 六書(the six ways of constructing Chinese words). In the ancient time (before Qing dynasty, 210 b.c.), the young students learned Chinese words by learning the 六書 first. Seemingly, the details about 六書 were lost. Thus, I must describe what it was first. And, I must show what it can mean today. Finally, I can show a new Chinese etymology which is in consistent with the 六書, while goes way beyond it.

Although the concept of 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) was mentioned 1,900 years ago, there was no further elaboration at all beyond the six sentences in the book of 說文 (So-Wen). The followings are the only six canonic sentences available today.

指事者 (pointing or assigning), 視而可識, 察而見意。上、下是也。

象形者 (pictographic), 畫成其物, 隨體詰出。日、月是也。

形聲者 (phonetic loan), 以事為名, 取譬相成。江、河是也。

會意者 (sense determinators), 比類合誼, 以見指偽。誠、信是也。

轉註者 (synonymize), 建類一首, 同意相受。考、老是也。

假借者 (borrowing), 本無其字, 依聲托事。令、長是也。

As there is no elaboration “at all” on 六書 available beyond the six sentences mentioned above now, my description of them is, in fact, a reinvention from me. Of course, we should check my invention against those old canonic sentences.

These six are divided into three groups,

Group 1 --- 指事者 (pointing or assigning) and 象形者 (pictographic). This group creates 文 (a pattern of something). That is, 文 is a pictograph symbol.

文 (pattern of ...) is Root 97 [一, meaning heavenly or heavenly virtue, which is the shared radical of (亢, 六, 玄, 文, 亡, 亦)] over 乂 (the crisscross pattern). Thus, 文 is a heavenly sign, an image.

字 (word) is Root 121 [roof or a house, which is the shared radical of (室, 安, 宓, 家, etc.)] over 子 (child). Thus, the original meaning for 字 according to my new etymology is child under roof, the descendants. Here, 字 is the descendant of 文.

Yet, there are two types of 文.

1. 象形文 (pictographic) --- an image (pictograph) points out or to a concrete object, such as 日 (Sun), 月 (Moon), 山 (hill), 牛 (cow), etc.. In fact, there are a total of 70 象形文 in the entire Chinese word set, and no more.

2. 指事文 (pointing or assigning) --- an image (pictograph) points out or to a concept (not object), such as 夕 (night), 白 (white color), 卜 (divination), etc.. There are a total of 87 指事文 in the entire Chinese word set, and no more.

These two 文 (70 + 87 = 157) account for 71.4% of the total of 220 Chinese word roots.

Group 2 --- 形聲者 (phonetic loan) and 會意者 (sense determinators). This group creates 字 (a word). 字 is composed of, at least, two 文.

In fact, this concept of 文 and 字 forms a composite model, 文 as the root while 字 is a composite word. That is, the ancient Chinese did know that Chinese character set is a 文 (root)-based composite system.

Group 3 --- 轉註者 (synonymize) and 假借者 (borrowing). This group does not truly create new word but create a new meaning or new usage for an existing word. This group causes the most troubles on decoding the words from their faces as the original meaning of those words were changed by these two operations.

If you are new to Chinese language, you will not have known the following words. Yet, can you still find some rules or relations among those words in their word group?

史, 吏, 使
里, 重, 動, 慟,
垚, 堯, 燒,

中, 串, 患,
乃, 秀, 莠, 盈,
可, 哥, 歌, 河,
工, 左, 佐, 差, 嗟, 江,
豆, 鼓, 鞞, 豎, 戲.

While Dr. F.S.C. Northrop was one of the greatest Sinologists in the 20th century, can you (a new comer) make a judgment on his saying, “Chinese written language (Chinese words) is denotative and solitary -- no logical ordering or connection the one with the other.”? Of course, you can. Dr. Northrop was simply wrong regardless of his great academic stature and reputation. There are obvious logic connections between the words (史 and 使), also (里, 働), (中, 患), etc..

Yet, the ignorance of Dr. Northrop was not an isolated case. All (each and every) great Sinologists are not better than him.

Dr. John DeFrancis (another great Sinologist of our time) wrote, “The concept of ideographic writing is a most seductive notion. There is great appeal in the concept of written symbols conveying their message directly to our minds, thus bypassing the restrictive intermediary of speech. And it seems so plausible. Surely ideas immediately pop into our minds when we see a road sign, a death's head label on a bottle of medicine, a number on a clock. Aren't Chinese characters a sophisticated system of symbols that similarly convey meaning without regard to sound? Aren't they an ideographic system of writing?”

The answer to these questions is no. Chinese characters are a phonetic, not an ideographic, system of writing, as I have attempted to show in the preceding pages. Here I would go further: There never has been, and never can be, such a thing as an ideographic system of writing. How then did this concept originate, and why has it received such currency among specialists and the public at large?”

Dr. J. Marshall Unger (Professor of Linguistics, Ohio State University) wrote in his book (Ideogram: Chinese Characters and the Myth of Disembodied Meaning), “Try this ‘thought experiment’: suppose a couple really smart little green guys from outer space showed up one night in a suburb of Tokyo, just like in a Japanese science-fiction movie. Would they instantly understand all those store-front Chinese characters as soon as they saw them?”

It's pretty obvious that cousins of E.T. would be as clueless about Chinese characters as you would be staring at street signs in Baghdad (unless, of course, you happen to be literate in Arabic). But that hasn't stopped generations of writers who really ought to know better from insisting that Chinese characters somehow convey meaning to brains through some mysterious process completely detached from language.”

Can “a death's head label on a bottle of medicine and a number of a clock” be intuitively understood by Tarzan (an archetypal feral child raised in the African jungles by the Mangani ‘great apes’)?

Can “cousins of E.T. instantly understand all those store-front Chinese characters as soon as they saw them”? In the American Heritage Dictionary, @, #, \$, %, &, *, {, } are ideograms. Can any of those ET green guys instantly understand all those ideograms as soon as they saw them?

If the term “ideograph” is defined as above, must be understood intuitively without any instruction, then, Chinese characters are, of course, not ideographs. However, I think that both Dr. DeFrancis and Dr. Unger are wrong. The meaning of @, #, \$, % and & can be understood only by an agreement among a language community. And, that agreement must be learned.

“Aren't Chinese characters a sophisticated system of symbols that similarly convey meaning without regard to sound?” (John DeFrancis)

The answer is Yes. Every Chinese character similarly conveys meaning in all languages which use it, such as, in Japanese, Korea and in all different Chinese dialects (Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka, Northern Min, Southern Min, Hsiang, Kan, Wu, etc.). That character conveys similar meaning while pronounces differently in a different language.

“Chinese characters are a phonetic, not an ideographic, system of writing, as I have attempted to show in the preceding pages.” (John DeFrancis)

Chinese characters are, of course, phonetic, as I have said that all (each and every) Chinese characters have one sound tag either explicitly or implicitly. The only thing is that those sound tags can be pronounced differently in different languages, the same as the English alphabet A is pronounced as (Ar) and B as (Bei) in German.

Thus far, I have discussed 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words), and we can get the following conclusions.

1. 六書 were known in the ancient time.

2. With 六書, I have showed the validity of two premises below via both the existential introduction and the existential generalization.

i. Premise one ---- Chinese words are composed of roots.

ii. Premise two ---- The meaning of Chinese words can be read out from their faces.

3. No one in the past 2,000 years knows about the content and the substance of 六書. Thus, many great Chinese philologists and Western Sinologists made all kinds of ignorant statements about Chinese characters.

4. Yet, 六書 did not mention that every Chinese character has a sound tag either explicitly or implicitly. In fact, 六書 discussed very little on the verbal part of the language.

5. 六書 did not address the mutation process of Chinese word system at all.

6. The six canonic sentences of 六書 are not exactly correct. And, I will discuss this later.

Thus, the point 4, 5 and 6 will be the center points of my future discussions.

Chapter 23 ---- About 形聲(phonetic loan) and 會意(sense determinators)

Indeed, the idea of Chinese characters being ideographs is wrong. Yet, none of the Sinologists and Chinese philologists knew what the Chinese character set actually is. They did not know that it is a root based axiomatic system, a composite system similar to the physical universe, starting from

1. elementary particles (mainly proton, neutron, electron, etc.) to atoms (elements), then
2. elements to chemical compound (inorganic, organic, bio-chemical, etc.) or matter, then
3. matter to objects or items (stars, life forms, etc.).

The Chinese written system is a composite system, starting from

- a. word roots to modules (compound roots), radicals or words, then
- b. words to word phrases, then
- c. word phrases to sentences.

However, no one in the past 2,000 years history knew about this before the publication of the book “Chinese Word Roots and Grammar” (US copyright # TX 6-514-465) in 2006. One of the reason is that many roots are deeply buried under some evolution processes, the root-fusion, the root mutation, etc.. Now, I will show two more root-fusion examples.

1. 並 (side by side) is the fusion of 立立 . 立 means “standing.”
2. 兼 (holding both) is the fusion of 秉秉 . 秉 means “holding.”

Now, you should be convinced that Chinese character system is an axiomatic system, and those Chinese scholars and Western sinologists were wrong. You possibly could dissect and decode the following words, 蟀, 捧, but you will not be able to decode 率 and 戌 without learning the basic of this new Chinese etymology.

By now, you must have convinced that most of those Sinologists are wrong, especially Dr. Northrop, the greatest Sinologist in the 20th century; otherwise, there is no point for you to read this book any further. Now, you can dissect and decode the following words with ease.

椒 is composed of 叔; (迎、仰、抑、昂) of 印; (條、條、修、條、悠、攸、筱、脩) of 攸. But you are still unable to decode the words of 叔, 印 and 攸 by your own study, without learning from this new Chinese etymology.

六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) was mentioned in the book “說文解字” which discussed only two issues.

a. Six sentences without further elaborations.

b. 六書 was used as the teaching tools for learning Chinese words during the “Warring States” period (about 300 B.C.). But, it was abandoned since.

Thus, the “details” of 六書 was not known by the author of 說文解字. The fact is that the author did not use 六書 as a framework for his book. The 90% words in his book were classified as 象形 (pictographic), and it is grossly mistaken. Furthermore, many of those six sentences are terribly wrong. I will show one example here for now.

The canonic statement about 形聲 from the book 說文 (So-Wen) is “形聲 (phonetic loan), 以事為名, 取譬相成。江、河是也。”

形 (concrete object) 聲 (sound or phonetic), 形聲 can mean using sound to identify a concrete object.

事 (manmade object or event), 名 (name of something), 以事為名 means using 事 to name an object or an event.

取 (take) 譬 (metaphor) 相 (together) 成 (complete), 取譬相成 means using metaphor to point out the meaning.

That is, the explanation for 形聲 (以事為名, 取譬相成) does not mention anything about the phonetics at all. Furthermore, its examples are wrong.

河 (river) is 水 (water) + 可 (able, no longer unable). So, 河 is a river while its chi (energy flow) is not blocked (such as by mountains). For example, the Yellow River (黃河).

江 (river) is 水 (water) + 工 (engineering). So, 江 is a river while its chi (energy flow) was opened up with engineering works. For example, the Long River (長江) which was blocked at three gorges and was opened up by the 夏 Emperor.

Furthermore, 河 does not pronounce 可, and 江 does not pronounce 工. Thus, 江、河 cannot be 形聲 words.

The following words are 形聲 (phonetic loan) words. They all have a 形 (such as, 鳥 or 魚) and a sound tag (such as, 合 or 連). That is, 形 is about a category and 聲 is a sound tag. This canonic 六書 sentence on 形聲 is simply wrong.

(鴿、鴨、鸚、鷓、鵬...),

(鯉、鯊、鯨、鯽、鰭、鱧、鱣、鱒、鱒、鱒、鱒...)

The fact is that I cannot use 說文's definition of 形聲 in this new Chinese etymology regardless of whether that definition is right or wrong. In fact, all discussions on 六書 in this book are mine.

I have discussed two of the 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words), 指事 (pointing or assigning) and 象形 (pictographic), in the previous chapter. We can, now, discuss the 2nd group; 形聲 (phonetic loan) and 會意 (sense determinators).

From the face meaning of the phrase, 會意 (sense determinators) is that the word meaning of this 會意 procedure arises from an inferring process between two or more composed radicals. That is, at least, the word meaning of this group of words can be and should be read out from their faces, by definition. Thus, the ancient Chinese already knew the two premises,

- i. Premise one ---- Chinese words are composed of roots.
- ii. Premise two ---- The meaning of Chinese word can be read out from its face.

However, the book 說文 (So-Wen) did not point out them, and no one truly understands the following statement in the past 1,900 years.

會意者 (sense determinators), 比類合誼, 以見指偽。誠、信是也。

For the process of 會意 (sense determinators), this sentence is all that was said for it in the past 2,000 years. 比類合誼 means that inferring two parts to produce a result. 偽 is manmade item or concept. 以見指偽 means that a manmade concept is pointed out. 誠 is 言 (speaking words) + 成 (completion), meaning “sincerity”. 信 is 人 (man) + 言, meaning “trust or believing”.

The above definition from 六書 is grossly inadequate. 會意 process is a general principle for “all” Chinese words. That is, even the ancient Chinese did not describe the system correctly, mistaken a general principle as a rule for a small group only. Thus, I will discuss this 會意 process later.

Now, I will talk about the 形聲 (phonetic loan) first. 形聲 is a special group of 會意 process.

1. For a 會意 process word, it has 2 or more radicals. For 形聲 word, it has two and only two radicals. One radical defines a category for some concrete objects, such as fishes, dog-like animals, cat-like animals, etc.. The sound tag acts as an identifier to distinguish one object from the others in the category.
2. While every Chinese word carries a sound tag explicitly or implicitly, the 形聲 word carries a sound tag “explicitly.”
3. For a 會意 process word, its sound tag, often, get involved in the meaning inferring process. For a 形聲 word, it has no inferring process. The sound tag is acting as differentiator to distinguish one word from the others in the group, such as, 鯁 pronounces as 連, 鱧 as 善, 鯉 as 里. They are all 魚 (fish), and their differences are pointed out with the sound tags.
4. For two 會意 process words with identical sound tag, this sound tag can pronounce differently while keeping the same vowel (韻母), that is, with different consonant (聲母). Yet, for 形聲 (phonetic loan) words, they pronounce exactly the same as their sound tag.

With the above understanding, we can revisit the two statements of “The Columbia History of the World, ISBN 0-88029-004-8 (On page 112), “

1. Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic method.
2. Unfortunately, the phonetics was often borrowed for other than exact homophones. In such cases, the gaps have widened through the evolution of the language, until today characters may have utterly different pronunciations even though they share the same phonetic.”

If the statement 1 is talking about the 形聲 (phonetic loan) words, then it is completely wrong. Phonetic loan words account only a very small portion of all Chinese words. Furthermore, as all (each and every) Chinese words have phonetic values, the system is constructed with phonetic value 100%, not 90%.

The statement 2 is also wrong as the sound tag of 會意 word can have different phonetic values. Thus, the gap is not caused mainly by the evolution but is an intrinsic part of the language although the evolution could make some contributions.

Li and Thompson (1982:77) wrote, “Who refer to Chinese writing as ‘semantically, rather than phonologically grounded’ and consider that a character ‘does not convey phonological information except in certain composite logographs where the pronunciation of the composite is similar to one of its component logographs.’”

Thompson’s statement is, again, terribly wrong. While 會意 word is, indeed, a semantic word, it does carry a sound tag either explicitly or implicitly, that is, it does convey phonological information, and I will discuss this next. Furthermore, every phonetic loan word also carries semantic information.

With the understanding from above, these words [(賽、塞), (蠻、變)] are obviously not phonetic loan words for the reasons,

1. They do not have an explicit sound tag,
2. They have more than two parts (radicals or roots).

Thus, it will be an excellent and correct guess that they are “sense determinator” words.

How about the following two groups?

Group A: (鴿、鴨、鸚、鷓、鵬...), (鯉、鯊、鯨、鯽、鰭、鱧、鱗、鱷、鱒、鱒、鱒...)

Group B:

1. (志、誌、痣), (悽、棲、淒、萋)
2. (貽、怡、詒)
3. (撤、澈、徹...)

Obviously, the group A words meet all conditions for being phonetic loan words.

- a. Each one of them has only two radicals.
- b. Each one of them has an explicit sound tag.
- c. Each one of them pronounces identical to its sound tag's phonetic value.
- d. The sound tag acts as identifier instead of a logic inferring part.

How about the group B words?

For B1 and B2 words,

- i. Each one of them also has only two radicals.
- ii. Each one of them also has an explicit sound tag.

Yet, for the B1 words, each word in the group pronounces "identical" to the other words in the group. This is a condition which is not a part of the definition for the phonetic loan words, and, in fact, it cannot be a part of it.

For the B2 words, while they do have the same attribute as the B1 words, they have another quality. Their pronunciations are different from their sound tag's.

For the B3 words, they obviously have more than two radicals although all three of them pronounce identically.

Thus, the group B words cannot be the 形聲 (phonetic loan) words although some of them are almost 形聲 – like words, with only two radicals and with an explicit sound tag. In fact, they are 會意 (sense determinators) words.

By mistaken the group B words as the 形聲 word, it caused the authors of “The Columbia History of the World, ISBN 0-88029-004-8 (On page 112)” making their mistaken statement, “Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic [loan] method.”

One 會意 (sense determinators) word is 聖 (holy sage) which is made of three radicals, 耳 (ear), 口 (mouth) and 壬. In fact, there are two words written as 壬. In the word 任 (responsibility), the center line of 壬 is longer than the bottom line, and it means duty or works of duty. Another word (the bottom radical of 聖) has a center line shorter than the bottom line, such as the lower radical of 呈 (逞, 程, 郢 ...), but it is not implemented in the computer fonts and cannot be printed out. This radical means the growth from earth as the bottom radical of it is 土 (earth) while the bottom radical of 壬 is 士 (scholar). So, 壬 means duty and responsibility, such as in the word 廷 (the courtyard). Therefore, 聖 depicts a scene of an ear (耳) and a mouth (口) and a nicely growing field. Thus, the decoding of 聖 is a person who is listening to Heaven and speaking (teaching) to commoners for getting a plentifully growing on earth (to feed the people). Therefore, a 聖 is a holy sage.

The difference between a 會意 and a 形聲 word is very fine. Now, I am going to introduce a few laws for distinguishing them.

Group A:

1. (鯉, 鯊, 鯨, 鯽, 鰭, 鱧, 鱷, 鱒, 鱒, 鱒, 鱒 ...)
2. (鴿, 鴨, 鸚, 鷓, 鵬 ...),

There should be no question that group A words are 形聲 (phonetic loan) words.

- a. All A1 words have a radical 魚 (fish) which identifies the category, and the sound tag of each word is identifying the type of fish. It is the same case for all A2 words which has a radical 鳥 (bird).
- b. Each sound tag has two attributes, its meaning and its phonetic value. In these cases, the meaning of the sound tag does not play a major role in making that word. The phonetic value of that sound tag makes a major contribution to separate that word from other words in the same group.

Group B: (志、誌、痣),

The meaning of the group B words is mainly coming from the “meaning” of the sound tag while its phonetic value contributes almost nothing. In fact, the phonetic value of the sound tag cannot make any contribution for distinguishing these three words as they are having identical pronunciation. The only

way to distinguish them is by their different word forms which infer out different meanings for each word.

- i. 志 (will, marked willingness) is 士 (scholar) over 心 (heart). Scholar's heart carries a will.
- ii. 誌 (journal) is 言 (speech or words) + 志 (will, marked willingness). Marking the will with words becomes a journal.
- iii. 痣 (a birth mark) is root 180 (illness or biologic) + 志 (will, marked willingness), a biologic mark.

Thus, the meaning of the group B words is mainly arising from a logic inferring process, not from the phonetic value of the sound tag. So, the group B words are 會意 words and cannot be phonetic loan words although they do have sound tags.

Thus, there are laws to distinguish the 會意 and the 形聲 words.

Law 1: If the meaning of a word arises from the phonetic value of its sound tag, it is a 形聲 word. If the meaning of a word arises from the semantic value of its sound tag, it is a 會意 word.

That is, the word type is determined by the way of how its meaning arises instead of its word form, as many 會意 words do have an explicit sound tag. And, there is a very special sub-group of the 會意 words which do have the word form identical to a 形聲 word, such as, 傢, 俱.

In fact, the word 形 in 形聲 means a concrete object, not a concept. So, 魚 (fish), 鳥 (bird), 犬 (dog), 木 (word or tree) and 玉 (jade) are all concrete objects. And, the following words are all 形聲 words.

狗 (dog), 獬 (dog with short shinbone), 獾 (hunting dog), 狐 (fox), 獅 (lion), etc., with 犬 (dog) as the 形 radical.

木 (word or tree), 樹 (tree in general), 樁 (tree stump), etc., with 木 (word or tree) as the 形.

玟 (文 jade), 珂 (可 jade), 璵 (真 jade), 碧 (bluish green jade), etc., with 玉 (jade) as the 形.

On the contrary, although the 人 (person) word does represent a concrete subject, it, often, points out a conceptual space. Thus, the 人 radical in the words 傢, 俱 does not point to a concrete subject but to something 'about' 人 (human).

傢 (about home) is 人 (human) + 家 (home).

俱 (furniture, tools used by man) is 人 (human) + 具 (tool, gadget, device, equipment, instrument, utensil, etc.)

So, 傢 俱 is the gadget in the home. These two words have the word forms identical to the 形聲 words, but their word meanings arise from the semantic value of their sound tag. Furthermore, their meanings arise from a very special inferring process, pointing (指事). In fact, they are 指事字 (pointed word), not 指事文 (pointed ideograph).

指事文 is a single pictograph symbol, which is an ideograph. 指事字 is a composed word. Is there any 象形字 (pictographic word)? The answer is No. All 字 are composed symbols and are not ideographs anymore. There are only 象形文.

Now, we know the difference between a 形聲 (phonetic loan) and a 會意 (sense determinators) word. If you are a native Chinese, you should know most of the words below. Yet, do you know which one is which, 形聲 or 會意? If you are new to Chinese language, can you find some rules from the words below just by comparing their forms?

史, 吏, 使

里, 重, 動, 慟,

垚, 堯, 燒,

中, 串, 患,

乃, 秀, 莠, 盈,

可, 哥, 歌, 河,

工, 左, 佐, 差, 嗟, 江,

豆, 鼓, 鞞, 豎, 戲.

If you are unable to tell which is which, I will show you a shortcut. Indeed, it is hard to know which is which by looking at any single word if it has an explicit sound tag. However, because of the DNA inheritance nature, we can tell which is which easily by looking at its family. This forms law 2 and law 3.

Law 2:

i. A word is a 形聲 word if the “shared” radical in its family is “silent”, such as, the shared radical 魚 is silent in the group (鯁, 鮭, 鱈).

ii. A word is a 會意 word if the “shared” radical in its family is “not silent” but is the sound tag, such as, the shared radical 君 is not silent in the group (君, 群, 郡, 裙).

Law 3.

i. A 形聲 word should pronounce identical to its sound tag.

ii. For a 會意 word, its sound tag has a span of sounds. That is, it might not be pronounced with the original sound of its sound tag.

Then, many characters have no explicit sound tag, such as, 祭 or 羸. How can we read their sounds from their faces? Yet, it is easy to read their meanings from their faces.

祭 (an offering ceremony to gods or ancestors) is 又 (hand) holding 月 (meat) while asking the answers or signs (示) from above. So, 祭 is an offering ceremony to gods or ancestors with offered foods, that is, asking gods to get into the seats to enjoy the offering. The word 即 means “ready to be seated.” Would you be surprised if the pronunciation of 祭 is identical to 即?

羸 (winning) is 亡 (disappear or death) over 口 (mouth or people) over 月 (meat), 貝 (treasure) and 丸 (an elixir pill). With so many treasures while no other (亡 口) can share it, it must mean winning. Yet, the word 盈 is a filled up or over flowed dish. In fact, the static scene of the word 羸 is the same as an overflow. Again, would you be surprised if the pronunciation of 羸 is identical to 盈?

With two examples, I have showed the existential generalization for a new law, the law 4.

Law4 --- Any character which does not carry an explicit sound tag will pronounce the same as its 轉註字 (synonymized word).

With these laws, it is clear now that Chinese word system is an axiomatic system.

Chapter 24 ---- Accommodating a verbal universe by the written system

What is the implication for a written system being an axiomatic system? It must be a constructed and a designed system. That is, it cannot be a direct derivative from a verbal system. Thus, how to accommodate a verbal system by that designed written system became a major engineering challenge. The merging of Chinese written and Chinese verbal systems is, indeed, a linguistics wonder. Now, we should look into what the Chinese verbal system is all about first.

Chinese verbal system has, at least, 8 major subsystems (Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka, Northern Min, Southern Min, Hsiang, Kan, Wu, etc.) while each subsystem has a few more dialects. Yet, the Chinese written system must and did accommodate all those systems. This is a fact, and it becomes a major guideline for our analysis.

How can this be done? Yet, it becomes a non-issue if all those subsystems are completely isomorphic to one another although they are mutually unintelligible phonetically. And, this is, indeed, the case. I will provide proofs on this later. Yet, with this understanding, I will use the Mandarin as the representative for the Chinese verbal system in our analysis of how Chinese written system merges with the verbal seamlessly.

First, we should outline the Chinese verbal universe. How many phonemes are there in the Chinese verbal universe? The answer is 1,000 maximum. And, every phoneme is a member of a 4-tone family. That is, there are only a total of 250 (1000/4) 4-tones. For the issue of 4-tone, please visit the webpage <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/prl020.htm>.

Note: another way of counting the phonemes results a number of 37, that is, 15 vowels and 22 consonants. Yet, the combination of these 37 results a total of 250 4-tones, that is, 1,000 distinguishable sounds.

Indeed, the entire Chinese verbal universe does not go beyond these 1,000 distinguishable sounds. As there are about 60,000 distinguishable written words, each sound must carry an average of 60 words

(from 20 to 120). That is, every single Chinese word has, at least, 20 homophones or homonyms. How to resolve this tangled mess becomes a major engineering design challenge for the Chinese written system. And, this issue has three dimensions.

1. How to accommodate 60,000 written words with only 1,000 distinguishable sounds?
2. How to distinguish homophones or homonyms in the written forms?
3. How to distinguish homophones or homonyms in the verbal cases, without the helping of the written forms?

The solution for the first issue is to make the easily distinguishable words with an identical sound, such as,

(妻、悽、棲、淒、萋)

(志、誌、痣),

(貽、怡、詒),

And (撤、澈、徹 ...).

The words above in their group are having identical pronunciation. This way, indeed, provides a partial solution for the first issue. Again, these words with the same sound are composed of different radicals, and they can be easily distinguished with their written forms. Thus, the second issue is resolved at the same time. How about the issue three? Without the helping from the distinguishable written forms, how can homophones be distinguished in the verbal situation? This becomes a new engineering challenge, and the entire Chapter 3 of “Chinese Word Roots and Grammar” is devoted for this issue.

Instead of analyzing how Chinese written system merges with the verbal system, it will be fun for us to make such a design ourselves and to see who is smarter, us or the ancient Chinese. Of course, we must first outline our objective and list out what is available (including the limitations) for such an objective.

A. The objective --- merging Chinese written system with the Chinese verbal system (which encompasses, at least, 8 subsystems) seamlessly.

B. The initial and the boundary conditions

1. There are about 60,000 Chinese characters which are the result of a root based axiomatic system. The root set has n members, while the n is a finite number. In our case, I make $n = 220$.
2. There are only 1,000 distinguishable sounds in the entire Chinese verbal universe.

3. Every Chinese word (character) has four dimensions.

- a. word form
- b. word sound
- c. word meaning
- d. word usage

Note: the word usage is very much about the relations among words. Thus, I will exclude it from this analysis. That is, every Chinese word will be viewed as a three-dimensional particle (form, sound and meaning).

4. Two functions

- i. Every distinguishable sound carries many written words.
- ii. Every meaning can be expressed with many different written words.

C. The design criteria

1. The meaning of every word (character) must be read out from its face.
2. The pronunciation of every word (character) must be read out from its face.
3. All material available for these tasks is the root set (220 in this case), nothing else.
4. We can make up rules any which way we prefer, to our heart's content, as long as they are consistent among themselves.

With the above, can this objective be achieved? What are the best design strategies? While this is the topic of this chapter, the readers should also think about these yourselves. So, I am providing some hints below from the works of the ancient Chinese first.

Case one: words in the group have the identical pronunciation.

(妻、悽、棲、淒、萋)
(志、誌、痣),
(貽、怡、詒).

Case two: words in the group have “slightly” different (still related) pronunciation.

(遛、溜、瘤、溜、颯、溜、溜、榴)
(娵、怨、苑、鴛、鴛)
(倦、倦、捲、捲、捲、睽、綵、捲、捲、圈)
(瞭、寮、瞭、潦、僚、撩、瞭、撩、獠、療、遼)
(灌、罐、鸛、觀、歡、懽、權、勸)
(儉、簽、儉、儉、獫、殮、儉、檢、檢、嶮、臉、險、劍、斂、斂)
(佳、哇、詿、桂、鮭、閨、奎、崖、涯、洼、卦、封、硅、鞋)

(曉、曉、曉、撓、嶠、僥、曉、撓、曉、撓、撓、撓、撓、撓、撓)

Case three: words in the group have “completely” different pronunciations.

(鳳、鳩、鳶、鳩、鴻、鴉、鴿、鴨、鸚、鵲、鵬、鶯、鷗、鷺、鷺)

Even if you are new to Chinese language, you can still find some rules from the above list by looking up the pronunciations of each word from a dictionary. Then, we might be able to borrow those ideas for our own design.

While I have outlined the objective (merging Chinese written system with the Chinese verbal system seamlessly), the initial and the boundary conditions, etc., now, let me rephrase them in more understandable terms.

Our objective is similar to making 60,000 distinguishable cookies which carry unique sound and meaning; by using only a set of lego pieces (220 pieces in this case) while there are only 1,000 distinguishable sounds available.

I will call these lego pieces as roots, and each root has a unique shape and meaning. Thus, it is not too difficult to make 60,000 distinguishable cookies by the different combinations of those 220 roots. As every root has its own meaning, the meaning of every cookie can be read out from the meanings of its composing parts. Yet, how can we attach a sound to each cookie with these roots?

Seemingly, we can assign a sound (phonetic value) to each root, and we can sound out the sound of the cookie from its composing roots. However, there is a problem for this special case. We have only 220 roots while there are about 1,000 distinguishable sounds. That is, we must assign 4 to 5 different sound to every root, and this will cause a major confusion for the sounding out process. In fact, we must make a new set of sound tags in order to achieve our objective.

Thus, our first design strategy is “not” to assign any sound to the roots. In the making cookie process, the roots will always keep silent.

Our second design strategy is to construct 1,000 small cookies as sound tag, and each of them is assigned with one unique sound. Now, we have enough sound tags to cover the entire phonetic universe according to our design specification.

Our third design strategy is to make 60,000 distinguishable cookies with those roots any which way we prefer, to our heart’s content.

Our fourth design strategy is to attach a sound tag to each of those 60,000 cookies.

Now, our design is complete, a great success.

1. We can make as many cookies as we like, not just 60,000. And, they can be all unique.
2. The meaning of each cookie can be read out from its composing roots.
3. The sound of each cookie can be read out from its sound tag.

However, there is one problem in this system, that is, many cookies share an identical sound, the homophone or the homonym. Yet, this problem can be resolved easily, and I will discuss it next. Now, I have showed a 4-step design for constructing 60,000 distinguishable cookies. In fact, the current computer cookies are designed in a similar way. Yet, the Chinese character set has a finer design.

Instead of attaching a sound tag on a finished cookie, the sound tag is playing a part at the beginning of its construction. As every sound tag has both the semantic and the phonetic values, it can make contributions in many different ways.

1. Its phonetic value plays a major way while its semantic value makes a minimum contribution, such as, (鴟、鸚、鷓、鵬、鶯、鷗) and (鯁、鯉、鱈). This makes the 形聲 (phonetic loan) word group.

2. Its semantic value plays a major way while its phonetic value makes a secondary contribution. This group can be further divided into two subgroups. This makes the 會意 (sense determinators) word group.

- a. The sound tag keeps a single phonetic value, such as, (妻、悽、棲、淒、萋) and (志、誌、痣).

The words in each group have the identical pronunciation, the same as the sound tag.

- b. The sound tag has a span of phonetic values, such as, (遛、溜、瘤、溜、颯、溜、榴), (袞、怨、苑、鴛、鴛) and (倦、倦、捲、捲、捲、睽、捲、捲、捲、捲、捲、圈)

The pronunciation of each word in its group is defined by its sound tag while it has a span of values. Please see the webpage (<http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/prl020.htm>) for more information.

It is a good time for revisiting the statements of “The Columbia History of the World, ISBN 0-88029-004-8 (On page 112). It states, "Structurally, the Chinese writing system passed through four distinct stages. No alphabetic or syllabic scripts were developed, but each word came to be denoted by a different character. The earliest characters were pictographs for concrete words. A drawing of a woman meant a woman, or of a broom a broom. Such characters were in turn combined to form ideographs. A woman and a broom became a wife, three women together treachery or villainy. The third stage was reached with the phonetic loans, in which existing characters were borrowed for other words with the same

pronunciation. The fourth stage was a refinement of the third: sense determinators or radicals were added to the phonetic loans in order to avoid confusion. Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic method. Unfortunately, the phonetics were often borrowed for other than exact homophones. In such cases, the gaps have widened through the evolution of the language, until today characters may have utterly different pronunciations even though they share the same phonetic. The written language, despite its difficulties, has been an important unifying cultural and political link in China. Although many Chinese dialects are mutually unintelligible, the characters are comprehended though the eye, whatever their local pronunciation. One Chinese may not understand the other's speech, yet reads with ease his writing."

The two major statements made by the authors of "The Columbia History of the World" are,

1. Nine-tenths of the Chinese characters have been constructed by the phonetic [loan] method.

2. Unfortunately, the phonetics was often borrowed for other than exact homophones. In such cases, the gaps have widened through the evolution of the language, until today characters may have utterly different pronunciations even though they share the same phonetic.

Both statements are wrong. They have mistaken that all 會意 (sense determinators) words which carry a sound tag as phonetic loan words. Again, they do not know that a sound tag has a span of phonetic values, especially, in the case of 會意 (sense determinators) words.

I have talked about the sound tag which can often have a span of phonetic values. Now, I should summarize the attributes or dimensions of the entire Chinese verbal universe.

1. It has only a total of 1,000 or less distinguishable phonetic values.

2. Each phonetic point is a part of a 4-tone group. Thus, there are a total of 250 (1000/4) 4-tone at the most.

3. As the phonetic values are limited (1,000 or less) while the written characters are unlimited (currently having about 60,000), there must have many homophones or homonyms. Now, every phonetic point carries an average of 60 (20 to 120) characters.

4. Every Chinese character carries two or more phonetic values. The same character changes its meaning when it changes its phonetic value. This is a very special attribute in the Chinese verbal universe.

In order to make sense the above facts, we should first know how a Chinese phonetic point (distinguishable sound) is defined. Every Chinese phonetic point is defined with two variables, the 聲母 (similar to consonant) and the 韻母 (similar to vowel). With 聲母 alone, it cannot define a phonetic

point. On the other hand, 韻母 alone can define a phonetic point.

Yet, how can “we” know the phonetic value of any phonetic point without already knowing them all? There is a way to resolve this issue. We can zero in the phonetic value (pv) of a phonetic point (pp) with two other points. Thus, by knowing only a few starting points, we can map out the entire set. This is called 反切 (reverse checking or engineering).

So, the sound (phonetic value) of a Chinese word (character) is “checked” out by two other words, by using the 聲母 of the first word + the 韻母 of the second word to get its own 聲韻 (the phonetic value). Now, the phonetic value of every word can be “recursively” defined which is an axiomatic operation. That is, by only knowing a very small starting group, the entire set can be mapped out.

In the entire Chinese verbal universe, there are about “206” 韻 which forms a 韻母 spectrum. And, a 韻 can easily go one step to its left or to its right, and this we call 轉 (rotate or change) 韻.

By allowing the sound tag rotates or changes (轉韻) one or more steps, it will increase the expressing power of the sound tag greatly. And, there is no need to have a sound tag for every phonetic point. Thus, the number of sound tags needed decreases, from 1,000 to 500 or less.

With the 韻母 spectrum in place, a span of phonetic values for a sound tag will no longer cause any confusion. For the words [群 (qún), 郡 (jùn), 裙 (qún)], 君 (jūn) is the sound tag while that sound tag has a span of phonetic values, (see note).

Without audio recording device in the ancient time, did the ancient Chinese keep any audio record of their tongue for us? The answer is Yes, via the 韻書 (the rhyme book).

I have showed above that the entire Chinese verbal universe is demarcated by the three coordinates, the 聲 (consonant), the 韻 (vowel) and the 4-tones. By knowing two of the three coordinates, the third will be known. A 韻書 (the rhyme book) lists all the 韻 and their 4-tones, and it encompasses the entire information of the Chinese verbal universe. Thus, the 韻書 is the best audio record for recording the phonetic data of Chinese verbal universe.

The oldest 韻書 currently known is the book 切韻 (check rhyme) which was published during the 隋朝 [Sui Dynasty (around 580 a.d.)]. While the original book of 切韻 does no longer exist, its contents are available as quotes from many other books.

The next 韻書 (the rhyme book) is the book of 唐韻 which was published during the 唐朝 [Tang Dynasty, from 618 to 907 a.d.).

The 韻書 of today is 廣韻 which was published during the 宋朝 [Song Dynasty, around 960 a.d.].

During the past 1,400 years, the evolution of Chinese verbal universe is clearly documented with these three 韻書 (rhyme books). As this period is wholly documented, it is called 今音 (the modern phonetics), and the period before 580 a.d., it is called 古音 (the ancient phonetics).

While there is no official 韻書 (rhyme book) for the 古音 (the ancient phonetics) period, the ancient verbal universe can still be analyzed, by looking into the rhymes used in the ancient writings. Many such analysis were available, such as, the book 音學五書.

Now, we know that the Chinese verbal universe is marked solely with Chinese characters. So, the written and the verbal systems were merged with the following procedures.

1. There is a set of roots.

2. About five hundred sound modules are constructed from those roots to encompass the entire Chinese verbal universe, the 1,000 distinguishable phonetic points. Please visit <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/prl020.htm>

3. A word (character) is composed of roots and one sound module to provide a unique meaning and a unique phonetic value. Unlimited number of words can be constructed with this procedure. That is, every character carries one sound module (sound tag) either explicitly or implicitly.

4. The phonetic value of a word is used as a coordinate to define the phonetic value of other words in the procedure of 反切 (reverse checking or engineering).

5. As the phonetic value of every character is firmly anchored in the verbal universe via a sound module and its 聲韻, it has the power and the freedom to acquire more phonetic values without losing itself in the sea of verbal universe. This is called 破音 (breaking the phonetic value), (see note).

Dr. John DeFrancis wrote, “Apart from the error of thinking that Chinese characters are unique in evoking mental images, where Creel and others from Friar Gaspar da Cruz right on down go astray in their characterization of Chinese writing is to succumb to the hypnotic appeal of the relatively few characters that are demonstrably of pictographic origin and to extrapolate from these to the majority if not the entirety of the Chinese written lexicon. The error of exaggerating the pictographic and hence semantic aspect of Chinese characters and minimizing if not totally neglecting the phonetic aspect tends to fix itself very early in the minds of many people, both students of Chinese and the public at large, because their first impression of the characters is likely to be gained by being introduced to the Chinese writing system via some of the simplest and most interesting pictographs, such as those presented at the beginning of Chapter 5. Unless a determined effort is made to correct this initial impression, it is likely to remain as an article of faith not easily shaken by subsequent exposure to different kinds of

graphs. This may also explain the oversight even of specialists who are aware of the phonetic aspect in Chinese characters, including such able scholars as Li and Thompson (1982:77), who refer to Chinese writing as 'semantically, rather than phonologically grounded' and consider that a character 'does not convey phonological information except in certain composite logographs where the pronunciation of the composite is similar to one of its component logographs.' It takes a profoundly mesmerized observer to overlook as exceptions the two-thirds of all characters that convey useful phonological information through their component phonetic."

Dr. DeFrancis pointed out the ignorance of the mainstream sinologists,

1. The Chinese character set is not a pictograph or ideograph system.

2. Two-thirds of all characters that convey useful phonological information through their component phonetic.

Yet, Dr. DeFrancis did obviously not know that Chinese character set is a root-based axiomatic system. It is also a surprise to me that he did not mention about the 韻書 (the rhyme book) to support his argument that Chinese character system is a phonological system. Furthermore, the Chinese characters are 100% phonological, not just two-thirds.

Note: These issues are discussed in detail in the book "Chinese Word Roots and Grammar".

Chapter 25 ---- The evolution of Chinese etymology and the verifications of four premises

After the publication of this new Chinese etymology, there are two types of comments on it.

1. Comment one ---Your few examples of showing that the meaning of a Chinese character can be read out from its face are not enough to prove a premise which must be examined for all words.

Answer --- In the book “Chinese Etymology” (US copyright TX 6-917-909), it lists about 8,000 examples, and the book is available at <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/cw3.htm> .

However, a premise must be proved with either deduction or induction for any theory. I have showed the premises of this new Chinese etymology with existential introduction and with existential generalization. The next step is to show the universal proof which will be discussed in this chapter.

2. Comment two --- Your theory is nothing new, as the radicals and 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) were known for over 2,000 years.

Answer --- In the previous chapters, I have showed,

a. The author of 說文 (So-Wen) wrote, “the 六書 was taught before the time of Confucius but was lost before that time.” The fact that Confucius did not ever discuss about 六書 is a circumstantial evidence for the above statement. That is, no one in the past 2,000 years truly understood the substance of 六書 before the publication of the book “Chinese Word Roots and Grammar” (US copyright TX 6-514-465).

b. The concept of radical in the book 說文 and the 康熙字典 (kangsi dictionary) did not lead to an understanding for Chinese character set to be a root-based axiomatic system for all those years since their publications. The facts that all those great Chinese philologists (魯迅, 錢玄同, 胡適, 林語堂, etc.) despised the Chinese character set and that the debates among all those great Western sinologists (Matteo Ricci, Herrlee Glessner Creel, F.S.C. Northrop, ... or, Peter S. DuPonceau, John DeFrancis, J. Marshall Unger, etc.) did not emphasize the concept of radical are the direct evidences that the “old” concept of radical did not point out that Chinese word set is a root-based axiomatic system.

c. I have also showed that the scope of this new etymology is much bigger than 六書 which is, in fact, a small subsystem of this new etymology.

i. 六書 did not encompass a set of sound modules.

ii. 六書 did not make sound module as an intrinsic part of constructing characters, except for the group of 形聲 (phonetic loan) words.

iii. Many of the six canonic sentences of 六書 are simply wrong.

iv. The 220 roots in this new etymology are significantly different from the 214 康熙字典部首 (leading radicals).

Now, I have shown you that Chinese words are composites, and you might be getting some senses out from the following words while not being able to decode them.

快, 決, 缺, 玦, 訣, 抉, 夬, ...

新, 親, ...

湯, 場, 暢, 煬, 礪, 傷, 腸, ...

困, 困, 圍, 國, 困, 回, 囿, ...

聿, 筆, 律, 津, 書, 畫, 妻, 事, ...

Without learning from this new Chinese etymology, there is no chance for you to decode the following words with your knowledge of 康熙字典部首 and with the old understanding of 六書. Thus, the comment two is simply nonsense.

亢, 六, 玄, 文, 亡, 亦

害, 服, 前, 夬, 假, 會

韋, 或, 有 ...

肅, 淵, 帝 ...

With these two comments being answered, we, now, can move on to make the universal proof of the four premises.

1. Premise one --- All (each and every) Chinese words (characters) are composited of from a set of word roots.

2. Premise two --- The meaning of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces.

3. Premise three --- The pronunciation of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces.

4. Premise four --- etymology memory algebra, with only 220 root words (R), it generates 300 commonly used compound roots (also as sound modules, M). Thus, $R + M = 220 + 300 = 520$. With these 520, all 60,000 Chinese written words are generated. That is,

etymology memory algebra is $R + M = R \times M$

Then, can these premises be universally proved, that is, an arbitrary selected character meets those premises? Can you (the reader) read the meaning of the following words out from their faces? The chance for you to do this is nil although you have learned about this axiom system.

明, 肌, 前

股, 几, 鼻

香, 音, 杳

For your convenience, I, however, will provide more examples for helping you to see an easier understandable picture on those premises. If you are new to Chinese language, please visit the page at <http://www.chineseetymology.com/exhibite.php> . If you are more comfortable on reading Chinese text, please visit the page at <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/cw1.htm> .

Here, I will show one special word group which was not discussed before. Although they are not randomly chosen, they are also examples for proving the validity of the above premises. Furthermore, they show some special principles of the Chinese language.

The reincarnation group --- when a word is “over-used” (its original meaning is lost after it acquired many other meanings and usages), a new word was constructed to regain the original meaning, and this is a reincarnated word. This belongs to the 轉註 (synonymize) group.

Example: 「嘗、嚐」

嘗 (cháng, to taste, already, to attempt, to try, formerly) is 尚 (prefer or fashion) + 旨 (sweet taste or imperial decree). Thus, the original meaning for 嘗 is to enjoy the sweetness (or to taste). Yet, the other acquired meanings (already, to attempt, to try, formerly), now, become the dominated and the fashion meanings. Thus, a new word 嚐 was constructed (reincarnation) to regain its original meaning.

Note: why does 旨 mean the imperial decree? A 旨 (a decree, however harsh or bitter) will eventually become sweet.

This type of reincarnated words is constructed by adding one appropriate root to the original word. The pronunciation of the new word will stay the same as the old word. The followings are more examples.

「幸、倖」，「欲、慾」，「效、倣」，「伊、欸」，「睿、叡」，「蝗、螂」，「付、附」，「贊、讚」，「志、誌」，「周、週」，「咨、諮」，「旨、指」，「敝、弊」，「眇、渺」，「禁、噤」…

The second word in the bracket is the reincarnated word (「還原字」), such as, 慾、讚、渺、弊…等。

The current simplified character system has two simplifications.

1. Reducing the number strokes of the traditional characters.
2. Eradicating all those reincarnated words.

Those who did the simplification did simply not know the reason of why many words have so many “not needed” synonyms, as they do not know the reason of their construction.

Now, I can reiterate the structure of this new Chinese etymology as below.

1. There is a root set, 220 members.
2. There is a sound module set, about 500 members. The sound modules are made of from roots. However, their phonetic values are assigned, not arising from the composing roots.
3. Every character has 4 dimensions,
 - i. the word form, composed of from roots and/or sound modules,
 - ii. the word sound, arose from its sound module or from a special rule,
 - iii. the word meaning, arose from an inferring process among its composing parts (roots and/or sound module),
 - iv. the word usage, depending on the interactions among other words.

The dimension i and ii are base (or variable) dimensions (as domain), which construct the word. The dimension iii and iv are result (dependent variable) dimensions (as range).

4. Some rules,

a. Roots are silent in their composing words. Note: when a root is a standalone word, it does have a phonetic value of its own. However, it becomes silent when it is a part of other word.

b. The sound module plays two roles in the word meaning inferring process.

i. If its phonetic value plays a major role, it produces a word similar to a 形聲 (phonetic loan) word.

ii. If its semantic value plays a major role, it produces a word similar to a 會意 (sense determinators) word. In this case, the sound module has a span of phonetic values. The way of the span is determined by its 聲母 (consonant) or 韻母 (vowel).

Note: some words do not have an explicit sound module. In general, it will have the same pronunciation as its synonym.

c. Ways of inferring the meaning of any word, the four pathways (see previous chapter).

i. Forward method --- from roots to modules to G1 (generation one word), ..., Gn. And, there are many ways of reading it in this pathway. This pathway accounts about 85% of all words. The most difficult part of this path is the "assignment".

ii. Mutation --- this will be discussed later.

iii. Backward method --- the meaning of a module is not from the composing roots but from a word. It is going to be a hard one.

iv. Then, the wild card --- the borrowing. There are some rules on this. This will be discussed later.

The above is the major outline of this axiomatic system (the new etymology), and it is quite different from the 六書 (six ways of constructing Chinese words) which did not explicitly point out the concept of sound module.

In addition to the axiomatic system above, the key point of Chinese system is the merging of the above system with a naturally evolved verbal system. From the previous chapter, we know that the 韻書 (the rhyme book) describes and encompasses the entire Chinese verbal universe. With the 韻書 (the rhyme book) of different periods, the evolution of the Chinese verbal universe is also understood.

However, there are, at least, 8 subsystems (Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka, Northern Min, Southern Min, Hsiang, Kan, Wu, etc.) which are, in general, mutually unintelligible in the Chinese verbal universe. Then, which subsystem is the 韻書 mentioned above describing? The answer is "All", all subsystems.

The book of 切韻 (check rhyme, published during the 隋朝 [Sui Dynasty, around 580 a.d.]) was based on the Wu (Southern China) system. The book of 唐韻 (published during the 唐朝 [Tang Dynasty, from 618 to 907 a.d.]) was based on the “Northern Min” system. Yet, the difference between the two was minimal. Then, the book of 廣韻 (published during the 宋朝 [Song Dynasty, around 960 a.d.]) encompassed all 韻書 before and including some of the ancient sounds.

Today, there is only one 韻書 (the rhyme book), the 廣韻 (the unified rhyme book). All subsystems, however mutually unintelligible, describe their system with the same 韻書. That is, these eight subsystems are eight clones, with different bodies while having the identical DNA.

Creel (1936:91-93) says: “That Chinese writing was pictographic in origin does not admit of question. On the other hand, Chinese is not, and was not three thousand years ago, a pictographic language in the sense that it consisted of writing by means of pictures all or most of which would be readily understood by the uninstructed. ... The Chinese early abandoned the method of writing by means of readily recognizable pictures and diagrams. ... It was in part because the Chinese gave up pictorial [sic] writing that they were able to develop a practicable pictographic and ideographic script, with comparatively little help from the phonetic principle. To draw elaborate pictures of whole animals, for instance (as is done on some of the Shang bones), is too slow a process. The course taken in many parts of the world was to conventionalize the picture, reduce it to a simple and easily executed form, and then use it to represent homophonous words or parts of words. The course the Chinese have chosen has also been to conventionalize and reduce, but they then use the evolved element for the most part not phonetically, but to stand for the original object or to enter with other such elements into combinations of ideographic rather than phonetic value. This parting of the ways is of the most profound importance.”

Creel’s insistence that the Chinese words have a pictographic origin is not entirely wrong. There are only 70 Pictographic symbols in the entire Chinese word system. But his insistence that “they [Chinese] then use the evolved element for the most part not phonetically, but to stand for the original object or to enter with other such elements into combinations of ideographic rather than phonetic value” is wrong. Chinese words are constructed with a root-based axiomatic system which consists of two dimensions.

1. Semantic dimension --- the meaning of each word arises from an inferring process of its composing radicals.
2. Phonetic dimension --- the phonetic value of each word arises from its sound tag.

(妻、悽、棲、淒、萋) have the sound tag 妻.

悽 (sorrowful or deeply heartfelt) is 心 (heart) + 妻 (wife, the beloved), the heart on the beloved.

棲 (perch, to stay or to inhabit) is 木 (tree or wood) + 妻 (wife, the beloved), with wood (or tree) and wife, one can make a habitat in the ancient time.

淒 (intense cold or mournful) is 水 (water) + 妻 (wife, the beloved), wife with tears is mournful. Note: I have mentioned before that the “assignment” is an important way of giving meaning for a word.

The same for the words (溜、瘤、餹、颯、溜、榴), they have the sound tag 留 (to stay or to keep), and their meanings can be easily read out from their faces.

溜 (to linger / to stroll)

瘤 (tumor)

溜 (slip away / to skate)

榴 (pomegranate tree)

餹 (reheat by steaming)

颯 (soughing of wind)

Thus, Creel’s mistake is minimal in comparison to the entire old school (both Chinese philologists and Western Sinologists). They view the current Chinese system (the 隸書) is the result of “evolution” from the Oracle Characters (甲骨文, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oracle_bone_script). This is fatally wrong. They have ignored a very important event happened around 220 B.C. .

The evolution of the old school theory is correct before the year 220 B.C., as follow,

Oracle Characters

--> Bronze Characters

--> Large seal characters

--> Small seal characters

--> Standardized small seal characters (around 220 B.C.), implemented by the Prime Minister Li (李斯, <http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E6%9D%8E%E6%96%AF>) of the Qin Empire.

The above evolution is correct. Yet, around 220 to 210 B.C., there was a “revolution” on Chinese character system. The revolution moved drastically away from the normal evolution.

Yes, there was another event happening at the same time of PM Li's work. Mr. Wang (王次仲, <http://baike.baidu.com/view/201945.htm>), a hermit, invented an "entirely different" system of written characters. Emperor Qin Shi Huang (秦始皇, <http://zh.wikipedia.org/wiki/%E7%A7%A6%E5%A7%8B%E7%9A%87>) read about this and was greatly impressed. The Emperor asked Mr. Wang to come out from his hermitage and to serve the government many, many times, but Wang declined all those invitations. Although the Emperor was very angry, he was unable to change Wang's mind. Mr. Chang (程邈, <http://baike.baidu.com/view/97773.htm>) was an officer and a highly revered scholar in the Empire. Yet, Chang was in jail for some reasons at that moment. So, the Emperor gave Chang an assignment of refining and completing Wang's work. If Chang is successful, he will be pardoned and will return to his high office. With 10 long years (in jail), Chang worked day and night on Wang's system and finally "constructed" 3,000 new characters. The Emperor was extremely satisfied, and Chang was put back to a high position. Chang's system was, then, used as the written system for the governmental papers, and it spread very quickly to commoners. At that time, most of the servants who did the chores of copying governmental papers were drafted commoners or prisoners, and they were called Lii (隸). As Chang was also a prisoner once and as his system was used by Lii, this new system was named as Lii characters (隸書). Very, very soon, the Small Seal characters were no longer used as a communication tool, and it became an art, not a living language any more.

Of course, nothing can be truly invented out of the blue. The Lii system, of course, used many Small seal characters or parts of those characters as roots. Yet, the two systems (old evolved system and Lii) are completely different. The old characters (from Oracle to Small Seal) are arbitrary vocabulary with every word as a standalone blob. The new system (Lii) is a root word based system.

Although these two events happened at exact the same time, around 220 B.C. to 210 B.C., there is, in fact, a break, a divide and a huge canyon between the two. Thus, anyone who describes the 隸書 with Oracle characters is the same as describing the human evolution with the facts of Neanderthal, and this is exactly what the "old school" is all about. They are all wrong.

At the time of the First Emperor, there were three events happened about the same time, from 220 B.C. to 210 B.C..

Event 1: the standardization of the Small Seal set by the Prime Minister Li.

Event 2: the construction of the Lii character set (the Wang - Chang set).

Event 3: a few years after the debut of the Lii set, the Small Seal set went extinct, not a living language any more. It survives to today as an art, not as a living language.

The Emperor - Wang - Chang encounter was documented in detail in "History Record" (史記), written around 140 B.C., in the article "the First Emperor's Record" (秦始皇正紀).

After knowing the correct evolution of Chinese etymology, I can reiterate a final proof for this new Chinese etymology again. I have proved the first three premises with both existential introduction (that is, with one example) and existential generalization (with, at least, two or more examples) in the previous chapters. I also showed over 8,000 actual examples in the book "Chinese Etymology". Of course, it is not too difficult to check out all (about 60,000) Chinese words. However, it is much better for providing a logic universal proof. That is, these premises are valid for an arbitrary selected word. If one negative example is found, there will not be a universal proof. Yet, I can arbitrary select thousands words while you (the world) would still not believe that I did arbitrarily. But, this randomness can be guaranteed if the selection is not done by me. Thus, I have asked you (the world) in the article "The final verdict on the Chinese character system (posted on May 14, 2011 at http://chineselanguageetymology.blogspot.com/2011_05_01_archive.html)" to select an arbitrary word. Eighteen months since then, no negative case was reported. Thus, I can now openly claim that this new etymology is inductively proved while the above open challenge to the world continues.

In order to show a true universal proof, an issue of mutation must be addressed. The fact is that the Chinese character set, now, has two systems,

- a. the original axiomatic system,
- b. a mutated system.

After over 2,000 years of evolution after the revolution, the Chinese character set did acquire a huge mutated system. Without knowing this mutated system, the universal proof becomes impossible. I will list some major mutation pathways here.

a. By fusion: such as,

並 is the fusion of 立 立 .

兼 is the fusion of 兼 兼 .

雨 is the fusion of 天 水 .

b. Via diverging mutation, such as,

犬 --- the radical 犬 is in all these words (犯, 戾, 狀, 吠, 狺, 狂, 狄, 狎, 狐, 狗)

网 --- the radical 网 is in all these words (羅, 罪, 罩, 罰, 罔, 岡)

肉 --- the radical 肉 is in all these words (肚, 肱, 肝, 育, 肥, 腐, 纘, 昔)

火 --- the radical 火 is in all these words (燿, 炬, 煮, 纂, 煎, 烹, 無, 光)

水 --- the radical 水 is in all these words (永, 暴, 雨, 泉, 泰, 懷, 況, 流, 滾, 涼)

心 --- the radical 心 is in all these words (必, 志, 恣, 志, 忘, 怕, 悄, 忖, 忙, 忡, 忝, 恭)

In these examples, we can see that one radical can mutate into a few different variants. This type of mutation is known to most of Chinese people. But, there are enough cases which are unknown to the common folk, such as 昔 has the radical of 肉, 恭 has the radical of 心 and 懷 has the radical of 水.

c. Via converging mutation, such as,

The look-like radical in (明, 肌, 前) are three different roots.

The look-like radical in (股, 几, 臆) are three different roots.

The look-like radical in (香, 音, 沓) are three different roots.

This is the most difficult issue in the Chinese etymology. This is 100% knowledge-based. There is no chance of any kind that one can decode this type of mutation with computer analysis.

d. Via insertion, such as,

行 --- the radical 行 is in all these words (術, 衛, 衙, 銜, 衍, 銜, 衙, 衝, 街, 衡, 衢)

衣 --- the radical 衣 is in all these words (裔, 裝, 製, 裴, 襲, 裘, 哀, 衰, 衷, 裏, 褒, 裹, 被, 初, 袁)

While some insertions are very obvious, some are not.

e. Via multiple pathways, such as,

黃 is the insertion of 田 into 光. This takes more topological work to see the transformation.

漢 is 水 + 黃, meaning “Yellow water” which is, now, the name for Chinese race. Again, the topological transformation of 黃 takes some detailed analysis.

There are many more different mutation pathways, and I will discuss them in due time. Now, the universal (final) proof of this new etymology is complete.

Universal proof --- for an arbitrary selected Chinese character, the three premises above are true and valid.

Again, you (the reader) can arbitrarily select a Chinese character, and it will be encompassed by the three premises above. One negative case will destroy this universal proof. Yet, many words of which you are unable to decode are encompassed by the premises. The only problem is you, not the words. Thus, I will give you one more help before your selection.

Logic is kind of rigid. So, there is fuzzy logic which is still bounded. Chinese etymology gives rise to a new kind of logic, the “life” logic (or evolutionary logic) which starts out with the old-rigid-logic, with roots and inferring rules. Then,

1. Root A + Root B (R-AB) produce a ballpark (not a single result) which encompasses two or more different concepts (such as, forget and busy). The choice of meaning for the first R-AB can be arbitrary assigned. But, the second choice is pushed by the squeezing effect. For examples,

忘 is 亡 (disappear) over 心 (heart), so, it means forgotten.

忙 is 心 + 亡, it has identical roots as 忘, also means disappearing of the heart. But, it means busy.

忘 and 忙 are composed with the same set of roots. In fact, assigning 忙 as “forget” is still logical with the rules. But, when a choice was made, the other in the group must accept it. The same set of roots can be “chosen” for different objects or concepts. Sometimes, the choice is arbitrary. Yet, the different ways of arrange the roots are not always making difference. This is another issue for the future.

足 is 口 (as a person) over 止 (stop or stepping), it denotes foot.

企 is 人 (man) over 止, it connotes "looking for someone to come", on the tiptoe looking. Now, it also means business.

暉 is 日 (Sun) + 軍 (army), it denotes as Sun-light. Sun light was important for the army operation.

暈 is 日 over 軍, it denotes the halos of the Sun. Now, it means dizzy.

愈 is 俞 (notification sound) over 心, it connotes "past a set target or got well".

愉 is 心 + 俞, it means happiness.

2. When root C + root E produces a word W-y with meaning of Y,

When Root C + root D + root E produce a word W-X with meaning of X. Yet, word Z = (root C + root E + something) could have two pathways.

- a. Word Z = Y + something.
- b. word Z = (X-) + something.

For example,

贏 means win or plenty.

贏 is, in fact, coming from 贏 by removing 貝 (treasure) and replacing it with 羊 (cheap livestock). Thus, 贏 means not-plenty. Thus, the meaning of 贏 is derived not from the composing roots but from a word in its group. There are many words must be decoded in this way.

Thus, this "life" logic has the following attributes.

- a. old traditional logic (starting roots and rules)
- b. arbitrariness (initial condition)
- c. squeeze effect

d. evolutionary liveliness

The above logic is, in fact, a life. The newly created word will become a part (substance and rule) of this logic universe. This life-logic will be the foundation for a true artificial intelligence. With this new logic, you can decode a lot of more words before your selection of a negative example.

Now, the true picture of Chinese system is very clear as below.

A. The scope of the Chinese verbal universe:

- i. The Chinese verbal universe consists of, at least, 8 subsystems (Mandarin, Cantonese, Hakka, Northern Min, Southern Min, Hsiang, Kan, Wu, etc.) while each of them has a few more dialects.
- ii. While these subsystems are, often, mutually unintelligible phonologically among one another, the scope of each system is wholly defined and demarcated by the same 韻書 (the rhyme book). That is, the scope of these systems is completely isomorphic to one another.
- iii. In each subsystem, it encompasses only, maximally, 250 four-tones, that is, 1,000 distinguishable sounds (phonemes). Of course, the issues of homonyms (similar-sounding words, often with the same spelling with different meaning) and homophones (having same sound but differs in spelling, origin and meaning) became major issues to be resolved in the language.

B. The accommodating the verbal by the written character system:

- i. The written system begins with a set of roots, 220 of them.
- ii. With these roots, 300 base sound modules are constructed.
 - a. When a root became a standalone character, it acquires a “sound” of its own.
 - b. When a root is a part of a composed character, it becomes silent, even though it might have a phonetic value while it is a standalone character.
 - c. The phonetic value of the sound modules is assigned (as sound roots). The assignment is not arbitrary, but it is an issue beyond the scope of this discussion now.
- iii. The attaching the phonetic value to each character was not an afterthought. It was done at the beginning, that is, a sound module played a part at the beginning of the character construction. Thus, every character carries a sound tag either explicitly or implicitly. And, this is the premise 3, the pronunciation of all Chinese words can be read out from their faces. I have showed the “explicit” sound tag cases.

- a. As a standalone word, that root has its own sound. In general, this sound will not become a sound tag.
- b. As a sound module, it has its own sound.
- c. The sound module becomes an explicit sound tag of a composed character.

Then, with the four premises being proved, my claim that the Chinese character system can be mastered in 90 days for anyone who knows not a single Chinese character at the beginning is proved valid.

In addition to being the only 100% axiomatic human language system in terms of linguistics, Chinese system encompasses one additional dimension, the morality. I am showing three examples below.

In the West, the self is I, me and ego. In China, "self" is a very complicated concept. For a commoner (without a title), there are three ways to say "self", 自, 己, 我.

自 is the pictograph of the nose, but it does not depict the nose. It points to the person himself, an "object" without any philosophical or moral context.

我 is composed of 手(hand) + 戈 (spear). With a spear on hand, one can be of himself, not a slave.

己 is composed of 一 (Heavenly) over 亡 (vanish). When a person vanishes himself according to the Heavenly virtue, he is a "self." Not being able to eradicate one's ego, he cannot be a 己.

A worthy self must be able to defend for himself and must (must, ..., must) vanish (his ego) himself according to Heavenly virtue.

The word for he (him or others) is 他 which is the composite of 人 (human, a neutral term) + 也 (the fusion of 九九). The number 九九 (99) is the highest number that the 人 (human or humanity) can have in Chinese philosophy. The number above 九九 (100, perfection) belongs to the Almighty 天. Thus, the word 他 encompasses the entire humanity. The Chinese morality is 他 centered. One person who cannot be a 己 (vanishes himself) cannot be a part of 他. While not a single expert of China studies knows about this etymology, most Chinese people do know about the difference between 小我 (the self) and 大我 (the 他). The 小我 only person has no morality.

Then, the last but not the least. The word of 錢 (money) which is 金 (gold) + 戈 (power). 戈 is the stacking of two 戈 (spear), and it means power. 貝 is treasure. Then, 賤 (貝 戈) should carry the similar meaning the same as 錢 (金 戈), but 賤 means being very lowly. In fact, many words with the radical 貝 are having negative meanings, such as, 敗, 貶, 狠, 損, 費, 貧, 貪, 賊, 賠, 賭, 賴. That is, in Chinese moral, the money (貝) and power (戈) are something of lowly.

This additional dimension further proves that the Chinese system is truly a linguistics wonder.

Chapter 26 ---- The Conceptual Language and Super Unified Linguistics paradigm

I have proved that the Chinese linguistics system is the only 100% axiomatic language system. Now, we should discuss the issue of language types.

At LinkedIn ESL International group, Hongbo WANG (Professeur d'anglais et de chinois), Kelly Parker (Learning and Development Consultant at Bleum Software Development), Rod Mitchell (Director of Studies at Cactus Language Training) and I discussed the issue of Language types and second language acquisition. The detailed discussion was posted at <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/linguistics-f25/language-types-and-second-language-acquisition-t222.html> . Here, I am summarizing that discussion below.

Roughly, I divided the nature languages into two types.

- a. Perceptual language --- it identifies space-time info with tailed-vocabulary. The tail encompasses all types of endings, regardless of how and what they are called. The rules of the tail give a very tight control about the grammatical rules.
- b. Conceptual language --- it discusses all events at the conceptual level. The space-time info is marked with markers, not carried by the individual vocabulary. Chinese language is an example of the conceptual language. Being without tails on the vocabulary, the Chinese language is “almost” without grammatical rule.

In linguistics, the term “grammar” is precisely defined. But, many people still use it in many different ways. Thus, I will use a new set of terms for this discussion. In general, people view the linguistics as languages. Yet, I will define the linguistics universe with three parts.

- a. A meta-space --- it encompasses the events and objects in the physical universe.
- b. Languages --- they try to describe the stories in that meta-space.
- c. A meaning-space --- the meaning of the meta-space story is understood by people.

In general, a meta-space story could be understood differently by different people who have different world views. However, at this discussion, I will exclude the culture element and deal the issue strictly linguistically, that is, in terms of translation among languages only. Then, the meaning-space for all languages is identical.

Now, for all languages, they share two identical parts. In this view, different languages are only different translation machines. I can further reduce (simplify) the issue by viewing the language machine as only a “sentence” machine. That is, we only need to analyze how “one sentence” is produced by all those different machines. A sentence has only two parts, a field (such as many seats) and a set of particles (occupying those seats). For English, its particles (vocabulary) have “only” two types.

- i. With tails --- (concept, conceptual, ...), (dog, dogs), ...
- ii. With masks --- (I, me, my, mine), ...

Of course, some with both, such as (go, goes, went, gone), In fact, the function for both tails and masks is the same as flags. Then, there are two more features.

- A. Subject – predicate (SP) structure
- B. Word order

So, English sentence is a “field” (having some seats) filled with flagged-particles. The particle’s flag and the seat’s flag color must match. Thus, the English grammar is very tightly controlled by the particle’s tails. With word order and SP, the English sentence has the “line-segment” structure.

For Chinese, its particles have no tails or masks. That is, it can go into the sentence “field” (seats) without restriction, no SP or word order. For example,

(I love you) and (you love me) are completely different sentences in English. But,

(I, love you), (Love you, I), (You, I love) are all identical sentences in Chinese. In fact, the Chinese sentence has ringed-structure.

In principle, Chinese sentence does not need word order or SP. But, Chinese sentence is able to encompass the word order and SP. After the May 4th movement of the 1930s in China, the most of Chinese writings are “now” using the word order and some sort of SP. So, for a young Chinese person,

he might not read enough old style writings to know that the SP and word order are not important parts of Chinese grammar. I am showing two sentences below.

漢語文系統, 是最容易學的語言。

下點功夫, 三個月就可以, 認識“所有”的漢字了。

These two sentences can be rewritten as below while having the identical meanings, not one bit difference.

最容易學的語言, 是漢語文系統。

認識“所有”的漢字, 下點功夫, 三個月就可以了。

Even our American friends who know no Chinese can still tell that the rewritten sentences have the identical (number of) words.

For a flagless vocabulary system, every “seat” in the sentence “field” is identical. That is, the “meaning unit” of a sentence does not need to be logically or grammatically linked among them. If the “meaning” of a sentence is composed of from three sub-parts, the order of these three parts is not important. For a flagged system, the sub-parts are linked “logically” and “grammatically”, and that order must be maintained.

[讀 (逗, comma)] is the key part of Chinese sentence, the meaning unit, isolated with a comma (,). It needs no SP. And, the order of those [讀 (逗)] is often not important.

Of course, you can say that this 讀 is functionally equal to a Subject and that 讀 can be identified as Predicate. But, in principle, No. They are not. The SP concept was never, never discussed in the 3,000 years in Chinese history before the May 4th of 1937.

As we all know that the syntax is the foundation for a language to build up its higher structures, such as, grammar, programmatic, etc. . Thus, different types of syntax will definitely have different types of grammar. For the convenience, I will use only English and Chinese as examples in this discussion.

Furthermore, their syntaxes are truly different in a big way. One carries flags and masks, the other flagless. Of course, there are tails and masks in Chinese language, but they are implemented at a different level, not on the character (lowest syntax) level. Most of Chinese natives do not know this. I will not go into too deep on this issue in this chapter.

As many of the readers of this book might not be well-versed in Chinese, I will discuss this issue in a general term without using a lot of Chinese examples. First, I would like to simply use one analogy. When a particle (syntax) carries a flag, it acts like a hook. Only the matching hooks can make a link. Thus, flagged-syntaxes can link up only via some allowed ways, such as, the SP structure or the word order etc. . For flagless syntaxes, they can go into the sentence “field” without the hindrance of hooks matching. This kind of difference is vividly demonstrated by the example of diamond and graphite.

Both diamond and graphite are pure carbon. Yet, the carbon atom must go into a lattice in a precise manner for diamonds. On the other hand, the graphite has an amorphous structure which is not precisely arranged. They both are great materials. The graphite can be made as the strongest material, often used in airplanes.

The fact that how a sentence can make sense while without SP structure and word order might be very difficult to be understood by Western linguists. And, the Chinese examples might not be any help for them either. Thus, I will discuss this issue in a general term, from the linguistics principles.

Noam Chomsky dreamed to construct a universal grammar from the assertion that some set of fundamental characteristics of all human languages must be the same. But, his generative linguistics was unable to encompass the Chinese language. In order to overcome that problem, I have introduced a new definition for sentence.

Sentence --- it has two and only two parts, a set of linguistic “particles” and a sentence “field”.

With this new definition, sentence is no longer bound to a particular set of syntaxes and grammar. A sentence field can be a highly ordered structure (such as, English sentence, a crystal lattice-like) or be an amorphous-like structure (Chinese sentence). The particles can be a fermion-like or a boson-like. With this new definition, we thus are able to distinguish the deep structure from the surface structure of sentences of different languages. This new definition is not a choice of technicalities but is based on two new linguistics principles.

The first new principle is ---

“The Martian Language Thesis -- Any human language can always establish a communication with the Martian or martian-like languages.”

This principle is based on the fact that all languages share two identical parts, the meta-space (our physical universe) and the meaning-sphere (the intelligence is universal).

When we meet a Martian, a translation table can be built in no time.

- a. We point to Sun and say “Sun”. Martian will smile and say “Arar”.
- b. We point to Moon and say “Moon”. Martian will understand and says “Yaya”.

Historically, the universal language was proclaimed with the economic and political supremacy, such as, Greek, Latin and English, etc.. They can, in fact, be the lingua franca for a short time period but will definitely fade into the history sooner or later. Universal language was never a linguistics reality. Yet, with this new Martian Language Thesis, it is not too difficult to prove that the universal language is, in fact, the foundation for all languages. That is, there must be a way to construct the universal language linguistically.

The second new principle will show the metaphysics of how all languages arose from a hidden universal language. Traditionally, the meaning of Pidgin and Creole is the dynamical forces in “one” language family. For me, it can also be the forces among families. Then, the language “structure” can actually move from one side (such as, flagged) to the other side (flagless), and Vice Versa. And, this forms a language spectrum.

Indeed, the Martian Language Thesis was subconsciously known in linguistics for long time. But, my description of it does have some metaphysical differences from that subconscious knowledge. In fact, it is only one side of a coin. The other side of the coin is the second principle, The Spider Web Principle.

The Martian Language Thesis is based on the fact that the linguistics universe has two continents, the meta-space (the physical or imagined universes) and the meaning-sphere (the intelligence). The great divide between them is the language universe as we know of traditionally. By definition, a (any, including Martian’s) language must be anchored to both continents. Thus, two different languages

(however different they look) are, in fact, connected, via these two continents. Yet, how does a language arise from this "language universe, the divide between the two continents"?

The Spider Web Principle has two points.

a. The language universe is isotopic and homogeneous. That is, every "point" in this universe is identical (total symmetrical). This symmetry is the base for a universal language linguistically.

b. The "Spider Web Principle" --- The whereabouts to build a spider web is completely arbitrary (total freedom or total symmetry). However, as soon as the first spider thread is casted, that total symmetry is broken, total freedom no more. The location of the web is fixed. With the second thread, the center of the web is defined. With the third thread, the size of the web is determined.

Thus, as soon as the first morpheme or the first grammar rule of a language is casted, it enters into a Godel system; "consistency" becomes the norm, and total freedom is no more. That is, every language has its own internal framework regardless of the fact that the language universe (universal grammar) is about the total freedom. Thus, the universal grammar has two spheres.

i. Universal level -- total freedom. Every language can choose its grammar arbitrary with the total freedom.

ii. Language x level -- as soon as a selection is made, it becomes a "contract" (among its speaking community) with a set of internal framework.

Please note that I have made distinction between the linguistics universe and the language universe.

The Martian Language Thesis is a law of permanent confinement. No language of any kind can escape from the permanent confinement of the two continents. And, it is also a law of total entanglement. Every language is linked (entangled) with all other languages. It is the force of convergence.

The Spider Web Principle defines the language universe (the divide between the two continents) to be isotopic and homogeneous. If the space of language universe is anisotropic and heterogenetic, then some languages cannot be allowed, but this is not the case. This is, in fact, a force of divergence.

A converging force must have a target to converge to. A diverging force must diverge from somewhere. These two, in fact, guarantee an ontological entity which sits underneath these two forces. There is an ontological reality while it has not manifested as a practical human language. But, in principle, the construction of a universal language is possible, as it is, indeed, an ontological reality.

After knowing the forces of diversities and entanglements of different languages, we, now, are able to address the pedagogical issues of learning the mother tongue and the second language with theoretical analysis, instead of from the empirical trial and error methodology. Yet, I would like to discuss a bit more metaphysical issues first.

a. In Zen Buddhism, the utmost mystery of the meta-space is understandable with intelligence but is unable to be described with languages. Thus, Zen developed a very special pedagogy, by yelling and beating the students, as the explanation teaching is just wasting of the time.

b. In Christianity, the utmost mystery of the meta-space (such as, God) can never be comprehended by human intelligence. That special mystery (God) can only be reached by vesting one's faith on a special person (Jesus).

Is faith a kind of intelligence? It is beside the point. The two views above claim that the three parts (meta-space, language space and intelligence) of linguistics universe are not equal in size. If they are right, the construction of a "Super Unified Linguistics Theory" will become very difficult, even impossible. Thus, we must first show that these three parts are exactly equal in size. This is the central point of my book "Linguistics Manifesto, ISBN 978-3-8383-9722-1". Thus, I will not repeat it here. But, the conclusion is that the three parts are exactly equal in size. With this conclusion, we can build a Unified Linguistics Framework. And, all issues (such as, the second language learning) can be discussed with theoretical analysis. With a clearly formalized theory, a test can then be carried out.

In the Introduction to *The Common Sense*, Paine wrote, "Perhaps the sentiments contained in the following pages, are not yet sufficiently fashionable to procure them general favor; a long habit of not thinking a thing wrong, gives it a superficial appearance of being right, and raises at first a formidable outcry in defense of custom. But the tumult soon subsides. Time makes more converts than reason." (page 3).

But, I think that reason can still prevail. I will discuss my view on the language acquisition to prove this point. The current paradigm of linguistics has three unstated premises:

Premise 1 -- The mother tongue is acquired naturally, as a living habit. Even those with mental handicaps can often acquire a mother tongue to some proficiency.

Premise 2 -- A second language is always more difficult to acquire than the first language.

Premise 3 -- The first language is kind of a learning obstacle for learning a second language. Thus, many classrooms of ESL have a sign "English Only."

With this paradigm, the immersion teaching (Language immersion) and the 5 C's (Communication, Culture, Connections, Comparisons, and Communities) become the central pillar for the ways of second language acquisition.

But, the followings are two important facts.

- a. It takes about 5 years for a person to acquire the verbal part of his mother tongue at home and another 5 years in school to master the written part of the language.
- b. In general, it takes about 5 years or less for a 10 year old kid to acquire a second language.

On the surface, people learn the mother tongue with immersion. But, down deep, there is another important mechanism, the anchoring. One learned verbal as the anchor, and with that anchor to learn the written.

Thus, with the mother tongue as the anchor, learning the second language "should be" much easier than learning the mother tongue.

The memory of a person at any given day is a "finite" number. Using that finite asset to spread over the 5 C's is a very inefficient way of using that limited resource. The best way is to identify some anchors for the second language and to master those anchors one at the time.

Chinese language was viewed as one of the most difficult language to learn. Yet, by using the anchor-methodology, it can be mastered in 90 days. The details of this anchor-methodology are available at <http://www.chinese-word-roots.org/nparadi.htm> .

Today, the new paradigm for second language acquisition is having two parts.

- i. Finding the anchors of the second language.
- ii. Memory management on learning those anchors.

With the immersion pedagogy, the second language is learned in the same way as the first language without using the mother tongue as an anchor or a bridge. In my view, it is a waste.

Today, the new second language acquisition methodology is based on two paths.

- a. Axiom-ing every language as much as possible. That is, finding many anchors for each language.
- b. Finding the best memory managing way for each language, the best way of learning those anchors.

The changing of Chinese language from the most difficult one to the easiest one is just a recent development. The issue of the mother tongue being a bridge or a hindrance for second language learning is not a central point of my work. My view has the following points.

- a. The universal language is an ontological reality. Thus, every language is connected to all other languages. This is reflected as the Martian language thesis.
- b. The manifestation of the point “a” is a language spectrum. Thus, two very distinct language types can be defined, and all languages are distributed between them.
- c. With the two points above, every language (however chaotic superficially) can be organized wholly or partly as an axiom system.
- d. Thus, we can learn any language as an axiom system, similar to learning high school geometry or chemistry. Of course, the mother tongue will be a different story, as the first 10 years of a person’s life has, in general, not developed a logic-based learning ability. So, even the mother tongue is the simplest axiom system, the kids will still learn it as a living habit, at least for the verbal part.

In addition to as a theory, I have made Chinese language as one example. With the immersion way of learning, Dr. David Moser wrote an article “Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard?” which documented the failure of the immersion pedagogy . Yet, by learning as an axiom system, Chinese can be learned by a 10 year old American kid in 90 days to the level of being able to read newspaper from a beginning of not knowing a single character. Furthermore, he can learn it all by himself without a need of a teacher. There are already many succeed stories. The article “The methodology on mastering Chinese written language in three months, <http://www.chineseetymology.com/2009/12/08/the-methodology>” can provide some info on this.

Chapter 27 ---- Wrong to the young students! (誤人子弟)!

At Yahoo!Answers, there was a question "Is it wrong to the young students?"

(http://answers.yahoo.com/question/index;_ylt=AsCBOaax_h3A9SE0Uzvw4voazKIX;_ylv=3?qid=20110616122025AA8jm9H)" as below.

For a few weeks, I have been looking into the issue of learning Chinese as the second language. I have investigated the following issues.

1. Chinese (especially the written) is so damn hard, and this is a universal consensus. There are thousands sites discussing this topic.

2. One young American claimed "Mastering Chinese Written Language in 90 days!"

I have searched the web. I found that site which provides good supporting info for his claim, such as,

a. It was done openly, in front of many newspaper and TV reporters.

b. It was reviewed by Taiwan government.

c. It was reviewed by many American universities.

d. I cannot find any negative report on it on web.

e. With the key word "Chinese etymology", it is on the first page on many search engines.

3. Trying to learn that methodology from universities, I cannot find any university teach that methodology.

Question --- if it is a proven methodology (not negated thus far), why is it not used by educators? Why let the young students keep doing the old way and face the lessons as the damn hard subject.

The above issue was then discussed at “Chinese Language Forums, <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/general-discussion/is-it-wrong-to-the-young-students-t36.html>”. One person commented, “This is a moral issue. Intentionally or knowingly denying students the new knowledge is immoral.” A newsletter on “Educators' karma and conscience! Wrong to the young students, <http://us2.campaign-archive2.com/?u=85f326a6ce571062818e95028&id=acb8425e20>” was mailed out to many Presidents of American universities.

This issue has two parts.

- a. Is Gong’s claim valid?
- b. Is the old school way bad in comparison with Gong’s method?

I (Tienzen) have discussed the issue of the difficulty of learning Chinese written language with the following facts.

1. It (the Chinese traditional character set) was viewed as the culprit for China’s demise and was despised by the entire Chinese people (the scholars and politicians) in the 20th century. And, it was viewed as the reason for the super high illiteracy in the country because of its difficulty for the native Chinese. Finally, it led the event of abandoning the traditional character set in 1958.
2. The humility and agony experience of one learned sinologist was discussed, and it turned out to be a universal experience for all people who learn Chinese as the second language.
3. The debate among Western sinologists was also discussed. Both schools view the Chinese character set which is ad hoc and chaotic, and it makes the Chinese written language very difficult theoretically as Chinese system of writing is similar to the hieroglyphic signs of the Egyptians and that they do not express their concepts by writing, like most of the world, with a few alphabetic signs, but they paint as many symbols as there are words. Thus, taking 10 to 20 years of agonizing study becomes the rite of passage for mastering Chinese written language.

However, even with the above facts, my new Chinese etymology is making a claim, “The Chinese written language can be mastered in “3” to “6” months to a point of being able to read the current Chinese newspaper by anyone who knows not a single Chinese word at the beginning, by learning it with my new Chinese etymology.”

How absurd this claim can be, from 20 years to 6 months? However, this claim can be tested or proved in two ways.

a. By testing – Can anyone do it (existential introduction)? And, can everyone do it (universal proof)? In fact, a major work on both cases was done, and those case studies are available at <http://www.chineseetymology.com/> .

b. With theoretical proof – this was provided in previous Chapters. However, I will reiterate it again here. This claim is based on a theoretical framework that the Chinese characters are composed of from only 220 roots. And, the meaning of each and every word can be read out from its face. Thus, there is new etymology memory algebra.

With only 220 root words (R), it generates 300 commonly used compound roots (also as sound modules, M). Thus, $R + M = 220 + 300 = 520$. With these 520, all 60,000 Chinese written words are generated. That is,

etymology memory algebra is $R + M = R \times M$

By learning only 520 and some rules, the entire Chinese word set can be mastered.

I have discussed the views of many great Western sinologists on the issue of Chinese characters. Yet, how are Western commoners learning Chinese written language in the old school? One of the popular way is by using some kind of mnemonic device, such as the book "Remembering the Hanzi", written by James Heisig and Timothy Richardson. A sample lesson of the book was available online before but is seemingly removed after my article "Mnemonic device, a joke in learning Chinese, <http://chineselanguageetymology.blogspot.com/2011/04/mnemonic-device-joke-in-learning.html>) was published. I do have printed out copy of that sample lesson, and the following is based on that paper copy.

The difference between us is greater than the difference between Heaven and Earth. In the sample lesson, Heisig showed 102 examples. There is not a single example having the correct etymology. As I made this statement openly, I must be responsible to my saying. Thus, I must give a few more examples to support my statement.

Heisig's method is 100% a mnemonic device, having zero substance on etymology. I am showing some simple examples here.

1. 胡 ,
 - a. Heisig

- i. key word -- recklessly
- ii. Primitive elements -- ancient moon lit up at 100% wattage.
- iii. story (imaginative memory) -- at full moon, people tend to get a little "loony" and start acting recklessly.

b. Tienzen's Chinese etymology

- i. meaning -- the skin under the chin (it droops at old age)

Note: the word 鬍 (beard) is the radical "hair" over 胡

- ii. word in roots -- 古 (ancient or old) + 月 (meat, a variant of root 96)
- iii. reading from the word face -- old or aged meat (skin)
- iv. its usage -- 胡人 (barbarian, who has long beard in comparing to Chinese)
- v. derived meaning -- reckless

2. 頁,

a. For Heisig: the example 57 in the sample material

- i. key word (meaning) -- page (of book)
- ii. Primitive elements -- turning a shellfish, one
- iii. imaginative story -- Pearl of Wisdom, radiant drop of wisdom with one and only page.

Note: In Kangsi dictionary, 頁 is a human head. There is no secret about this. Yet, Heisig discredited it.

b. Tienzen's Chinese Etymology

- i. Original meaning -- human head. Kangsi dictionary is correct on this one.
- ii. Word in roots -- root 47 (human's head) + 儿 (child, root 36)

The Chinese words are composed of roots (the PB set). The roots in a word give a static image. Then, this image is inferred to give meaning for its descendant words. I will show enough examples on this.

Heisig simply does not know that 頁 is child's head. It depicts the head as an item itself. So, every word containing it is about the "head".

頂 , top of the head

項 , back of the head

順 , following the head, obeying

須 , makeup on head, such as beard, hair, etc.

頑 , slow head, dumb or stubborn

頓 , lowering the head

頭 , another word for head

頒 , many heads, award to many heads

頗 , leaning head (not fair)

領 , back of the head (collar)

額 , the forehead

頷 , lower the chin

頸 , neck

顆 , the unit (or number) of head

There are another hundreds examples. Why does 頁 also mean "page" today? It is a long story.

In Heisig's lesson 4 (page 43, example 57, 頁) of his sample lesson, he wrote, "As a primitive, this character often takes the unrelated meaning of a head (preferably one detached from its body), derived from the character for head (Frame 1067)". This is the precise quote, word by word.

Heisig mistakes 頁 as 一 (one) over 貝 (sea shell). Not only is this a major mistake but is a great laughing matter. Every 5th grader in China will laugh his tooth off on this. This kind of mistake cannot be excused

by claiming as it is only an imaginative mnemonic device. After all, the etymology of the word itself is already the best mnemonic device for the word.

3. 亡 ,

a. Heisig

i. Key word -- deceased

ii. Primitive elements -- top hat on a hook

iii. story (imaginative memory) -- the deceased gentleman left a top hat on a hook in the front hall.

b. Tienzen' Chinese etymology

i. meaning -- dead or disappear

ii. word in roots -- root 186 (Heaven or heavenly) + root 216 (disappearing)

iii. reading from the word face -- disappearing into Heaven (could be death or eternal life or just a flying away jet or a bird). The key is disappearing.

Let's look some descendant words.

忘 (forget) is 亡 over 心 (heart). The heart wonders away is "forget."

忙 (busy) is "a variant of heart" + 亡 . The heart disappears into ..., it has no time to consider others.

荒 (desolate or lacking of) is 亡 over 川 (flowing water). Flowing water disappears into

荒 (desolate field, not managed garden) is root 49 (grassy plant) over 荒

慌 (nervous) is "a variant of heart" + 荒 . The heart is facing a desolate situation, not knowing what to do.

謊 (lie or untrue words) is 言 (speech) + 荒 . When the words are as not managed garden (big mess) or desolate, it cannot be true words.

In all these words, 亡 does not give any hint of an image that "a man is hanging up' a hat while kicking the bucket".

By knowing the correct etymology, the meaning of the words can be read out from their "faces" after learned some basic and some practices. No mnemonic device is needed at all. In fact, not much memory is needed for them neither.

4. 頑 (example 58, lesson 4, page 43 of Heisig's book)

a. Heisig

i. key word -- stubborn

ii. primitive elements -- a blockhead, at the beginning

iii. imaginative story -- Abel and Cain seeking favors of heaven, with stubborn grimace on their faces.

b. Tienzen's etymology

i. word in roots (or radical) -- 元 (beginning) + 頁 (human head)

ii. direct reading -- as a newborn's head (not the physical head but is about its mental capability).

iii. usages

頑皮 -- playful in a mischievous or nuisance sense.

頑劣 -- as a rascal, cannot be educated

頑固 -- stubborn. By selecting "stubborn" as the key word for 頑, it shows that not only does Heisig not know its etymology, but he does not know the true meaning of the word.

5. 首 (example 67, page 46 of Heisig's book)

a. Heisig

i. key word -- heads

ii. primitive elements -- horns, nose (自, see his example 32, on page 32)

iii. imaginative story -- the picture of a moose-head hanging on the den wall. with a note: ... frequent metaphorical use of term..., as head of state

b. Tienzen's etymology

- i. word in roots -- 人 (root 176, dividing) + root 47 (human head)
- ii. direct reading -- combing the head or dressing up the head
- iii. usages -- the abstract head of anything, leader, etc..
- iv. the descendant words -- 道、導

Obviously, Heisig does not know anything about the root 47 (human head) and mistakes it as a horn over nose (自). In fact, there are many words from root 47 without the horn, such as,

憂 (worry) -- root 47 (the human head) over root 205 (covering) over 心 (heart) over root 17 (pacing). Direct reading -- the heart is covered by the head while pacing to and fro. Higher generation words -- 優、擾 etc.

夏 (name for Chinese race, also means summer) -- root 47 (human head) over root 17 (pacing). Direct reading -- a cultured head pacing. Higher generation words -- 廈

Note: Heisig makes this type of serious error all over the places, such as,

胡, the right radical 月 (meat) was mistaken as 月 (Moon). This is excusable as most of Chinese people do not know the difference on this one neither.

頁 (head) as 一 (one) over 貝 (shellfish), and this not only is a big error but is a laughing matter.

首 (head) as "animal horn" over 自 (nose). Again, a joke.

6. 丁 (example 86, page 54)

a. Heisig

- i. key word -- fourth
- ii. primitive elements -- fourth of enumeration ... an lunar calendar
- iii. imaginative story -- someone waiting fourth in line , using a giant metal spike as a makeshift chair.

His note: When used as a primitive, the character changes its meaning to nail or spike.

b. Tienzen's etymology

i. word in roots -- 一 (root 1, heaven's chi) over root 5 (rooted chi)

ii. direct reading -- heaven's chi is rooted

iii. the usages

盯 (keep eye on ...) is 目 (eye) + 丁 (rooted)

釘 (nail) is 金 (metal) + 丁 (rooted)

打 (hitting with hand) is "a variant of hand" + 丁

叮 (repeated reminders or sting with mouth) is 口 (mouth) + 丁

訂 (place order or sign agreement) is 言 (speech) + 丁

亭 (a permanent hill top pavilion, as an ancient road site rest area) is root 208 (high ground) over root 205 (cover) over 丁 . Direct read -- a permanent (丁) covered place on the hill top.

停 (stop) is 人 (man) + 亭 . Direct read -- at 亭 , man stop for a break.

寧 (tranquility) is root 118 (roof) over 心 (heart) over 皿 (cook ware) over 丁 (rooted). Direct read -- cook ware is set (rooted) under roof (house), the heart is in peace.

Can Heisig's 丁 provide the meaning for those words? What is fourth eye? Fourth metal? Fourth hand? Fourth mouth? etc.. The etymology of above is already the best mnemonic device for those words. Heisig's error cannot be excused by claiming them as simply imaginative mnemonic devices.

Heisig's book could be a fun book for a beginner who knows not any Chinese word. If anyone benefited from Heisig's method, good for him. I, myself, do not see it as a good mnemonic device by arbitrary making up a story for a given Chinese character. In etymology, a true mnemonic device flows out from its logic naturally. Learning all those invented stories will definitely poison learner's mind for a true understanding of Chinese characters.

More information is available from the following discussion threads.

1. Is it wrong to the young students? (誤人子弟)! <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/general-discussion/is-it-wrong-to-the-young-students-t36.html>
2. Chinese character set is pseudoscience, 汉字是伪科学!
<http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/general-discussion/chinese-character-set-is-pseudoscience-t15.html>
3. How about the zhongwen.com? <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/asking-questions/how-about-the-zhongwen-com-t40.html>
4. T.K.Ann and Leon Wieger <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/asking-questions/t-k-ann-and-leon-wieger-t124.html>

With all the above, I have showed that Chinese philologists and Western Sinologists were wrong. The mnemonic device without knowing the correct etymology is very bad. Thus, any educator who is still teaching his students with those old ways is definitely wrong to his students and will definitely carry the karma of his immoral act.

Chapter 28 --- 500 examples of this new Chinese etymology

I have showed that only a small portion of the vocabulary in English is made of roots while the Chinese system is 100%. I will show the comparison between the two systems by listing out all the English roots, prefixes and suffixes while showing some Chinese examples. The Chinese examples are written in Chinese as I presume that those who are reading this chapter are already able to read some Chinese or at least are willing to take the time to look them up from online dictionaries. These 500 examples are good lessons for the young students too.

1. This new Chinese etymology goes way beyond the Chinese system. It shows a general principle of linguistics, and it is the central point of my book "Linguistics Manifesto" (ISBN 978-3-8383-9722-1), which is available at Google book

(<http://books.google.com/books?id=Uh8EtwAACAAJ&dq=inauthor:%22Jeh-Tween+Gong%22&hl=en&sa=X&ei=JIHyT-3sO8mA2wW90bz3AQ&ved=0CE4Q6AEwBA>). You are encouraged to take a look of it.

2. 英文字根：acr-, acu- (尖銳), acrimony 痛恨的, acuity 敏銳的。

中文釋字：睚, 目垂. 睚, 目困. 我, 手戈. 忘, 亡 心.

3. 英文字根：ac-, act-, 動作. agenda 議程. actor 表演者. enact 去作...

中文釋字：收割後燒禾桿 (禾 火) 為秋. 揖讓而升, 下而飲. 競射之後的互賀語 (言 射) 為謝.

4. 英文字根：am-, 喜愛的. amateur 業餘愛好者. amiable 可愛的. amatory 憐愛的.

中文釋字：侖, 寫入書冊的共識. 定下的人際 關係 (人 侖), 倫也. 車同軌, 定下的設計 (車 侖) 為輪. 打水漂的侖 (水侖), 淪也. 言 侖, 論也.

5. 英文字根：anim-, 生命的. animal 動物. animate 有活力. animosity 痛恨的.

中文釋字：聿，巧手製出之物。（竹 聿）為筆。人建水邊渡口（水 聿）為津。日為智慧之語，化為手製物（日 聿）為書。

6. 英文字根：annu-, enni-, 年度的。annals 年刊。annual 一年一度的。perennial 長久的。

中文釋字：藿，抓魚的水鳥。裝魚之缶（缶 藿），罐也。藿在樹上（木 藿），自由了，權也。力逼藿抓魚（藿 力），勸也。

7. 英文字根：anthrop-, anthropo-, 人類的。Anthropology 人類學。Philanthropist 慈善家。

中文釋字：文，紋路或圖案。紋口封嘴（文 口），吝也。以手圖紋（手 文），技也。雲之形狀（雲 文），雯也。

8. 英文字根：archo-, archi-, arch-首要的，古老的。Archeology 考古學。Archangel 大天使。

中文釋字：交，相會，相比。車相會（車 交），較也。繩相會（糸 交），絞也。女相會[比]（女 交），姣也。

9. 英文字根：aud-, audit- 聽得到的。audience 聽眾。audio 音響的。audition 試鏡。

中文釋字：辛，困難，費力。兩人言詞互詰難（言 辛 辛），辯也。合力克服困難，（力 辛 辛），辦也。

10. 英文字根：bene-, benign- 慈善的。benefactor 恩人。benefit 福利。beneficiary 受益人。

中文釋字：立，站直（的人）。竹在人（頭）上 [竹 立]，笠也。站在一起（立 立），並也。石頭相撞（石 並），碰也。

10. 英文字根：bio- 生命的。Biology 生物學。biography 傳記。Biochemistry 生物化學。

中文釋字：亡，消失。記心不見（亡 心），忘也。把心亡了（心 亡），忙也。眼不行了（亡 目），盲也。血氣到不了處（亡 肉），盲也。

11. 英文字根: aut-, auto- 自動的. automatic 自動的. autograph 簽名. automobile 汽車.

中文釋字: 令, 權威的密碼. 知 (口 令) 者能活, 命也. 帶頭持令 (頁 令) 者, 領也. 以耳受令 (耳 令) 者, 聆也.

12. 英文字根: cad-, cid-, cas-發生. accident 意外. casual 偶發的. incident 發生的事.

中文釋字: 每, 不間斷. 木气冬仍旺 (木 每), 梅也. 心念不斷 (心 每), 悔也. 陰雨不止生菌, 霉也. 艸每年結果 (艸 每), 莓也.

13. 英文字根: cap-, capt-, cip-, ceiv- 抓住. capture 抓到. receive 收到. incipient 誕生.

中文釋字: 粵, 自由. 馬自由的跑 (馬 粵), 聘也. 請自由進言 (粵 耳), 聘也. 可信 (不需綁) 的人 (粵 人), 俚也.

14. 英文字根: ced-, cede-, ceed-, cess- 行走. exceed 超越. precede 在..前. process 程序.

中文釋字: 可, 能夠, 口气通. 大能力 (大 可), 奇也. 斬不斷的艸 (艸 可), 苛 (死纏也). 又兄又父 (可 可), 哥也.

15. 英文字根: cent- 一百的. century 一世紀. percent 百分比. centipede 百足虫.

中文釋字: 青, 純色. 純色水 (水 青), 清也. 真心話 (青 言), 請也. 真純心 (青 心), 情也.

16. 英文字根: cern-, cert- 分開, 隔離. secret 秘密. concern 關懷. discern 不關懷.

中文釋字: 韋, 抵抗. 以行動抵抗 (行 韋), 衛也. 以撤退抵抗 (走 韋), 違也. 以言抗 (言 韋), 諱也.

17. 英文字根: clam-, claim- 宣告. declaim 宣告. exclaim 大叫. Acclaim 稱許.

中文釋字：包，裝好。衣裝（衣包），袍也。裝食入肚（包食），飽也。裝石入管（包石），砲也。

18. 英文字根：clud-, clus-, clos- 了結。conclude 結論。enclose 納入。exclude 排除。

中文釋字：俞，招呼聲。以言招呼（言俞），諭也。以心招呼（心俞），愉也。車運送時鳴聲（車俞），輸也。

19. 英文字根：cord-, 心（主要的）。cordial 熱心。accord 同意。discord 不同意。

中文釋字：北，相反。對著幹（干北），乖也。後面的肉（北肉），背也。反對異議（北異），冀也。

20. 英文字根：corpor-, corp-（屍，身）體。corpulent 肥胖。corpuscle 粒子。incorporate 公司化。

中文釋字：非，消除。以言除人（言非），誹也。除私心（非心），悲也。不是一般衣裳（非衣），裴也。

21. 英文字根：cre-, cresc-, cret- 成長。increase 增加。crescent 新月。concrete 成型。

中文釋字：不，非也。以口反對（不口），否也。非盤子（非皿），盃也。比地還大（不一），丕也。

22. 英文字根：cred-可信（的）。credit 信用。accredit 認證。confidence 有信心。

中文釋字：至，抵達。黏身的虫（虫至），蛭也。黏人的人（人至），侄也。刀來了（刀至），到也。人遇到（人到），倒也。

23. 英文字根：cumb-, cub- 坐。cubicle 小（臥）房。incubate 孵（卵）。incumbent 現任官員。

中文釋字：昔，乾肉。停屍處（昔屋），厝也。心念乾肉（心昔），惜也。人要乾肉（人昔），借也。

24. 英文字根: cur-, curs-, cours- 發生. concur 同心的. occur 出現. recourse 解決方案.

中文釋字: 單, 荒野獨處. 持戈獨處 (單 戈), 戰也. 獨處求神指示 (示 單), 禪也. 獨鳴虫 (虫 單), 蟬也.

25. 英文字根: de-, div- 神靈的. deify 封神. deity 神明. divine 神靈的.

中文釋字: 乍, 突然. 對意外的表情 (口 乍), 咋也. 以言突襲 (言 乍), 詐也. 突然動心 (乍 心), 怎也.

26. 英文字根: dict- 記憶. dictionary 字典. predict 預測. contradict 矛盾的.

中文釋字: 且, 牢靠. 有力可靠 (且 力), 助也. 有天上先人靠 (示 且), 祖也. 靠言取勝 (言 且), 詛也.

27. 英文字根: doc-, doct- 紙 (的). doctor 有知識的人. doctrine 教條. document 文件.

中文釋字: 岡, 小土丘. 小山 (山 岡), 崗也. 張網岡上獵物 (糸 岡), 網也. 岡上煉鐵 (金 岡), 鋼也.

28. 英文字根: duc-, duct-行為的. conduct 作為. abduct 綁架. reduce 減少.

中文釋字: 罔, 蓋住. 心被蓋住 (心 罔), 惘也. 以絲蓋物 (糸 罔), 網也.

29. 英文字根: equ-相等的. adequate 適當的. equinox 春 (秋) 分. equator 赤道.

中文釋字: 禺, 荒野之一角落. 山腳之禺 (阜 禺), 隅也. 迷失荒野的心情 (禺 心), 愚也. 有他人在禺 (人 禺), 偶也.

30. 英文字根: fac-, fic-, fact-某 ...之部分. fiction 虛擬的. deficient 缺陷的. proficient 熟練的.

中文釋字：厲，廣且大（能力）。出大力（厲力），勵也。使大病（病厲），癘也。以污水為食的虫（虫厲），螻也。

31. 英文字根：fer- 給予的。confer 給予。offer 提供。transfer 轉移。

中文釋字：敬，謹慎小心。要他人小心（人敬），傲也。讓他人謹慎（敬言），警也。讓馬知敬（敬馬），驚也。

32. 英文字根：firm- 穩固的。affirm 確定。infirm 寡斷的。confirm 確認。

中文釋字：帚，打掃器具。以手持帚（手帚），掃也。持帚之女（女帚），婦也。掃清居所（阜帚），歸也。

33. 英文字根：flect-, flex- 可彎的。flexible 可妥協的。reflect 反射。deflect 滑開。

中文釋字：志，士子之心。以言紀志，誌也。身紋紀志，痣也。

34. 英文字根：flu-, flux- 流的。fluency 流利。influx 流入。fluctuation 起伏的。

中文釋字：召，命令。以手召（手召），招也。以走召（走召），迺也。以住處召（邑召），邵也。

35. 英文字根：frang-, fring-, fract-, frag- 一段的。fraction 一部份。refraction 折射。fragile 易碎的。

中文釋字：加，助也。（人加）物，伽（如衣裳，裝飾）也。（加喜），嘉也。（加木），架也。

36. 英文字根：fus-, fund-, found- 流動的。fusion 鎔合。diffuse 稀釋。refuse 拒絕。

中文釋字：扁，平也，不直。人不直（人扁），偏也。平竹（竹扁），篇也。馬不直立（馬扁），騙也。

37. 英文字根: gam- 婚姻(的). bigamy 雙妻. monogamy 一夫一妻. polygamy 多妻的.
中文釋字: 各, 單也. 室中落單者 (室 各), 客也. 有獨立門之樓 (門各), 閣也. 人人走處 (走 各), 路也.
38. 英文字根: gen-, genit- 創造. Genesis 創世紀. progenitor 祖先. ingenious 天才的.
中文釋字: 易, 開張. 水气開 (水 易), 湯也. 人气開 (人 气 易), 傷也. 皮肉開 (肉 易), 腸也.
39. 英文字根: geo- 地球的. geography 地理. Geology 地理學. Geometry 幾何學.
中文釋字: 亢, 高也. 抬手 (手 亢), 抗也. 口高喊 (口 亢), 吭也. 火高 (火 亢), 炕也.
40. 英文字根: ger-, gest- 製造. gestate 孕釀. congest 擁擠. ingest 吸入口中.
中文釋字: 睪, 偵察. 以手察 (手 睪), 擇也. 以言察 (言 睪), 譯也. 入水察 (水 睪), “澤” 也.
41. 英文字根: grad-, gress- 行, 動. aggression 冒進. progress 進展. transgress 違法.
中文釋字: 建, 打造. 以手造 (手 建), 捷也. 以金造 (金 建), 鍵也. 人自造 (人 建), 健也.
42. 英文字根: grat- 感謝. gratify 使愉快. ingrate 忘恩者. gratuity 贈品.
中文釋字: 分, 變整為零. 發給各人 (分 頭), 頒也. 小盤子 (分 皿), 盆也. 各種气息 (气 分), 氛也.
43. 英文字根: grav- 重的. gravity 引力. aggravate 聚積. gravitation 地引力.

中文釋字：高，上層（物）。以手弄高（手高），搞也。肉之上層（高肉），膏也。以牛賞高（功）者（牛高），犒也。

44. 英文字根：her-, hes- 留住. adhere 黏住. cohere 在一起. inhere 屬於.

中文釋字：喬，比高還高。人在高遠處（人喬），僑也。以木架高（木喬），橋也。離地高車（喬車），轎也。

45. 英文字根：jac-, ject- 流出. inject 灌入. project 投入(計劃). abject 厭惡.

中文釋字：秉，手持物。雙手持物（秉秉），兼也。雙手持貝（兼貝），賺也。以言代手（言兼），謙也。

46. 英文字根：junct-, join-, joint- 合併. adjoin 靠在一起. junction 連接. enjoin 禁止.

中文釋字：家，住處。種禾之家（禾家），稼也。女兒之家（女家），嫁也。有人之家（人家），傢也。

47. 英文字根：leg-, lig-, lect- 組合. collect 收集. junction 連接. select 選擇.

中文釋字：其，（指）那個東西。那個圓月（其月），期也。定在地上的東西（其土），基也。木製的指物者（木其），棋也。

48. 英文字根：loqu-, locut- 說, 話. eloquent 亮麗的. colloquy 會議. locution 語法.

中文釋字：豐，飽滿。身（骨豐），體也。（水豐），澧也。祭（示豐），禮也。

49. 英文字根：mit-, miss- 允許. admit 準許. permit 允許. commit 委, 托

中文釋字：卑，低下的。低下女僕（卑女），婢也。低下器官（卑肉），脾也。低下之人（卑人），俾也。

50. 英文字根: mon-, monit- 示範. admonish 忠告. monitor 監察者. admonitory 警告.
中文釋字: 曷, 力窮盡了. 缺水了 (水曷), 渴也. 要進言 [缺(曷)言], 謁也. 短衣 (曷衣), 褐也.
51. 英文字根: mov-, mot- 行, 動. emotion 情緒. promote 鼓吹. remove 移除.
中文釋字: 茲, 小草. 柔如小草心 (茲心), 慈也. 如小草成長 (茲子), 孳也. 水助草長 (水茲), 滋也.
52. 英文字根: nasc-, nat- 自然 (界) 的. nascent 新出生的. Nation 國家. native 本土的.
中文釋字: 爭, 競也. 手相爭 (手爭), 掙也. 以(言爭), 諍也. 以(水爭), 淨也.
53. 英文字根: pel-, pell-, puls- 推 (逼). compel 強迫. impel 自逼的. repel 抵抗.
中文釋字: 番, 獸足印 (野外). 帶獸足印入室察看 (室番), 審也. 以羽毛察看 (羽番), 翻也. 野外生火 (番火), 燔也.
54. 英文字根: pend-, pens- 付 (帳). depend 依賴. dispense 給付. append 附加.
中文釋字: 暴, 洪旱同虐 (強大外力). 大火肆虐 (火暴), 爆也. 大 (水暴), 瀑也. 大 (日暴), 曝也.
55. 英文字根: pet-, petit- 追, 尋. compete 競爭. petition 申訴. impetus 衝勁.
中文釋字: 堯, (使)高大也. 大火 (火堯), 燒也. 以水使高大 (水堯), 澆也. 以食使高大 (食堯), 饒也.
56. 英文字根: ple-, plet- 擁有. complete 完全. deplete 耗盡. implement 落實.
中文釋字: 肖, 小塊肉 (小也). 以刀切肉 (肖刀), 削也. 小心翼翼 (肖心), 悄也. 小石 (肖石), 硝也.

57. 英文字根: plic-, plicit-, plex-, ply- 摺, 層. complex 複雜的. duplicate 複製. reply 答復.

中文釋字: 孫, 兒之子 (小也). 小猴 (猴 孫), 獼. 走在後面 (走 孫), 遜也. 小蔬菜 (艸 孫), 蓀也.

58. 英文字根: pon-, posit-, pound-, pose- 處, 放. dispose 處置. compose 組合. oppose 反對.

中文釋字: 曹, 同事, 同志. 同走 (走 曹), 遭也. 同航道 (水 遭), 漕也. 同時說話 (口 曹), 嘈也.

59. 英文字根: port- 拿, 移動. deport 送走. import 進口. report 報告.

中文釋字: 庶, 平民, 平凡. 無車平民旅行 (庶 走), 遮也. 平民女子 (庶 女), 嫵也. 踏在足下 (足 庶), 蹠也.

60. 英文字根: quir-, quisit-, quest- 尋, 問. acquire 取得. inquire 質問. request 要求.

中文釋字: 袁, 長衫 (長也). 走長路 (走 袁), 遠也. 長擘猴 (袁 猴), 猿也. 長車軸 (袁 車), 轆也.

61. 英文字根: rupt- 爆裂. erupt 爆裂. interrupt 中斷. rupture 爆裂.

中文釋字: 解, 分割, 得答案. 能割物之虫 (解 虫), 蟹也. 能找答案之獸 (犬 解), 獬也. 心有答案 (心 解), 懈也.

62. 英文字根: scrib-, script- 寫. describe 說明. postscript 附註. manuscript 草稿.

中文釋字: 僉, 共識 (無異議). (竹 僉), 簽也. 同格式的刀 (僉 刀), 劍也. 看馬的異同 (僉 馬), 驗也.

63. 英文字根: sed-, sid-, sess- 坐(定)下. preside 主持. reside 住下. dissident 異議者.

中文釋字: 甫, 父親的作為. 可替代父者(人甫), 傅也. 離開父親(走甫), 逋也. 超越父親的(十甫), 博也.

64. 英文字根: spec-, spic-, spect- 看. inspect 檢查. perspective 觀點. suspicion 懷疑.

中文釋字: 卷, 長軸(書, 畫). 收卷(手卷), 捲也. 以卷圍起(口卷), 圈也. 人身如卷(人卷), 倦也.

65. 英文字根: tang-, ting-, tact- 觸摸. contact 接觸. contingent 可能發生的. tangible 摸得到的.

中文釋字: 專, 一心一意, 無二樣. 無二樣的石(專石), 磚也. 與師傅一樣的(專人), 傅也. 車上同樣的(零件)[車專], 轉, 車軸也.

66. 英文字根: ten-, tin-, tent-, tain- 握住. contain 包含. continent 大陸. detain 扣押.

中文釋字: 惠, 善心(念). 禾的最善物(禾惠), 穗也. 草之最善者(艸惠), 蕙也. 心之善者(心惠), 悞也.

67. 英文字根: tract- 拉. retract 退後(回). Tractor 拖拉機. contract 合約.

中文釋字: 屯, 仍在困境(不自由). 困在圍裡(屯口), 圍也. 未抽的蠶絲(屯絲), 純也.

68. 英文字根: ven-, vent- 圍繞. event 事件. prevent 防止. convenient 方便.

中文釋字: 古, 過世的(老). 老肉(古肉), 胡(頷下肉)也. 猜人之年歲(人古), 估也. 過往仍影響現在者(古效), 故也.

69. 英文字根: vert-, vers- 轉動. convert 轉換. reverse 轉回. avert 避免.
中文釋字: 莫, 看不清. 以布巾遮住 (巾 莫), 幕也. 以手去看 (手 莫), 摸也. 以心去看 (心 莫), 慕也.
70. 英文字根: vid-, vis- 看, 見. vision 視力. Evidence 證據. television 電視.
中文釋字: 句, 結束. 不再要了 (句 多), 夠也. 以手了結 (手句), 拘也. 以犬將獵物帶回 (句 犬), 狗也.
71. 英文字根: voc-, vok- 聲, 音. vocal 發聲. provoke 刺激. vocabulary 字彙.
中文釋字: 免, 不取該取的. 日不當空了 (免 日), 晚也. 不再懷子 (女 免), 娩也. 不再空手 (手 免), 挽也.
72. 英文字根: volv-, volute- 滾. revolve 轉動. evolve 演化. involve 介入.
中文釋字: 卓, 較強 (好). 遮 (壓) 強者 (网 卓), 罩也. 手除強者 (手 卓), 掉也. 心念 (除) 強者 (心 卓), 悼也.
73. 英文字首: ab-, abs- 分離. abduct 綁架. abort 放棄. absent 缺席.
中文釋字: 蓼, 美麗 (羽毛). 美麗之言 (言 蓼), 謬也. 美麗居室 (室 蓼), 寥也. 美麗絲綢 (糸 蓼), 繆也.
74. 英文字首: ad- 前進, 附近. adjacent 附近. admire 喜愛. adhere 黏住.
中文釋字: 半, 一分為二. 陪另一人 (半 人), 伴也. 反到另一面 (反 半), 叛也. 以線組合 (糸 半), 絆也.
75. 英文字首: ambi- 兩面的. ambidextrous 兩面手法. ambiguous 不明確. ambition 志向.
中文釋字: 者, 士 (讀書) 人. 以艸 (為書紙) 人 (艸 者), 著也. 士人之言 (者 言), 諸也. 整理絲路者 (糸 者), 緒也.

76. 英文字首: ante-, anti- 前面的, 相反的. anteroom 入門小房間. antedate 以前的事. antibiotic 抗生素.

中文釋字: 籤, 神明的指示. 心得神示 (心 籤), 籤也. 求神指示之艸 (艸 籤), 籤也. 神指示之言 (籤 言), 籤也.

77. 英文字首: bi- 兩次. biannual 一年兩次. bicycle 兩輪車. bilingual 雙語的.

中文釋字: 襄, 幫助. 以口相助 (口 襄), 嚶也. 助理女娘 (襄 女), 孃也. 以醇助造酒 (酉 襄), 釀也.

78. 英文字首: circum- 周圍, 全方位. circumference 圓週. circumspect 小心的. circumvent 繞過去.

中文釋字: 夾, 攜帶. 以手攜帶 (手 夾), 挾也. 攜帶兩山 (夾 山), 峽也. 頭(帶)之兩面 (頭 夾), 頰也.

79. 英文字首: com- (co-, col-, con-, cor-) 在一起. company 團體. combat 戰鬥. colleague 同事.

中文釋字: 章, 完整之(音)言. 美好的玉玩 (玉 章), 璋也. 完整的遮避 (阜 章), 障也. 圍障之好木[不易朽] (木 章), 樟也.

80. 英文字首: contra-, counter- 相反, 相對. contradict 矛盾. counterfeit 偽造的. contraceptive 避孕的.

中文釋字: 意, 內心所想. 口吐意 (口 意), 噫也. 心思意 (心意), 憶也. 意容幾人 (意 人), 億也.

81. 英文字首: de- 離開. depart 離去. decline 拒絕. decipher 解碼.

中文釋字: 步, 足動數. 頭晃動數 (頭 步), 頻也. 以足過水 (水 步), 涉也. 以足過山 (阜 步), 陟也.

82. 英文字首: dis-, di-, dif- 離去. discomfit 不舒服. dissect 解剖. disable 無能的

中文釋字: 頻, 頭晃動數, 經常. 婢女晃頭 (卑 頻), 輦也. 果子晃動 (艸 頻), 蘋也. 水流下處 (水 頻), 瀕也.

83. 英文字首: ex-, e-, ef- 出來. exclude 排除. exhale 呼氣. expire 過期了.

中文釋字: 我, 自, 己. 我口出聲 (口 我), 哦也. 我需食 (我 食), 餓也. 烏發 “我” 聲 (烏 我), 鵝也.

84. 英文字首: extra- 超越. extraordinary 傑出的. extrasensory 敏感的. extra weight 過重.

中文釋字: 咸, 共識, 相同. 心同 (咸 心), 感也. 以 (手 感) 人, 撼也. 以 (心 感), 憾也.

85. 英文字首: hyper- 過量的. hyperacidity 強酸的. hypersensitive 過敏的. hyperactive 過動的.

中文釋字: 成, 做完 (美). 完美之言 (成 言), 誠也. 完美都市 (有牆者) [土 成], 城也. 裝滿容器 (成 皿), 盛也.

86. 英文字首: hypo- 某... 之下. hypothesis 假設. hypodermic 皮膚下. hypochondria 假病.

中文釋字: 幾, 不多, 少也. 食不多 (食 幾), 饑也. 一, 二石之山崗 (石 幾), 磯也. 諷人小語 (言 幾), 譏也.

87. 英文字首: in- (em-, en-, il-, im-, ir-) 沒有, 負的. illiterate 文盲. irresistible 不可抗拒的. insatiable 無法滿足的.

中文釋字: 昏, 打 (磨) 碎. 以足打碎 (足 昏), 踏也. 以手打碎 (手 昏), 搥也. 需昏打之禾 (禾 昏), 稻也.

88. 英文字首: inter- 之(中)間的. interfere 干擾. intercept 攔截. international 國際的.

中文釋字: 婁, 貫(串), 抱著. 以手抱著(手婁), 摟也. 串竹(竹婁), 簍也. 以木串成(木婁), 樓也.

89. 英文字首: intra- 之間的. intramural 內臟內的. intravenous 靜脈內. intranet 內網路.

中文釋字: 皆, 相同. 同輩之人(皆人), 偕也. 可與同輩說之言語(皆言), 諧也. 有規格之木(皆木), 楷也.

90. 英文字首: mal-, male-, mis- 壞的, 不好的. maladroit 很大意. malediction 詛咒. mistake 錯誤.

中文釋字: 必, 一定要. 守家者(家必), 宓也. 守家之虫(宓虫), 蜜也. 守家之山(宓山), 密也.

91. 英文字首: non- (dis-, de-, in-, un-) 不是的, 負面的. nonsense 無意義的.
nonentity 不存在. unable 辦不成.

中文釋字: 占, 請神啟示. 手占後, 可拿(手占), 拈也. 人占後, 可拿(人占), 佔也. 屋占後, 可開張(屋占), 店也.

92. 英文字首: ob- (oc-, of-, op-, ad-, in-) 對著..., 反對. object 反對. oppress 壓迫. offend 冒犯.

中文釋字: 臬, 雕刻. 刻金板上(金臬), 錄也. 神示之臬(示臬), 祿也. 將絲定色(糸臬), 綠也.

93. 英文字首: on- (out-, over-, under-) 超越. onset 開始. outermost 最外層. overture 開場白.

中文釋字: 鬲, 污譏. 以刀毀(鬲刀), 鬪也. 以口毀人(口鬲), 喝也. 以金毀(金鬲), 鍋也.

94. 英文字首: per- 完整的. perfect 完美的. persist 堅持. pertain 相關的.

中文釋字: 爰, 施以助力. 以手助 (手 爰), 援也. 以細絲 (非粗繩) 相助, 非真心相助 (糸 爰), 緩也. 以火相助 (火 爰), 煖也.

95. 英文字首: post 之後的. postmeridian 下午. postpone 延後. postscript 附註.

中文釋字: 末, 將結束. 以(手 末), 抹也. 最後開的花草 (艸 末), 茱也.

96. 英文字首: pre- 之前的. precaution 小心謹慎. preface 前言. precinct 公安派出所.

中文釋字: 朱, 成長中 (未成熟). 未老的女人 (朱 女), 姝也. 未長高之人 (朱 人), 侏儒也. 小玉 (朱 玉), 珠也.

97. 英文字首: pro- 同意的. proceed 前進. propaganda 宣傳. produce 生產.

中文釋字: 貫, 打洞串起. 以手串起 (手 貫), 攢也. 以心串起 (心 貫), 慣也. 家中多串 (家 貫), 實也.

98. 英文字首: re-再次的. recall 召回. rebuff 駁回. recoup 復原.

中文釋字: 戔, 勇猛, 強壯. 勇踏腳下 (足 戔), 踐也. 以言保證 (言 戔), 譏也. 以金保證 (金 戔), 錢也.

99. 英文字首: se-分離. secede 離去. segregate 隔離. select 選擇.

中文釋字: 叟, 老人. 女老人 (女 叟), 媿也. 病老人 (病 叟), 瘦也. 失禁老人 (水 叟), 溲也.

100. 英文字首: sub- (suc-, suf-, sug-, sum-, sup-, sur-, sus-) 一部分的. substitute 代替. subterranean 地下的. submit 呈上.

中文釋字：龍，有神力之動物。可容龍之小山（阜龍），隴也。可容龍之湖（水龍），瀧也。可容龍之竹器（竹龍），籠也。

101. 英文字首：super- 超越，偉大。superfluous 額外。supervise 監督。superlative 最高級。

中文釋字：辟，免除。走開以免除（走辟），避也。造牆免禍（土壁），壁也。以手擋禍（手辟），擘也。

102. 英文字首：syn- (syl-, sym-, sys-) 系統，同步。synonym 同義詞。synthesis 組合。syllable 音節。

中文釋字：奴，（女）僕人。以口叫僕（口奴），呶也。盡力之奴（奴力），努也。奴以手拿（奴手），拏也。

103. 英文字首：trans- 走（越）過。transact 交易。transatlantic 橫跨大西洋。transfer 轉移。

中文釋字：困，圍綁住。以（手困），捆也。以（心困），惘心。把（木困）起，梱也。

104. 英文字首：ultra- 超出。ultraviolet 紫外線。ultraconservative 太保守。ultrasound 超音波。

中文釋字：因，原由。心思念之因（因心），恩也。以口為源頭（口因），咽也。以水為源（水因），涸也。

105. 英文字首：un- 否定的。unbend 放鬆。untouch 不碰觸。unwanted 不要的。

中文釋字：卯，正確的程序。正式交換財物（卯貝），質也。以釘釘住（金卯），鉤也。可以保住之田（卯田），留也。

106 英文字首：hemi- 一半的。hemisphere

中文釋字：留，保住。保住食物（食留），餹也。大釘子（金留），鎚也。留身之病（病留），瘤也。

107 英文字首：mono- 單調的。monogamy

中文釋字：舌，口中觸食器官。以舌言（言舌），話也。舌覺甘（舌甘），甜也。以手清舌答（手舌），括也。

108 英文字首：proto- 開始的。prototype

中文釋字：孚，可信（靠）的。水中可靠的（水孚），浮也。可靠木船（木孚），桴也。可靠的蛋（卵孚），孵也。

109 英文字首：duo-, du-, dichot- 雙份的。dichotomy, duplex

中文釋字：冬，寒冷（四季之末）。寒冷致病（病冬），疼也。蠶虫至冬（糸冬），終也。冬之虫（冬虫虫），蠹也。

110 英文字尾：-ing 進行式。

中文釋字：東，日出方向。冰在東方（冰東），凍也。向陽木（木東），棟也。向陽山阜（阜東），陳也。

111 英文字尾：-ed 過去式

中文釋字：義，正當的，合規矩的。合規矩的人（人義），儀也。合規矩的車（車義），轆也。有規律的虫（虫義），蟻也。

112 英文字尾：-er 比較式，或表（人）。

中文釋字：重，很沉。力推重（重力），動也。行推重（行重），衝也。沉在艸下（艸重），董也。董事皆在幕後。

113 英文字尾: -est 最高級.

中文釋字: 齊, 均勻, 平等. 平等之人 (人 齊), 儕也. 一起渡水 (水 齊), 濟也. 以手拉平 (手 齊), 擠也.

114 英文字尾: -ly (表) 副詞. 註: 有極少數 -ly 字為形容詞.

中文釋字: 從, 跟隨在後. 以 (足 從), 蹤也. 追尋蛛絲馬跡 (糸 從), 縱也. 只能耳聞 (不能親睹 (從 耳), 聳也.

115 英文字尾: -acity (表) 行為. tenacity 固執. audacity 勇敢的. capacity 有能力的.

中文釋字: 連, 相聯. 以 (金 連), 鏈也. 水波連 (水 連), 漣也. 相連艸 (艸 連), 蓮也.

116 英文字尾: -acy (表) 狀態. celibacy 不婚的. confederacy 聯合的. fallacy 不正確的.

中文釋字: 票, 許可, 指示 (證). 以木指示 (木 票), 標也. 可浮水指標 (水 票), 漂也. 可召來之女 (女 票), 嫖也.

117 英文字尾: -ence, -ance, -ency, -ancy (表) 條件. influence 有影響的. acceptance 可接受的.

中文釋字: 合, 統一. 頭合處 (合 頭), 頷也. 有蓋皿器 (合 皿), 盒也. 將水(管)接合 (水 合), 洽也.

118 英文字尾: -al (表) 條件.

中文釋字: 凶, 危險 (處). 對小兒危險 (凶 儿), 兇也. 包住 (看不見) 之凶 (包 凶), 匈也. 身之要害 (肉 匈), 胸也.

119 英文字尾: -ion (表) 狀態.

中文釋字：亶，祭台（桌）。以土堆之亶（土 亶），壇也。造亶之木（木 亶），檀也。管亶之手（手 亶），擅也。

120 英文字尾：-ment（表）狀態。

中文釋字：嗇，穀倉。存（禾 嗇），穡也。以斤（砍下之木）做嗇（斤 嗇），牆也。依牆花艸（艸 嗇），薈也。

121 英文字尾：-ty（表）狀態。

中文釋字：蜀，（吊著的）虫繭。有虫繭之水（水 蜀），濁也。煮繭之火（火 蜀），燭也。（鳥）口吃繭（口 蜀），噉也。

122 英文字尾：-ure（表）條件。

中文釋字：申，延長出。以口長出（口 申），呻也。以土長出（土 申），坤也。能知未來的指示（示 申），神也。

123 英文字尾：-ism（表）學派。

中文釋字：焦，燒過頭。（心 焦），憔悴也。過頭的看（目 焦），瞧也。燒火木（木 焦），樵也。

124 英文字尾：-mony（表）狀態。

中文釋字：軍，打戰的部隊。（走 軍），運也。行軍之火（火 軍），輝也。烈日下行軍（日 軍），暈也。

125 英文字尾：-ness（表）條件。

中文釋字：皇，君王。見皇心慌（心 皇），惶也。君王出遊（走 皇），遑也。保皇的城池（阜 皇），隍也。

126 英文字尾: -meter (表) 度量.

中文釋字: 共, 一起. 一起喊 (口 共), 哄也. 一起動手 (手 共), 拱也. 同時來水 (水 共), 洪也.

127 英文字尾: -scope (表) 視覺.

中文釋字: 追, 在後趕. 以 (金 追), 鎚也. 以 (手 追), 搥也. 以 (糸 追), 緹也.

128 英文字尾: -cracy (表) 政體.

中文釋字: 正, 上天許可的. (正行為), 征也. 正攻 (擊), 政也 (正當的使用武力). 正敕令, 整 (齊) 也.

129 英文字尾: -graph (表) 書寫.

中文釋字: 寺, 官府. 人在官府 (人 寺), 侍也. 心靠官府 (心 寺), 恃也. 官府文雅之言 (言 寺), 詩也.

130 英文字尾: -ics, -logy (表) 邏輯.

中文釋字: 尚, 喜好的. (尚 衣), 裳也. (尚 貝), 賞也. (尚 巾), 常也.

131 英文字尾: -nomy (表) 學科.

中文釋字: 當, 負責, 扛下. 以 (手 當), 擋也. 以 (木 當), 檔也. 以 (口 當), 嚙也.

132 英文字尾: -al, -ar, -ary, -ic, -id, -ile, -ish, -ory (表) 狀態.

中文釋字: 旬, 十日, 或 (週全). 以死全志 (歹 旬), 殉也. 以言查明全部 (言 旬), 詢也. 十日成竹 (竹 旬), 筍也.

133 英文字尾: -ate, -fic, -ose, -ous, -ulent, 充滿的.

中文釋字: 牟, 取 (拿) 走. 以眼取之 (目 牟), 眸也. 以口取之 (口 牟), 啣也. 以人取之 (人 牟), 侔也.

134 英文字尾: -able, -ible, -ive (表) 能力.

中文釋字: 噪, 吵雜聲. (水 噪), 澡也. 心亂 (心 噪), 燥也. 口吵聲 (口 噪), 噪也.

135 英文字尾: -cle, -el, -il, -let, -cule (表) 數量.

中文釋字: 面, 臉也. 人之臉 (人 面), 面也. 女之臉 (女 面), 媚也. 塗臉之麥粉 (麥面), 麵也.

136 英文字尾: -less 少於 ...

中文釋字: 參, 加入, 偉大. 以手加物 (手 參), 摻也. 以水加物 (水 參), 滲也. 心中有事 (心 參), 慘也.

137 英文字尾: -ate, -fy, -ize, -ise, -ish (表) 動作.

中文釋字: 离, 散 (隔) 開. 隹 (小鳥) 跑散 (离 隹), 離也. 以水沖散 (水 离), 漓也. 把光散開之玉 (玉 离), 璃也.

If you studied this new Chinese etymology, you should have learned 3,000 characters in three months by following the study steps. That is, you should know enough words for reading the newspaper now. Of course, knowing the characters alone might not be enough for you to comprehend the Chinese sentences. The best way is simply doing more reading. In the article “句讀之不知, 何以為文? (<http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/stories-teaching-learning-chinese/topic-t197.html>)”, you will learn some basic grammar about Chinese sentences. And, you will find hundreds of short news articles there, written by the contemporary authors and news reporters from Taiwan. If you are native Chinese, you should read them even more so as many things there will truly surprise you.

“Why Chinese Is So Damn Hard?” is now a hot issue in China. A professor of Chinese language in China asked my opinion on it. I have written a few articles (in Chinese, not in English) to answer him and it is available at <http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/stories-teaching-learning-chinese/topic-t217.html>

「道德經」 (Tao Te Ching) is a very important book in China. At the following site (<http://www.chineselanguageforums.com/tao-te-ching-f23/tao-te-ching-t154.html>), it shows the original Chinese text and the English translation.