BULLETIN OF CHINESE LINGUISTICS

Vol.11　No.1 & 2

CONTENTS

Early Sino-Vietnamese Lexical Data and the Relative Chronology of Tonogenesis in Chinese and Vietnamese

Mark J. Alves
Montgomery College (USA)
mark.alves@montgomerycollege.edu

Abstract

Vietnamese has numerous early-era Chinese loanwords with *ngang* and *huyền* tones, which in Middle Chinese loanwords correspond to the *pingsheng* level tone category, for words that should have *sắc* or *nặng* tones, corresponding to the Middle Chinese non-level *qusheng* departing tone category.[1] It is proposed that this layer of Early Sino-Vietnamese represents borrowing of Chinese words in the period after which Old Chinese had lost final *-s and prior to tonogenesis in Viet-Muong, thus leading to words with the level-tone category when tones emerged in Viet-Muong. This paper provides 60 items of Early Sino-Vietnamese that exemplify this phenomenon of *ngang*/*huyền* tones in *qusheng* words, but also 120 items exemplifying the previously noted reversal of *sắc*/*nặng* and *hỏi*/*ngã* tones between Early Sino-Vietnamese and later Sino-Vietnamese (the formalized readings of Chinese characters). Altogether, this allows for an overall relative chronology of the development of tones in both Sinitic and Vietic.

Keywords

Sino-Vietnamese – Chinese loanwords – tonogenesis

1   Introduction

Haudricourt's (1954b) hypothesis of Vietnamese tonogenesis was that Vietnamese tones could be shown to be associated with former final consonants: in native Vietnamese vocabulary, Proto-Austroasiatic final fricatives *-s/*-h correspond to the Vietnamese *hỏi* and *ngã* tones, while final *-ʔ is associated with the *sắc* and *nặng* tones (see Table 3). He also showed that these tone categories could be seen in Chinese loanwords in Vietnamese (Haudricourt 1954a), which similarly demonstrated a connection between

---

1   The terminology for tones in Vietnamese and Chinese historical phonology create challenges in both presentation and comprehension of the issues, as noted by reviewers of this paper. In general, I refer to tones in native, non- Chinese Vietnamese vocabulary and early Chinese loanwords before tonogenesis in Vietnamese using Vietnamese tone names (*ngang*, *huyền*, *sắc*, *nặng*, *hỏi*, *ngã*), but those in Chinese and later Sino-Vietnamese words, which fully follow Chinese tone patterns, using the Chinese historical phonological terms (*ping*, *shang*, *qu*, *ru*, *yin*, *yang*). It is not simple to keep both systems in mind according to the situation, and I hope the method I have used will be sufficiently clear to readers.

BRILL

Studies in Pyu Phonology, II: Rhymes

Marc Miyake
The British Museum
amritavira@gmail.com

Abstract

The extinct Pyu language was spoken during the first millennium CE and the early millennium CE in what is now Upper Burma. Pyu appears to be Sino-Tibetan on the basis of its basic vocabulary. It survives in inscriptions in an Indic script. This study reconstructs Pyu rhymes on the basis of spellings in those inscriptions and concludes that Pyu was an atonal language with 7 vowels and 18 final consonants. Some previous scholars have interpreted the subscript dots of the Pyu script as tone markers, but this study argues that they indicate fricative initials.

Keywords

Pyu – Sino-Tibetan – phonology – reconstruction – rhymes – tones

1   Introduction[1]

The extinct Pyu language was spoken during the first millennium CE and the early centuries of the second millennium CE in an urban Buddhist civilization located in what is now Upper Burma. On the basis of its basic vocabulary, Pyu appears to be Sino-Tibetan like the Burmese language that began to replace it in the late first millennium CE. Griffiths et al. (2017b) provides the archaeological context for Pyu language studies.

Apart from a few transcriptions in the Chinese script, Pyu survives only in Indic-script inscriptions. Most long texts are on stone and are in poor condition. Few have dates and even fewer have dates in a recognizable system. The most famous Pyu text is the quadrilingual ဂူ‌ေပြာက်ကြီး <gūprok·krīḥ> 'Kubyaukgyi' inscription[2] in Old Burmese, Old Mon, Pali, and Pyu. This 'Rosetta Stone' of Pyu

---

2   This inscription is often anachronistically called မြ‌ေစတီ <mracetī> Myazedi after a temple built centuries later. The inscription is conventionally referred to in the singular, even though it actually consists of two pillars with slightly different copies of the same text.

論現代湘語中的覃談有別及其早期形式的擬測

吳瑞文
中央研究院
ruiwen@gate.sinica.edu.tw

提要

中古咸攝一等有兩類，分別是覃韻和談韻。從漢語音韻史的觀點來看，在唐代初期南人能區分覃談，北人則不分。換言之，覃談有別可以用來區分當時的南北方言。湘語是否區分咸攝一等覃談兩韻，在這個議題上學者之間看法也不一致。本文透過十二種現代湘語方言的考察，探討湘語中覃談兩韻的分合以及音韻對比，並嘗試擬測原始湘語中覃談兩韻的對立。本文一方面參考《切韻》框架進行湘語方言的語音對比，另一方面則從湘語口語詞彙入手，考訂其中存在的覃韻鑑別詞。本文的結論是：1.就語音而言，湘語婁邵片方言保存原始湘語中覃談有別的特徵，長益片及漵浦片則已經合流。2.就詞彙而言，本文歸納出湘語中能夠區分覃談兩韻的四個覃韻鑑別詞「墈函佫罯」。這四個口語詞彙在各湘語方言中或多或少保存。3.從歷史的觀點來看，共同湘語（proto Xiang）的覃韻見影系韻母可以構擬為*-oN/*-oʔ，而談韻見影系韻母則可以構擬為*-ɑN/*-ɑʔ。這顯示湘語局部地保留覃談兩韻的區別。就演變而言，原始湘語中的*-oN/*-oʔ韻母有元音分裂（vowel breaking）的傾向，因此在現代湘語方言中反映的形式多半為-uẽ、-uɛ̃、-ua、-ue等。

關鍵詞

湘語、重韻、覃談有別、比較方法、歷史語言學

1 前言[1]

以《切韻》為代表的中古音，有所謂「重韻」的對立。所謂「重韻」，係指同攝同一等第有兩個或兩個以上不同的音類，例如蟹攝一等哈泰、止攝三等支脂之微、遇攝三等魚虞等。觀察現代漢語方言是否存在重韻的區別，對於理解漢語方言及漢語音韻史是相當重要的，其重要性可以從兩方面來申述。首先，就現代漢語方言而言，觀察重韻的分合可以建立現代方言與早期漢語在時間與空間上的聯繫。其次，就漢語音韻史而言，現代方言重韻上的語音表現有助於我們理解早期系統中若干音類的實質內涵，進而構擬具體音值。

What is Kiranti?

A Critical Account

Pascal Gerber
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Bern
pascal.gerber@isw.unibe.ch

Selin Grollmann
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Bern
selin.grollmann@isw.unibe.ch

Abstract

This paper challenges the conventional views on the phylogeny of the bundle of languages of Eastern Nepal subsumed under the name 'Kiranti'. Contrary to the widespread belief that the group constitutes a stable, monophyletic subgroup of the Trans-Himalayan language family, the empirical evidence for the coherence of a Kiranti branch is remarkably limited. Additionally, the internal structure of the alleged Kiranti branch is to a large degree unclarified, despite a number of contributions to this topic. This paper aims to critically review the different subgrouping proposals and the potential shared innovations defining a coherent Kiranti subgroup within Trans-Himalayan. Furthermore, it will be shown that certain languages outside the Kiranti speaking area may be more closely related to certain Kiranti languages than those are to other Kiranti languages. The Kiranti branch constitutes a largely unsubstantiated subgroup and its phylogenetic coherence should not be taken for granted in work on Trans-Himalayan historical linguistics.

Keywords

Kiranti – historical-comparative linguistics – shared innovations – phylogeny – internal classification – Trans-Himalayan

1   Introduction

The Kiranti languages are a group of Trans-Himalayan (also known as Tibeto-Burman or Sino-Tibetan) languages spoken in the Himalayan foothills of eastern Nepal in the region historically known as Kirã̄t or Kirāt (किराँत or किरात). The group includes approximately 30 languages. Table 1 presents a geographical list of Kiranti languages with the corresponding classificatory schemes by Michailovsky (1994), van Driem (2001), Opgenort (2005, 2011) and Bickel/Gaenszle (2015).[1]

---

1   The list represents the geographical distribution from West (Hayu) to East (Limbu). The letters in the columns indicate the phylogenetic classification as assumed by the respective author. The symbol > indicates a subgrouping proposition, e.g. *W>N*