

CONTENTS

Portrait of the Late Professor Li Fang-Kuei (1902-1987)

Introduction

- i Preface
發刊詞

Articles

- 1 論《切韻》四等韻介音有無的問題
(On the Medial *-i-* in *Qieyun* Division IV Finals)
丁邦新 (Pang-Hsin Ting)
- 15 關於輕唇音產生的幾個問題 (Some Problems on the
Emergence of Dentilabialization)
平山久雄 (Hisao Hirayama)
- 27 《唐蕃會盟碑》中的地名「將軍谷」(The Place Name “Jiangjun
Yu” in the Inscription of the Sino-Tibetan Treaty of 821-822)
梅祖麟 (Tsu-Lin Mei)
- 37 從上古到中古音韻演變的大要 (Phonological Development
from Old Chinese to Middle Chinese: An Outline)
何大安 (Dah-an Ho)
- 47 關於方言語音歷史層次的研究 (On the Study of Strata in the
Phonological History of Dialects)
李如龍 (Rulong Li)
- 61 The Graph 日 for the Word “Time” in the Shang Oracle-Bone
Inscriptions (論甲骨文之「日」字)
Ken-ichi Takashima (高嶋謙一)
- 81 Syllabic Nasals in the Chinese Dialects (漢語方言裡的成音節
鼻音)
Zhongwei Shen (沈鍾偉)
- 109 Fission Reduplication in Modern Chinese Dialects (現代漢語方
言中的裂變重疊)
Jingtao Sun (孫景濤)

- 133 Miin Animal Body Parts (閩方言的動物身體部位詞語)
Jerry Norman (羅杰瑞)
- 145 Convergence Testing in Common Sound Systems of the Yangtze
Watershed (長江流域漢語方言共同音系中趨同現象的檢測)
W. South Coblin (柯蔚南)
- 171 One Language, Two Systems: A Phonological Study of Two
Cantonese Language Manuals of 1888 (一語兩制：1888年兩本
粵語教科書的語音研究)
Hung-Nin Samuel Cheung (張洪年)
- 201 Syntactic Typology in Chinese (Part 1): The Neutral Question
Forms—V-not-V (漢語句法類型學 (第一部分)：中性問形
式——V-not-V)
Anne O. Yue (余靄芹)
- 255 漢語與苗瑤語同源關係的檢討 (The Sino-Miao-Yao
Relationship Revisited)
龔煌城 (Hwang-cherng Gong)
- About Li Fang-Kuei
- 271 在一個涼爽的地方……
李林德 (Lindy Li Mark)
- 285 Vignettes of His Life
Peter Li (李培德)
- Appendices
- 293 Appendix I: 李方桂語言學論著獎申請辦法
- 294 Appendix II: 紀念李方桂先生中國語言學研究學會的公開信
Letter from the Li Fang-Kuei Society for Chinese Linguistics
- 298 Appendix III: Linguistic Change and the Chinese Dialects — An
International Symposium Dedicated to the Memory of the Late
Professor Li Fang-Kuei (語言變化與漢語方言——紀念李方桂
先生國際學術研討會)
- 299 Appendix IV: An International Symposium on the Historical
Aspects of the Chinese Language Commemorating the
Centennial Birthday of the Late Professor Li Fang-Kuei (紀念
李方桂先生誕辰一百周年漢語史國際學術研討會)

論《切韻》四等韻介音有無的問題*

丁邦新

柏克萊加州大學 香港科技大學

0. 引言

《切韻》四等韻有沒有介音是一個老問題，從高本漢 (1915-26, 1940:473) 認為四等韻有一個強的元音性的 -i- 之後，趙元任 (1940:213) 就說四等韻的開頭有一個低而開的 -i-，贊成的如周法高 (1948:216)、董同龢 (1954:98)，反對的如陸志韋 (1947:20)、李榮 (1956:112)、邵榮芬 (1982:126)。反對的理由之一是梵漢對音中漢語的四等字對梵文的 -e-，但劉廣和 (2002) 也根據梵漢對音卻認為從漢代到唐代四等字一直就有 -i- 介音。尉遲治平 (2002) 從隋唐詩文用韻證明四等韻也有 -i-。我在討論重紐的文章中 (1997:51) 曾經提出四等韻有介音 -i- 的想法，現在希望作一個徹底的梳理。

1. 四等韻合口音的演變

《切韻》中只有八個韻是四等韻：齊、先、蕭、青、添，跟先、青、添相配的入聲韻則是：屑、錫、帖。這些韻的字有的有開合口之分，有的只有開口，它們的分佈並不相同：

	齊	先	青	蕭	添	屑	錫	帖
開口：	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
合口：	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	-

蕭、添、帖三韻並沒有合口字，主要的原因是蕭韻收 -u 尾，添韻收 -m 尾，

* 本文在付印前承龔煌城兄指正數處，在此致謝！

關於輕唇音產生的幾個問題*

平山久雄
東京大學

1. 輕唇音產生的條件

1.1 切韻音系沒有輕唇音，輕唇音非母/f/、敷母/f^h/、奉母/v/、微母/mj/ (>/v/) 從唇音（重唇音）幫母/p/、滂母/p^h/、並母/b/、明母/m/的分化，是唐代發生的一項重要的音位變化。

按照高本漢（1940）的擬音，切韻音系的唇音聲母在下列各韻中後來變為輕唇音（舉平聲韻目以賅與之相配的仄聲韻）：

東≡iung，鍾i^wong，微^wei，虞iu，廢i^wei，文iuən，元i^wen，陽i^wang，
尤iəu，凡i^wem

高本漢（1940:417）認為，唇音聲母變為輕唇音必須具備下面兩個條件：

a) 聲母j化；b) 合口，即聲母後面隨著一個u(或^w)音。

高本漢把大部分唇牙喉音聲母以及來母分為不j化的和j化的兩種，這是根據《廣韻》裡代表這些字母的反切上字各分兩類，例如見母的反切上字分為「古」、「公」、「工」等與「居」、「舉」、「九」等，前一類主要用來切一等、二等和「四」等（即「純四等」）字，後一類主要用來切三等字。基於這種分用現象，高本漢認為：這些聲母在三等介音i前面是j化的，如pj, kj, lj等，因此反切作者給三等字注音時特地選擇了同樣屬三等的反切上字來表示其j化特徵。

不過，對高本漢這一看法，多數學者並未贊同，這是因為：j化與不j化兩種

* 本文係對平山久雄（1967）加以刪節和增補，並用中文改寫而成的。

《唐蕃會盟碑》中的地名「將軍谷」*

梅祖麟

康奈爾大學

1.

「谷」字在《廣韻》裡有三種讀音：

- 甲、古祿切。山谷，亦善也，窮也，又姓，漢有谷永，又欲、鹿二音。
- 乙、余蜀切。山谷。爾雅曰水注谿曰谷，說文曰泉出通川爲谷，亦虜三字姓吐谷渾氏，又音穀。
- 丙、盧谷切。漢書匈奴傳有谷蠡王，蠡音離。

唐寫本《唐韻》殘卷（蔣斧舊藏）¹ 已是這樣。此書入聲卅四韻以下載有：

- 甲'、「穀，古鹿反」下列「谷。山谷。亦養也，窮也，又姓，漢有谷永，又欲、鹿二音。」
- 乙'、「欲，余蜀反」下列「谷。山谷。又音穀。」
- 丙'、「祿，盧谷反」下列「谷。漢匈奴傳有谷蠡王，蠡音離加。」

據周祖謨（1983:912）考證，

唐寫本《唐韻》殘卷：書中去聲「翰」韻「旦」字避睿宗諱缺筆作「旦」，入聲「職」韻「郎」字注「新郟縣在豫州」，「豫」字避代宗諱缺末兩筆作「豫」，代宗以後帝名都不避諱，據此推測此書可能寫於代

* 本文寫作期間，蔣紹愚告知北方有帶「峪」的地名，鄭張尙芳告知「將軍谷」的資料。謹此向兩位先生表示衷心的感謝。

¹ 周祖謨編《唐五代韻書集存》下冊 641-729 頁是《唐韻殘卷》（蔣斧印本）的影印本。

從上古到中古音韻演變的大要*

何大安

中央研究院

從上古到中古音韻演變的大要有三：聲母簡化、韻部重組、調別趨嚴。現在分別解說如下。

首先是聲母簡化。

上古聲母結合型態豐富，除了一般常見的單聲母之外，還有帶 **h**-聲母（或清響音聲母）、帶 **-l**-聲母、帶 **-r(j)**-聲母、帶 **s**-聲母，以及帶 **-w**-聲母（或圓唇聲母）。¹ 中古則只有單聲母一種。上古單聲母到了中古，有的原封不動，有的發生了發音部位或發音方法上的變化，如捲舌化、顎化、展唇化，或甚至弱化而消失。除了消失的不計外，基本上變化的結果仍是單聲母。表一是單聲母和帶 **-r(j)**-聲母的演變情形。²

表一 上古單聲母與帶 **-r(j)**-聲母演變表

	p ph b m	t th d n	k kh g ŋ	ts tsh dz s	? h ɣ	r l
-V	p ph b m	t th d n	k kh ɣ ŋ	ts tsh dz s	? h ɣ	l Ø
-r(j)V	p ph b m	ʈ ʈh ɖ ɳ	k kh ɣ ŋ	tʂ tʂh dʒ ʂ	? h ɣ	- Ø
-jV	p ph b m	tʃ tʃh dʒ ʒ	k kh g ŋ	ts tsh dz s	? h ɣ	l dʒ/ʒ
-iV	p ph b m	t th d n	k kh ɣ ŋ	ts tsh dz s	? h ɣ	l Ø

上古帶 **h**-聲母、帶 **-l**-聲母、帶 **s**-聲母，以及帶 **-w**-聲母的演變，則傾向於

* 本文初稿曾承審查人及丁邦新師惠賜修改建議，並指示應該繼續探討的問題，十分感謝。

¹ 其中帶 **-r**-聲母，因為與中古以後二等韻的形成關係密切，也可以看成是單聲母在 **-rV** 前分佈的一種，與單聲母在 **-jV** 前的分佈同類。

² 表中第一橫列為上古聲母，方左第一直欄為韻母類型，其他則為中古聲母。本文上古、中古聲母擬音依據李方桂（1971）、Ting（1980）、龔煌城（2002）而稍有折衷，細節不贅，請讀者自行檢看。

關於方言語音歷史層次的研究

李如龍

廈門大學

關於漢語方言語音的歷史層次，已經引起了越來越多的學者的關注。漢語方言大多有千年以上的歷史，各種方言的形成和發展都有自己獨特的過程。造成這些不同的過程、形成不同的特點的因素是多方面的。從社會外部因素說，形成的時代不同、移民的來源地不同、經過的地區不同、融合的民族不同，以及由於人口多少、分佈地域大小、經濟文化發展程度的高低、歷史演變過程的複雜性的不同等等，都會影響方言語音的層次構成。從語言的內部因素說，方言受不同時代通語的制約度不同，方言自身演變速度不同，相處的周邊方言和語言不同，接觸中所受的影響度也不同，作為現代的共時結構系統，不同的方言有不同的整合力，語音演變與詞彙、語法的演變之間的相互作用力也不同（例如詞義延伸是否引起字音的異讀，詞的多音化與語法化是否造成音值的變異和音類的分合）等等。這些因素則是影響方言語音歷史層次不同表現的更直接的因素。

由於這些內外因素的差異，不同方言的語音歷史層次的形成往往有各種不同的類型，有的單純、層次少，有的複雜、層次多；不同的層次的構成也往往有不同的方式，有的相互取代和覆蓋，有的相互疊置和共存。可見，研究方言語音的歷史層次不能從單一的視角出發，例如只與上古音、中古音作比較，只參照通語不參照方言和外族語言；也不能用單一的模式作分析，例如就語音論語音，只考慮歷時演變不考慮共時整合。本文試就這些問題聯繫閩方言的事實提出若干看法，求證於方家。

1. 縱向發展與橫向變化

應該說，任何語言的演變都有兩種動因，一是同一種語言的自身的流變，一是不同語言的接觸造成的外來影響。前者是必有的動因，經常是起主要作用的，後者的作用有大有小，但卻是不容忽視、不可漠視的。就漢語方言說，民族遷徙中往往有不同民族的融合，移民形成新方言時常常有經停地，形成方言之後也不

The Graph 日 for the Word “Time” in Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions*

Ken-ichi Takashima
University of British Columbia

1. Introduction

It is a standard interpretation among *jiaguwen* 甲骨文 specialists to interpret the graph 日 (日) as expressing the words “sun” and “day.” For example, the determiner phrases 出日 ‘rising sun’ and 入日 ‘setting sun’ contain 日 used in the former sense, whereas 今日 ‘present day’ and 之日 ‘that day’ have the same 日 used in the latter sense. It goes without saying that many languages in the world have this sort of polysemy. Japanese word *hi* 日, for instance, means “fire”, as well as “sun” and “day.”¹ This paper proposes that in *jiaguwen* the graph 日 (日) also stands for the word *shi* 時 ‘time’ in certain specific contexts. This is in addition to “sun” and “day” mentioned above. Thus the trisemic Japanese *hi* is matched with the trisemic Chinese *ri*, though they depart in the sense of “fire” in Japanese and “time” in Shang Chinese.

The pronunciation of “sun” and that of “day” must have been identical in earlier historical periods as it is in modern times. The Old Chinese (abbreviated hereinafter as OC) as reconstructed by Li Fang-kuei (1971) and by William Baxter (1992) show the

* This is a revised version of the paper originally presented at the International Conference on the Processing of and Research on Historical Chinese Characters (中國歷史漢字整理與研究國際學術研討會) held at East China Normal University 華東師範大學 in Shanghai, 12-14 December, 2003. I wish to thank all those who commented on the paper at the conference or on other occasions, including Huang Dekuan 黃德寬, Yu Suisheng 喻遂生, Li Lingpu 李玲璞, Christian Schwermann, Françoise Bottéro, and Zev Handel.

¹ The common etymon linking the three words could well be “heat,” although Horii (1988:208) thinks that it is related to what he calls abstract-concept word *hiru* ‘daytime’ in which the syllable *hi*, according to Horii, indicates the passage of time. This is possible and might eventually be shown to have a similar etymological parallel with the Chinese word *shi*/**djæg(x)*, though it should be mentioned that classical Japanese word meaning “to pass (through time)” is *fu* going back to **pu*, and *hi* going back to **pi* (category “B”). Horii also raises the possibility that it is related to Korean *hæ* (<**hi*) ‘sun’. Unfortunately, more reliable etymologies such as Yoshida (1976) does not deal with this etymology.

Syllabic Nasals in Chinese Dialects

Zhongwei Shen

University of Massachusetts Amherst

1. Introduction

In historical linguistics, there is a famous slogan, “Every word has its own history.” (Gilliéron 1915, Schuchardt 1917, quoted from Lehmann 1992) It should be also true that every isogloss has its history. Isoglosses (boundaries of linguistic features) are often used in dialect classification (Hock 1986, Anttila 1989, Lehmann 1992). If the classification is synchronic, all isoglosses are equally important. But if we are interested in the diachronic aspect of the dialects, some are clearly more informative than others. Unique relics, such as structurally rare but wide spread sound changes, are particularly fundamental for assessing the historical relationship of dialects.

As a clear contrast to northern Mandarin dialects, in many southern Chinese dialects a single nasal consonant can form a syllable by itself. Examples include 畝 ‘acre’ [m³¹] in the Suzhou dialect, 你 ‘you’ [n²¹³] in the Nanchang dialect, and 五 ‘five’ [ŋ²³] in the Guangzhou dialect (*Hanyu Fangyin Zihui* 1989, hereafter HFZ). In terms of syllable structure, syllabic nasals are unusual and violate the basic constraints for a well-formed Chinese syllable, which requires an obligatory nucleus vowel. But interestingly, such peculiar syllables are in wide existence in the colloquial layer of central and southern dialects. If we can show that the syllabic nasals in different areas are the results of the same historical change, their isoglosses should provide us with valuable information about the relationships and boundaries of Chinese dialects in history. In this paper we conduct a cross-dialect examination of the syllabic nasals. Through the analyses, we hope to show that the historical sources and geographical distributions can shed some light on our understanding of dialectal relationships in history.

Linguistic similarities are due to various reasons, including chance, common inheritance, borrowing, and language universals (Comrie 1981:194). However, a distinction must be made for similarities due to common inheritance. Inheritance similarity can be the result of both **shared retention** and **shared innovation** (Hoenigswald 1990, Fox 1995). Shared retention and shared innovation do not provide

Fission Reduplication in Modern Chinese Dialects*

Jingtao Sun

The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology

1. Introduction

There is a common phenomenon in Chinese, from Old Chinese down through modern dialects, in which a monosyllabic word phonologically and semantically corresponds to a disyllabic word. Here are three examples from the Xin'an 新安 dialect: 1) $tjəw^{33}$ 丟 'carry, lift'¹ \leftrightarrow $tj^{33} ləw^0$ 'lift (something to throw it away), detain'; 2) $təjəw^{33}$ 焦 'coke, burned things'; \leftrightarrow $təj^{33} ləw^0$ 'dregs of fat'; 3) $xuŋ^{53}$ 哄 'fool, humbug' \leftrightarrow $xu^{53} luŋ^0$ 'fool, palm something off on'.² Scholars have been interested in this phenomenon for a long time, and they have identified many instances of it through history. Over the past several decades, the research on this phenomenon has progressed, not only in data collection, but also in attempts to account for the phenomenon. In my previous paper (Sun 2004), I dealt with the case in Old Chinese. The present paper aims at investigating and analyzing the same phenomenon in modern Chinese dialects. There are three objectives in this paper: the first is to analyze the data collected from modern Chinese dialects to explore the nature of this phenomenon; the second is to develop a generative theory of morpho-phonological interaction to account for the formation of this reduplication pattern, and the third is to make a comparison across modern dialects with respect to the form alternation.

2. The establishment of fission reduplication

The phenomenon under discussion is actually related to a type of reduplication that I

* This paper is one of the results of my project "Fission reduplication in modern Chinese dialects", supported by the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Project no.: DAG03/04.HSS01). I would like to thank Zev Handel and Douglas Whitehead for their checking over the English of this paper. Errors that remain are of course my own responsibility.

¹ This usage of 丟 can also be found in the Xiaoyi 孝義 dialect. See *Hanyu fangyan dacidian* [漢語方言大詞典] Vol. 2, P.2002.

² All data in this paper come from my fieldwork except where otherwise noted.

Miin Animal Body Parts

Jerry Norman

University of Washington

1. Introduction

The present note is an exploration of a small set of the Miin lexicon – animal body parts. Some of these terms are phonologically quite straightforward; others present interesting semantic and phonological problems. This study will be principally based on the following documented dialects: Fwujou 福州 (Feng 1998), Shiahmen 廈門 (Jou 1993, Douglas 1899), Chaurjou 潮州 (Tsay 1976—Tsay's work is based on the dialect of Jieyang 揭陽), Jangpyng 漳平 (Jang 1992), Jiann'ou 建甌 (Lii and Pan 1998), Jiannyang 建陽 (Norman 1969, supplemented by the author's field notes), Jennchyan (Norman 1996, supplemented by the author's field notes); in addition forms from Miindong 閩東 dialect of Muhyang 穆陽 are cited from personal field notes made in 1971 in Tairbeei; Muhyang is very similar to the Fwuan 福安 material found in the Spanish-Fwuan dictionary of Ibañez (1941-1943).

There is much overlap among human body parts and those of animals. For the most part I limit myself to body parts associated only with animals – mammals, birds and fish. The exceptions are FUR/FEATHER and MEAT. Both are as commonly associated with animals as with humans and both illustrate interesting phonological traits.

Miin dialects can broadly be divided into Eastern Miin (EM) and Western Miin (WM). Eastern Miin can be further divided into Northeastern Miin (NEM) and Southern Miin (SM).

Reconstructions are given in a revised version of earlier attempts (Norman 1973, 1974, 1981).

2. Mammal body parts

2.1 FUR/FEATHER Common Miin (CM) **mhɔ*² [毛]

As in many Chinese dialects, the words for FUR and FEATHER are not

Convergence Testing in Common Sound Systems of the Yangtze Watershed

W. South Coblin
University of Iowa

1. Introduction

In the field of historical linguistics, phonological reconstruction is pursued using two different tools, i.e., the comparative method and the method of internal reconstruction. It is only the first of these that can be practically applied in Chinese.

The comparative method takes as its premise an hierarchical or family tree model for the development of language. Certain languages are assumed to have evolved from a single, common source, now no longer extant. The sound systems of the derivative languages are then systematically compared, resulting in a common system from which the development of all the derivative systems can be accounted for by the application of rules effecting changes on the common system. To some, the common system is merely a summa of relationships between the derivative systems. For others, the common system has at least some degree of historical reality. The latter group customarily call the common system a “proto-system”. The comparative method is generally viewed as the central tool for the reconstructive study of historical phonology.¹ It has a venerable history of nearly two centuries, and the techniques for its application are well established. It is taught as a conventional *modus operandi* in historical linguistics courses, where textbooks, often accompanied by exercises and workbooks, present it to students as a formalized series of methods and procedures.

All this notwithstanding, as an historical linguistic tool the comparative method has long been subject to controversy. This is because of its very dependence on the family tree model, which fails to account for a major and universally acknowledged factor in linguistic evolution, i.e., convergence through language contact. A common system has by definition been constructed on the basis of actually existing later systems, and those systems will inevitably have developed through a combination of events. In part, they

¹ Wherever possible, it must be used in concert with the method of internal reconstruction. This method is not of concern to us in the present discussion.

One Language, Two Systems: A Phonological Study of Two Cantonese Language Manuals of 1888*

Hung-nin Samuel Cheung
The Chinese University of Hong Kong

1. Introduction

Any historical investigation begins with data. Data tell of the past by betraying secrets of change; they also help us gauge the direction of these changes and reconstruct the patterns in which the changes have taken place. Data, however, could also be misleading. Historical linguistics resorts to both modern idioms and ancient documents in its efforts to examine how languages evolve over time and to account for differentiation and assimilation between languages and language communities. Chinese, not being a phonetic language, is known for its inadequacy in capturing sounds or sound changes in its orthographic system. Early writings in dialects other than Mandarin were scarce, and the scarcity is even more pronounced in Cantonese. Unlike the Wu and Min dialects which saw some productions of fiction and drama in regional speech in as early as the 16th century,¹ the earliest extant work in Cantonese is a collection of folksongs that dates back to the early 19th century.² However, because of their composite style of mixing the vernacular with the classical, the songs do not necessarily reveal much about the actual happenings in the language. It wasn't until the twentieth century, thanks to radio recordings and movie productions especially in Hong Kong that colloquial Cantonese was recorded and preserved in its full gamut of styles

* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 13th Annual Meeting of the International Association for Chinese Linguistics, Leiden, 2005. The study was supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, HKUST/CUHK6055/02H.

¹ For example, the earliest extant material for the Min dialect is *荔鏡記*, a drama composed in the 16th century. 馮夢龍 (1574-1646) compiled a collection of folksongs, entitled *山歌*, written in a colloquial Wu dialect.

² *粵謳* was a collection of close to a hundred Cantonese love songs produced by 招子庸 in 1828.

Syntactic Typology in Chinese (Part I): The Neutral Question Forms—V-not-V *

Anne O. Yue

University of Washington

1. Introduction

Typology is concerned with the classification of types of structures observed in human languages, be they phonological, morphological or syntactic. The goal of a typological study is to observe divergence and similarity in patterning for certain structures, their distribution and their possible correlation with other attributes. On the basis of such patterning typological classification of languages can be made. Although such classification of patterns does not necessarily constitute a genetic relationship among the languages sharing these traits, such shared formal features commonly occur in either genetically related or areally close languages. The significance of a typological study may shed light on the question of language universals, while dialectology can provide the necessary data for a typological study. From typological research, formal features across languages are observed and classified, creating a massive database for identifying and establishing linguistic characteristics common across languages. Greenberg's study on word order on the sentence and on the phrase level across some thirty languages has led to his formulation of language universals concerning not only the types of word order such as SVO, SOV, VSO, etc. but also the relationship of this

* A rough sketch of the first draft of this paper, entitled "Syntactic typology in Sino-Tibetan – A beginning," was presented at the 25th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics at the University of California, Berkeley, October 14-18, 1992. It constituted part of Yue-Hashimoto 1993a and was based on research supported by the National Endowment for the Humanities grants No. RO-21696-88 and RO-22-33-90 as well as by the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange (1990-92) for Comparative Chinese Dialectal Grammar. I am deeply indebted to the late Professor Zhu Dexi 朱德熙 for serving as consultant to these two research projects and for arranging for colleagues in China to assist in field work on many dialects. To all of these colleagues, especially Zhang Min, who enthusiastically investigated the greatest number of dialects, and the native speakers of the various dialects I owe my gratitude. I would also like to thank the two reviewers of the present paper for their valuable suggestions. For what appears here, I am solely responsible.

漢語與苗瑤語同源關係的檢討

龔煌城

中央研究院

1. 引言

漢語與苗瑤語之間存在相當數量的音義相似的詞彙，這些語詞究竟是同源詞還是借詞，乃是決定漢語與苗瑤語是否屬於同一語支的關鍵。本文針對此一問題，將過去學者研究漢語與苗瑤語的系屬關係所提出的「同源詞」，加以收集；另一方面也直接從苗瑤語的語料中收集了苗瑤語與漢語音義都接近的詞彙，加以分類整理，並且從原始漢藏語音韻系統的觀點，參照確實可靠的漢語與藏緬語之間的同源詞，重新加以檢討，以了解其真正的性質。

過去學者所作的漢語與苗瑤語的比較研究，主要都是將漢語與個別的幾個苗語與瑤語加以比較，而都未把構擬的原始苗瑤語包含進去，直到陳其光（2001）才將他自己所構擬的原始苗瑤語與漢語上古音比較。另一方面，過去的比較研究幾乎都是僅僅比較漢語與苗瑤語，而從未把藏緬語同源詞也同時放進去加以考量。本文將過去學者所提出的漢語與苗瑤語的同源詞（特別是陳其光、李永燧 1980, 1981；王輔世 1986；陳其光 1990, 2001 等）及本文所收集的漢語與苗瑤語音義接近的詞彙，改寫成王輔世、毛宗武（1995）所構擬的原始苗瑤語，在必要時並加上作者認為可靠的、相關的漢語與藏緬語的同源詞（Gong 1995；龔 2000, 2001, 2003）作比較檢討，發現下面幾個現象。

2. 漢語與苗瑤語的關係詞

2.1 漢語與藏緬語的同源詞與漢語與苗瑤語的相關語詞之間很少有共同性。漢語與藏緬語的同源詞包含很多基本辭彙，但是這些詞彙在苗瑤語都很少有關係詞。例如：