Book Review: The Roots of Old Chinese

Axel Schuessler
Wartburg College

Sagart's very topic, Old Chinese morphology, is controversial. The monosyllabic nature of Chinese makes morphological derivational mechanisms far from self-evident, and an Old Chinese (OC) reconstructed monosyllable, even with an initial consonant cluster, is so compact that some skeptical linguists reject the idea of segmental morphology in OC as a matter of principle. Others approach Chinese like any other natural human language on the premise that it is impossible to conceive of a language whose lexicon is a heap of thousands, tens of thousands, of individual words which cannot be genetically grouped and reduced to a more manageable and intelligible number of etyma and roots. One's attitude correlates rather transparently with one's native language. Thus it was the French scholar Maspero who pioneered the inquiry into OC segmental morphology, particularly prefixes, and Haudricourt who suggested that tones derive from earlier syllable final segmental phonemes which could have morphological functions.

In the book under review, Sagart continues in this tradition. The work is to some extent a synthesis of proposals which he published in recent years in articles and conference papers. The body of the text (29 chapters) is followed by lists and indices: a list of references (216-232); Appendix A: Chinese chronology (i.e. Table 29) on p.233; Appendix B: A convenient list of Sagart's Old Chinese (OC) reconstructions (235-242); index of Chinese characters (243-249); and a general index (250-255). The indices are a bit off, e.g. for qī 妻 the character index refers to pp.171, 172, but in reality the occurrences are on pp.173-174; or 'Han river' in the general index refers the reader to p.178, but apparently the occurrence on p.176 was intended.

S sets himself a threefold task (p.4): (a) identify OC affixal processes and their functions, and (b) integrate the understanding of the OC affixal morphology into a

coherent system of phonological reconstruction (discussions throughout chs. 1-14); (c) illustrate and test his ideas through a series of etymological studies; these are grouped according to subject matter such as 'Body parts', 'Agriculture: Cereals', 'Metals', 'Writing'. The proposals should 'be judged…for their explanatory power within Chinese' (p.4), therefore he leaves aside here the question of Chinese's kinship to other languages (such as Tibeto-Burman (TB), Austronesian (AN)). Nevertheless, other languages are sometimes invoked in the discussions. Thus the major practical values of this work are (1) S's presentation of his own OC reconstructions which can be conveniently look up on pp.235-249; and (2) a wealth of proposed OC etymologies (chs. 15-29).

This reviewer is sympathetic the S's inquiry and approach and believes that S's quest for Chinese morphology is a legitimate one. What makes this work especially interesting is S's inclusion of extensive data and evidence from modern dialects which he attempts to integrate with hypotheses on historical phonology and morphology into a diachronically coherent picture of Chinese. Also, he makes important observations relating to OC phonological reconstruction. However, any such work is based on premises which cannot escape some measure of subjectivity and which are open to question. This review will discuss several issues, including assumptions which underlie OC reconstructions as well as etymology, and how they necessarily color any investigator's conclusions. S is known for his often unconventional conclusions to which his careful research leads him. We will discuss in some detail several of S's proposed etymologies in order to understand how he arrives at his hypothese.

The definition of a root is instrumental for the understanding of morphology and even of phonological reconstruction. In Indo-European (IE) studies, Benveniste's hypothesis that the IE root had a CVC structure has contributed to the understanding of certain irregularities in verbal morphology, but also to the understanding and reconstruction of IE laryngeal phonemes. So far, investigations into OC morphology have lacked a precise definition of a 'root' (i.e. 'unaffixed bases', p.14), and hence of a 'morpheme'. In this regard, S's hypothesis is a significant contribution to the study of Chinese morphology. His formula for a root is $C^1V(C^2)(?)$ (p.20f). Thus a root has only one initial consonant which means all initial clusters in OC words are due either to prefixes or to the infix *r, although S grants that it is entirely possible that one day there might be evidence for initial clusters in roots (p.23). He apparently prefers for the time being to leave potential candidates for such clusters unexplained (see 'dog' below).

A possible etymology should satisfy a number of criteria, according to S. The first among them is the reconstruction of the OC 'pronunciation' which should evolve regularly into MC (p.139). By 'pronunciation' he obviously means phonemic reconstruction. Offering his own OC reconstruction is one of the major objectives of

S's work, as we have already seen. OC is reconstructed on basis of MC, of phonetic series (xié-shēng 諧聲=XS), and of Shijing rimes. A growing number of investigators believe that Baxter's OC, or something close to it, is the most plausible system which S takes as a point of departure. (Regrettably, S quotes Middle Chinese (MC) forms not in the Karlgren/Li transcription which is widely used for reference, but in Baxter's orthography in which concessions have been made to accommodate a computer or the keyboard of an American typewriter. Sometimes the phonetic value of the symbols cannot be easily guessed, e.g. the difference between sy- and sj-, or what in Baxter's transcription might correspond to the conventional MC vowels a, â and ă).

In ch. 3, S discusses the differences between his OC reconstruction and that of others (Pulleyblank, Starostin, mostly Baxter). He follows Bodman and Baxter in distinguishing between phonetic series with OC initial dental stops and OC lateral *l-. However, he considers all MC ji- to come from OC *l-; there is no initial OC *j- > MC ji- in his system. Concerning the MC div. 3 'medial j', S has made the interesting observation that phonetic series in which velar or labial initials co-occur with MC l-, are segregated into those with only div. 1/4 and div. 2 rimes after the velar or labial, or only div. 3 after velar or labial initial (p.44-49). S suggests that irregular behavior of l-initial words in such series is due to the loss of a prefix. After considering theories on the yod/non-yod phenomena, S concludes that none of the ones currently available present a satisfactory explanation for the totality of the evidence. Therefore, for the time being, S symbolizes OC > MC div. 1/4 syllables with a superscript 'a', OC > MC div. 3 syllables with a superscript 'b' (I will omit these superscript letters in these pages, for they are predictable on the basis of MC).

Particularly interesting is his discussion concerning the MC rimes -juŋ, -juk after labial and labiovelar initials (p.57-61). So far, OC systems derive MC rimes -juk (as in fú 福/pjuk) almost completely from the OC rime *-ək (MC pjuk < *pjək) which has been reconstructed on the basis of Shijing rimes and XS, yet there is no OC syllable of the type *puk. S suggests that here the MC forms go back to such syllables as *puk, while the early Zhou dialect of the Shijing and bronze inscriptions dissimilated the rounded vowel to *ə. The same would hold for words like jiù 舊 'old'/OCBaxter *gʷjiʔ, or niú 牛/OCBaxter *ŋʷɨ 'cow', gōng 弓/OC *kwəŋ 'bow' or mèng 夢/OC *məŋ 'dream' which in the Shijing rime with words which are reconstructed with *ə, such as zhī 之/*tjə etc., while the strain of Chinese which is reflected in later MC retained the original rounded vowels such as OCS (OCS = Old Chinese - Sagart) *gʷuʔ 'old', OCS*ŋʷu 'cow' etc. (The TB and Tai forms like ŋua for 'cow' are loans from late OC: p.193). S who is concerned with empirical methodology which can 'falsify' theories points out that Behr's statistical study of these rimes confirms these patterns. Thus S would set up OC *puk for the dialect which led to MC pjuk, and OC *pək for

the Shijing and XS language. S's observations seem a step in a promising direction. It also is, mutatis mutandis, an extension of Baxter's proposal concerning MC rimes -əu and -uậi after labials, as in mǒu 某/məu^B vs. méi 媒/muậi. Shijing rimes and phonetic series require an OC rime *-ə for both, but Baxter suggests that they had merged in the Shijing and early Zhou dialect, whereas the MC reflexes go back to the original separate rimes *-o and *-ə (某 OC *moʔ vs. 媒 OC *mə, both *mə[ʔ] in Shijing and phonetic series).

The Qieyun system's final -əŋ includes no words with shàngshēng 上聲 (tone B), apparently the nasal was lost there (note GSR 885). S draws attention to Jiyun doublets with final -ŋ as in ěr 耳 'ear' and chǐ 齒 'tooth' which he believes are dialectal retention of the final nasal. Also Min forms for 'ear' like Jiànyáng noiŋ might be survivals of the final nasal (p.61-62). We might add that words with the OC final *-uŋ (i.e. > MC categories dōng 冬/-uoŋ in div. 1, and > MC dōng 東/-juŋ in div. 3) have no shàngshēng words at all, not even doublets.

The crux of the reconstruction of the OC initials is one's view of the xiéshēng 諧 聲 (XS) 'principle', why a certain graphic element had served as a phonetic in the writing of one word but not another. Let us pursue this issue for the next few paragraphs. In the early days of research, Karlgren and Li Fang-kuei had necessarily been concerned with determining such a principle and rigorously adhered to it when interpreting XS. Without that, the reconstruction of OC would be a free-for-all. But any principle leads to a *reductio ad absurdum* when pushed beyond a certain point. Although the XS are by and large consistent and reveal which particular MC initials typically co-occur, there are many odd cases where an unexpected or incompatible initial shows up. Karlgren and Li insisted that a certain initial consonant category, e.g. velars or dentals/palatals have to be postulated for every word within a XS. That 'the dove' zhuī 隹/tświ was borrowed to write wéi 惟/jiwi 'to be' has led Karlgren and Li to set up OC coronal initials: Karlgren as OC *dịwər, Li Fang-kuei as *rəd, this reviewer once was sure it could only be *lul. Baxter is less rigid and allows for exceptions in order to make OC look more natural, he thus reconstructs OC *wjij (which also turns out to be reasonable in light of MC jiwei--and, quite by coincidence, is also close to Tibeto-Burman (TB) *wi or *wəj 'to be'); the reviewer has since independently reached Baxter's conclusion (wéi could simply be written as OC *wi). Evidently, reconstructions which have previously been proposed sometimes provide amazingly different phonological shapes for the same word.

S follows the stricter tradition (p.128f), at least in some phonetic series. He proposes to solve the 'mystery' why 隹 was chosen to write 惟 morphologically by assuming an OC prefix *tə- ~ *t-, hence *tə-wij ~ *t-wij (p.91). But how can we know for sure why someone more than 3000 years ago decided to use 'dove' for writing 'to

be': was it because of phonetic similarity, similarity just in the rime? Was it because of religious or folkloristic associations? Because we cannot be quite sure about the rationale behind such odd XS contacts, we should, like Baxter, not assume an OC dental initial in this word. Tibeto-Burmanists who deal with living languages and not with philological data and theoretical constructs have known all along that MC jiwi must be cognate to TB *wəj or *wi 'to be' (Matisoff, Thurgood). Thus linguistic evidence should take precedence over philological theories.

The zhuī 隹/tświ vs. wéi 惟/jiwi case involves two clearly unrelated words. At times, this may not be clear-cut: one graph may in fact cover two unrelated words which are near homophones with vaguely similar meanings. The graph 喙 writes huì/MC xjwɐi^C 'snout' as well as chuì/tśʰjwäi^C 'to pant'. The phonetic series (GSR 171) suggests OC l-like initials with which MC initial xj- seems incompatible. S takes huì 喙 back to an OC *q-hlor-s (p.109), and chuì to OC *t-hlor-s (p.92; S's superscript 'b' omitted for simplicity). Alternatively, I suggest that huì 'snout' is probably related to TB hnut, snot etc. 'mouth' and apparently borrowed from a Lolo-Burmese-like TB proto-language: TB *snot > WB hnut 'mouth'. When the graph 喙 was chosen for 'snout' (among others for semantic reasons), the foreign nasal had been lost along the way so that only aspiration remained. The two words written with the same graph are etymologically unrelated. Therefore, there is no reason to postulate some kind of OC lateral initial for both. So phonetic contacts need on occasion to be taken with a grain of salt when semantics can be suspected to interfere.

Conversely, the same word may be written with two phonologically incompatible phonetics. GSR 551 夷 is clearly an l-initial series, and GSR 591 弟 looks like a t-series. Because of the double writing of two words (涕洟 'tear'/'snot' and 稊荑 'kind of spurious grain'), S concludes that GSR 591 must then also be an l-series, therefore *all* words in 591 had an l-like initial, incl. dì 弟 'younger brother' (p.172-173) where the OC l-like initial had turned into d- by Han times. Therefore, S believes that Chinese dì and the TB word *doj 'younger sibling' cannot be cognates, the TB item can only be a Han or post-Han Chinese loan. But one may wonder if there might have been more mundane reasons for writing the same word with different phonetics: could the graphs in the received texts have been replaced after the Han period merger of OC *tʰ- and *hl- > *th-? Such replacement can be shown to have occurred, e.g. huì 賄/xwậi^B 'valuables' of the received texts should derive from *hwəʔ according to the phonetic yǒu 有, but the bronze inscriptions use consistently the phonetic měi 每, hence the OC word was probably *hməʔ.

The three examples above illustrate how an investigator's, premises on any matter, here on the interpretation of phonetic series and on the relationship between TB and OC, inevitably influence the conclusions, also in the area of morphology.

S's book's major contribution to this field is the addition of morphological reconstruction to phonological reconstruction. Pulleyblank has already articulated the importance of morphology: 'If one can identify such [morphological] processes [in OC], they are potentially more reliable evidence than rhyming or phonetic loans since they refer to something that is in the language itself and not, like rhyming, the product of an aesthetic concept whose relationship to linguistic features is uncertain' (1991:43). S applies this morphological dimension to his reconstructions. In reality, therefore, his OC reconstructions are not the bases for his etymological inquiries, as he says (p.139), but rather the results of his etymologizing. Thus, he inserts for instance an OC medial *l- (S's 'root initial *l') into words like zuó 昨 'yesterday' (OCS *s-lak) and xī 昔 'previously' (OCS *s-hlak), something which is purely based on his morphological theories.

OC reconstruction is only part of the book's objective. The major one is an investigation into OC morphology itself. Chs. 4-12 are devoted to the individual prefixes and clusters, ch. 13 to suffixation (*-s, *-ŋ etc.), ch. 14 to reduplication and compounding. S uses the term 'prefix'. (Others prefer 'pre-initials' in order not to imply the existence of morphology. Yet even these pre-initials often distinguish allofams (related words) and thus, by implication, carry a semantic load of some kind). S identifies for OC the prefixes *s-, *N-, *m-, *p-, *t-, *k-, *q-, most of these have been introduced already in Baxter and Sagart 1998. Recently, Pulleyblank (2000) has made similar suggestions which include prefixes *kə-, *tə-, *pə- and *mə- which can be culled from modern dialects. S follows Pulleyblank and Baxter in making same kind of voiced prefix responsible for the voicing of initials in word derivation (unlike Baxter and Sagart, Pulleyblank does not set up a nasal *N-, but a 'pharyngeal glide' *ă-).

An analysis of prefixes must of course rely on the understanding and reconstruction of OC initial clusters. Investigators have been confronted with the phenomenon that two or more different MC syllables seem to go back to what looks like the same OC shape, e.g. MC ɣɐk and lâk both appear to come from something like OC *grak. How to account for these differences? Bodman has suggested that it is a matter of *grak vs. *g-rak, Li reconstructs *grak vs. glak. S postulates, besides OC unprefixed monosyllabic forms (yì 亦 *lak > jiäk 'armpit'), forms with fused prefixes (gē 胳 *k-lak > kâk 'armpit'), and variants with what S calls iambic forms, i.e. words with an unstressed syllabic prefix (Cantonese kə-laːk-tɐi, Fuzhou kɔ-louʔ-a 'armpit') (p.14f). The two types of prefixes existed side by side in OC, the consonantal prefix fused with the initial in MC (胳 kâk), while the iambic prefix was lost as in luò 落 *kə-lak > MC lâk 'to fall'; MC initial l- descends from an OC root initial *l with a lost iambic prefix (see especially pp.124-128). S assumes that in OC one graph could write such iambic words (p.19-20).

The example 'armpit' is striking because OC and modern dialect data can be connected. Unfortunately, however, this is not the rule. For most prefixes, S hypothesize about their existence in OC, based on his theories and assumptions, and then point to the sporadic occurrence of a similar prefix in one or the other Jin dialect and traces in southern dialects, while he attempts to show that their meanings or function are similar. The meaning of some prefixes seems convincing, e.g. *k- forms nouns, among others (see 'armpit'; p.106), *s- forms causatives and directives, among others (p.70ff). However, the function of other prefixes is not clear, e.g. 'OC *p- still await[s] clarification' (p.89). Perhaps we must resign ourselves to accept that some pre-initials can be no more understood than 'stem extensions' ('Stammerweiterungen') in IE languages.

S has collected convincing sets which show that an 'r-infix' forms causatives (p.111). In fact, one could add one: bìng 屏/bjäŋ$^{B/C}$/OC *beŋʔ/h 'to remove, retire' ⇌ bèng 迸/pɛŋ^C/OC *preŋh 'to drive out, relegate'. Pulleyblank had first proposed this; however, he suggested that the 'r' might have initially been a prefix or pre-initial (most recently in Pulleyblank 2000:39). This would be in line with cognate TB languages, e.g. Tibetan has an r-prefix, but no one has persuasively made the case for r-infixes in TB. In Chinese, the metathesis of the r could well have occurred after this morpheme had ceased to be productive so that infixation is a superficial appearance, provided the div. 2 words really all went back to an earlier 'r' rather than something else.

The second part of the book consists of etymological case studies for the purpose of 'testing' his root theory. This part presents many new interesting, thought provoking ideas. For example, he suggests that chá 茶 'tea' is a loan from Lolo-Burmese *la 'leaf' (p.188) (tea may have originated in Sichuan). Actually, *la occurs also in Tai Language as 'leaf, tea', the ultimately source of this area word may have been Austroasiatic *sla 'leaf'. Or: he suggests that lù 鹿/luk 'deer' is cognate to jiǎo 角/kåk 'horn', many languages make this connection (p.161). Other words raise questions which illustrate why it has been difficult so far to reach a consensus on individual etymologies, let us take a closer look at 'dog', 'bean' and 'blood':

狗 (p.190). S agrees that Miao-Yao (MY, = Hmong-Mien) *qlAu^B 'dog' appears to be related to gǒu 狗/kəu^B 'puppy, dog', initial, final and tone corresponding perfectly, but the MY medial l is a problem for him because OC roots are not allowed to have initial clusters in S's system, apparently he has decided that *k- (not *l) is the root initial, and l is not an infix in his system. S finds a PWMP (Proto Western Malayopolynesian, presumably) word which 'correspond[s] exactly' to Ch. gǒu: *u(ŋ)kuq 'dog'. Even if we grant that the Ch. and PWMP etyma are genetically related, the interaction between Chinese and MY is geographically, chronologically and culturally much more intimate; therefore, MY is considerably more relevant for

Chinese historical phonology of the past 3 to 4,000 years. The word gǒu would be an excellent candidate for a root with an initial cluster. According to p.23 n.11, Matisoff had raised the same question with regard to liáng 涼 (< ST *gr-) 'cold', but was met with a negative response. Suppose that the Ch. word is a loan from MY: would OC still reinterpret foreign clusters as root initial plus segmental morpheme?

菽 shú/śjuk 'bean' (p.187). Today it is generally accepted (also by S) that MC śj- is a common reflex of OC *hn- (p.29; 155). From a broader linguistic and ST vantage point, there can be no doubt that this word is related to the TB etymon, as in Proto-Loloish *s-nök^H, Jingpo^{31}noʔ etc. (Apparently first proposed in Coblin 1986). Yet from the point of rigid adherence to philological XS principles, S can only reconstruct a stop root initial in the series GSR 1031, hence OCS *s-t(h)[u]k. Consequently, he doubts that the TB item can be directly cognate to shú. There is one word in the phonetic series GSR 1031 with initial n-. This confronts the investigator with a classical judgment question which is beyond provability; if one believe that shú 'bean' had once had an OC nasal initial and is cognate to TB, this item would be supporting evidence for reconstructing OC *hn-; if one is ambivalent about the nature of the Chinese-TB relationship and insist on unity of initials in XS as firm principle, then this item with initial n- is looked upon as just one exception which is without relevance for 'bean'.

血 (p.153). The character for xuè/xiwet 'blood' is used as phonetic in words in MC -ək, therefore S reconstructs a final *-k in xuè. He may well be correct since OC *-it is the result of a merger of earlier *-it and *-ik (p.51). Then S reconstructs an initial *hm- for xuè because there are Han period paronomastic glosses and a graph substitution which link xù 恤/sjuet to an m-initial character (Bodman 1954:63f). The suspected m-initial in xuè is confirmed, according to S, by the cognate miè 蠛/miet 'to defile with blood, blood' (汙血) which first appears in the dictionary Shuowen jiezi. (The later gloss 'blood' is suspect because dictionaries tend to make the glosses they copy more concise and shorter over time). S reconstructs it OC *mik thus this chain of reasoning leads S to the reconstruction OC *hmik for xue. The generally recognized connection between Chinese xuè and TB *swi ~ *hwi 'blood' would 'probably' be due to TB borrowing from Chinese. Matisoff who had suggested a different etymological connection for xuè has been 'mislead by a superficial phonetic resemblance' (p.153 n.1).

This etymology raises many questions. First, Coblin has systematically studied Han period sound glosses (Coblin 1983), but later (Coblin ms. 1993) has expressed serious doubts about their value: '... we shall be very suspicious of paronomastic sound glosses. For the phonological parameters inherent in these puns have never been satisfactorily determined [...] And in addition, it is clear that these glosses had a sort of

life of their own and could survive through period after period, quoted and requoted by successive authorities as valid statements or maxims about the relationship between language and the world of things and ideas' (p.4). Therefore, it seems best not to put too much stock in such puns.

Secondly, two of the three phonemes in S's OC reconstruction of miè as *mik are open to question. The phonetic series miè 蔑 is comprised of the MC rimes -at and -iet (see Guangyun shengxi:442), the final OC *-k has therefore no support from the XS angle. Then, the vowels in the rimes of this XS series point to OC *-at ~ *iat /*-et, not the rime *-it (which is the only one that can also derive from earlier *ik). Since miè appears first in the Han period, we may grant that it was committed to writing after the merger of OC *-et with *-it, which, however, implies that there still is only a 50:50 chance that the rime was OC *-it rather than *-et.

Third, miè is a rare and/or dictionary word. The Shuowen includes other uncommon words for 'blood': huāng 衁 which is an AA loan (Mei Tsu-lin 1980), and lü 膟/ljuet which is apparently the Tai etymon (PTai *liet[D2]L). Clearly, neither word could be invoked for internal Chinese morphological arguments. So what do we know about miè?

Fourth, it is difficult for a Sino-Tibetanist to understand how an OC word *hmik > *hwit could be loaned into TB as *swi, among others. If OC *hmik should indeed come from earlier *smik, TB forms could only be either *smi, or (later) *hmi or *hwi, but never *swi. And then there would be the missing final consonat in the TB language group, but that remains a problem no matter how one views the relationship. All else being equal, though, a *swi/*hwi ~ *swit/*hwit discrepancy could be easier accepted if one assumes a genetic relationship between living, evolving language rather than a loan relationship in which the recipient tries to preserve faithfully the form and shape of what has been borrowed.

S is greatly concerned about methodology. He states that the method 'used in the reconstruction of Old Chinese is not the comparative method, it is nonetheless perfectly compatible with the general procedure of empirical sciences, that is, the production of testable hypotheses which stand until they are shown to be false ('falsified' in the sense of Popper 1973)' (p.10). The individual etymological case studies in the second part are to serve as '... a testing ground for the ideas presented' in the first section on OC reconstruction and morphology (p.139). On some occasions, S does use statistics as an empirical tool in his work (e.g. p.22). Yet otherwise, one could just as well posit different roots and reconstructions and select and interpret the data in ways which 'prove' a completely different outcome and usually with less special pleading (For example, we could reconstruct OC *kloʔ for gǒu 狗 'dog' and relate it directly to the MY form, then there would be no need to bring in AN).

In general, the problem with reconstructions and etymologies is that they tend to involve circular arguments. Even the well-established Indo-European field cannot escape this entirely. Take the classical Greek word for 'one'. The citation forms are the nominative singular in the three genders masculine, feminine, neuter: hɛîs, mía, hén. These look like unconnected stems, but they have been reconstructed as earlier *séms, *smía, *sém, looking now quite regular. So why is the fem. reconstructed *smía? Because it is cognate to *sems; why is it genetically related to *sems? Because it derives from *smía. This reconstruction is widely accepted because of its plausibility in the eyes and experience of fellow investigators. The only consideration from outside this logical circle are (1) its agreement with IE morphological patterns, and (2) the simplification of the paradigm (one stem instead of two or three). Unlike in IE there are not very many derivational paradigms in Chinese which are clearly understood. Precisely therein lies the virtue of S's book that he makes an attempt to come to grips with this.

It lies in the nature of the subject matter that S's etymologies and his OC reconstructions based on these are not all equally convincing, but he himself has conceded at the outset that this ought not to be expected (this is not 'the last word…but a series of proposals'). For many of S's hypotheses, alternate opinions and theories can readily be entertained. But the scholarly community should be pleased to have the views and a wealth of etymological suggestions of this prominent sinologist available in the form of a book which is, as all of S's work, carefully researched and clearly presented and written (albeit at a steep price). It is hoped that this pioneering work and its crucial approach of getting at the root, will revive an interest in, and stimulated discussions on, the important field of OC morphology.

References

Baxter, William H. III. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

____, and Laurent Sagart. 1998. Word formation in OC. *New Approaches to Chinese Word Formation*, ed. by Jerome Packard, 35-76. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bodman, Nicholas C. 1954. *A Linguistic Study of the Shih Ming*. Harvard-Yenching Institute Studies XI. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Coblin, W. South. 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.

____. 1986. *A Sinologist's Handlist of Sino-Tibetan Lexical Comparisons*. Nettetal: Steyler Verlag.

_____.1993. Beyond B[uddhist] T[ranscriptional] D[ialect]: An excursion in Han phonology. Manuscript.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1993. *The Theoretical Bases of Indo-European Linguistics.* New York: Routledge.

Mei, Tsu-lin. 1980. Chinese and the language of Southeast Asia. Assoc. for Asian Stud. Conf.

Pulleyblank, E. G. 1991. The ganzhi as phonograms and their application to the calendar. *EC* 16:39-80.

_____. 2000. Morphology in Old Chinese. *JCL* 28.1:26-51.

Shen Jian-shi (沈兼士). 1944. *Guangyun Shengxi. [廣韻聲系].*

Thurgood, Graham. 1982. The Sino-Tibetan copula *wəy(°). *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale* 11.1:65-81.

513 East Alder Dr.
Sedro Woolley, WA98284, USA
Xuedu12@gte.net

People walk under Chinese flags in the old city of Kashgar, China, September 2018. Thomas Peter / Reuters. One public government document reviewed by Agence France-Presse in 2018 made the CCP's strategy abundantly clear. The overarching goal of these policies toward Uyghurs, it said, was to "break their lineage, break their roots, break their connections, and break their origins." Beijing should take a page out of the books of other countries, including many in South America and Scandinavia, which have granted indigenous peoples at least limited sovereignty—as the CCP itself contemplated doing in the 1980s. But Chinese actions don't suggest any return to a more inclusive vision of the country that accepts Uyghurs on their own terms. ANIMALS IN CHINA factsanddetails.com; WORLD'S OLDEST RICE AND EARLY RICE AGRICULTURE IN CHINA factsanddetails.com; ANCIENT FOOD, DRINK AND CANNABIS IN CHINA factsanddetails.com; NEOLITHIC CHINA factsanddetails.com; JIAHU (7000-5700 B.C.): CHINA'S EARLIEST CULTURE AND SETTLEMENTS factsanddetails.com; JIAHU (7000 B.C. to 5700 B.C.): HOME OF THE WORLD'S OLDEST WINE AND SOME OF THE. "The Jiahu inscriptions are important because they shake the deep-rooted assumption made by many that pictographs on pottery from Neolithic cultures such as Dawenkou represent the origin of Chinese characters. The inscriptions have not been reviewed by experts outside the country, but 2. Old Chinese Words and Roots. 13. 2.1 The Asian look of Old Chinese words. 13. 2.2 Words, roots, word-families, affixes. 14. 2.3 Chinese words and the Chinese script. 19. 2.4 Root structure. 20. 2.5 Place of insertion of the infix. "This is easily the most important book on the Old Chinese lexicon since Karlgren's Word-Families [...] and the most challenging contribution on Old Chinese morphology ever written. It deserves to be taught and tested, applied or amended, by whoever reads Old Chinese texts." Wolfgang Behr. Cited by. 2006. Review of Matisoff (2003): Handbook of Proto-Tibeto-Burman: System and philosophy of Sino-Tibeto-Burman reconstruction. Diachronica 23:1 â–º pp. 206 ff. Sagart, Laurent. This made Old Chinese typologically more like modern languages such as Khmer, Gyarong or Atayal, than like Middle and modern Chinese, where only faint traces of the old morphology remain. In the first part of the book, the author proposes improvements to Baxter's system of reconstruction, regarding complex initials and rhymes, and then reviews in great detail the Old Chinese affixal morphology. New proposals on phonology and morphology are integrated into a coherent reconstruction system. The second part of the book consists of etymological studies of important lexical items in Old Chinese. Th... Start your review of The Roots of Old Chinese.