

ARCHAIC CHINESE **-iəwəŋ*, **-iəwək* AND **-iəwəg*

LI FANG-KUEI 李方桂

From the study of the riming system in Shī-king and the hie-sheng system, we found a group of words having in Ancient Chinese finals *-iung*, *-iuk*, *-iəu*, but riming with words having an Archaic *-ə* (**-əŋ*, **-iəŋ*, **-ək*, **-iək*, **-əg*, **-iəg*, etc.). As Ancient Chinese has no *-iəwəŋ*, and inspite of some cases of *-iəwək* and *-wi*, I concluded that these finals must go back to Arch. **-iəwəŋ*, **-iəwək*, and **-iəwəg* against Prof. Karlgren's **-iung*, **-iuk* and **-iug* (cf. Karlgren, Shī-king Researches, BMFEA, No. 4, 1932, pp. 128-130, and my articles, 切韻 & 的來源, BIHP, vol. III, part 1, 1931, pp. 22-27, and Ancient Chinese -ung, -uk, -uəŋ, -uək, etc. in Archaic Chinese, BIHP vol. III, part 3, 1933, pp. 384-386, 390-395). Karlgren in a recent article of his (Word Families in Chinese, BMFEA, no. 5, 1934) maintained his **-iung*, **-iuk* and **-iug* with slight modifications (**-iǔŋ*, **-iǔk*, **-iǔg*). In my opinion, even after such modifications, his reconstructions are unacceptable. Let us examine how he arrived at such conclusions.

In Shī-king Researches he failed to see a vocalic difference between Anc. Ch. *-ung*, *-uk*, *-iəwəŋ*, *-iəwək* on the one hand and *-uəŋ*, *-uək*, *-iung*, *-iuk* on the other, and therefore supposed an *-o-* vowel alike in all these finals in Archaic Chinese. This left him empty spaces for **-ung*, **-uk*, **-iung*, **-iuk*, etc. which he identified with this group of *-iung*, *-iuk*, etc., thus making an assumption that *-u-* and *-ə-* are accoustically sufficiently similar to be allowed to rime in Archaic Chinese—an assumption which I rejected as not being sufficiently grounded. Following the distinctions that I made, Karlgren, in the course of revising his reconstructions (Word Families in Chinese pp. 39-55), suddenly came to the result that he had **-ung*, **-uk*, **-ug*, **-iung*, **-iuk*, **-iug*, and **-ǔŋ*, **-ǔk*, **-ǔg*, but no **-iǔŋ*, **-iǔk*, **-iǔg* (p. 51). To fill in, therefore, the empty squares, he modified his **-iung*, **-iuk*, **-iug* to be **-iǔŋ*, **-iǔk*, **-iǔg*, thus considering his riddle solved. In doing so, however, he got himself into the difficulty that these **-iǔŋ*, **-iǔk*, **-iǔg* hardly ever rime in Archaic literature with his **-ung*, **-uk*, **-ug*, **-iung*, **-iuk*, **-iug*, nor even with his **-ǔŋ*, **-ǔk*, **-ǔg*. To get over this difficulty, he had to make a similar assumption that this *-ǔ-* after a medial *-i-* has so changed its pronounciation that it becomes accoustically similar to an

-ə-. The crucial point in this question is: Have we any right to designate a vowel to be -ǔ- while the main evidence, the Shī-king rimes, points to be otherwise? Are we warranted to admit accoustic similarities of Archaic sounds without any evidence? and can we find data in Archaic literature from which we can determine the accoustic affinities of this -ə-? My answer is that we can find data enough to determine the accoustic affinities of this -ə-, and therefore we are not allowed to imagine freely that an -ǔ- is similar to an -ə-; for we must remember that these *-iǎng, *-iǔk, *-iǔg rime not occasionally but consistently with *-əng, *-iəng, *-əʔ, *-iək, etc. and hardly ever with *-ǎng, *-ǔk, *-ǔg.

If we examine the category *-əng, *-iəng, we see that the strict system of riming in Shī-king forbids these and Karlgren's *-iǎng to rime with either *-ung, *-ǎng, *-iung, or *-ong, *-ǒng, *-iong.⁽¹⁾ The rimes in Yi-king practically make no distinction of *-ung, : *-ong, and occasionally present an *-əng or *-iəng riming with both *-ung and *-ong, evidently due to loose riming from which no conclusion can be drawn. But, Shī-king presents in several occasions *-əm, *-iəm riming with *-ong, *-ǒng and *-iong, but never with *-ung, *-ǎng, and *-iung (cf. Ancient Chinese -ung, -uk, -uong, -uok, etc. in Archaic Chinese, pp. 381). If this indicates anything at all, it shows Archaic -ə- is accoustically more close to -o- rather than to -u- or -ǔ-.

In my discussion of the sources of the Ancient Chinese vowel â, I have already noticed the close relation between Archaic *-ək, *-əg, *-iək, *-iəg, etc. and the Archaic rime category 幽, which I shall now designate by forms *-ok, *-og, *-iok, *-iog, etc. (op. cit. pp. 30-31). As a matter of fact, in Archaic literature including Shī-king, we find an overwhelming number of exceptional rimes in which *-ək, *-əg, *-iək, *-iəg go together with *-ok, *-og, *-iok, *-iog, etc. Here are a few examples:—

詩經 (大雅, 思齊 5),	德 tək : 造 dz'og : 士 dz'iek
„ („ , 抑 2),	告 kog, kok : 則 tsək
„ („ , 生民 1),	夙 s'ok : 育 diok : 稷 ts'iek

(1) In my previous article I reconstructed Anc. -ung, -uk to be Arc. *-ong, *-ok, mainly due to the fact that they rime frequently with forms in -ǎng, -ǎk. Karlgren has now cleverly disposed of this difficulty by assuming this -ǎng to be from earlier *-ǎng. There is then no difficulty to think that these -ung and -uk are original. Similarly -iung, -iuk go back to *-iung and *-iuk. This explains much better certain cases of exceptional riming of -iū, -əu with -uk, -iuk in Shī-king. I accept also his *-ong, *-ok, *-iong, *-iok, *-og, *-iog, etc. (he designated the main vowel with -ô-) for -uong, -uok, -iung, -iuk, -āu, -iəu, etc. The introduction of a lax vowel renders also my -ω- quite useless in the category 宵 (Tuan's second category), I shall designate Anc. -āu, -au, -iāu, -ieu, -ǎk, -ǎk, -iək, -iək by *-og, *-ǒg, *-iog, *-iog, *-ok, *-ǒk, *-iok, *-iok.

- 詩經 (小雅, 賓之初筵 2), 能 *nəŋ*, *nəŋ* : 仇 *g'iog* : 又 — (1) : 時 *d'iəŋ*
 „ (豳風, 七月 7), 穆 *ml̥iok* : 麥 *mwək* (2)
 „ (魯頌, 閟宮 1), 稷 *tsiək* : 福 — : 穆 *ml̥iok* : 麥 *mwək* :
 國 *kwək* : 穡 *ʃiək*
 易經 (彖傳, 恆), 道 *d'og* : 已 *ziəŋ* : 始 *ʃiəŋ*
 „ (繫辭下傳 8), 保 *pog* : 母 *mwəŋ*
 禮記 (月令), 起 *k'iəŋ* : 始 *ʃiəŋ* : 道 *d'og* : 理 *liəŋ* : 紀 *k'iəŋ*
 老子 (養身), 事 *dʒ'iəŋ* : 教 *kōŋ* : 辭 *dziəŋ* : 有 — : 特 *d'iəŋ*
 „ (運夷), 已 *ziəŋ* : 保 *p'og* : 守 *ʃiog* : 咎 *g'ioŋ* : 道 *d'og*
 „ (歸根), 道 *d'og* : 久 — : 殆 *d'əŋ*
 „ (象元), 改 *kəŋ* : 殆 *d'əŋ* : 母 *mwəŋ* : 道 *d'og*
 „ (辯德), 富 — : 志 *t'iəŋ* : 久 — : 壽 *d'iəŋ*
 „ (守道), 齋 *ʃiəŋ* : 復 *b'iok* : 德 *tək* : 克 *k'ək* : 極 *g'iek* :
 國 *kwək* : 母 *mwəŋ* : 久 — : 道 *d'og*
 管子 (正), 紀 *k'iəŋ* : 理 *liəŋ* : 止 *t'iəŋ* : 道 *d'og* : 子 *tsiəŋ*
 莊子 (天運), 首 *ʃiog* : 起 *k'iəŋ* : 待 *d'əŋ*
 荀子 (蠶賦), 游 *dioŋ* : 絲 *siəŋ* : 治 *d'iəŋ*
 爾雅 (釋訓), 極 *g'iek* : 德 *tək* : 直 *d'iəŋ* 力 *liək* : 服 — : 急 *k'iəŋ* :
 息 *ʃiək* : 德 *tək* : 毒 *d'ok* : 忒 *t'ək* : 食 *d'iək* : 告 *kog*, *kok* :
 則 *tsək* : 慝 *t'ək* : 職 *t'iek* : 鞠 *k'iek*

These examples are sufficient to show that Archaic *-ə-* is more akin to *-o-*. Curiously enough, in Shī-king, where the riming system is very strict, we hardly have any example of even an exceptional riming of *-ə-* with Karlgren's *-u-*, *-ü-*, but numerous cases of *-ə-* with *-o-*. In other Archaic texts rimes of *-ə-* : *-ü-* are also extremely rare, even in the loose riming of Yi-king. Shī-king has further offered us even exceptional cases of riming **-əŋ*, **-iəŋ* with **-o-*, **-io-*, i.e. 豳風, 蟋蟀 2, 雨 *giwo* : 母 *mwəŋ* ; 大雅, 常武 1, 士 *dʒ'iəŋ* : 祖 *tso* : 父 *b'io* : 戎 *n'ioŋ*. In other Archaic texts, we have also some cases of **-əŋ*, **-iəŋ* riming with **-o-*, **-io-* : 禮記 (禮運), 戶 *g'o* : 下 *g'ō* : 俎 *tsio* : 鼓 *ko* : 嘏 *ko* : 祖 *tso* : 子 *tsiəŋ* : 下 *g'ō* : 所 *ʃio* : 祐 *g'o* ; (射義) 舉 *k'io* : 士 *dʒ'iəŋ* : 處 *t'io* : 所 *ʃio* : 射 *d'iō* : 譽 *zio*, etc. All these point to the affinity of *-ə-* with *-o-*, but not with *-ü-*. The worst, however, is the fact that Karlgren's *-iək*, *-iüg* not only do not rime

(1) Temporarily I denote those *-iəu* and *-iuk* forms by a blank.

(2) For Anc. *-ək* (革), *-ai* (戒), etc. which rime with Arc. **-ək*, **-əŋ*, etc., we evidently have a lax variety of the *-ə-* vowel in Archaic Chinese. I denote them as **-ək*, **-əŋ*, etc. similarly Anc. *-əŋ* as **-əŋ*.

even exceptionally with his *-ǝk*, *-ǝg*, but, on the contrary, do occasionally rime with **-og*, **-iog* in *Shi-king* and other texts:—

詩經 (周頌, 烈文),	福 — : 造 <i>dz'og</i>
” (周頌, 閔予小子),	造 <i>dz'og</i> : 疚 —
易經 (彖傳, 臨),	道 <i>d'og</i> : 久 —
” (”, 大過),	久 — : 醜 <i>i''iog</i>
管子 (白心),	寶 <i>pog</i> : 久 —
逸周書 (周祝解),	牧 — : 杼 <i>b'iog</i>

etc.

If an unknown sound rimes consistently with *-ə-*, *-ǝ-*, and, just like *ə-*, *-ǝ-*, it occasionally rimes with *-o-*, *-ǝ-*, but practically never with *-u-*, *-ǝ-*, have we still the right to assign it the value of an *-ǝ-*? Certainly Anc. Ch. *-iung*, *-iuk* prove nothing about its Archaic value. If Karlgren thinks that this *-ǝ-* goes back etymologically to an *-ǝ-* but has modified its value to an open timbre after a medial *-i-*, his “etymologically correct” reconstructions might be accepted—had he given us proofs! From the study of *hie-sheng*, we can conclude that Arc. **-o*, **-io* by forming phonetic compounds with **-āk*, **-iak* can be traced back to still earlier **-āg*, **-iag*. There Karlgren may be allowed, but he has not done so, i.e., to reconstruct **-o*, **-io* as **-āg*, **-iag* and thus be etymologically correct. But *hie-sheng* hardly shows any definite case of his **-iǝng*, **-iǝk*, **-iǝg* forming phonetic compounds with his **-ǝng*, **-ǝk*, **-ǝg*.⁽¹⁾ It does not give the slightest support to his etymology. According to his theory it would be equally hard to explain the erratic behavior of *-ǝ-* changing its pronunciation to something like an *-ə-* during the *Shi-king* period, but reverting back to an *-u-* in *T'sie-yün*. I do not mean such a thing is impossible, but it is hardly plausible when his etymology is not founded on the slightest evidence.

(1) Cf. op. cit. pp. 384—385, 390, 398—400. In that article, I made an extensive study of *hie-sheng* as represented in *Kuang-yün*, for we must remember a character may be authenticated by its occurrence in an Archaic text but its pronunciation came down to us mainly thru *Kuang-yün*. It is therefore extremely important to know the system in *Kuang-yün* first. I have demonstrated that the *hie-sheng* system in *Kuang-yün*, inspite of what I called spurious words, agrees with the Archaic sound system rather than with the Ancient system. I have used therefore, my results, but strictly controlled them by *Shi-rimes*. It is absurd to try to give an Archaic reading to every word in *Kuang-yün* cited in my article. The evolution of Chinese characters leaves much to be desired; hundreds and hundreds of words in bone and bronze inscriptions are still not deciphered. What late forms took their place and when? The problem of *kia-tsie* in Archaic texts, with later and often concurrent separate characters in use, offers us many a stumbling block in assigning a phonetic form to a definite character.

Karlgren's **-iung*, **-iuk*, **-iug*, then, go against two main sources, Shi-rimes and hie-sheng, on which we based our reconstructions; they are unacceptable.

If we examine Karlgren's system as given on p. 54 of his *Word Families in Chinese*, we may have another possibility; for he has **-ōng*, **-ōk*, **-ōg* (i.e. *-ōng*, *-ōk*, *-ōg*) but no **-iōng*, **-iōk*, **-iōg* (i.e. *-iōng*, *-iōk*, *-iōg*), which he could have filled in with these *-iung*, *-iuk*, *-iəu* forms with less difficulty. This, in my opinion, is equally impossible. In the first place, if a vowel only occasionally rimes with an *-o-*, *-ō-*, but consistently with an *-ə-*, have we the right to designate it as an *-ō-*? In the second place, the hie-sheng system, which shows an earlier stage, gives us consistently an alternation with an *-ə-*, very exceptionally with an *-o-*, i. e. 裴 *kiwəg* : 求 *kiog*. But such occasional hie-sheng is not in any sense comparable to cases of consistent alternation, such as **-o* : **-āk*, **-io* : **-iak*, which clearly indicate **-o*, **-io* to be from earlier **-āg*, **-iag*. We cannot similarly deduce that an earlier **-iō-* has become later more like *-ə-* than *-ō-*. In the third place, the Shi-rimes are far stricter than have been imagined. Rimes of a tense and a lax vowel are allowed, but rimes of an open *-ə-* and a close *-o-*, of a close *-o-* and an *-u-* are permitted only as exceptions. From the consistent manner in which these *-iung*, *-iuk*, *-iəu* rime with an Archaic *-ə-*, I do not hesitate to assign them a principal vowel of the *-ə-* variety. Other vowels would not satisfy the Shi-rimes. I have perfect right to maintain my **-iwəng*, **-iwək*, **-iwəg*.

For the **-iwəng* forms, I see no objection, nor has Karlgren any reason against them. It is of course impossible to exclude the possibility of an *-iəwəng* which would give us equally well Anc. Ch. *-iung*. The sole reason why Karlgren was so strong in rejecting these forms was because we have *-iwək* and *-wi* which I have also reconstructed to be **-iwək*, **-iwəg*. I have suggested that *-ə-* may be in one case accented and in the other case unaccented, so that in one case we may have *-wi* and in the other case *-iəu*. Such difference of accent may be due to certain accentual variation we have no knowledge of or may be due to dialectal differences. I have further suggested the possibility of analogical forces which would then give us double developments, especially exception of any consequence is the form 域 *iwək* which has not gone to *iuk*, because its phonetic 或 *ywək* and such common words like 惑 *ywək*, 國 *kwək* have all preserved an *-ək* while forms like 囿 *iuk* have no *-ək* or *-wək* forms preserved in its phonetic. This *-iwək* then may be a reading pronunciation, after its phonetic 或 *ywək*. Karlgren rejects all such possibilities, he prefers to follow a purely formal logical way of reasoning: as there are *-iwək* and *-iuk*, similarly *-wi*, and *-iəu*, these *-iuk* and

We are now still dealing with the broad outlines of Chinese Archaic sound system, there are whole chapters of phonology yet to be written, such as the development of unaccented syllables, which would throw a flood of light on the origins and development of particles so common in use in Chinese. Such a common particle 的 *tī* (pronounced *tə* in connected speech) corresponds in usage to the literary 之 *tʃī* and 者 *tʃə* (Arc. **t'īag* and **t'īag*); it may turn out actually to be modern representative of these two words under special phonological rules of unaccented words. Similarly 不 *pu* (Cantonese *pǎi*) may come from 弗 *pīuat*, 你 *nī* from 爾 *nʒie* etc. I do not mean that such etymologies are certain, but they at least indicate to us the necessity of taking such additional factors into account in the very complicated problem of Chinese phonology. In order, therefore, to be careful about reconstructions, before data about the Archaic language and dialects are in any form to be utilized to explain different developments to a certainty, I am willing to modify my **-iwək* and **-iwəg* to be **-iwǎk* and **-iwǎg*, to keep the two lines of development clear, the *-ǎ* may be a weak or lax variety of *-ə*. We have then for these rime categories the following reconstructions:—

*-əng > -əng (等)	*-ək > -ək (德)	*-əg > -ài (來)
*-iəng > -iəng (兢)	*-iək > -iək (亟)	*-iəg > -i (基)
*-wəng > -wəng (弘)	*-wək > -wək (國)	*-wəg > -uài (灰)
*-iwəng > -iung (弓)	*-iwək > -iwək (域)	*-iwəg > -wi (龜)
*-əng > -iŋg (橙)	*-ək > -ək (革)	*-əg > -ai (戒)
*-wəng > -wəng (宏)	*-wək > -wək (麥)	*-wəg > -wəi (?)
	*-iwək > -iuk (圍)	*-iwəg > -iau (有)

If these reconstructions show no **-iəng*, **-iə̃k*, **-iə̃g* forms, we are not allowed to conclude that they did not exist. For they may have existed and merged, for instance, with **-iəng*, **-iə̃k*, **-iə̃g*, but the rimes of Shī-king and the hie-sheng system do not offer any indication.

Karlgren has further modified his **mug* 母 to **mæg* (p. 43) against my **mwæg*. He has ignored such forms as 倍, 菩 *b'ai* (< *b'æg*); a labial initial cannot

have been the cause for 母 **mæg* to become *məu*. His **mæg* is unacceptable. I suggested that there is a tendency for **mwæg* to become *məu* in shang-sheng words. Karlgren objects to this. He mentions (pp. 42-43) two common words which he considered as fatal exceptions, 每 *muài* and 悔 *xuài*. The word 悔 *xuài* can be dismissed at once, for we do not know under what form, if it had a labial initial at all⁽¹⁾, it existed in Archaic Chinese. Even if we concede that there is some kind of a labial initial, the relative chronology of this labial's development into *x-* and the date of *-wæg*'s development into *-uài* and *-eu* are of such importance, that we have to give due consideration before we should multiply a single exception into two. To mention such phonologically uncertain word is worthless, for, just a few lines below, Karlgren mentions 海 *hài* (< **xmæg*) which would be against his 母 *məu* as **mæg*, if he thinks 悔 *xuài* is against 母 *məu* as **mwæg*. I have noticed long ago the possibility of a secondarily developed medial *-u-* when a labial precedes an *-â-* (cf. “切韵 *â* 的來源”, pp. 7, 15, 18, 27-28). There is quite a bit of uncertainty in Kuang-yün in separating this secondary *-u-* from the original *-u-*, so that we have only *puâ*, *puân*, *puât* etc., but no *pâ*, *pân*, *pât*; *pâi* (泰韵) but no *puâi*; predominantly *-uài* but very few *pâi*. We have further a very interesting phenomenon of reassortment in the rime 唐:—

	ping sheng	shang-sheng	k'ü-sheng	ju-sheng
<i>p</i>	[-âng] ⁽²⁾ -wâng	-âng [-wâng]	[-âng] -wang	-âk [-uâk]
<i>p'</i>	-âng [-wâng]	-âng [-wâng]	[-âng] [-wâng]	-âk [-wâk]
<i>b</i>	[-âng] -wâng	[-âng] [-wâng]	-âng [-wâng]	-âk [-wâk]
<i>m</i>	-âng [-wâng]	-âng [-wâng]	-âng [-wâuy]	-âk [-wâk]

Such curious distribution is evidently due to the fact that in this rime the *k'ai-k'ou* and the *ho-k'ou* are included in one rime, and we have to depend on the *ts'ie* for differentiation, while in the majority of the other finals there are separate rimes for the *k'ai-k'ou* and for the *ho-k'ou*. In modern dialects, none of these *puâ* and *pâ* are distinguished, the confusion starts some where about the time of Ts'ie-yün. Such being the state of affairs, we should not think that all these *ho-k'ou* words were original *ho-k'ou* words, nor generalize that all these *ho-k'ou* words go back to original *k'ai-k'ou* words.⁽¹⁾ Generally speaking, Kuang-yün sometimes do have *k'ai-k'ou* words classified as *ho-k'ou* due to the development of a secondary medial *-u-*, *-w-*, but the reverse is not generally true. Such

(1) Karlgren suggests *xm-*, but it could equally well be *mx-* or even a voiceless *m-*. Nothing definite can be said for such an initial.

(2) Forms not found are put in brackets.

word as 倍 *b'ai* (attested in Kuang-yün and T'ang manuscripts of Ts'ie-yün) must be taken as real *k'ai-k'ou* word, on the other hand, 每 *muai* may go back to **mæg* instead of **mwæg*. The point here is that we cannot say anything definite about the word 每. For this reason I prefer to leave it as exceptional. But the majority of cases is so overwhelming, that we had better take a further look at the following facts before we get so keen about a single exception.

p'ing-sheng		k'ü-sheng		shang-sheng	
梅	<i>muai</i>	佩(珮)	<i>b'uai</i>	母	<i>məu</i>
媒	"	邶(鄘)	"	某	"
脍	"	背	<i>puai, b'uai</i>	拇	"
膜	"	每	<i>muai</i>	畝(晦)	"
禡	"	[罨	"] ⁽²⁾	鵠	"
罨	"	[脍	"]	部	<i>b'əu</i>
鉞	"			[培	"]
培	<i>b'ai</i>			[脍	"]
陪	"			馥	"
[酈	"]			鯨	"
[脍	"]			節	"
[頊	"]			脍	<i>pəu</i>
杯(杯)	<i>puai</i>			剖	<i>p'əu</i>
胚	<i>p'uai</i>			[髻	"]
坏(坏)	"				
醅	"				
[𩚑	"]				
shang-sheng		p'ing-sheng		k'ü-sheng	
每	<i>muai</i>	[髻	<i>b'əu</i>	[莓	<i>məu</i>
		[脍	"]	[脍	<i>b'əu</i>
		[脍	"]		
		[鯨	"]		
		[筭	"]		

The above list consists exclusively of words that occur in Archaic texts or at least in Shuo-wen, a Han work, and includes all the common words in question. Their pronunciation is taken from Kuang-yün. We find that *-uai* forms abound in p'ing-sheng and k'ü-sheng with a single exception 每 *muai* in shang-sheng, and *-əu* forms abound in shang-sheng with five *-əu* forms in p'ing-sheng (4 of which have alternative readings in shang-sheng) and 2 *-əu* forms in k'ü-sheng (one has alternative reading in shang-sheng). I suspected such *-əu* forms in other tones

(1) Some more cases of confusion are 旃 *b'ai*, etc. given in a T'ang manuscript of Ts'ie-yün as *b'uai* (蒲外反), 梅 *muai* give as *m'ai* (唐蘭, 內府藏唐寫本刊繆補缺切韻).

(2) Words in brackets are readings not given in either manuscripts of Ts'ie-yün.

than shang-sheng to be spurious readings. Here Ts'ie-yün is most illuminating,⁽¹⁾ for it gives no -*eu* forms under labial initials in p'ing-sheng and in k'ü-sheng.⁽²⁾ On the other hand it gives 陪 and 陪, which Karlgren mentioned against me, actually in shang-sheng just as in Kuang-yün, but not in p'ing-sheng and registers 筭 also in shang-sheng under the initial *l*-. It is obvious that such late additions of -*eu* forms in p'ing-sheng and k'ü-sheng are analogical or spurious readings. If we keep to strictly authenticated words as well as their authenticated readings, we find that no -*eu* forms exist in p'ing-sheng and k'ü-sheng, but plenty of -*eu* forms in shang-sheng and plenty of -*ui* forms in p'ing-sheng and k'ü-sheng, with a single exception 每 in shang-sheng (also with an alternative reading in k'ü-sheng attested by T'sie yün). It seems to me quite useless to harp on that single exception, which may be explained if we can be more than merely determining the framework of our Archaic reconstructions. I see no reason to change my opinion that Arc. **-wag* after a labial initial tends to become -*eu* in Ancient Chinese, in shang-sheng words, otherwise -*ui*. The distinction in modern Pe'p'ing dialect between p'ing-sheng and shang-sheng such as 歸 *kui* : 鬼 *kuei* is at least suggestive of such possibilities.⁽³⁾

The problem of a medial -*w*- after labials is a very complicated one. The point I am contending here is not the precise issue of whether to reconstruct 母 *məu* as **mæg* or **mwæg*, but the implication of Karlgren's reconstructions. His **mæg* > **məu* versus **mwæg* > *muï* seems to me quite impossible without a thorough investigation of the problem of medial -*w*- after labials. In the first place, it is against 倍 *b'ui*, unless he assumes 倍 to be *b'ui* against Kuang-yün and Ts'ie-yün. In the second place, it implies that all Anc. Ch. *muï*, *puï*, etc. go back to truly ho-k'ou words. This is to take the problem of medial -*w*- after labials too lightly.⁽⁴⁾ In the third place, it does not explain the curious distribution of -*eu* forms in shang-sheng and -*ui* forms in p'ing-sheng and k'ü-sheng. The

(1) Cf. 王國維, 唐寫本切韻殘卷 and 唐蘭, 內府藏唐寫本刊繆補缺切韻.

(2) Words not belonging to this category such as 仆 *p'eu* are eliminated. An interesting case of spurious reading are the characters 陪趙 which are through semantic similarity identified with 仆, so that in Kuang-yün (but not in T'sie-yün) they are also given the reading *p'eu* after 仆, and similarly 仆 is given the reading *b'ok*, after 陪, 趙.

(3) Cf. the interesting observation of Lo Ch'ang-p'ei about the Tibetan transcription of shang-sheng words by doubling the main vowel. Evidently a difference of vocalic length or quality is felt in shang-sheng as early as about a thousand years ago (羅常培: 唐五代西北方音, pp. 65-67).

(4) Cf. the treatment of words with labials as a third separate class in 黃澤伯, 慧琳一切經音義反切考.

ho-k'ou element in words of labial initials should be taken with extreme caution to explain different developments of this nature.

A further point about those *-ā (家), *-iā (者), *-wā (華) which rime with *-o, and *-io, etc. As Archaic *-ok, *-og, etc. do not rime with *-ok, *-og, etc., there is no reason to believe that -ā can rime with -o-. They go back to *-ō, *-iō, *-wō, with a lax variety of the vowel -o-. Our view that the rimes in Shī-king are very strict is further confirmed by the introduction of a lax vowel, brilliantly employed by Prof. Karlgren. Shī-king rimes a tense and a lax vowel together regularly, as *a : ā, o : ō, ɔ : ǔ, ə : ǝ, u : ŭ, e : ẽ*, etc., but vowels of other variety only exceptionally, as *o : ɔ, o : u, o : ə*, etc.