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ABBREVIATIONS


MC Middle Chinese = Karlgren's 'Ancient Chinese'.

OC Old Chinese = Karlgren's 'Archaic Chinese'.

OM Old Mandarin.

Pk Modern Standard Mandarin, based on the Peking dialect.

ST Sino-Tibetan.
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To account for the phonological relationship between forms in a proto-language and the corresponding forms in a daughter language, we rely heavily on general statements about this relationship that together describe the regular sound changes. As we proceed, we adjust these statements to account for other aberrant forms and eventually incorporate most of these into a revised set of general statements about the regular sound changes. But eventually, in spite of our best efforts at this sort of fine tuning, we end up with a few recalcitrant forms. At this point we abandon the safe rigors of regular laws and resort to other means of explanation that are more likely to be subjective and risky. Among these, borrowing from one or more closely related dialects is a recourse that has gained respectability, even though external corroboration is seldom possible. Dialect borrowing is made to seem more likely when it can be pointed out that there are indeed nearby dialects that can plausibly be said to have supplied the aberrant forms in the language being described. The idea of strains also seems useful. In 1962 I offered the following definition: “A strain is a manifestation of one dialect in a language which is a mixture of this and other closely related dialects. One strain is recognized as distinct from another in that it comprises a group of forms which share characteristics of phonological development from the proto-language not shared by forms grouped in other strains.” (S: 1962, 378). Doublets, especially when they occur in sets that share characteristics of phonological development, provide convincing corroboration of the strain hypothesis. The term “doublet” appears in many places in what follows, so perhaps a

1) A version of this paper was first presented at the Third Meeting on Reconstruction of Sino-Tibetan, Cornell University, October, 1970. I am grateful for the helpful comments of Ann Yue and Mantaro Hashimoto, and Tsu-lin Mei.