



HAL
open science

SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY OF SINITIC LANGUAGES: A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHINESE DIALECTS

Hilary Chappell

► **To cite this version:**

Hilary Chappell. SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY OF SINITIC LANGUAGES: A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHINESE DIALECTS. Hilary Chappell. Sinitic grammar: synchronic and diachronic perspectives., Oxford University Press, pp.3-28, 2001, 9780198299776. <hal-03931688>

HAL Id: hal-03931688

<https://hal.science/hal-03931688v1>

Submitted on 9 Jan 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire HAL, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY OF SINITIC LANGUAGES: A BRIEF HISTORY OF CHINESE DIALECTS

Hilary Chappell

1.1 Introduction

Even though Sinitic languages are spoken by more than one billion people, very little research has been carried out on the synchronic grammar of major languages and dialect groups of Chinese, apart from standard Mandarin or *pǔtōnghuà* 普通话, and Cantonese to a lesser extent. The same situation applies to the diachrony of Sinitic languages with respect to the exact relationship between Archaic and Medieval Chinese and contemporary dialects.

Since diachronic and historical research reveal important insights into earlier stages of grammar and morphology, they cannot but form a crucial link with synchronic studies: First, it can be expected that different kinds of archaic and medieval features are potentially preserved in certain of the more conservative dialect groups of Sinitic. Second, clues to the pathways of grammaticalization and semantic change can only be clearly delineated with reference to precise analyses of earlier stages of the Chinese language. These are two decisive factors in employing both approaches to syntactic research in the one analysis. Indeed, the main motivation behind compiling this volume of studies on the grammar of Sinitic languages (or Chinese dialects) is to highlight the work of linguists who use the two intertwined perspectives of synchrony and diachrony in their research.

A corollary of this first view, espoused in this anthology either explicitly or implicitly, is that if only standard Mandarin grammar is analysed, then such connections between the diachronic and the synchronic state may often be overlooked. This could simply be due to Mandarin innovating where other dialect groups have remained more conservative in their retention of features of Archaic and Medieval Chinese. This possibility has been pointed out in seminal studies by

Hashimoto on Hakka (1973, 1992) and shown to be the case for various features of grammar in Southern Min by Y.-C. Li (1986) on aspect and negation, Mei and Yang (1995) on chronological strata in Min, not to mention in the research of scholars such as Zhu Dexi (1990) and Anne Yue-Hashimoto (1991b, 1993a,b) on Southern Sinitic syntactic typology, particularly interrogative structures. The same phenomenon for morphosyntax has been described for Min passive and comitative markers in Chappell (forthcoming (a)), which resembles Late Medieval Chinese more closely than Mandarin where grammatical renovation has occurred. It will be seen that the studies in this volume effectively meld these two approaches of synchrony and diachrony.

1.2 Typological features of Sinitic

Sinitic and Tibeto-Burman form the two major branches of the Sino-Tibetan language family located in East and Southeast Asia. Sinitic languages are, nonetheless, as diverse as Slavonic, Romance or Germanic languages within the Indo-European family. Despite continuous use of written forms of Chinese dating back three millennia, the spoken forms of Chinese languages are not mutually intelligible: a speaker of the Fuzhou dialect, a variety of Min spoken in the southern coastal province of Fujian, will not understand a compatriot from Lake Tai in Jiangsu province of central China, who speaks a Wu dialect. The lack of comprehensibility, in this case, refers to the use of the normal colloquial register, questions of bilingualism in the standard language, Mandarin, temporarily set aside. Even within dialect groups such as Min or Yue there is a high degree of mutual unintelligibility between subdivisions such as Coastal versus Inland Min or one of the Guangxi or Western Yue dialects versus Hong Kong Cantonese. The use of a common script in the domain of officialdom and education has served as a culturally unifying force over many centuries. Despite the fact that this literary language - *wényán* 文言- is quite distinct from any spoken form of Chinese and was a genre mainly learned by an elite (see Chen 1999), its unifying use as a written medium has reinforced the belief that the spoken varieties in China are dialects of the one language rather than related languages.

Typologically, Sinitic languages are tonal languages which show a certain degree of analytic or isolating features, although historically Archaic Chinese possessed inflectional morphology. Agent-Verb-Object is one of the basic word

orders, while object preposing is used as a common contrastive device: AOV or simply patient topicalization with OV. Postverbal intransitive subjects are common in presentative constructions: VS. These word orders are subject, however, to important discourse constraints and processes of anaphora (see Tao 1996).

Some of the major typological features of Sinitic are described in the contributions to this volume, including those shared with surrounding language families. In general, modifier precedes modified. This allows us to predict the basic form of a large number of structures. In complex clauses of cause and condition, subordinate clauses precede main clauses, while in VP syntax, adverbials of manner in general precede verbs apart from some notable exceptions in Southern Sinitic languages for time and frequency adverbs which may follow (Ch 10).

Modal verbs also precede main verbs with semantic change from deontic to epistemic meanings attested as early as Late Archaic Chinese (fifth to third centuries BCE), research made possible by the large corpus of ancient texts available to the historical linguist (Ch. 6). Even three millennia ago, markers of predication with modal, focalizing and copular functions filled a preverbal position in the Shang dynasty inscriptions of the fourteenth to 11th centuries BCE (Ch. 6). It is well-known that the domains of modality, negation and interrogatives are closely linked by their irrealis feature: One of the main strategies in Sinitic for the interrogative is the Yes/No question type, neutral in presupposition. This is formed through simple juxtaposition of the positive and negative forms of the verb: V-NEG-V and shown to be subject to certain diachronic changes affecting word order in the VP for Cantonese in Ch. 8.

NP syntax similarly shows prenominal modification: relative clauses, possessors and attributives all precede the head noun. Classifier constructions of {(Demonstrative)/(Numeral)}-Classifier-Noun are used in specifying nouns which are otherwise opaque as to number or referentiality, as well as in other relational functions such as marking the functional equivalent of the relative clause in Cantonese (Ch. 10)

The relation between events, situations (*Sachverhältnisse*) and time is predominantly coded by aspectual systems in Sinitic, realised as enclitics to the verb in most dialect groups (Ch. 3), apart from a tendency to express progressive or durative aspects preverbally in some of the languages. Aspect systems also include the use of verb reduplication V_1V_1 to code tentativeness 'do an action for a short

while' which is very widespread in Sinitic (Ch. 11). It has been shown that aspect markers follow a similar path of grammaticalization to other kinds of postverbal complements which have developed out of V_1V_2 serial verb constructions (see Ohta 1958, Cao 1997). Postverbal complements may indicate the result an event, manner of an action, or its potential to take place (Ch. 4, Ch. 9). The close relationship between such markers of aspect and of complements is explored in Ch. 4. It is possible for aspect markers to undergo further semantic change and develop into markers of epistemicity, treated in Ch. 3 on the category of evidentials.

Furthermore, locative verbs can grammaticalize into both locative coverbs (prepositions or postpositions) and into aspect markers. From V_1 position in a V_1V_2 series the tendency is to develop into preverbal markers of the progressive aspect while from V_2 position, they develop into postverbal markers of the perfective and durative (Ch. 2). Other kinds of coverbs or prepositions which have grammaticalized out of verbs come to serve the function of marking case roles such as agent, patient and benefactive (Ch. 13).

Despite the characterization as isolating, Sinitic languages show many kinds of productive affixing processes. Prefixes on nouns form vocatives or designative kin terms while typical functions of suffixes are as nominalizers, agentive markers and diminutives (Ch. 12). Gender may be marked by either prefixes (Northern Chinese) or suffixes (Southern Sinitic). Traces of earlier infixes and prefixes reconstructible for Archaic Chinese can be detected in some of the more conservative dialects, used both on nouns and verbs with different semantic effects (Ch. 5). I next describe each Sinitic language or dialect group in turn.

1.3 Dialect history and geographical distribution

It is generally recognized that the Sinitic stock comprises at least seven major dialect groups. Major works on Chinese such as Yuan (1960), Ramsey (1987) and Norman (1988) use this classification, based on earlier pioneering work on Chinese dialectology by Li Fang-kuei (1939) :

- I. Northern Chinese (Mandarin) 北方话
 - (i) Northern
 - (ii) Northwestern

- (iii) Jiang-Huai or Xiajiang (Lower Yangtze) dialects
- (iv) Southwestern
- II. Xiāng 湘
- III. Gàn 贛
- IV. Wú 吳
- V. Mǐn dialect group 閩
 - (i) Western or Inland Min
 - (ii) Eastern or Coastal Min
- VI. Kèjiā or Hakka 客家
- VII. Yuè dialects 粵

Mandarin covers the largest expanse of territory, from Manchuria in the northeast of China to Yunnan and Sichuan provinces in the southwest. The other six main dialect groups fall neatly into almost complementary geographical distribution with Mandarin, covering the east and southeast of China.

Since the 1930s, a further three dialect groups have been identified or their establishment as a separate group argued for: these are the *Jin* dialects of Northern China (Shanxi province and Inner Mongolia); the *Huī* dialects found in parts of Anhui, Jiangxi and Zhejiang provinces; and the *Píng huà* dialects of Guangxi. The *Jin* dialects are the only other Sinitic dialect group to be found natively in northern China.

- VIII. Jìn dialects 晉
- IX. Píng huà 平話
- X. Huī dialects 徽

Research into the classification of these dialect groups is only at a rather preliminary stage, although scholarly descriptions of various dialects within each group are available (see section 1.3 for some references). I next discuss the dialect groups in more detail. In addition to these, some dialects or groups of dialects remain unclassified. These include the Shaozhou patois spoken in northern Guangdong and Waxiang or Xianghua, spoken in northwestern Hunan province.

The area around the Huang He or Yellow River is considered to be the mainspring of early Han Chinese civilization, with expansion occurring in a southwards direction to cross the Yangzi River into the former kingdoms of the Wu, Chu and Yue. The development of Sinitic has thus been moulded by a long history of migrations from north to south of present day China in conjunction with ensuing language contact with the ‘barbarian’ tribes of the newly settled areas. Successive waves of migration from the North over many centuries led to the superimposing of further new layers of different Northern Chinese dialects onto these evolving southern dialects. The end-effect is that Sinitic languages are each a product of many factors including genetic inheritance, language convergence, areal diffusion and stratification. No simple tree diagram could effectively capture all these contributing factors (see Sagart 1997 on dialects as fuzzy entities; Chappell 2001).

Table 1.1 A chronology of Chinese dynasties

	PINYIN form	WADE-GILES/ANGLICIZED form	DATES
夏/殷	XIA or YIN	HSIA or YIN	21 st – 17th century BC
商	SHANG	SHANG	17 th – 11 th century BC
周	ZHOU	CHOU: Western 11th c. – 771 BC; Eastern 770- 256 BC	11 th century – 256 BC
春秋	CHUNQIU	SPRING & AUTUMN PERIOD	770 – 476 BC
戰國	ZHANGUO	WARRING STATES	475 – 221 BC
秦	QIN	CH'IN	221 – 207 BC
漢	HAN	西漢 Western Han 206 BC – 24 AD (Former Han) 東漢 Eastern Han 25 AD – 220 AD (Later Han)	206 BC – 220 AD
三國	SAN GUO	THREE KINGDOMS: 魏 Wei 220 – 265 AD 蜀漢 Shu Han 221 – 263 AD 吳 Wu 222 – 280 AD	220 – 280 AD
晉	JIN	Western Jin 265 – 316 AD Eastern Jin 317 – 420 AD	265 – 420 AD
南北朝	NANBEICHAO or	NORTHERN & SOUTHERN DYNASTIES or	420 – 589 AD
六朝	LIU CHAO	SIX DYNASTIES <i>Northern:</i> 北魏 Northern Wei 386 – 534 東魏 Eastern Wei 534 – 550 北齊 Northern Qi 550 – 577 西魏 Western Wei 535 – 556 北周 Northern Zhou 557 – 581 <i>Southern:</i> 宋 Song 420 – 479 齊 Qi 479 – 502 梁 Liang 502 – 557 陳 Chen 557 – 589	
隋	SUI	SUI	581 – 618
唐	TANG	T'ANG	618 – 907
五代	WU DAI	FIVE DYNASTIES 後梁 Later Liang 907 – 923 後唐 Later Tang 923 – 936 後晉 Later Jin 936 – 946 後漢 Later Han 947 – 950 後周 Later Zhou 951 – 960	907 – 960
宋	SONG	SUNG 北宋 Northern Song 960-1127 南宋 Southern Song 1127-1279	960 – 1279
遼	LIAO	LIAO	907 – 1125
晉	JIN	CHIN	1115 – 1234
元	YUAN	YUAN	1206 – 1368
明	MING	MING	1368 – 1644
清	QING	CH'ING	1616 – 1911

The earliest known description of dialect differences is given in the *Lǐ Jì* 礼记 or Record of Rites, a compilation of works based on the rites, ceremonies and

etiquette of the Zhou dynasty (You 1992: 91) for which the dating is controversial. Conservative historiographers place it in the Former or Western Han dynasty (206BCE – 24CE), although the material clearly relates to and describes an older period (Loewe 1993). In the Record of Rites, names of the languages of the barbarians are given, specifically the Ji 寄 in the east, Xiàng 象 in the south, Dídī 狄鞮 in the west, and Yì 译 in the north. However, it is far from clear whether these names refer to dialects of the Xià 夏 language, that is, the language of the Western Zhou rulers whose kingdom was in present day Henan province during the period from 11th century to 771 BCE, or to completely different languages. Nonetheless, other historical events can aid in building a clearer picture of dialect history.

There were at least four main series of migrations – planned and unplanned - which took place over a fifteen hundred-year period. The first one occurred under the Qin Emperor who unified China in 221 BCE. He was responsible for sending half a million soldiers to settle the frontier territories in southeastern China and set up garrisons. Colonization continued into this area, particularly during the Later Han dynasty (25-220CE). These population movements laid the foundation for the six oldest dialect groups, Min, Wu, Yue, Gan, Hakka and Xiang with a substratum of the languages of the original inhabitants, possibly Austroasiatic in some areas in the view of Norman and Mei (1976); Norman (1988) on Min and Pan (1991) on Wu; Hmong-Mien in the area of present-day Hunan, Jiangxi and western Fujian provinces (Sagart 1993a); and the ancestors of the Tai in the present-day Guangxi region and Guangdong province.

Two further population movements in the following millennium also played a important role in dialect formation. The first set occurred during the five hundred-year period between the Eastern Han dynasties (25-220 CE) and the Sui (581-618 CE), particularly after the fall of the Jin capital, Luoyang, in 313 which saw the nobility flee south to re-establish their capital in Jinling (present-day Nanjing).

The third major set of migrations occurred during the Tang dynasty (618-907 CE), either due to active colonization policies or at times of war and upheaval, while the fourth was at the end of the Northern Song dynasty (960-1127) when the ruling class moved south again, re-establishing its capital in Hangzhou, in Wu territory. Sagart (1999, Ch. 5) proposes three main pathways for migration during this extended period of dialect formation along the major axes of (1) the Xiang River valley in

Hunan, (2) the Gan River valley in Jiangxi and (3) the coast south of the Yangzi. These three routes laid the foundation respectively for the Xiang and Nanling dialect groups, possibly extending further south to the Yue group; the Gan and Hakka dialect groups; and the Wu and Min dialect groups.

The larger dialect picture or situation for Sinitic languages was basically in place by the time of the Southern Song (1127-1279), apart from the later formation of the Hui dialects by the time of the Ming dynasty. A brief description of each Sinitic language or dialect group is given in the next section.

I. Northern Chinese or Mandarin 北方话

Mandarin is the official language of three countries: (1) the People's Republic of China, where it is called *pǔtōnghuà* 普通话 'the common language'; (2) Taiwan, where it is called *guóyǔ* 国语 'the national language' but is only the first language of a 12% minority; and (3) Singapore, where *Huáyǔ* 华语, originally an elegant appellation for 'Chinese language', is one of four official languages alongside English, Malay and Tamil. Demographically it has the largest number of speakers of any Sinitic language, spoken by 71.5 per cent of the population in China in one of its four main dialect varieties (Ramsey 1987: 87). The four subdivisions of Mandarin are listed below with their geographical location. The reader may refer to Map 1.1 for the precise distribution.

(i) Northern

Hebei, including Beijing, Henan, Shandong, Manchuria, northern Anhui, parts of Inner Mongolia

(ii) Northwestern

Shanxi, Shaanxi, Gansu, Qinghai and Ningxia, parts of western Inner Mongolia

(iii) Jiang-Huai or Xiajiang (Lower Yangtze) dialects

Nanjing, Jiangsu province north of the Yangtze, central Anhui province

(iv) Southwestern

Hubei, northwest Hunan, Sichuan, Yunnan, Guizhou, northwest Guangxi

The Northwestern dialects are claimed to be the most heterogeneous of the four varieties of Mandarin.

The concept of *běifānghuà* 北方话 ‘northern speech’ is first mentioned in the dialect work by Guo Pu 郭璞 known as *Fāngyán Zhù* 方言注 (Commentary on the *Fāngyán*) and compiled during the Eastern Jin dynasty (317-420 CE). Certain dialect words, listed in earlier works such as the first century *Fāngyán* 方言 (Dialects) by Yang Xiong, are given in this later work by Guo Pu as the common term in northern speech (You 1992: 94). This is interesting in that it suggests some unification of the northern dialects of Chinese had already taken place by this time - the period of Early Medieval Chinese in the fourth and fifth centuries CE.

In the provinces where Han Chinese settlement occurred *en masse* much later, postdating the Song dynasty, older varieties of Chinese and non-Sinitic languages have been progressively replaced by Mandarin during the Yuan, Ming and Qing dynasties (see Table 1.1 for chronology). These are the border regions of the northwest, the northeast and the southwest. This is true even where Han Chinese arrived at much earlier periods. For example, although Chinese settlers arrived in the western region of Qinghai as early as the Han dynasty {1}, they were never in the majority until the Ming dynasty (1368-1644 CE), when large-scale migration led to their outnumbering other nationalities, particularly in the eastern parts of Qinghai.

Southern Sinitic languages began to evolve out of Early Medieval Chinese during the first half of the first millennium CE, with diversification resulting from factors such as substratum influences, geographical isolation in the inaccessible regions of southeastern China, and successive overlays of Northern Chinese, creating degrees of convergence, particularly for the dialect groups of central China, Wu, Xiang and Gan, or sharp stratification as in the more isolated Min dialects.

II. Xiāng 湘

The language of the Chu kingdom, an important dialect before the Jin dynasty was established in the third century CE, was spoken in the area of modern-day Hunan and Hubei. It appears not to have been mutually intelligible with the court language of the Zhou, *Xià* 夏, the goal of reconstruction for Archaic Chinese. You (1992) regards Old Chu as the basis for Old Xiang which probably split off from Medieval Chinese some time prior to the Tang dynasty. Today the Xiang dialects are spread over most of Hunan province, except for the north, northwest and some southern areas where Southwestern

Mandarin has encroached upon Xiang territory. They are spoken by 4.8 per cent of the population in China. The name is taken from the major river in this region.

By the time of the Southern Song, early Mandarin extended only as far south as the middle and lower reaches of the Yangtze, apart from one small pocket where Northern speakers had crossed the Yangtze into the Northwest Xiang area after the Ānshǐ 安史 turmoil of the mid-Tang dynasty, with a resultant dramatic impact on Northern Xiang. Consequently, the more archaic features from Old Xiang are now better preserved in the southern dialects of Xiang. The dialect of the provincial capital Changsha is an example of New Xiang which has steadily converged towards Southwestern Mandarin, with the result that there is apparently little difficulty in communication between speakers of both languages. The complex interrelationship between Changsha Xiang and Mandarin is described in Y. Wu (1992). Wu, in fact, contributes the single study on Xiang in this book investigating locative structures in the Changsha dialect and their grammaticalized aspectual functions (see Ch.2). Norman (1988: 190) characterizes Xiang and Mandarin as sharing a weak dialect boundary and suggests that some of the southwestern Mandarin dialects may originally have been Xiang.

III. Gàn 贛

The focal territory for Gan is Jiangxi province. Gan dialects are also found in eastern Hunan and southeastern Hubei. Speakers account for 2.4 per cent of the population in China. The Gan group can be split into northern and southern types. Northern Gan was probably formed during the period between the end of the Eastern Han and the beginning of the Tang dynasty (third to seventh centuries CE) when a melange of speakers of various northern Chinese dialects flowed into Jiangxi province along the Gan river valley, one of three main roads to the south (Ch. 5). This mixture of dialects was superimposed on the local Jiangxi dialects, which were possibly a merger of the Old Wu and Old Chu languages of former eponymous kingdoms (You 1992). {2}

The early formation of these Northern Gan dialects meant they escaped the influence of the newly emerging standard language of the Tang capital in Chang'an, in contrast to the situation for Southern Gan which developed under the influence of the Chang'an koine brought south during a second larger wave of migration in the middle and late Tang periods (eighth to ninth centuries CE). The merger of such a superstrate of

dialects close to Chang'an Northern Chinese with Northern Gan speakers thus created Southern Gan in the broad area of central Jiangxi (detailed in Sagart 1993a). {3}

The Gan dialects were originally grouped together with Hakka due to sharing certain major sound changes from the time of Medieval Chinese. However, some striking lexical differences, combined with exceptions to these sound rules have led linguists more recently to treat them as separate groups, although the relationship is close (see Sagart 1988, 1997 for more discussion).

IV. Wú 吴

Like Gan, the Wu group can also be split into northern and southern types. The focal area of the Wu dialects is Zhejiang province on the central eastern coast of China. In addition, Wu dialects are spoken in the contiguous regions of southern Jiangsu and southeastern Anhui province. Shanghainese is the most prominent member of this dialect group and, in terms of population, Wu is second largest Sinitic language after the Northern Chinese group, with 8.5 per cent of the population, or over eighty million speakers. P. Wu (1991) and You (1992) both view Wu as the oldest dialect group, having its homeland in southern Jiangsu province with southwards expansion to northern Zhejiang and ultimately to the rest of the region. This early southwards migration of the first century CE along a coastal pathway was followed by three further waves of northern Chinese immigrants who moved through Wu territory in the third, fourth and twelfth centuries CE.

The more archaic Wu dialects are thus to be found in the south of Wu territory in Southern Zhejiang. You (1992) strongly supports the hypothesis that the Wu dialects are the basis for Min which preserve, in his view, the most archaic Wu features, citing lexical and phonological evidence shared by Wu dialects spoken in Southern Zhejiang with those of Min. Norman (1988: 189, 1999) claims, nonetheless, that there is a strong demarcation line between Min and Wu dialects. The less contentious standpoint would be to posit a common ancestor for Wu and Min, formed by the first century CE, from which both split off. The proximity of Wu to Northern Chinese dialects has led to constant incursions into Wu territory, with resultant Mandarinization of certain features, as opposed to Min, whose isolation allowed for preservation of older features. This is further discussed in the section on Min below.

V. Mǐn 闽

The Min group is a very diverse group of dialects whose subdivisions are, in the main, not mutually intelligible. This dialect group is spoken by 4.1 per cent of China's population. Its speakers live principally in the southeastern coastal province of Fujian, with some incursions into the Guangdong region.

Bielenstein (1959) uses historical records detailing the establishment of prefectures to show that Fujian was sinicized at a much later date than other frontier areas of China. Before settlement by the Han Chinese, the Fujian region was originally inhabited by the Yue, who conquered and destroyed the state of Wu in the first half of the fifth century BCE, but were then themselves defeated by the Chu in 333 BCE. Emperor Qin (221-210 BCE) made a commandery out of the territory, but it remained outside of China proper for another ten centuries. The problem was a topographical one: there were no natural north-south river routes through this region of high impassable mountain chains. Consequently, the area was bypassed during the large scale migrations to the south during the Eastern Han dynasty (25-220 CE). In fact, major migrations to Fujian province first took place in the seventh century and comprised mainly farmers, rather than soldiers, who opened up this territory to Chinese habitation in a peaceful manner.

In the third century CE, there is however, evidence of smaller scale migration into northern Fujian from the inland, first from Zhejiang in the north and then from Jiangxi in the west. The reason that the coastal areas were only settled four to five centuries later is a consequence of their remoteness and the difficulty of reaching the coast of Fujian from Zhejiang except by boat. It is the 742 CE census, which records ninety-one thousand households in Fujian compared with twelve- to thirteen-thousand households recorded in the 609 CE census, that points to such a second large-scale migration south from Zhejiang and Jiangxi in the 7th century, which proceeded this time along the coast.

These migration routes tally well with the dialect divisions independently established for Min: the basic one is between Inland (or Western) Min and Coastal (or Eastern) Min (see Norman 1988, 1991b, 1999; You 1992). Inland Min is divided into Northwestern and Far Western versus Central, which form a natural correspondence to the two different routes of migration taken in the third century CE, from Jiangxi in the

west and Zhejiang in the north. The formation of Coastal Min would correspond to the seventh century migration down the coast from these same two provinces.

(i) Inland Min

a. *Northwestern*: Jian dialects

b. *Far Western*: Shàowǔ, Jiānglè

c. *Central*: Yǒng'ān

(ii) Coastal Min

a. *Northeastern*: Fúzhōu, Fú'ān

b. *Southern*: Xiàmén, Taiwanese, Cháozhōu, Hainanese

The traditional view is that Min split off from mainstream Chinese during the transition time between the two Han dynasties (early in the first millennium CE) (see Ting 1983, and Sagart's critique in Ch. 5). There is general agreement that Proto-Wu (also called Old Wu-Min) is the likely basis for the development of Min, given that the early colonists moved into Fujian from Wu territory from the end of Han times and throughout the Three Kingdoms period in the third century CE (Norman 1991b, You 1992). On the other hand, as Ting (1983) and Norman (1988, 1999) propose, its very archaic features could simply be due to early bifurcation from Medieval Chinese, before the period reflected in the sixth century rhyming dictionary, the *Qièyùn* which has been used in the reconstruction of the Middle Chinese phonological system. Nonetheless, the historical evidence suggests its formation must have begun in Wu territory and, if this is true, it must have occurred during the period of the two Han dynasties (206 BCE - 220 CE), as explained above.

The stark contrast between literary and colloquial pronunciations is a well-known phenomenon in Southern Min, known as *wén-bái yì-dú* 文白异读 in Mandarin. Williams (1896: xxxiii) describes the difference between reading and colloquial pronunciations of the Amoy dialect in the following manner in the introduction to his syllabic dictionary (note that his use of the term 'Amoy dialect' encompasses the two departments of Zhangzhou 漳州 and Quanzhou 泉州 as well as Formosa or Taiwan):

‘The colloquial used by the people of this region differs widely from the style in which books are written, -- as much perhaps as anywhere in China. They substitute other words or disyllabic phrases for the single terms used in books, and vary the inflection of even common words; giving them a nasal or contracted ending, or changing their sound and tone altogether. The greatest part of them are earlier forms of what is now accepted as the authorized reading sound which has gradually become assimilated to the mandarin; but some are manifestly derived from characters which have dropped out of use and some perhaps from an older aboriginal speech.’

Several strata can be detected in the Min lexicon: The earliest stratum can be traced back to the Han dynasty while the second is from the Nanbeichao period. The third stratum of reading pronunciations, used to recite texts in Min, reflects the late Tang koine, based on the prestige dialect of the capital, Chang’an (Norman 1991b: 338-9). This resulted in the present-day stratification, aspects of which are treated by Lien (see Ch. 12) who shows this third stratum cannot be simply explained as a literary register and also in Yue-Hashimoto (1991a) on Min interrogative structures.

During the Song dynasty, the Min continued to spread southwards along the coast to Chaozhou (Teochiu) and Shantou (Swatow) areas in northeastern Guangdong, even settling as far south as the Leizhou peninsula in this province. Both Chaozhou and Shantou dialects are varieties of Southern Min, classified under Coastal Min. Min speakers began to migrate to Hainan Island and Taiwan from Southern Fujian from the early Qing dynasty onwards, that is, from the seventeenth century CE.

Taiwanese is the language under investigation for three studies in this volume concerning reduplication, lexical diffusion and prepositions (Chs. 11, 12 and 13 respectively). It remains very close to the dialects of Southern Min spoken in Xiamen (Amoy), Quanzhou and Zhangzhou on the mainland of China.

VI. Kèjiā or Hakka 客家

There are two main opposing views about the formation of Hakka (discussed in detail in Sagart 1988). In the first view, espoused by Lo (1933), Hakka was already formed in the north in the area of present-day Henan province, before the first southwards migration

took place in the fourth century CE following the fall of the Western Jin dynasty in 313. This view assumes that there were specific Hakka migrations, separate from those of other Han peoples. The folk genesis of the Hakka people certainly appears to support this view in its depiction of a migrant people who moved southwards from the Zhōngyuán or central plains area of China in five successive waves. However, this is based on family genealogies compiled in the south long after the migrations took place and reflects the desirability of establishing an orthodox northern ancestry, as Hashimoto (1973), (1992: 6) and Sagart (1988: 148) separately observe.

In the second more plausible view, Hakka evolved in the south in the period of the Song dynasty, specifically in southeastern Jiangxi and western Fujian, *after* migration had taken place (Sagart 1988: 148; You 1992: 103), with a following movement south to northeastern Guangdong. This constitutes the modern heartland of the Hakka with further settlements scattered over these three provinces and as far west as Sichuan. According to the second view, Hakka develops from Southern Gan by the end of the Song, possessing a possible substrate of non-Chinese languages spoken in the mountainous border areas straddling Jiangxi and western Fujian such as the She and Yao (Hmong-Mien). Its recent development would explain the relative uniformity of the Hakka sound system from one dialect to another (see Hashimoto 1992; Sagart 1988). The Hakka, whose name means ‘guest people’, make up 3.7 per cent of China’s population. Migration to Taiwan began in the early Qing period, where the Hakka constitute twelve per cent of the current population of 21.4 million. A third, very recent, view groups Yue, Hakka and Southern Gan together as subdialects of a Guangzhou dialect type (Lau 1999).

VII. Yuè 粵

The core area for Yue is Guangdong province and the southeastern part of the Guangxi region in south China. Cantonese is the best-known member of this group of heterogeneous dialects spoken by five per cent of China’s population. This area, known as *Lǐngnán* 岭南 ‘south of the five ridges’, was gradually settled during the two Han dynasties. Records from the Han period indicate that this area was originally populated by many ‘barbarian’ tribes of the *Bǎi Yuè* 百越 or ‘One Hundred Yue’. The Yue dialects were thus formed in a language contact situation with non-Han peoples in a frontier area, first annexed as Chinese territory in the Qin dynasty (late 3rd century BCE), as outlined

above. Yue-Hashimoto (1991b: 298) suggests that two main migration routes were used over many centuries and these were along the Xiang and Gan rivers from North China. She also cites evidence for two substrata in Yue dialects: Tai and Hmong (1991: 305). Yuan (1989: 179) similarly lists lexical items that Yue dialects share with Zhuang [Tai] languages, still spoken in this region, particularly in Guangxi province.

It is thus interesting to note that the sound system of Guangzhou and Hong Kong Cantonese remains remarkably close to the Medieval Chinese of the Tang and early Song. Possibly, the final formation period for Yue was shaped by northern Chinese refugees fleeing to this area in the Song dynasty when North China was under attack from the Inner Asian invaders, the Liao and the Jin. This saw a tripling of the population in Guangdong in comparison with that of the Tang dynasty (You 1992). Today, Hong Kong Cantonese is one of the few non-Mandarin dialects with its own flourishing popular literature based on the vernacular form (see Bauer 1988). Specially-created characters, evident in newspapers, comic books, novels and advertisements, are used for morphemes that have no cognates in Mandarin, for example, lexical items such as *leng*² 靚 ‘pretty’ and *tau*² 俱 ‘take a rest’; grammatical particles such as the plural suffix *-dei*⁴ 哋; the relative clause and subordination marker *ge*³ 嘢 (Ch.10) and the perfective aspect marker *-jo*² 咗; not to mention the large number of clause-final discourse markers, including *woh*⁴ 嘢 for surprising news or reminders; *lok*³ 咯 for irrevocable situations and *la*⁴ 喇 for polite refusals (see Matthews and Yip 1994: chapter 18). Three chapters in this book form a section on Yue, specifically the Hong Kong Cantonese dialect investigating interrogative structures (Ch. 8); verb complementation (Ch. 9) and relative clauses (Ch. 10).

VIII. Jin 晋

Jin dialects are spoken by more than 45 million people in Northern China in the most of Shanxi province, central and western Inner Mongolia, and also in parts of Hebei, Henan and Shaanxi. They are less diversified than those of southern China. This is the only dialect group to be spoken in an area within the Mandarin zone of North China. The Jin dialects all share the feature of a *rù* or entering tone which the surrounding Mandarin dialects do not possess, nor standard Mandarin (J. Hou 1989, Map B-7 in Wurm and Li (eds.) 1987).

Since Jin dialects represent a peripheral area, confined by mountainous areas and the Ordos desert to the northwest, it is not surprising that they preserve features reflecting earlier stages of Chinese. Hence, Jin dialect material can be profitably used in the reconstruction, for example, of affixes already lost in many modern Mandarin dialects (Ch. 5).

IX. Huī 徽

The Hui or Huizhou dialects are spoken by 1.8 million people mainly in the southern part of Anhui province, with incursions into northeastern Jiangxi and western Zhejiang. Hirata (1998) classifies and describes Hui as comprising six main dialects, observing that these are in the main mutually unintelligible. Moreover, neither a koine nor a prestige dialect has emerged which could serve as a means of interdialectal communication. The linguistic situation reflects the historically isolated nature of Hui communities, predominant in the mountainous areas of Anhui. Hirata (1998: 18) is of the view that the Hui sound system stabilized by the early Ming dynasty (14th century), based on a comparison of contemporary dialects with the rhyme system of Ming dynasty plays using this vernacular.

The evolution of the Hui dialects is not at all transparent. Some suppose that the Wu dialects are the basis for Hui which split off during the Ming dynasty (see You 1992). According to Hirata, however, Hui is composed of many layers: its dialects are spoken in an area originally occupied by the Yuè 越 tribe, suggestive of a possible substrate, later to be overlaid by migrations from Northern China in the Medieval Nanbeichao period and the Tang and Song dynasties. This was followed by the Jiang-Huai Mandarin dialects of the migrants who arrived during the Ming and Qing periods, and more recently by Wu dialects in particular, acquired by peripatetic Hui merchants who represented an active social force in the region from the Qing dynasty onwards. According to its typological features, Hirata (1998: 19) describes Hui as being fundamentally a Southern Sinitic type of language with some encroachment from the Northern type.

According to Zheng-Zhang (1987), Hui dialects show some traits which are similar to the Gan dialects to the south, such as voiceless aspirated initials, and other traits which are similar to the Wu dialects to the east, such as the rhymes or final sections of syllables. Not surprisingly, the Yanzhou Hui dialects spoken in western

Zhejiang show an overlay of Wu features. This is merely the starting point for further research on the relationship between Hui and other dialect groups.

X. Pinghuà 平话

Pinghua dialects are spoken by an estimated two to three million Chinese, mainly living in Guangxi whose population is predominantly Zhuang [Tai subfamily]. They are also found in adjacent areas of Hunan and Yunnan provinces. This dialect group comprises the Guinan 桂南 and Guibei 桂北 types, which are not mutually intelligible.

Guinan is mainly spoken in the outskirts of Nanning, alongside Cantonese, and in other towns in the southern parts of Guangxi while Guibei is spoken in the outskirts of Guilin, alongside Southwestern Mandarin, as well as in many towns in northern Guangxi, particularly along the waterways.

It has become a widely held view among scholars in China that the Pinghua dialects should be treated as separate from Yue, with which they were formerly classed. The Yue dialects were introduced relatively late in the Qing dynasty whereas the history of Pinghua goes back at least 1000 years to the Song dynasty (Liang and Zhang 1999; S. Wei 1996). Some of the Guinan Pinghua dialects appear to have a close relationship, however, with Yue, which is not surprising, given the fact that they are co-extensive in the southern and southeastern parts of Guangxi, adjacent to Guangdong province. Sagart is of the view that they do in fact belong to Yue and their Cantonese features are not the result of convergence or borrowing (Sagart, pers. comm.). Furthermore, he considers that Guibei Pinghua dialects may have shared a common ancestor with Xiang and he classifies these as the separate dialect group of Nánlíng 南岭 (Ch. 5).

Historical records relate that large contingents of soldiers, many from Shandong, settled in Guangxi, particularly after the southern expedition of General Di Qing to suppress a Zhuang uprising during the Song dynasty. Many of the subsequent waves of migration also appear to have originated in the Central Plains region, travelling through Hubei and Hunan. The Song dynasty may thus have been a crucial formation period for the Pinghua dialects.

1.4 Periodization

An informative periodization for the history of Chinese which bears great relevance for syntactic studies is given in Peyraube (1988) and (1996). Even though this is designed to represent the different stages for the grammar of mainly vernacular forms of written Chinese, in the case of post Han times, it can be profitably used to summarize the preceding section on dialect history:

Table 1.2 Periodization for written Chinese

Pre-Archaic Chinese: language of the oracle bone inscriptions	14 th - 11 th c. BCE
Early Archaic Chinese:	10 th - 6 th c. BCE
Late Archaic Chinese:	5 th - 2 nd c. BCE
Pre-Medieval: (<i>transition period</i>)	1 st c. BCE - 1 st c. CE
Early Medieval:	2 nd - 6 th c. CE
Late Medieval:	7 th - mid-13 th c. CE
Pre-Modern: (<i>transition period</i>)	mid-13 th - 14 th c. CE
Modern:	15 th - mid-19 th c. CE
Contemporary:	mid-19 th - 20 th c. CE

This periodization is useful in that it does not pre-empt the development of the Sinitic languages other than Mandarin by assuming a vertical line of descent from proto-Chinese to Mandarin. Furthermore, it allows for certain correlations to be made: Early Archaic Chinese corresponds to the period reconstructed for Old Chinese, and Late Archaic Chinese to the representative period for the literary language, Classical Chinese. Classical Chinese is modelled on historical texts from the Warring States or Zhànguó period (5th - 3rd centuries BCE) as well as the philosophical treatises of Mencius and Confucius. It became codified as a literary genre during the Han dynasties.

The Pre-Medieval period coincides with Han dynasty expansion to the southern and southeastern frontiers that laid the foundation for the imminent

diversification into new dialects, while the Early Medieval period from the end of the Han dynasty to the beginning of the Sui coincides with the formation period for the majority of Chinese dialects. It also corresponds to the period reconstructed for Middle Chinese on the basis of the seventh century *Qièyùn* rhyming dictionary, compiled in 601 CE by Lu Fayan, (Norman 1988; Ramsey 1987; see also Ch. 5).

For the Late Medieval period of the Tang and Song dynasties, texts exist containing both dialect materials or discussion of clear dialect differences between regions in China which are relevant to the modern dialect groups. {4} There is general consensus that this must have been the crucial period when many Southern Sinitic languages became clearly identifiable entities, separate from Northern Chinese, apart from the dissension concerning Min noted above. Thus, by the end of the Song dynasty in the thirteenth century, the Sinitic subfamily of languages was largely discernible in its present form. The modern period from the thirteenth century onwards is applicable in the sense of it being diachronically relevant to a developmental period for the majority of Sinitic languages. It appears that only Hui had its formative period after the Song dynasty.

1.5 Analyses of Sinitic grammar in this volume

In the final section of this introduction, abstracts of the studies in this book are presented in order of their appearance.

The first section of this volume sets the overall theoretical framework of a descriptive and functional approach used in the analysis of the grammar and morphosyntax of Sinitic languages. This section comprises three studies which employ an essentially typological and comparative perspective to examine aspect markers and their close semantic relatives - locatives and verb complement markers of manner and extent. Furthermore, locatives are one of the typical lexical sources that trigger grammaticalization into aspect in the right syntactic environment. This is not only true of Sinitic but is found as a recurrent pattern crosslinguistically (Dahl 1985; Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca 1994). Verb complement markers and aspect markers often develop from the same structures, as Lamarre shows (Ch. 4), while aspect markers may metalinguistically extend their scope to the whole clause upon semantic change into epistemic markers of evidentiality, for example (Ch. 4).

Yunji Wu presents a study of grammaticalization processes which have synchronically resulted in the co-existence of four locative constructions in the

Changsha dialect of Xiang, each with its own distinctive semantic and syntactic characteristics. Using spoken narrative data, Wu shows that the markers *tau*⁴¹/*tau*⁴⁵ 到 and *tsai*²¹ 在 can occur in both postverbal and preverbal position, while *tɕ*²⁴ 得 and *ta*²¹ 哒, showing only the postverbal use, have developed additional aspectual uses as perfective and durative markers. Although *tɕ*²⁴ 得 is the most common of these four locative markers used postverbally, *ta*²¹ 哒 is less restricted than *tɕ*²⁴ 得 in its use as an aspect marker. Wu argues that, in fact, *tɕ*²⁴ 得 and *ta*²¹ 哒 have the same lexical source in a verb ‘to get, catch’, while *tsai*²¹ 在 is a Mandarinization, progressively replacing the native Xiang locative *ku*¹³ 跼 ‘to squat, to stay’. She provides further evidence of the allomorphs of the essentially locative morpheme [*tau*⁴¹] and [*tau*⁴⁵] 到 - being conditioned by their function, respectively, as a verb complement with perfective meaning, and as a postverbal preposition introducing a locative noun of destination.

Hilary Chappell investigates verb enclitics in Sinitic languages, such as Mandarin *kuo*⁵⁵, Cantonese Yue *kwo*³³, and Shanghainese Wu *ku*³⁴ (çir?⁵), or preverbal markers such as Taiwanese *bat* and Fuzhou *pei*?³¹ *tseij*⁵², both Min dialects. These have commonly been described as experiential aspect markers whose function is defined as indicating an event has taken place at least once in the past (see, for example, Comrie 1976: 58).

The main purpose of this study is to challenge the view that this category is primarily aspectual in the case of Sinitic languages. After discussion of the syntactic and semantic features of these markers in eight Sinitic languages in terms of prototype theory, Chappell argues that the experiential aspect in Sinitic languages should be reclassified as an evidential marker.

The analysis shows that the relevant marker in each Sinitic language is used to express the speaker’s commitment to the truth of the proposition, namely, certainty about the occurrence of an event. One use of these markers can be classified as a kind of inferential evidential, since the source of information is based on an inference made from an observable result state (cf. Willett 1988: 57). The other use is as an immediate evidential of personally experiencing an event (hence the traditional label). This conditions a person split.

Other non-core uses are also examined such as imperatives of repeatability expressing ‘do a certain event again’, and marking the verb in the protasis of conditionals. Further extensions of meaning for these evidential markers are found in constructions of ‘partial effect’ and as a phase complement marker of completion in Mandarin. It is shown how these are semantically linked with the prototypical meaning through discussion of the grammaticalization process of these markers from two main sources: verbs meaning ‘to cross, pass through’ which are cognate in most Sinitic languages, or verbs meaning ‘to know’ in Min dialects. This is the first study to analyse this grammatical category in Sinitic as a whole.

Christine Lamarre sets up a four-way classification for the treatment of verb complement structures in terms of the markers for manner, extent and potential complements in Sinitic languages. Standard Chinese represents the first type, where these distinctions are neutralised, all three kinds of complement structures using DE 得. In the second type, distinct markers are used for potential versus manner and extent complements. While the potential complement marker is generally DE 得 < ‘able, obtain’ in the different Southern Sinitic languages surveyed, the manner or extent complement is drawn from a set of high frequency verbs such as LAI 来 < ‘come’, ZHUO 着 < ‘hit:the:target, touch, be:attached’, QI 起 < ‘start’, QU 去 < ‘go’, or DAO 到 < ‘arrive, reach’. The data show, however, that Northern Chinese DE 得 is encroaching on the semantic territory of these manner/extent markers. It is significant that diffusion of the Mandarin stratum is clearly morphologically constrained, for example, to monosyllabic stative verbs in the complement. Lamarre also investigates a second Northern Chinese pattern belonging to this type, where the potential marker is LIAO 了 or its cognates, while manner and extent are marked with DE 得. This includes many Jin dialects of North China.

The third type of complement marking distinguishes manner from extent complements, in many cases conflating manner with the potential. This is characteristic particularly of Wu and Yue dialects. Min dialects form the fourth type in which at least three kinds of complements are distinctly marked: manner, extent and potential.

Lamarre also discusses the paths of grammaticalization in detail for each of the attested markers for the three categories of complements, and investigates their polysemy. A recurrent pattern is for aspect and resultative markers to develop into

markers of manner and extent or potential complements. The data come from Lamarre's own fieldwork in China as well as a large corpus of published works on this topic.

In the second section of this book, three chapters on syntax and morphology of earlier periods of Chinese are presented, including the reflexes of reconstructed prefixes and infixes in Archaic Chinese found in certain contemporary dialects and their semantic function; predicate markers found in the Shang bone inscriptions of Pre-Archaic Chinese (14th – 11th centuries BCE); and a functional analysis of modal verbs in Archaic Chinese. This set of studies is informed by either approaches in the methodology of comparative and historical linguistics combined with linguistic geography (Sagart), in structural descriptive linguistics (Djamouri), or in functional diachronic syntax and grammaticalization (Peyraube).

Laurent Sagart presents evidence from modern Chinese dialect groups, particularly the Jin, Min, Yue and Hakka dialect groups, to argue that: (i) they possess reflexes of the Archaic Chinese prefix **k-* and the Archaic Chinese infix **-r-* and that, similarly, (ii) the core meaning of these affixes has also been retained. These are affixes which had disappeared in the standard language by the time of Medieval Chinese. Referring to evidence from etymological sources such as Chinese classical texts and on the basis of phonological reconstruction, Sagart shows that the reflexes of these affixes in certain conservative dialects play a derivational role with an identifiable meaning.

Sagart first examines the **k-* prefix which can derive verbs, nouns and adjectives in some of the Jin dialects as well as in some Southern Min, Wu, Yue and non-standard Mandarin dialects. In its verbal use, and applied to a verbal base, it derives verbs which code dynamic action of limited duration 'V for a little while' and progressives. When it derives nouns from nouns, the prefix is used only with concrete, count nouns. The adjectival meaning is not so clearcut, the examples in some cases coding result states of dynamic action or psychological events.

Next, Sagart examines the **-r-* infix and shows that in the Jin dialects, certain Min dialects of northern Fujian, and in Mandarin dialects of the peripheral area of Shandong, it codes distributed or iterative action when infixes to verbs. In the Jin dialects, it can also be infixes in nouns, coding objects that occur in pairs or multiples; in Min and Yue in classifiers coding collectives while in one Min dialect, it gives an intensifying function to some adjectives. For both affixes, the semantic and

phonological relationship with the reconstructed forms for Archaic Chinese is given and the basic meaning established on comparative grounds.

Redouane Djamouri examines five markers of predication from the Shang bone inscriptions (ca. 1500-1028 BCE). These are *wéi* 唯 *huì* 惠, *qí* 其, *bù* 不, and *wù* 勿. He applies a structural approach to describe the verbal syntax of this period. In the Shang bone inscriptions, word order is clearly the means for signalling relations between verbs and their actants, there being no morphological marking of dependency relations, apart from the optional use of *yú* 于 and *zài* 在 to mark benefactive and locative functions. However, Djamouri argues that these five morphemes are, nonetheless, not to be considered as adverbs but rather as abstract operators of predication. Evidence for this view is presented first of all in the semantic analysis of *wéi* 唯 as assertive modality, ‘be the one who’, *huì* 惠 as injunctive deontic modality, ‘must’, and *qí* 其 as future modality, ‘will’, which not only express these modal meanings when they modify verbs but can also be used as obligatory copular verbs in equative, descriptive and nominalisation constructions. These three markers of predication have a further use in focalising the various actant roles of subject, object, benefactive and circumstantial NPs in preverbal position.

Djamouri next discusses the two negators, *bù* 不 ‘not’ and *wù* 勿 ‘must not’ which are more restricted in use than *wéi* 唯, *huì* 惠 and *qí* 其. While *bù* 不 can be used as a copula and to focalise subjects, *wù* 勿 only has the focalisation use and requires the coverb *yú* 于 before the benefactive actant. Finally, the distribution of *bù* 不 is contrasted with that of the negator of transitive verbs with overt object NPs, *fú* 弗, to show that *bù* 不 is the negator of both intransitive verbs and predicates of low transitivity such as descriptive and passive clauses. However, *bù* 不, and not *fú* 弗, is the obligatory negator when a verb has a pronominal object. This fact points to an earlier focalisation construction for objects with *bù* 不 that has become fully grammaticalized by the period of the Shang inscriptions. The three main uses of these modals as auxiliary verbs, copular verbs and as preverbal markers of focalisation thus supports their analysis as markers of predication, and not as adverbs.

Alain Peyraube discusses four main auxiliary verbs of volition in Classical Chinese, a written genre represented in works from the 5th –3rd century BCE. These are *gǎn* 敢 ‘dare to’, *kěn* 肯 ‘be willing to’, *yù* 欲 ‘wish’, and *yuàn* 愿 ‘to wish’. Of

these , *gǎn* 敢 ‘to dare to’ and *yù* 欲 ‘to wish, intend’ are the two most common auxiliaries of volition in Late Archaic Chinese. Both the syntactic and semantic features of these four auxiliaries are discussed in detail in the main analysis, which is preceded by a brief overview of a related group of modal verbs expressing possibility. The verb *gǎn* 敢 ‘to dare to, to have the necessary courage to do’ is typically found in either negative declarative sentences or in interrogative sentences when these are not negated. Its use in interrogative sentences far outweighs its use in declarative ones, however, by the time of Late Archaic Chinese. In contrast to this, the verb *yù* 欲 ‘wish, intend to’ is mainly used in affirmative declaratives. Occurrences of negated forms are rare. In the case of *kěn* 肯 ‘be willing to, consent to’, Peyraube observes that it was infrequent in Late Archaic Chinese, where it was used mostly in negated declarative sentences, but in the affirmative form for interrogatives. Moreover, this complementary distribution was maintained well into the transitional Han period (206BCE - 220CE).

The fourth verb discussed, *yuàn* 愿 ‘wish to’, is equally infrequent in use before the Han period. Its meaning is, however, more subjective than *kěn* 肯 ‘be willing to’ in that it concomitantly expresses the notion of hoping. It is shown to be used exclusively in the declarative sentences that rarely occur in negated form. These Classical Chinese data neatly show how the concepts of modality and negation are closely intertwined, given the complementary syntactic distribution for three of these verbs of volition across interrogative and declarative sentence types with respect to negation. Hence, *gǎn* 敢 ‘dare to’ and *kěn* 肯 ‘be willing to’ favour negated declaratives while *yù* 欲 ‘wish’ and *yuàn* 愿 ‘wish to’ tend to appear in affirmative declaratives.

The focus of the third section of this volume is the Cantonese language, as representative of the Yue group of dialects within Sinitic. All the data are based on the variety spoken in Hong Kong, including historical texts as used in the studies by Cheung and Yue, and contemporary colloquial data used in Matthews and Yip’s analysis. The first two studies are diachronic ones which respectively pinpoint changes over the last century for Cantonese interrogatives (Cheung) or describe the evolution of affirmative and negative forms of verb complement structures from Archaic to Medieval Chinese, then relate these findings to modern Cantonese (Yue).

The third study uses a stratificational account to explain the coexistence of several relative clause structures in contemporary Cantonese (Matthews and Yip).

Hung-Nin Samuel Cheung carries out a longitudinal study of the *A-not-A* or Yes/No question structures in Cantonese Yue in order to pinpoint a major word order change affecting VP-NEG-VP that has occurred over the last century. A database of twelve sets of language teaching materials compiled between 1828 and 1963 is the reference point for this diachronic study tracing the evolution of six major subtypes of the *A-not-A* constructions identified by Cheung. He argues for the predominance of the forward deletion process (VP NEG V) from the early nineteenth century up until the mid-twentieth century, when the backward deletion process (V NEG VP) began to gain ascendancy.

In some texts of the early twentieth century, both structures are found side-by-side, for example: *Néih sīk sé jih m̀h sīk nī?* 你識寫字唔識呢? (2SG-know-write-character-NEG-know-PRT) (forward deletion: VP-NEG-V) versus *Néih sīk m̀h sīk sé jih nī?* 你識唔識寫字呢? (2SG-know-NEG-know-write-character -PRT) (backward deletion: V-NEG-VP) ‘D o you know how to write?’. In fact, Cheung is able to locate the 1930s and 1940s as the pivotal period during which backward deletion to V-NEG-VP became the favoured process, extending by analogy from V-O predicates to disyllabic verbs and compounds. Furthermore, Cheung shows that the VP-嗎 [VP-*ma*] and the VP-未 [VP-*meih*] (which replaced VP-唔曾 [VP-*m̀h chahng*]) can be analysed as reflexes of this early Cantonese forward deletion VP-NEG-V structure. On the basis of such internal evidence, he argues that the forward deletion, or VP-NEG-V structure, is native to Cantonese and not a borrowing from Northern Mandarin as some researchers have supposed.

Anne Yue traces the development of the verb complement structure when co-occurring with an object noun phrase, comparing examples from Archaic and Medieval Chinese texts with their reflexes in modern Cantonese. Residues of archaic structures can still be found in nineteenth century Cantonese texts such as the pattern of Verb-Object-Complement, prevalent in extant Tang (618-907CE) and Song dynasty (960-1279CE) materials. She limits the scope of the discussion to the causative/resultative and aspectual types of verb complements which allow formation of the potential mode with 得 *dak*¹ ‘can’, for example: *da²-sei² jek¹ wu¹ying⁴* 打死隻烏蠅‘(hit and) kill a fly’. It is shown that pivotal constructions of the form V1_{tr} + NP

+ V2_{intr}, where the noun phrase is both object of the first verb and subject of the second (and not a coordinative V₁ V₂ structure), formed a transitional construction out of which the Verb-Complement structure emerged as early as the Han period (206BCE-220CE). However, examples are rare from this period as the V-C (O) structure was not fully established until the Early Medieval period.

Yue also analyses the development of the negative form of the Verb-Complement structure and its interaction with the development of the negative potential mode, showing that it has more structural freedom in contemporary Cantonese than does its positive counterpart. Yue argues on the basis of a set of thirty-seven Cantonese language materials from 1841 to 1993 that this asymmetry can be attributed to temporal and spatial stratification of the different syntactic patterns.

Stephen Matthews and Virginia Yip analyse two main types of relative clause structure in Hong Kong Cantonese within a framework of ditaxia. This term refers to the parallel use of two syntactic structures, differentiated only by register: colloquial Cantonese typically uses classifiers as relative markers as in (1) while in formal Cantonese, a structure formed with the possessive *ge*³ 嘅 mirrors the use of Mandarin *de* 的 as a relativizer, as in (2). Compare the following examples:

(1) 佢 唱 嗰 首 歌
 koei⁵ coeng³ go² sau² go¹
 3SG sing that CL song
 ‘the song she sings’

(2) 佢 唱 嘅 歌
 koei⁵ coeng³ ge³ go¹
 3SG sing PRT song
 ‘the song(s) she sings’

In addition, different semantic and syntactic constraints apply to these two structures, while studies in language acquisition of Cantonese show that the classifier relative is acquired first. Typologically, the relational, including possessive, use of the classifier in the colloquial Cantonese is characteristic of some Southern Sinitic languages and

also Hmong-Mien languages. A third and innovative construction represents a hybridization of these two, where both the appropriate classifier and the possessive marker *ge*³ 嘅 are present, with the form [...CL *ge*³ N].

Matthews and Yip show that a deletion analysis cannot be used to derive the *ge*³ construction from the classifier relative clause. Nor can an analysis as an internally-headed relative clause explain all types of relative clause data in Cantonese. Consequently, they argue for the incorporation of ditaxia into linguistic description to provide a multistratal model of grammar which can more adequately account for these phenomena.

The fifth and final section of this volume comprises three studies on the grammar and morphosyntax of Southern Min, specifically, the Taiwanese variety. As discussed in Section 3, Min represents one of the most archaic of the Sinitic dialect groups and, thus, can shed much light on the evolution of grammar within this subphylum, an area which Li has pioneered (see Li 1986). Tsao uses a functionalist approach of prototype theory to compare Southern Min and Mandarin verbal and adjectival reduplication processes while Lien presents a seminal study of morphological devices such as noun affixation. These form semantic domains revealing the co-existence of lexical items from both the native Southern Min and literary strata. Lien makes use of the notion of competing morphological forms within the framework of lexical diffusion theory. The volume ends with *éclat* in the form of the broad overview given by Li of the historical processes involved in the formation of the preposition (or coverb) inventory found in Southern Min and Mandarin. Appropriately to this volume, he makes use of a comparative typological approach in his analysis and surveys a large number of construction types, including the passive, the locative and the disposal.

Feng-fu Tsao carries out a comparative analysis of Taiwanese Mandarin and Taiwanese Southern Min for two main kinds of reduplication processes - verbal and adjectival - showing that neither the functions nor the reduplicated forms are completely symmetrical in these two Sinitic languages. He first argues that reduplication has a perfective aspectual function, then proceeds to compare the Mandarin and Southern Min structures. For verbal reduplication, Mandarin and Southern Min both exhibit the core meaning of tentativeness and the semantic feature of 'short duration of an action'. In addition to this, the Southern Min verbal

reduplication structure can express the notion of ‘rapid completion’ of an action, when used in combination with either a resultative complement, a phase marker, a directional complement or an intended result introduced by complementizer *hoo*⁷. Only Mandarin verbal reduplication, however, shows the function of trial action.

For adjectival reduplication, the contrast is even greater between the two languages: the Mandarin structure expresses intensity or ‘vividness’ as its core meaning for both monosyllabic and disyllabic adjectives, the latter being reduplicated in the form of AABB, for example, *lǎo-lǎo-shi-shi* 老老實實 ‘very honest’. The main type of Southern Min adjectival reduplication is, however, predicative, taking the form of ABAB. Its core meaning is extended metalinguistically to code tentativeness in categorising or in ascribing a property to some object, for example, *láusit-láusit* 老實老實 ê ‘kind of honest’. Nonetheless, for some disyllabic adjectives in Southern Min, the Mandarin AABB structure is possible and, so too, the meaning of vividness. This is described as a loan into Southern Min. In general, however, for monosyllabic adjectives, tripling of the syllable must be used in order to achieve the ‘vividness’ interpretation. In conclusion, Tsao uses the framework of prototype theory to elucidate these meaning extensions, aptly choosing ‘tentativeness’ as the core meaning for verbs.

Chinfa Lien presents an analysis of morphological change in Taiwanese Southern Min which has resulted in stratificational distinctions in the lexicon for colloquial and native versus literary and alien forms. Since the variation is present in everyday colloquial language, it cannot simply be explained as the existence of separate registers, resulting from the impact of Mandarin on Taiwanese over many centuries. Thus, by adapting the theory of lexical diffusion in phonological change used in Wang (1969) and Wang and Lien (1993), Lien sets out to account for this variation in terms of bidirectional lexical diffusion which results in competing morphological changes between chronological strata. He first compares allomorphs which are etymologically related but assume different morphological and semantic characteristics, such as *ló-láu~lāu* 老 ‘old’. Next, synonyms which are non-cognate such as *lāng* 儂 and *jîn* 人 ‘person’ and negative markers are examined to show how stratificational features can often predict collocation possibilities as well as their resultant morphological composition as either compounds, derivatives or phrases.

Lien then discusses two main cases of morphological competition which have been synchronically resolved in favour of either the colloquial or literary strata. Ordinal numbers and the morpheme *lâng* ‘person’ are examples of the first type where the colloquial strata is in the ascendant, while an example of the second type concerns the use of the literary suffix *su* 師 to derive names for more prestigious professions and occupations which is winning out over the colloquial suffix *sai* 師 (with the same etymon) used to name different kinds of tradespeople. Other morphological alternates which are in complementary distribution are also described, such as *ke* 家 versus *ka* 家, used as agentive suffixes or nominalizers but in different semantic fields. Finally, three main features which distinguish the colloquial from the literary strata are proposed. These are (1) the features of free versus bound, (2) belonging to basic and popular vocabulary versus technical or cultural, and (3) concrete versus abstract.

Ying-Che Li carries out an historical study of the divergent paths of development of prepositions in Taiwanese Min and in Mandarin. These are the prepositions which act as formal markers of the passive, disposal and comparative constructions in both languages, as well as markers of location, time and focus phrases, among other categories. The inventories contrast in terms of both number and kind. He shows that Mandarin has by far the larger stock of prepositions, possessing ninety-three forms, with the consequence that a high degree of specialization of meaning has occurred. For Taiwanese, with a smaller inventory of forty-nine forms, it proves to be the case that where these prepositions are cognate with Mandarin, which is true of thirty-five of the forms, they belong to the literary stratum of Taiwanese, acquired through education. Thus, only fourteen prepositions are commonly used in the colloquial register, reinforcing linguistic differences. In terms of structure, Mandarin has more disyllabic prepositions, including doublets and aspectually-marked prepositions. Li observes that the development of the aspectually-marked prepositions postdates the Medieval Chinese period and is one that is clearly structurally dispreferred by Taiwanese, not possessing any in its native inventory. Li also considers the historical development of prepositions, observing that the inventories for Archaic and Medieval Chinese have largely undergone attrition with new prepositions arising after each period at the rate of three times the quantity of inherited prepositions.

I hope that this volume will inspire further in-depth research in these two main areas of Chinese linguistics, synchronic and diachronic and conclude by mentioning two desiderata:

First, more detailed analyses of the grammar of historical texts are needed which take into account the diachronic relationship with contemporary dialects, not just with Mandarin. This endeavour should increasingly include investigation of early texts written in the vernacular of dialects other than Mandarin, which continue to be unearthed in various libraries and private collections around the world, or are well-known exemplars of Min, Wu and Yue dialects as in the case of plays and ballads.

Second, more fieldwork is necessary, particularly in terms of research teams to survey and work on the grammars of many Sinitic languages and dialects which have not been fully described, or even recorded at all, yet face obsolescence within the next century, given the effective governmental implementation of the use of standard Mandarin or *pǔtōnghuà* in China and consequent language shift.

NOTES

1. For convenience only I refer to the names of modern provinces and countries to define ancient dialect boundaries.
2. The term ‘Old Wu’ refers to an ancient kingdom and should not be confused with the dialect group of the same name situated in the neighbouring province.
3. More details can be found in Sagart (1988, 1997) and You (1992).
4. Note that mention of dialect differences is made in texts as early as the Chunqiu period (770-476 BCE) such as those of *Měngzǐ* (Mencius). However, it is usually not clear whether reference is being made to different dialects of the one language or to different languages. A lexicon of dialect words from Western Han times is also represented in the *Fāngyán* by Yáng Xiōng from the first century BCE. This is extensively examined in Serruys (1959) and discussed in Ramsey (1987), Norman (1988) and Wang (1996).