SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 166 November, 2005

Reviews XII

by

Julie Lee Wei, Hodung Kim, David Selvia, and the Editor

Victor H. Mair, Editor
Sino-Platonic Papers
Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA
vmair@sas.upenn.edu
www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series edited by Victor H. Mair. The purpose of the series is to make available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor actively encourages younger, not yet well established, scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration. Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including Romanized Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM) and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is **not** the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

The only style-sheet we honor is that of consistency. Where possible, we prefer the usages of the *Journal of Asian Studies*. Sinographs (*hanzi*, also called tetragraphs [*fangkuaizi*]) and other unusual symbols should be kept to an absolute minimum. *Sino-Platonic Papers* emphasizes substance over form.

Submissions are regularly sent out to be refereed and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered. Manuscripts should be double-spaced with wide margins and submitted in duplicate. A set of "Instructions for Authors" may be obtained by contacting the editor.

Ideally, the final draft should be a neat, clear camera-ready copy with high black-and-white contrast.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/ or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations (including filling orders) may temporarily cease for up to two or three months at a time. In such circumstances, those who wish to purchase various issues of *SPP* are requested to wait patiently until he returns. If issues are urgently needed while the editor is away, they may be requested through Interlibrary Loan.

N.B.: Beginning with issue no. 171, *Sino-Platonic Papers* has been published electronically on the Web. Issues from no. 1 to no. 170, however, will continue to be sold as paper copies until our stock runs out, after which they too will be made available on the Web at www.sino-platonic.org.

Contents

1	**Julie Lee Wei**	漢語印歐語詞彙比較 *Hanyu Yinouyu Cihui Bijiao* (Comparison of Words between Old Chinese and Indo-European) by ZHOU Jixu.
23	**Julie Lee Wei**	历史語言学论文集 *Lishi yuyanxue lunwenji* (Collected Papers on Historical Linguistics) by ZHOU Jixu
34	**KIM Hodong**	*China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia* by P.C. Perdue
37	**David Selvia**	*Chinese Law: A Language Perspective* by Deborah Cao
41	**Victor H. Mair**	*Cantonese as Written Language: The Growth of a Written Chinese Vernacular* by Don Snow
50	**Victor H. Mair**	*Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon. Asian Englishes Today* by Braj B. Kachru
53	**Victor H. Mair**	*When They Severed Earth from Sky: How the Human Mind Shapes Myth* by Elizabeth Wayland Barber and Paul T. Barber
56	**Victor H. Mair**	*A Dictionary of Cantonese Slang: The Language of Hong Kong Movies, Street Gangs and City Life* compiled by Christopher Hutton and Kingsley Bolton
59	**Victor H. Mair**	*On the Formal Way to Chinese Languages* edited by Sze-Wing Tang and Chen-Sheng Luther Liu

Book Reviews

Zhou, Jixu. 漢語印歐語詞彙比較 ***Hanyu yinouyu cihui bijao*** (Comparison of Words between Old Chinese and Indo-European), Chengdu: Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe, 2002. 652 pp.

This is an intriguing and very important book written in Chinese by ZHOU Jixu, a professor at Sichuan Normal University, on the subject of whether the Sinitic and Indo-European languages were in contact in prehistoric times. The book concludes that there was a close relationship, but as to whether it was genetic or a case of borrowing, that is a question left unresolved.

The traditional and standard belief in China is that the Chinese language is a self-contained language that originated and developed on its own. Similarly with Indo-European. Indo-Europeanists, and, for that matter, almost all sinologists and comparative historical linguists, do not believe that there was contact between Indo-European and the Sinitic language in prehistoric times.

Zhou Jixu's *Comparison of Words Between Old Chinese and Indo-European* should be a serious challenge to the unbelievers. Zhou proposes 716 correspondences between Old Chinese monosyllabic words and Indo-European roots, including 62 groups of Old Chinese homonyms or near-homophones that correspond with Indo-European, and a number of disyllabic or polysyllabic words that correspond. Furthermore, Zhou analyzes his data to give phonological rules of correspondence, that is to say, correspondences for consonants, vowels, and finals, as well as for the four tones of Chinese.

The idea of a close link between the Sinitic and Indo-European languages in prehistoric times, namely before approximately 1200 B.C., is not as fantastic as it would have been, let us say, thirty years ago. In the late 1970s Chinese archaeologists excavated Europoid mummies from the desert of the Tarim Basin in present-day Xinjiang, adjacent to the Yellow River valley region that was anciently the home of the earliest recorded Sinitic civilizations, the Shang and the Zhou. These were mummies with European-looking features and coloring, dressed in European-style garb, and some of

them dating to the second millennium BC.

The kurgan style of burial and grave goods of the Xinjiang mummies bears striking similarity to kurgan style burial that stretched all across Europe and the Eurasian steppe, and was characteristic of ancient Indo-European cultures (Mallory and Mair 2000).

Then there was the evidence of the Shang royal tombs, again with similarities to Eurasian steppe burials, including burial with chariot and horse. There is now widespread agreement among scholars East and West that the sheep, the domesticated horse, the horse-drawn chariot and the use of iron and bronze came to the Yellow River Valley from the steppe to the far west. (For reports by various scholars, see conference volumes edited by Mair, 1998). There have been various linguistic and historical studies suggesting the presence of Indo-Europeans in the region now called China during the first millennium BC. In an article published in 1990 Victor Mair argued from linguistic and archaeological evidence that Iranian magi were present in the Zhou dynasty court, and perhaps in the Shang court as well (Mair 1990). More recently Mair published an article on the horse demonstrating that the Chinese oracle bone characters/graphs (circa 1200 BC) for horse was much later those for cow and sheep, suggesting a much later introduction of the horse, and he gave a number of ancient Sinitic words related to the horse that correspond with Indo-European words (Mair 2003). He also pointed out how symbols for cattle and sheep played a very large role in the oracle bone script, suggesting that the Shang were a pastoral people in origin, perhaps herders from the steppes.

Meanwhile historian Yu Taishan of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, Beijing, wrote a book (Yu 2000) arguing that various non-Sinitic tribes mentioned in ancient texts, such as the Da Yuezhi, the Sai, and the Wusun, who in the first millennium BC lived in the areas of present-day Shantung, Shanxi, Shaanxi, and Gansu provinces, were probably Iranian-speaking Indo-Europeans. Yu also points out that *Baimin* (白民 "White People") appear repeatedly in ancient texts such as the *Shan Hai Jing* 山海經 , the *Yi Zhou Shu* 逸周書 , and the *Huainanzi* 淮南子 . The "Dixingxun" 墬形訓 chapter of the *Huainanzi* records that "There are ... the *Baimin* (White People) from the northwest to the southwest". The ancient commentary of Gao You 高誘 says that they have "white bodies...wear their hair down, and their hair is also white." (Yu: 130).

So the time is ripe for a book such as Zhou Jixu's, whose aim is to find out if the

Chinese language had ties to Indo-European languages in prehistoric times. Zhou, however, is by no means the first person to come up with a large list of word correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European. A number of people have come up with lists, as Mair points out in his preface to Zhou's book, the most notable being Professor Tsung-tung Chang of Germany, whose well-known article on the subject, "Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese: A New Thesis on the Emergence of Chinese Language and Civilization in the Late Neolithic Age" appeared in *Sino-Platonic Papers* , 7 (January, 1988). Chang unfortunately died before he was able to complete his dictionary of 1,500 shared etymons.

Zhou's *Comparison of Words* comes out of his doctoral dissertation at Sichuan University, and it was done before he had any knowledge of Chang's work. Although Chang's work was path-breaking, and many of his correspondences are in agreement with Zhou's, the *Comparison of Words* has the advantage that while Chang used the Old Chinese reconstructions of Bernhard Karlgren, Zhou's work is based on the reconstructions of Zhengzhang Shangfang 鄭張尚芳 , which incorporates numerous advances made in Old Chinese phonology by Chinese and Western scholars in the decades since Karlgren's seminal work of the 1920s and 1930s.

This is not to say that I agree with all of Zhou's 700-plus proposed correspondences. They range in degree of persuasiveness, from the highly persuasive at one end to the much too speculative at the other end. Some are patently wrong, and some are wrong on closer examination. However, many of the correspondences are brilliant and there are enough persuasive ones to make this book deserving of careful study. Before I discuss Zhou's correspondences, let me take a few moments to describe the organized, painstaking, and systematic way in which he goes about his project.

Zhou begins with a discussion on methodology and materials. He first briefly outlines the work that has been done by linguists such as Li Fang-kuei, Paul K. Benedict, Nicholas C. Bodman and James A. Matisoff in the twentieth century to determine the genetic affinity of the Chinese language, the hypothesis that Chinese belongs to the Sino-Tibetan family of languages, the problem of correct sub-groupings, and the difficult question of how to determine whether shared words are due to a genetic relationship or to borrowing.

Zhou follows linguists like Paul Benedict, Laurent Sagart and S.A. Starostin in taking sound-and-meaning correspondences as the primary criterion for determining the genetic affinity of Chinese, and not the criterion of typology as Li Fang-kuei and others had done before. He is influenced by Benedict's work on classifying some Sinitic languages as Austro-Thai, Sagart's work on the genetic affinity of Chinese and Austronesian, Starostin's work on the affinity of Sino-Tibetan and the languages of the Caucasus, and Pulleyblank and Lubotsky's discussion of Chinese and Tocharian.

Zhou then gives a brief overview of the larger picture of language affinities suggested by recent work in various disciplines such as history (concerning the Da Yuezhi of China and Tocharians), anthropology (the Xinjiang mummies), metallurgy (iron and bronze), genetic science (DNA studies of early man) and comparative linguistics (linguistic macro-families) to set the background for a comparison of the Chinese and Indo-European languages.

This is followed by a brief review of the methodology of comparative historical linguistics developed by Indo-Europeanists such as Grimm, Bopp, Rask, and Pedersen. He then argues why, even though the Chinese and Indo-European languages are typologically different, Chinese being an analytic, non-inflected, tonal, and largely monosyllabic language, and Indo-European being inflected, non-tonal, and largely polysyllabic, it is feasible to compare Chinese monosyllabic words, or morphosyllables, with Indo-European roots, which are predominantly also morphosyllables.

Zhou then quickly reviews what can be called the three historical stages in the progress made in Old Chinese phonology. The first stage was the work done by Chinese phonologists in the centuries before Bernhard Karlgren's work of the 1920s. The tools they used were the rhymes of the ancient *Shi Jing* (circa 600 BC), the phonetic series (characters with the same phonophores), and medieval rhyme books, as well as such clues to ancient pronunciation as alternate characters used to write the same word, alternate sounds for the same character, and graph/character families or cognates. Karlgren initiated the second stage by introducing modern descriptive linguistics to Chinese phonology, and the methods of European comparative historical linguistics. Besides using the traditional tools and clues, he also looked at the sounds of characters in China's regional languages/dialects and Sinitic loanwords in neighboring languages such

as Tibetan, Japanese, and Korean. The work of Li Fang-kuei in the 1970s initiated a third stage, building on Karlgren's work, and contributing important insights especially in the reconstruction of initial consonant clusters in Old Chinese. Zhou sees Li's work as the foundation for subsequent work by other linguists in their comparisons of Chinese with the Tibeto-Burman, Dong-Tai, and Miao-Yao languages, with Vietnamese, with Austronesian, with the Caucasus languages, as well as with Yeniseian, Basque, and Tocharian/Indo-European languages. Reconstruction has also made use of such additional clues as Indo-European terms and names translated into Chinese in Buddhist and other ancient and medieval texts.

The upshot is that there is now much greater, although not complete, understanding of how Old Chinese sounded in ancient times, and general consensus on many key points. Zhou tells us that the OC reconstructions he uses are based largely on the reconstructions of Zhangzhang Shangfang (Zhengzhang 2003), although he also takes into consideration the reconstructions of such historical phonologists as Wang Li, Yakhontov, Pulleyblank, Li Fang-kuei, Bodman, and Pan Wuyun. (He does not explain how Zhengzhang arrives at his reconstructions, but later on refers us to a helpful book, *The Phonological System of Old Chinese*, an English translation by Laurent Sagart of a work by Zhengzhang [Zhengzhang 2000].)

Through his comparison of Old Chinese and Indo-European, Zhou goes a step further and reconstructs sounds for Proto- or Pre-Old Chinese, the postulated sounds that preceded Old Chinese. Some other historical phonologists have made similar attempts, among them Bodman, using his comparison of Chinese and Tibeto-Burman. However, Zhou is of the opinion that Bodman's Proto-Chinese reconstructions do not give the earliest Chinese, or Sinitic, sounds. For Zhou, Proto-Chinese should span the period from 2000 B.C. to 1300 B.C., the latter date approximately the middle of the Shang dynasty.

Zhou also fills us in on some of the debates in traditional Chinese phonology. For example, he tells us that he follows principles laid down by Karlgren in determining when homonyms are cognates in Chinese, and relates that there were three schools of thought among Chinese linguists of the Ming and Qing dynasties and the first half of the twentieth century as to how we can determine when homonyms were cognates. Qian

Daxing and Wang Guowei, for instance, believed that the key to whether they were cognates was whether they shared the same initials, Duan Yucai and Wang Niansun believed the key was whether they fell in the same rhyme category, and Zhang Taiyan and Wang Li believed that cognates should be similar in both initials and rhyme category. Karlgren stressed the similarities of both initials and final consonants in determining whether homonyms were cognates.

Zhou's correspondences, he tells us, are based on Old Chinese words that date to the second century B.C. at the latest and may be attested as early as the thirteenth century BC. His sources for glosses are old texts, in particular the *Shuowen Jiezi.* Besides also using Han and Tang dynasties commentaries, he makes frequent use of Qing commentators, in particular Duan Yucai, Wang Niansun, Wang Yun, and Zhu Junsheng for the glosses of words. We find in his list of correspondences that these sources are quoted for the glosses of Chinese characters.

His main source for the glosses on Indo-European words is Eric Partridge's *Origins: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English* (1966 edition). This dictionary, he points out, is based on a long list of etymological dictionaries on Indo-European languages.

Zhou then devotes a chapter to delineating the sound systems of Old Chinese and Indo-European. The section on Old Chinese sounds is a chronological survey of the sound systems proposed by some of the leading historical phonologists beginning from Bernhard Karlgren. They are presented as tables of initials proposed by each phonologist followed by Zhou's commentary and an account of how each proposal was received by other phonologists, such as Baxter, Starostin, and so forth, Chinese and Western, and then tables of proposed finals, again followed by Zhou's commentary. This is then followed by tables and analyses comparing the various systems. The proposed Old Chinese phonological systems represented are those of Karlgren, Wang Li, Li Fang-kuei, and Zhengzhang Shangfang, supplemented by Zhou's own reconstructions of Pre-Old Chinese. Zhou points out the strengths and weaknesses of each system, and shows how the understanding of Old Chinese initials and finals evolved with each proposal. What he has given here is a condensed history of Old Chinese phonology since Karlgren. After some trenchant reasoning, he derives his own system of sounds of Pre-Old Chinese. The

following are a few examples of his innovations. For Zhengzhang Shangfang's reconstructed Old Chinese rising-tone finals:

1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
m?	*n?*	*ng?*	*(l?)*	*?*	*(u?)*	--	--	--	--

Zhou postulates an earlier Pre-Old Chinese:

mb	*nd*	*ngg*	*ld*	*rd*	*b*	*d*	*g*	*ug,ud,ub*	

For Zhengzhang Shangfang's reconstructed Old Chinese entering-tone finals:

--	--	--	--	--	--	*b*	*d*	*g*	*ug*

Zhou postulates an earlier Pre-Old Chinese:

mp,mt	*nt*	*ngk*	*lt*	*rt*	*pt,p*	*t*	*kt,k*	*(uk),ut,up*	

(*ng* here stands for the phonetic symbol ŋ)

Zhou then gives a brief history of the comparative study of the Indo-European family of languages together with tables of the sound systems of Greek, Latin, Sanskrit, and Germanic. He then gives tables of the initial consonants of Middle Chinese and Old Chinese and the corresponding Proto-Indo-European consonants, and of Old Chinese finals (i.e., rhyme categories and tones) with the corresponding Indo-European finals, based on his correspondences.

After this long and substantial preamble, Zhou presents his OC-IE correspondences, which take up roughly four-fifths of the book. For each set of OC-IE correspondences he gives (where possible) the Chinese cognates of the Chinese character in the left column and in the right column the corresponding word with its IE cognates. After listing all the correspondences, Zhou analyzes them under the categories of groups of OC homonyms

with IE correspondences, corresponding basic terms, corresponding cultural terms, corresponding affixes, and corresponding word endings, followed by a final summation and conclusion. The book ends with an alphabetical index of all the Chinese characters in his list of correspondences, as well as an index of the corresponding Indo-European words, which are most helpful.

I shall now discuss Zhou's correspondences in the following sequence:

1. Correspondences for basic terms and cultural terms
2. Correspondences for pronouns and demonstratives relational terms
3. Problematic correspondences
4. Correspondences in word/root affixes and word endings.

1. OC-IE Correspondences in Basic Terms and Cultural Terms

While historical phonologists such as Karlgren, Li Fang-kuei, Bodman, Zhengzhang Shangfang and Sagart have used comparisons of Chinese with languages such as Japanese, Tibeto-Burman, Korean, Vietnamese and Austronesian to bring new insights to the sounds of Old Chinese, Zhou has used comparison with Indo-European to make new postulates on how Old Chinese sounds evolved, and in some cases to make his own reconstructions of Old Chinese and Pre-Old Chinese.

Since a discussion of each of Zhou's 700-plus OC-IE correspondences would require the space of a whole book, I shall restrict my discussion to a small number here. First let me point to some of the numerous correspondences that I find persuasive because they are close in sound and meaning:

The following are some examples and will show how Zhou proceeds. In the left column the sound preceding the Chinese character is Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), the sound with double asterisks is Zhou's reconstruction of Pre-Old Chinese, based on the comparison with the corresponding Indo-European in the right column. The sound(s) with one asterisk is Zhengzhang Shangfang (ZZSF)'s reconstruction of Old Chinese (with occasional modifications by Zhou), and the sound following that is Middle Chinese (based on Wang Li). The corresponding Indo-European is in the right column. The material presented in both columns is an abridgement of Zhou's fuller material. Zhou bases the glosses in the left column on ancient Chinese texts, which he quotes, and his main source for the material on the right column is *Origins: A Short Etymological*

Dictionary of Modern English by Eric Partridge.

(**Abbreviations**: Acc.= accusative; adj.=adjective; Arm.=Armenian; Av.= Avestan; dem.=demonstrative; *DTch* = Adams, *Dictionary of Tocharian B*; Chin.=Chinese; *CLD = Collins Latin Dictionary*; Eg.= English; *EZ*= Schuessler, *Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*; Ga.=Gaelic; Gm.=German; Gmc.=Germanic; Goth.=Goth; Gr.= Greek; IE = Indo-European; indef.=indefinite; int.=interrogative; Ir.=Irish; L.=Latin; Lith.=Lithuanian; ME=Middle English; MSM = Modern Standard Mandarin; nom.=nominative; O = Old; OC = Old Chinese; OF=Old French; OInd.= Old Indic; ON= Old Norse; *Origins*= *Origins* by Eric Partridge; P=Proto; Pok= Julius Pokorny; pron.=pronoun; rel.=relative; Sagart=Laurent Sagart; Sax.=Saxon; Skt.=Sanskrit; Tib.=Tibetan; Tch.= Tocharian; VL=Vulgar Latin; W.=Welsh; ZZSF=Zhengzhang Shangfang, *Old Chinese Phonology*.)

(Note: For easier typing, the symbol ŋ is represented by *ng*. The numbering on the left margin is mine, as are the comments in square brackets. The page numbers from Pokorny have been added by me.)

1) ZHOU 晝 **tjos, ȶĭəu-* "daytime, daylight" (Zhou 534)	Skt. *dyāùs* "sky, day, heaven"; PIE **di̯ēus* "Father Sky". (Pok 185)
2) ZHAO 照 *tjaus, .tɕĭeu "to shine, bright." (Zhou 534)	As above 1).
3) TIAN 天 ***thiim, *thiin, thien* "sky, heaven" (Zhou 535)	IE **din-*, "day, sky". [(Pok 186)]
4) WANG 望 **mangs, mĭang* "the full moon" (Zhou 364)	Toch. A *mañ* "the moon; month." Gr. *mēnē* "moon"; Gmc. *mān-*, mon- "moon". (*Origins* 391)
5) LIAO 燎 ***raug, *rauʔ, lĭɛu* "light up fire; blazing fire; big candle; to light up; to shine" (Zhou 171)	Eg. *light*, OE *lēoht*; OGoth. *lioht* "light; candle"; Skt. *rōčís* (**raučís*, **leukís*) "a light", *rŏcatē* "it shines" (*Origins* 355).
6) PIAO 票 ***phleu, *phleu, phĭɛu* "flames flying" (Zhou 164).	L. *flagrāre* "to flame", IE **bhlag-*, **bhleg-*.
7) PIAO 飄 **phleu, phĭɛu* "violent gusts, swirling wind"(Zhou 165).	Eg. *blow*, OE.*blāwan*; O.Goth. *blāhan, blāen*; L. *flāre* "to blow"
8) FU YAO 扶搖 **ba·leu, bĭu·jĭɛu*	As above, 10).

"whirlwind, violent gusts" (Zhou 166)

9) LING 霝 **reeng, lieng* "rain, rain falling" (Zhou 366).
Eg. *rain*, OE *regn*, akin to O.Fris. *rein*, ON *regn* "to rain" (*Origins* 548).

10) LING 嶺 ***k·reng?, *reng?, lǐeŋ:* "mountain slope, mountain range". (Zhou 375)
Eg. *link* "a ridge, a bank"; OE *hlinc*, akin to OE *hlinian* "to lean". (*Origins* 259, 342)

11) LUN 陯 **run, lǐuěn* "collapse of mountain." (Zhou 391)
L. *ruīna* "a falling or a crumbling". (*Origins* 574)

12) LUN 淪 **run, liuen* "collapse, extinction, fall." (Zhou 391.)
As above 11).

13) LU 碌 **rook, luk*, "stones, rocks, rocky" (Zhou 225).
E. *rock* "rock", ME *rokke*, OF *roche*, from presumed VL word or form **rocca*. (*Origins* 569).

14) LU 摝 **rook, luk* "to shake, to rock" (Zhou 228)
E. *rock* "to move": OE *roccian*; ON *rykkia* "to jerk, push, pull". (*Origins* 569)

15) FU 跗 ***pod, *po, pǐu* "top of foot; the foot; foot/feet of vessels" (Zhou 218)
OE *fōt* "foot", Gmc. root **fōt-*;. Gr. *podi-*"foot"; Gr. *pous* "foot" (*Origins* 225-226)

16) BU 步 **baas, bu-*"to walk; step(s)" (Zhou 237) .
E. *pace* "to walk; a step taken in walking"; OF *pas*, L. *passus* "a pace or step" (*Origins* 461).

17) ZHI 之 ***k(j)ɯ, *kjɯ, tɕĭə* "to go to", reconstruction **kjɨ* based on Bodman (Zhou 132).
OE *gan* "to go", Gm.*gehen* "to go", root perhaps IE *ghe-*.(*Origins* 258).

18) RU 乳 ***nod, *no?, nʑĭu:* "to suckle" (Zhou 204).
L. *nūtrīre* "to suckle" (*Origins* 440).

19) LUO 酪 **g·rəak, lak* "cream, milk, yogurt, etc." (Zhou 276).
Gr. *gala* "milk", L. *lac* "milk" (*Origins* 333).

20) BU 餔 **paa/*baas, pu/bu-* "a kind of cereal porridge or gruel; a
Gr. *pasta* "barley porridge"; LL. *pasta* "a pastry cake." (*Origins* 474)

kind of fried rice-cake" (Zhou 245).

21) *PU* 餔 **baa, bu* "to drink heavily; drink in company". (Zhou 246).
L. *bibere* "to drink"; Gr. *pinein* "to drink"; Skt. *píbati* "he drinks". PIE root **pi-, *po-*. (*Origins* 46).

22) GU 羖 ***kaad, *kaaʔ, ku:*"he-goat, male sheep" (Zhou 270).
[GU 穀 "grain", with the same phonophore 殳 is *kuk* in EZ, *kok* in Baxter)].
AS *gāt* "goat", Gmc root **gait-*; L. *haedus* "he-goat, young goat" (*Origins* 259).

23) BEI 犕 **bɯs, bĭə* "eight year old cow" (Zhou 141)(Note: **brɯgs*, ZZSF 272a).
L. *bōs*, Gr. *bous* "cow"; Ir. *bo*, W. *buwch* "cow" (*Origins* 126).

24) NIU 牛 ***ŋgwɯ, *ngwɯ, ngĭəu* "cow, ox" (Zhou 141).
OE *cū* "cow", Gmc. root **kwō*, PIE root **gwōw*. (*Origins* 126).

25) GOU 狗 ***kooʔ, kəu* "dog" (Zhou 190).
O.Ir *cú* "dog"; Tch..A *ku* "dog" Gr. *kuōn* "dog" (*Origins* 75)

26) QUAN 犬 **khweenʔ, khiwen* "dog" (Zhou 190)
Gr. *kuōn* "dog".

27) MA 馬 ***maərg, *mraaʔ,ma:*"horse" (Zhou 252).
Eg. *mare* "female horse"; OE *mearh* "horse"; Ga. *marc*; OW *march* "a horse". (*Origins* 380).

28) PEI 轡 **prɯlts/prɯis, pi-* **pridh* (Li Fang-kuei) "reins; a bridle" (Zhou 492).
OE *brīdel* "bridle", E. *bridle*; related OE bregdan "to weave", E. *braid*. (*Origins* 56).

29) LUO 絡 **g·raak, lak* "a tie, a halter" (Zhou 276).
L. *laqueus* "a noose, snare, cord, lace." (*Origins* 145).

30) HU 呼 ***qhaal, *qhaa, xu* "exhale" (Zhou 271).
L. *halāre* "to breathe" (*Origins* 275).

31) DUI 敓 ***loot, *l'oot, duat* "rob, loot" (Zhou 474).
Hindi *lūt*, denasalized from Skt. *luṇṭati* "he plunders". (*Origins* 364).

32) ZHI 織 ***tɯk, *tjɯk, tɕĭək* "to weave" (Zhou 152).
L.*texere* "to weave", probably IE **tekhsere*; Gr. *tekh-* "handcraft".

33) JU 巨 **kwad, *kwaʔ, kĭu*
"carpenter's square" (Zhou 259).

L. *quadra* "a square". (*Origins* 539).

34) DU 讀 ***l'ook, *dook, duk*
"to read; recite" (Zhou 154).
[ZZSF has already reconstructed this
this character as **l'oog*, see ZZSF 543].

L. *legere* "collect, select, read";
Gr. *logos* (stem log-)"sayings;
counting, reckoning"; Gr. *legein*
"to gather, count, recount, say, speak".

35) HOU 籀 ***lɯɯgs, *dɯɯgs, dĭəu*
"to read" (Zhou 153).

As above, 34).

36) MEI 媒 ***mɯɯd, *mɯɯ, muɒi*
"a go-between, medium" (Zhou 130)

Eg. *medial, medium*; L. *medius*,
root *med-*, **medhios, *methjos-*.
.Goth. *midjis*; O.Sax. *middi*; PIE **medh-*

There are numerous other persuasive OC-IE correspondences on Zhou's list. They include those that have been recognized before, such as words for father (FU 父), mother (MU 母), elder brother (BE 伯), sea (HAI 海)., ruler (JUN 君), lord-on-high (DI 帝). I shall return to a few of them later on in discussing my reservations about some of Zhou's reconstructions of Pre-Old Chinese.

Among Zhou's correspondences there are some especially perceptive insights. Here are some examples:

37) FENG 風 **pum* "verse(s) (poems)
sung in folk songs." (Zhou 293).

Gr. *poēma, poiēma*, L. *poëma*
"a poem" (*Origins* 508).

38) FENG 風 ***plum, *pum, piung*
"air, wind".(Zhou 294).

Gr. *pneuma* "air, wind, breath"
(*Origins* 507) .

39) FENG 諷 ***pums, *pungs, pĭung*
"to recite" (Zhou 294).

Gr. *phēmi* "I speak"; Gr. *phonein*
"to produce a sound".

40) FENG 風 ***plum, *pum, piung*
"a sound" (Zhou 295).

Gr. *phone* "a sound" (*Origins* 492) .

41) FENG 鳳 **bums, biung*
"the phoenix" (Zhou 295).

Gr.*phoinix* "the date palm tree",
from *Phoinix* "a Phoenician", whence
L. *phoenix* "the phoenix bird".
(*Origins* 491)

42) WANG SHU 望舒 ***man·ljasʔ, *mangs. *hlja*

Hittite *meinulas* "crescent moon"

"moon deity" (Zhou 365). (*Origins* 391.1)

43) QI 祇 **ge, gie* "spirit, deity of the earth." (Zhou 264). — Gr. Gaia, Attic Gē "goddess of the earth.

44) ZI 自 ***epsils, *bsils/*bsiis, dzi-* "self" (Zhou 522). — L. *ipse* "self".

45) BI 鼻 ***(s)birts, *bils, bi-* "nose", *bi-*. (Zhou 524). — Akin to Gr. *psuke* "a breath", *psukhein* "to breathe." (*Origins* 531).

46) XI 息 ***psɯk, *sɯk, sĭək* Also ***sp-*, see below 50), "breathe heavily, breathe rapidly, breathe" (Zhou 147). — As above 44).

47) SI 思 ***psɯg, *sɯg, sĭə* "think, thought." "XI 息 'breathe' is also used to write SI 思 'think'," says one commentator, Lu Deming, to the *Shi Jing* (*Poetry*, c.600 BC). That is, XI 息 and SI 思 were used interchangeably in the *Shi Jing*. [This is supported by the presence of the XIN 心 "heart,mind" semaphore in XI 息 "breathe, breath; think".] (Zhou 148). — Gr. Psukhe/Psyche "Goddess of the Soul or Spirit"; *psuke* "a breath; the breath of life; the spirit or soul or mind-and-spirit". (*Origins* 531).

Anciently the character ZI 自 had the meaning of both "self" and "nose" but the sound for this character in Old Chinese was unknown. The medieval rhyme books give us some clues, but by then "nose" had the sound BI and "self" had the sound ZI (DZ-). Li Fang-kuei then surmised that the characters BI 鼻 and ZI 自 originally had the sound **sbi* (inferred from *zi* + *bi*). However, it was Zhou's original insight to conjecture that the two characters originally also had the sound **bsils*. He then proposes the following as well, maintaining that the correspondence with IE confirms Li's reconstruction of **sbi*:

48) ZI 自 ***sbrts, *sdils, dzi-* "nose."(Li Fang-kuei: **sbjidh>dzjiʔ*) (Zhou 523). — L. *spīrāre* "to breathe", *spīritus* "breathing, breath; spirit." (*Origins* 531).

This would mean that ZI 自 "self, nose" had two sounds ****sbrts**" and ****epsils** (above 45) and 44)), with parallels in Greek and Latin:

49)	Gr. *psyche/psukhe* "breath	L. *spiritus* "breath"
50)	OC 自 ***epsils* "nose"	OC ***sbirts* "nose"
51)	OC 息 ***psɯ k* "breathe"	OC ***sb-* "breathe"
52)	Gr. *psyche/psukhe* "mind, spirit"	L. *spiritus* "spirit"
53)	OC 思 ***psɯ k* "thought, think"	OC 息 ***sb-* "thought, think"

Is it plausible that ZI 自 "nose" had two sounds ***–ps-* and ***sb-*? I think it is. Some Sinitic speakers may have said ***-ps-*, others ***sb-* for "nose" and "self". Consider a case in English:

"I asked him" vs "I axed him"

and

ask (Modern Eg.) vs *axian* "to ask" (Old English)

These are all cases of metathesis.

2. Pronouns and Demonstratives

Because grammatical terms such as pronouns and demonstratives are of such great interest to linguists, I shall list some of those on Zhou's list of correspondences and make a few comments on them.

54) WU 吾 *** əgaa, *ngaa, ngu* "I"(pronoun) (Zhou 265). — L. *egō*, Gr.*egō* "I", IE etymon **ego*, Gmc. etymon **ika* (*Origins* 177).

55) QI 其 **gɯ, gĭə; *kɯ. kĭə, *kɯs, kĭə-* "that (dem. pron.), he" (Zhou 135). [其 "this, he, they, etc.", *EZ* 470]. — L. *hic, haec, hoc,* etc. "this (one), he, etc." dem. adj. and pron. [From PIE **ghe/*gho* (Pok 417)].

This correspondence may be correct, although the OC seems closer to PIE **ghe* than Latin *hic*, which comes from PIE **gho* or **ghe* + **ke* (Pok 417). It could also correspond to Tch. *ce* "this", masc. dem. pron. (*DTch* 255, 698).

Zhou's correspondences continue:

56) SHI 是 ***ghjeg, *gheʔ, dʑĭe* "this (dem. pron.)" (Zhou 136). — As above 55).

I disagaree with this correspondence. The reconstructed sound for SHI is **dee/*tee*

(ZZSF 465b), **djigx* (Li Fang-kuei, *EZ*), **dji* (Schuessler, *EZ*). I suggest the following correspondence instead:

57) SHI 是 **deel***tee* "this (dem. pron.)" ; "this (pron.); this is" (*EZ* 557 [2]).	Tch. *te*, pron. "this one, it", neuter of Tch.B *se* "this" (*DTch* 698, 303).

Zhou's correspondences continue:

58) QU渠 **ga, gio* "he, she, it" (Zhou 136)	Same as 55) above.

Again, I believe this is basically correct, although OC seems closer to PIE **ghe*/**gho*. Zhou's correspondences continue:

60) ZI 兹 ***stɯ, tsĭə* "(dem.pron.) this" (Zhou 137).	L. *iste, ista, istud* "this one, that one, he" (Zhou 137).

I disagree with this correspondence. Latin *iste* is defined as "that (one)[adj. and pron.]", not "this (one)", and ZZSF (p. 574b) has reconstructed ZI 兹 as **ʔsɯ*. I suggest the following correspondence instead:

61) ZI 兹 ***ʔsɯ* "(pron.) this".	Ir. *e seo, i seo* "(dem.pron.) this". Toch. B *se* "(dem./pronoun) this", PToch **se* (*DTch* 698).
62) CI 此 ***sthed, *sthe?, tshĭe* "(dem. pron.) this" (Zhou 137).	L. *iste*, as above 60).

I disagree with this correspondence for the same reasons. ZZSF has reconstructed CI 此 as **she* (ZZSF 294). I suggest the following:

63) CI 此 **she* "(dem. pron.) this".	O.Ir. *se* "this", Ir. *e seo* "(dem.pron) this"; Tch. B *se* "(dem./pron.) this" (*DTch* 698).

Zhou also gives the following:

64) SI斯 ***iste (?), *se, sie* "(dem.pron.) this" (Zhou 138).	L. *iste*, as above 60).

Again, I believe this corresponds with O.Ir. *se* and Tch.B *se*, as above, 63). Zhou's correspondences continue:

65) YI伊 **qil*/**qii, i* "(dem.pron.) that,	L. *ille, illa, illud* "(dem.pron.) that, he".

this". Also **lei* (Wang Li), **jid* (Li Fang-kuei), **ʔjier* (Zhou Fagao) (Zhou 521).

ZZSF has reconstructed YI 伊 as **qlil*. This correspondence, 65), is plausible, based on Zhou Jixu's and Zhou Fagao's reconstructions. Zhou's correspondences continue:

66) ZHI 之 ***k(j)ɯ*, **kjɯ*, *tɕĭə* "(relative pron.) who". L. *qui, quae, quod*, rel.pron."who".

Although this is a very original and intriguing interpretation of ZHI 之, I do not agree with Zhou. This meaning of ZHI is also not included in Schuessler definitions of ZHI in his dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese (*EZ* 829). Schuessler explains ZHI 之 as meaning:

1. Demonstrative adjective; demonstrative or personal pronoun: "This, he, she, it, they, them".
2. Object pronoun: "Him, her, it, them."
3. Marker of possession (i.e., equivalent to English apostrophe-*s*— '*s*)or attribution (optional); nominalizes clauses.

Let us look at the difference between Schuessler's and Zhou's interpretation of ZHI in the following sentence:

	罔	知	天	之	斷	命
	wang	*zhi*	*tian*	*zhi*	*duan*	*ming*
Word for word translation:	not	understand	Heaven	ZHI	terminate	mandate

Schuessler's translation: We will not understand THAT (=ZHI) Heaven will terminate your mandate. (*EZ* 831a) (ZHI here is a nominalizer.)

Translation based on Zhou's gloss on ZHI: We will not understand Heaven who(=ZHI) will terminate your mandate. (ZHI is here a relative pronoun.)

My own translation based on ZHI = 's: We will not understand Heaven's ('s=ZHI) terminating your mandate (or: Heaven's termination of your mandate).

Another example, this one from Zhou's book (page 133):

大 哉. 堯 之 為. 君!

Da zai Yao zhi wei jun

Literal translation:	Great oh! Yao ZHI serves as king
Translation based on Schuessler:	Great oh! THAT (=ZHI) Yao serves as king. (ie: Great oh! HOW (=ZHI) Yao serves as king.) (ZHI is a nominalizer.)
Zhou's translation:	Great oh! Yao, WHO (=ZHI) serves as king.
My translation:	Great oh! Yao's ('s=ZHI) service as king. (i.e., Great oh! Yao's conduct as king.)

My understanding of the function of ZHI yields the same meaning as Schuessler's. What is great is Yao's conduct/service as king, not Yao per se. Zhou's sentence makes the subject of "Great oh!" not Yao's conduct as king, but Yao.

Zhou gives a Latin sentence as parallel in grammatical structure to this sentence (Zhou 133):

Discipulus, qui hoc fecit, est laetus.

The student, who did this, is glad.

Yao, who (=ZHI=Latin *qui*) serves as king, is great.

In Zhou's words: 作為君主的堯真偉大啊. "*Zuo wei junzhu de Yao zhen weida o.*"

("Yao, who serves as king, is great.")

I therefore do not agree with Zhou that ZHI corresponds to Latin relative pronoun *qui, quae, quod.*

However, I do agree with Zhou's understanding of another meaning of ZHI 之 , the meaning of demonstrative adjective and demonstrative pronoun, singular and plural "this, that, his, her, their, etc." and as marker of possession (i.e. ZHI='s) or attribution:

67) ZHI 之 ***k(j)ɯ*, **kjɯ*, *tɕĭə* "demonstrative adjective and pronoun, single and plural" (Zhou 133-34).	L. *hic, haec, hoc* [From PIE **ghe*/**gho*, (Pok 417); or Tch. *ce* "this (one)", above 55), comments.]

I am here in agreement with Wang Li, whom Zhou quotes as saying that ZHI 之 , the possessive particle, was ZHI 之 , the demonstrative pronoun, e.g., meaning TA 他 "it" (see Zhou 134a). Zhou's correspondences continue:

68) JUE 厥 **kwot, kǐwɐt*
"(dem.pron.) that" "similar to
QI 其 'that'" (Zhou 135).

L. *quod.*

Here, again, I disagree with Zhou. Latin *quod* is not a demonstrative, but a relative pronoun and an adjective. Dictionaries (*CH* and *Er Ya*) define JUE 厥 as meaning QI "that (dem. adj. and pron.); he", and indeed Zhou quotes this definition from the *Er Ya*: "*Jue* 厥 *qi* 其 *yeh* (*que* is the same as *qi*)." If so, then JUE 厥 also corresponds with IE* *ghe*, Latin *h*ic, haec, *hoc*, as in above, 55).

Although I cannot cover all of the pronouns that Zhou finds correspondences for in this paper, and many of those are correct, I shall just point out one of Zhou's most perceptive insights:

69) HUO 或 **gwɯɯk, ɣuək*; also
**ɢw(r)ɯk, ɣǐwək* "(indef. pron.)
"some people; someone; some (things);"
"each, every (time, occasion, person,
etc)", "always" (Zhou 150).

L. *aliquis, aliquid*, indef.pron. "someone, something, anyone, anything"; adj. *aliqui, aliqua, aliquod*, also adj. *qui, qua, quod*; L. *quisque, quaeque, quidque* "each, every, everyone, everything (indef.pron.)".

Zhou points out the close sound-and-meaning correspondence of OC HUO / **gwɯɯk* 或 with L. *quoque* (singular, masculine, feminine, and neuter, ablative case of *quisque, quaeque, quidque*) "each, every, etc." He explains that this ablative "each, every" (HUO 或) can mean "for each (person), for every (occasion), etc." and hence the meaning of HUO 或 "always, invariably". He then provides a number of illustrative sentences from ancient texts. I think he should also include in the correspondences L. *quisquis, quaequae, quodquod, quidquid* "whoever, whatever, all" (*CLD* 180). I would like to mention that V.H. Mair pointed out this meaning of HUO 或 in a two-page handwritten memo which was distributed several years ago. The memo, entitled "無時或忘 *wu shi huo wang*", gave a grammatical analysis of this difficult expression, translating it as "Never forgetting for an instant/ moment" (i.e., Never forgetting at any moment, at every moment, at whatever moment).

Other persuasive grammatical correspondences on Zhou's list include:

70) HU 胡 **gwaa, ɣu* "why (interrog.)
(Zhou 461).

OE *hwa* "how, why"; L. *qua*
"who, what".

71) U 惡 **qwaa, wu* "what, why, where (interrog.)" (Zhou 461).
L. *quare* "why (interrog.)"; OE *hwaer* "where" (interrog.).

72) HE 曷 **gaat, ɣat* "what, how (interrog.)" (Zhou 461).
OE *hwæt*, OS *hwat* "what (interrog.)".

73) HE 何 **gaal/gaai, ɣa* "(interrog.) what, where, who, how" (Zhou 459).
IE interrogative *kw-*, **kwi-*, **kwa-*, **kwe-* **kwo-*, L. *qui, quae, quod* (interrog.),

74) SHEI 誰 **gwjul/*gwjui, dʑwi* "what, which (interrog adj. and pron.)".
As above.

75) AN 安 **qaan, an* "where, when" (Zhou 463)
OE *hwaenne, hwanne* "when"; also related forms in Germanic.

3. Problematic OC-IE Correspondences

Although there are numerous persuasive, insightful, correspondences in Zhou's large list of 700-plus, there are quite a number that I find doubtful. The following are a few examples, followed by my comments.

76) FU 婦 ***bɯlə. *bɯʔ, bǐəu* "a female, married woman" (Zhou 140)
L. *puella* "female child, girl, young female".

This correspondence is problematic because Chinese FU,**bɯʔ* "woman, wife" and Latin *puell-* are not sufficiently close in sound, and *puella* means "girl", not "woman" or "wife", and it comes from an IE stem meaning "small" (Pok 843). FU 婦 in Early Zhou Chinese means "wife, woman, lady" (*EZ*). FU 婦 **bɯʔ* "wife, woman" and FU 夫 **pa/*ba* "husband, man" (ZZSF 320a) come as a pair, just as English *man-woman, husband-wife* are paired words. I suggest the following correspondence:

77) FU 夫 **pa/*ba* "man, husband" (EZ 169)
OInd. *páti*, Av. *paiti* "master, husband"; Toch.A *pats*, Toch.B *pets* "husband"; Lith. *pàts* "self, husband" (Buck 2.31; *DTch* 401; Pok 842).

78) FU 婦 **bɯʔ* "woman, wife, lady".
OInd. *pátnī* "mistress, wife"; Lith. *patì* "wife".(Buck 2.31;Pok842).

Zhou's correspondences continue:

79) HE/HOH 赫 ***skraak, *qhraak,*
E. *scarlet* "bright red", from OF

xak "fire red; bright red; red" (Zhou 289).

escarlate; from Persian *saqirlat*, a fabric decorated Persian *saqirlat*, a fabric decorated with seals, fr. L. *sigillatus*, decorated with *sigilla* (seals).(*Origin592*).

This correspondence is doubtful. Zhou 's postulated Pre-OC ***skraak* follows Bodman. Zhou tells us that Bodman (1980) proposed the following correspondences (Zhou 68):

Tib. *skrag* "fright"	Chin. HE 嚇 **skhrak*(s) "to frighten, frightened"
Tib. (**skrag*) "frightened"	**xrak(s)/xăk/xa-*
Tib. *khrag* "blood"	Chin.HE 赫 **skhrak* "red"
(blood red)	*xrak/xɐ k*
	Chin.CHI 赤 **khrjak, khjak/tśhjäk* "red"
	(Li Fang-kuei)

(Zhengzhang has **qhraag* for HE/HOH 赫 "red" "frighten", **qhraags* for HE/HO 嚇 "to frighten", and **khljag* for CHI 赤 "red", see Zhou 289.)

I should first mention that although HE is the Modern Standard Mandarin for HE 赫 "red; to frighten", Mathews' also gives the pronunciation HO which is found among many regional Chinese dialects/topolects (e.g. Hupei).

Apparently both Bodman and Zhou have added an initial **s* to *xrak/*qhraag/*qhraak* "red; to frighten" because Tibetan *skrag* "fright" has an initial *s-*, and because Tibetan has a pair "fright" and "blood" closely paralleling Chinese "frighten" and "red." But the Tibetan word for "blood", *khrag*, has no initial *s-*.

I would suggest the following OC-IE correspondence for HE/HO *qhraak "red":

(80) HE/HO , **qhraak/*qhraag,* xak "red". — O.Ir *cróch* "red" (Vendryes C-242), W. *coch* "red"; Gr. *kokkinos* "red".

(For other OC-Celtic correspondences, see Wei 2005b.)

Zhou's correspondences continue:

81) FU 甫 ***pare, *pa?, piu* 'courteous term for male; appellation for male when he first reaches majority" (Zhou 248). — L. *puer* "boy, youth".

This correspondence seems doubtful. The *CH* dictionary tells us that this FU 甫 is also pronounced FU **pa?* 父 "father" (*CH* 1960). And English "mister" stood for "master". I suggest the following correspondence:

82) FU 甫 **pa?* "elegant term, or term of address, for male, and for male when he first reaches majority."	The same as above, 77). OIndic *páti-* "master, gentleman, sir; lord, commander, governor, etc.; husband"; L. *potis* "powerful"; Lith. *pàts* "master of the house; self". IE *poti-s* "master".

Although numerous correspondences on Zhou's list are persuasive, I do not always agree with his reconstructions of Pre-Old Chinese for those correspondences. For instance,

88) MU 母 ***mɯɯd, *mɯɯ?, mə u* "mother" (Zhou 127) .	L. *mater*, Gr. *mater, meter*, Skt. *mata*, Tch.A *macar*, Tch.B *macer*, PIE base **ma-*".
89) FU 父 ***bate, *ba?, bĭu* "father" (Zhou 248) .	PIE root **pət-*, Skt. *pita*, L. *pater*, Gr. *pater*, etc. "father".

Must these Pre-Old Chinese words for father and mother end with a dental stop? Could it have ended as ***mak* "mother" and ***pak* "father", or simply as a glottal stop, corresponding with Tocharian rather than with Latin, Greek and the other western Indo-European languages?

4. Corresponding Affixes and Word Endings

In his section on affixes (pp. 573ff.), Zhou postulates that there are many prefixes and word endings that correspond to their IE counterparts. These deserve careful study. From my preliminary examination of them, I find his ideas highly original. For example, Zhou postulates that the word XUAN ***ljwols, *ljwons* "revolve" corresponds to Latin *reuoluere* "revolve", and the **lj-* corresponds to Latin *re-*. Because this XUAN 旋 also has the reconstruction **sɢʷan* (ZZSF 509b), I am not ready to accept this correspondence of OC **lj-* with Latin *re-* without further study.

Let me give another example. Zhou proposes the following correspondence:

90) JUAN 卷 ***korwole, *kwron?, kiuən* L. *convolvere* "to roll together, roll

"curved; to roll up; a roll or scroll" (Zhou 433, 576).

round (of a scroll, a snake, etc.)."

As I understand Zhou, he postulates the L. *con-* prefix is reconstructed OC ***kor-* so that L. *convol-* becomes OC ***korwole*, then contracted to **kwrons*. This is not impossible. However, I would like to suggest the following as an alternative:

91) JUAN 卷, **kwrons* "to roll up", "curved". ZZSF reconstructs this character as **kron?*, **gron*, * *kroons* (ZZSF 386b, 387a).

OW. CRUNN, OBret. *cron*, Ir. *cruinn* "round" (Pok 938).

One of Zhou's most impressive insights is the following correspondence:

100) GONG 共 ***kwom*, **kwong* "with, together with, share, all" (Zhou 348).

L. *cum, co-, con-, com-* "with, together with".

GONG 共 is also used as a prefix to verbs, as in the sentence from the *Analects*:

可	與	共學	，	未	可	與	適	道。
Ke	*yu*	*GONGxue*	,	*wei*	*ke*	*yu*	*shi*	*dao*
Can	with(him)	togetherlearn	,	not	can	with(him)	reach	Dao.

As to Zhou's ideas on word endings, he is of the opinion that some OC *–*s* and *–*t* finals reflect morphological endings, -*s* often representing second-person singular endings, and –*t* often representing third person singular endings. His illustrations and arguments deserve careful study.

In sum, Zhou's book is of tremendous importance, not only to Sinology but to the broader field of linguistics, and to the study of early human history on the Eurasian land mass as well. It certainly impinges on such fields as archaeology, anthropology, and genetics. Zhou is a pioneer who has boldly and impressively extended the boundaries of the study of the Chinese language, and although not all of his proposed correspondences are convincing, the aggregate cannot be ignored.

Julie Lee Wei

Zhou, Jixu. 历史语言学论文集 ***Lishi yuyanxue lunwenji*** (Collected Papers on Historical Linguistics) Bashu Shushe, Chengdu, 2003, 256 pp.

The seventeen papers in Zhou Jixu's *Lishi Yuyanxue Lunwenji* (Collected Papers on Historical Linguistics) give us a picture of his intellectual journey over the past fifteen years, a path that culminated in his ground-breaking *Comparison of Words Between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European.* Almost the entire latter half of this second book, *Collected Papers*, consists of material culled from that bigger work. They are presented here in three papers, in Chinese and English. The English translations previously appeared in *Sino-Platonic Papers*. Most of the first half of the *Collected Papers* consist of work previously published in Chinese scholarly journals.

We learn from Zhou's preface to this second volume how he acquired his impressive proficiency in, and love of, the ancient Chinese texts which he has used so assiduously to make his arguments in Chinese etymology and comparative historical linguistics. As a graduate student in the late 1980's at Sichuan Normal University, Zhou's professors in the Chinese department included Ran Youqiao 冉友侨, Liu Junhui 劉君惠, Guo Chengyong 郭诚永, and Du Daosheng 杜道生, all over seventy years of age. "They had a lifetime devotion to traditional Chinese culture," Zhou says. "They loved ancient

---

Abbreviations

CW *Comparison of Words Between Old Chinese and Indo-European* by Zhou Jixu

EZ *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*, by Axel Schuessler

DWL *Geriadur Prifysgol Cymru: A Dictionary of the Welsh Language*

WD *Welsh Dictionary*, by Henry Lewis

Pok *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch* by Julius Pokorny

XYZ *Xing Yin Yi Zonghe Da Zidian*
(Palaeographical Dictionary of Chinese)

ZZSF *Old Chinese Phonology* by Zhengzhang Shangfang

(Note: All reconstructions in this review are from ZZSF, unless otherwise noted.
For easier typing, the sound ŋ is represented by *ng*.)

---

texts and knew them inside out, which had a profound influence on me. Professor Du could recite any passage from the *Shuowen Jiezi* [說文解字, a Han dynasty dictionary] from memory, which was astonishing, awesome. I fell in love with the *Duan Zhu* commentary to the *Shuowen.*"

As a doctoral student in linguistics under the direction of Professor Sung Yong-pei 宋永培 at Sichuan University in the late 1990s, Zhou felt the excitement in the phonology of ancient Chinese generated by the recent work of such scholars as N.C. Bodman, W. H. Baxter, and S.A. Starostin abroad and Zhengzhang Shangfang 鄭張尚芳 and Pan Wuyun 潘悟云 at home, but it was the work of Laurent Sagart's work on the genetic relationship of Chinese and Austronesian that inspired him to look farther afield and compare Old Chinese with Indo-European.

The first paper in this collection is occasioned by the *Duan Zhu.* In this book, its author, the great philologist Duan Yucai (1735-1815), confused the names of two rivers in Sichuan province, the O 涐 and the Mo 沫, which are also the names of the Qingyijiang River and Dadu River, and his error is perpetuated in three major present-day dictionaries, the *Ci Yuan, Ci Hai*, and *Hanyu Da Zidian.* The paper is a tenacious piece of detective work, where Zhou traces the names/characters and their meanings in ancient texts and finally sorts out how Duan made the mistakes, even though Duan himself lived at one time in Sichuan. In solving the conundrum, Zhou exposes a jungle-tangle of names of mountains, counties, towns, and rivers, and disentangles them. Dadu River, it turns out, was also referred in texts as Dadu Shui, Mo Shui, and Da Meng Shui. Qingyijiang River was also referred to as Zai Shui, O Shui and Qing Yi Shui. And Mount Meng, for instance, was the name of two different places. Complicating the matter was scribal error. Although Zhou's paper is ostensibly aimed at elucidating the referents of two characters, O 涐 and Mo 沫, it has larger implications. Namely, how many other errors are being perpetuated by our most august dictionaries? And Zhou's work reminds us that exactitude is by no means a simple matter.

This paper typifies the character and method of Zhou the etymologist and linguist. Making use of ancient dictionaries, histories, geography books, and other texts, he zooms in on words/characters/graphs, as it were, with a magnifying glass, revealing the data in microscopic detail. This etymological work can lead him into paleography, as in his

study of the origin of the meaning and graph of *gao* 告 "to tell"; into cultural history, as in the paper on *gong* 弓 "the bow"; into the history of the Chinese language, as in the paper on how numerous disyllabic words in the 300 B.C. poem *Li Sao* became monosyllables having the same meaning; and into prehistoric cultural contacts, as in the paper on the parallels between Old Chinese 林 **krum*, 烝 *krjɯŋ, 君 **kun* "lord, king", 群 **gwun* "group, kindred" and corresponding Indo-European words for "kin" and "king/head of kin": among them Old English *cynn*, Old Gothic *kunni*, Latin *gens*, Greek *genea* "kin" and Old Saxon *kuning*, Old Gothic *kuning*, Old Norwegian *konungr* "king, head of kin".

Zhou's work presents many new insights. For example, that 烝 **krjɯŋ* means both "group, multitude" and "king", just as 君 **kun* means "king", and its near-homophone, written with the same phonophore, 群 **gwun* means "group, multitude, kin". This is in parallel with the IE pair *kin* and *king*, where "group" and "king" derive from the same word.

Zhou's study of the words for the bow in Old Chinese leads him to conclude that the bow came anciently to China from the West. This is because the *Zhou Li* gives the character 柎 **phog* as meaning "curved back of the bow", in other words the bow without the string. He points out that Old Chinese **phog* corresponds with PIE **bheug*(*h*)- "curved", whence English *bow*. Likewise, the Chinese word for bow, *kung* 弓 means "convex" or curved.

The paper on the alternation between Old Chinese **kw-/*k* and **p-* discusses a most interesting phenomenon in the Chinese lexicon. Zhou has compiled a large list of homonyms or near homonyms that alternate between **kw-/*k-* and **p-*, for example:

香	**qhang*	芳	**pang*	"fragrant" (*ng* here stands for Zhou's)
光	**kwaaŋ*	炳	**prang*	"brilliance"
跨	**khwaas*	步	**baas*	"stride, step"
豭	**kraa*	豝	**praa*	"pig"

Is this just coincidence? Using evidence from Old Chinese and Tibetan, he argues that these numerous pairs are not due to happenstance but are cognates that experienced sound changes, and says that the changes did not take place over time in one language/ dialect but that they reflect dialect differences or the impact of another language/dialect

on a given language/dialect. He points out that a parallel change happened in Greek, for example,

PIE *k^w*os* "who" Greek *po-then* "from where"

PIE **kwaan* "all" Greek **pan-* "all"

I might point out here that the **k-*/**p-* alternation is also well known in Celtic, in the difference between Goidelic (e.g., Irish) , or Q-Celtic, and Gallo-Britonnic (e.g., Welsh). or P-Celtic. For instance, Irish *ceann* "head" and Welsh *pen* "head".

Zhou's interest in the effects of contacts between dialects on phonetic changes was stimulated by his studies of sound changes in the present-day Chengdu, Sichuan, dialect. Traditionally, phonologists have explained historical phonetic changes with the genealogical tree model, focusing on articulatory phonetics, and giving short shrift to impact of other language/dialects, while they tend to use the "wave model" to explain present-day phonetic changes. Zhou's work on present-day changes in the Chengdu dialect persuaded him that the wave model is just as valid for phonetic changes of the past. His study shows how after the 1970's, and especially during the 1980s, government-mandated Putonghua (Modern Standard Mandarin) in schools, and in radio and TV, as well as the economic boom and increased communication with the outside world, have combined to bring about significant changes in the native dialect of the city of Chengdu. In many words, the Chengdu dialect has become closer to Mandarin, particularly among the young. To take a few random words from Zhou's charts:

	模	六	損	轮	崩
	"model"	"six"	"damage"	"wheel"	"collapse"
Chengdu dialect: orig. sound	*mu*	*nu*	*sən*	*nən*	*pən*
Chengdu dialect: changed	*mo*	*nieu*	*suən*	*nuɛn*	*pong*
Putonghua (Mandarin)	*mo*	*liou*	*suən*	*luən*	*pəng*

(*ng* stands for Zhou's ŋ)

We see here the influence of Mandarin sounds on the Chengdu dialect. Zhou charts these changes systematically and in detail with respect to sound and demographics, and sees patterns of why certain characters change in sound and others remain stable. For example, words that are most often used in colloquial speech tend to remain stable. His study convinced him that we need to rethink the historical comparative method of

linguistics, which has downplayed the effect of other dialects/languages on the sound changes of a given dialect/language.

Very amusing and entertaining is Zhou's paper on the word *ba* 巴 in modern Chinese. We tend to think of colloquial Chinese as changing faster in pronunciation than literary Chinese, but in instances of *ba*, the opposite is often the case, as Zhou demonstrates. Such lively expressions as *ba* 巴 *zhe* 着 *chuanghu* 窗户 *ye'er* 眼儿 *yi* 一 *qiao* 瞧 (*Hong Lou Meng*) "stuck to the window and peeked" or *bazhang* 巴掌 (a smack) as in "gave him a smack [on the face]" are vestiges of ancient words once pronounced *ba*. *Ba* 巴 "stick to" was originally the character 傅 , meaning "be close to". *Ba* in *bazhang* 巴掌 was originally the sound of the archaic word 尃 , now pronounced *fu*, meaning "the width of a palm", and *bazhang* literally means "the palm of the hand". Zhou comes up with many other examples of the ancient lineages of the earthy word *ba* 巴 .

Zhou's paper "A New Interpretation of *Datong*" brings him into the terrain of intellectual history, or rather into comparative intellectual history, where he finds a correspondence between the great Confucian political/social and utopian ideal of *datong* 大同 "great concord" (also translated "grand equality", "great commonwealth") and the Greek word *demos* as well as the concept of democracy, and from this posits that the correspondence suggests that there were links between the civilization of the Yellow River valley in prehistoric times and the West, and that the ideal of a democratic society was transmitted between them. *Datong* was a prehistoric society (perhaps mythical) of the Yellow River valley that Confucius harked back to; it was also the democratic ideal of Sun Yat-sen. .

The famous statement of Confucius on *datong* appears in the "Li Yun" chapter of the *Li Ji*. Confucius says that a *datong* society prevailed in the Three Dynasties (Xia, Shang, Zhou), that although he could not reach it, he has records of it. Zhou Jixu, following the ancient commentators Zheng Xuan 郑玄 and Kong Yinda 孔颖达 , interprets the latter sentence not as Confucius aspiring to (*zhi* 志) that society but that he has records (*zhi* 誌) of it.

Zhou's arguments for a pre-historical link and cultural transmission of the concept of democracy between the Yellow River valley civilization (Old Chinese) and the West (IE/PIE) turn around the following word correspondences:

1) 同 *tong/*doom>*doong* "the same" : Latin *idem* "the same"
2) 重 *zhong/*dom>*dong* "many same" : Latin *eadem* "many same"
3) 同 *tong/*dom >*doong* "territory of a state": Greek **dem-* "city/state"

Furthermore, he gives the following correspondence:

4) 众 *zhong/*tjums* "people, multitude" : Greek *demos* "people"

This is a very intriguing set of correspondences, and calls for closer examination.

I should first of all mention that the * –*m* and *–*m*- in 1), 2), 3), and 4), are Zhou's conjecture and should here bear the double asterisk **. Zhou has shown in his earlier work, *CW*, through many OC-IE/PIE correspondences, that the words that rhymed with **doong* 東 in Old Chinese had a final *-*m* earlier. This is a most valuable insight.. I do not believe that all words with *dong/*doong* 東 rhyme in Old Chinese previously had an *-*m*, but I have found it to be true in many cases.

My reservation about Zhou's correspondence 1) above is that it is not certain that the earliest or primary meaning of *tong/*doong* 同 was "same". It may have been "to meet", to "bring together, join, unite", and then "to concur". Li Jinzhai 李敬齋 is cited in the *XYZ* dictionary as stating the view that the earliest, OSBI (oracle shell and bone inscription), graph 凡 of this character means "all mouths are of one accord, *zhong kou yi zhi* 衆口一致 "(i.e., "agree") because the element 冂 is the word *fan* 凡 "all" and the element ㅂ is the early graph for "mouth". It is well accepted that these two elements are graphs for "all" and "mouth". *XYZ* also cites Xu Hao and the *Shuowen* dictionary as supporting the view that the original meaning of *tong/*doong* 同 was "to meet", and *XYZ* says that "to agree" means that "minds join and meet, *qi yi xiang ho er qi yi de hui* 其義相合而其意得會". (*XYZ* 0126). The *Cihai* dictionary (*Cihai* 543) also gives first place to "meet, *he hui* (literally "join meet") 合會 " among the meanings it lists for *tong/*doong* 同, referring also to the *Shuowen*. Schuessler's *Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese* gives the meaning of *tong/*doong* 同 as "be the same, join, unite." He then immediately gives sentences from ancient texts with the *tong/*doong* 同 meanings of "concur", "come together", "were joined", "the same", "united", "share", "joined", "united", "gather (unite)", "shared", "made uniform", "bring together" "same" "together" "concordantly" "call together" "unanimous", in this order (*EZ* 613-614). But, so far as I

know, the meanings of "join", "meet", "agree", "together", and "share" are not attested for Latin *idem* "same" or its IE cognates.

Therefore I would like to suggest the following correspondence:

a) 同 **doong* "to meet, join, unite, concur, make uniform, be the same, share, bring together, together, unanimous".

Welsh *dyun*, *duun* "agreeing, or in (full) agreement, accordant, concordant, united, with one accord, of one mind,..." (*DWL* 1150)

Welsh *dynaf*, *duunaf*, *dyunno*, *duuno* *dy* + *uno*) "to agree, accord, consent, concur, unite, meet, join, combine, confederate (with)." (*DWL* 1150)

Welsh *cytun* (**cyd-dduun*) "agreeing, unanimous, of one mind, in harmony, as one man, united, peaceable..." (*DWL* 825).

(Modern Welsh *dd* has sound *th* in English *this*)

As we can seen, the root of Welsh *dyun*, *duun* is Welsh *uno* "join, unite, amalgamate" (*WD*); *unaf*, *uno* "unite, unify, coalesce, amalgamate, combine, join, connect; agree, be reconciled" (*GPC* 3704a).

As an illustration of OC-Welsh correspondence for OC *-*oong* final, consider:

a.1) 俑 *yong*/**lhoong* "wooden figures of men and women buried with the dead".

Welsh *llun* "shape, figure, form, appearance" (*DWL*); "form, image"(*WD*)

In Zhou's correspondence 2) above, glossing *chong*/**dong* 重 as "many same" is Zhou's conjecture and not given in dictionaries. The dictionary meanings of *chong*/ **dong* 重 is "double, dual, be double, multiple, repeat, layer(s)." Zhou conjectures that all these meanings derived originally from "the same", so that "to double" would mean "two the same" and "seven layers" would mean "seven the same". This is certainly an interesting conjecture. It deserves attention. However, I would like to suggest the following correspondences for consideration:

b) 重 *chong* /**dong* "double, to double, repeat, multiple"	:	Welsh *deuol* "pertaining to two; double"; IE**twai-na*, Old English *twene* "two", English *twain* "two".
b.1) 斷 *duan*/**toon*ʔ/**doon*ʔ (ZZSF 307a) * *tuanx* (Li), **tuan*ʔ(s)/**duan*ʔ (Schuessler) (*DEZC* 136) "cut up, cut off, decide" (*DEZC* 136); "cut up, cut off, decide, separate/ divide (*fen* 分)" (*Cihai* 1335)		Welsh *deuol*; IE**twai-na* "two"

I believe Chinese *duan*/**toon*ʔ 斷 "cut up, separate, etc." originally meant "to two" or "to separate in two, cut in two", hence "to cut up, cut, decide". The Oracle Bone graph is , the meaning axe, the meaning silk or thread. So this graph seems to say "cut a thread in two; cut in twain".

As to correspondence 3), I am inclined to agree with Zhou, with a small difference. "Territory/land of a state" is not quite an adequate gloss for *tong*/**doong* 同 . The *Cihai* dictionary gives the meaning of *tong*/**doong* 同 as a measure of land, 100 square *li*, traditionally said to be the size of the land granted to a feudal state in early Zhou. I think there are two possible correspondences that are closer in sound than 3):

c.1) 同 *tong*/**doong* "land of 100 sq. *li* in the early Zhou dynasty; size of the land granted to a Zhou feudal state."		Old English *tun* "enclosure, hedge or manor, settlement, village, town"; Norse *tun*, "enclosure, homestead, manor." Alternatively:
c.2) 同	:	Welsh *ton* "ley, lealand (i.e., meadow, field, pasture, grassland)...." Old Irish *tonn* "earth, g round, soil" Celtic **tonda*, IE **ten-d* < **tem-d-*. (*GPC* 3520)

It is not quite clear whether Greek *demos* "district, area, region, territory, town, etc." goes back to the same IE root as IE **tem-d-*., IE *tem-* "to cut" (Pok 1063). Greek *demos*

"district, territory, area, region, town, etc." seems derived from IE stem *da-*, *de-*, etc. "to cut, divide" (Pok 176), presumably "a cut of land". If they do, the OC **doong* and Welsh *ton* may suggest that there was contact between Sinitic and Celtic rather than Sinitic and Greek.)

Moving on to Zhou's correspondence 4) above, I agree that *zhong/*tjung* "multitude" probably earlier had a final **-m*, but I think it corresponded with another IE word, not Greek *demos*:

d) 众 *zhong/*tjung* "multitude" (衆) : Irish *diorma*, *dam* "troop"; Latin *turma* "throng, multitude".

Although I have some reservations about Zhou's correspondences, I do, however, agree with him that Old Sinitic-speaking peoples had a concept of democracy, in the form of *datong*. According to Confucius, such a *datong* society existed in the Yellow River valley during the Three Dynasties.

That OC-speaking peoples and IE-speaking peoples were in long and intimate contact during the prehistoric period is supported especially by the data in the latter part of Zhou's book, specifically the papers dealing with correspondences in basic terms (89 groups out of M. Swadesh's 200) and cultural words (97 groups). There are not only astonishing correspondences between individual words, but between many sets of homonyms. Most of the material is culled from the earlier book but presented with more concision and force in this volume. I will not discuss it here because I have already treated it in a review of that book. I should mention at least one new correspondence in the material Zhou presents here:

人 *ren/*nin* "human being, person" Skt. *nr/nár* "human being, man", IE **ner-*.

I would also suggest the following:

男 *nan/*nuum* "male, man"	:	IE **ner-*; Old Indic *nár-* "male, man". Persian *nar* "male" (Pok 765)
女 *nu/*na?* "woman"	:	IE **ner-*, Old Indic *nárī* "woman, wife"
奶 *nai/*rneel* "milk, "grandmother, woman"	:	IE **ner-*, Avestan *nāirī* "woman, wife"

I think these parallels further support Zhou's thesis that there was close contact between Sinitic-speaking and IE/PIE-speaking peoples in the prehistoric period. Who borrowed

what words from whom and when and where that took place will be the subject of his next project, Zhou tells us. The present book ranges widely over many aspects of the Chinese language and proves the author to be an erudite and painstaking scholar, original, and path-breaking. His work on correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European is of tremendous significance not only for the Chinese language, but for the entire field of linguistics, and furthermore, challenges us to rethink our paradigms of early human history.

J.L. Wei

References

Adams, Douglas Q., 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi.

Baxter, W.H., 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs 64. Berlin & New York (NY): Mouton de Gruyter.

Buck, Carl Darling, 1949. *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Chang, Tsung-tung, 1988. Indo-European Vocabulary in Old Chinese: A new thesis on the emergence of Chinese language and civilization in the late Neolithic age, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 7(January), 1-56.

Cihai 辭海, 1957. *Chinese-Chinese Dictionary*. Taipei (Taiwan): Chung Hua.

Geiriadur Prifysgol Cymru: A Dictionary of the Welsh Language, 1950-2002. Cardiff, (Wales): University of Wales Press.

Han Yu Da Cidian (*HYDCD*) 漢語大辭典 (*Comprehensive Dictionary of the Chinese Language*), 1992. Shanghai: Hanyu Da Cidian Chubanshe.

Lewis, Henry, 1960. *Welsh Dictionary*. London and Glasgow: Collins.

Lewis, H. and H. Pedersen. 1937. *A Concise Comparative Celtic Grammar*. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

MacLeod, N, and D. Dewar, 1909. *Dictionary of the Gaelic Language*. Edinburgh: John Grant.

Mair, V.H., 1990. Old Sinitic *M^{y}ag, Old Persian *Maguš*, and English 'Magician', *Early China* 15. 27-47.

Mair, V.H., 1996. Language and script: biology, archaeology, and (pre)history. *Interna-*

tional Review of Chinese Linguistics 1.1, 31-41, 47-50.

.Mair, V.H. (ed.), 1998. The *Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Peoples of Eastern Central Asia*, 2 vols. Washington (DC): The Institute for the Study of Man; Philadelphia (PA). The University of Pennsylvania Museum Publications.

Mair, V.H., 2003. The horse in late prehistoric China: Wresting culture and control from the 'barbarians', in *Prehistoric Steppe Adaptation and the Horse*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute for Archaeological Research.

Mallory, J.P. & V.H. Mair, 2000. *The Tarim Mummies: Ancient China and the Mystery of the Earliest Peoples from the West*. London: Thames and Hudson.

Mathews. R.H. 1975. *Chinese-English Dictionary*. Revised American edition. Thirteenth printing. Taipei: Dunhuang Book Co.

Partridge, E., 1958. *ORIGINS: A Short Etymological Dictionary of Modern English.* Reprint, 1983. NewYork (NY): Greenwich House.

Pokorny, Julius, 1959. *Indogermanisches Etymologisches Worterbuch*, 2 vols. First published 1959. Tubingen and Basel: A. Francke.

Sagart, L., 1999. *The Roots of Old Chinese*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schuessler, A., 1987. *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese.* Honolulu (HI): University of Hawaii Press.

Vendryes, J., 1981. *Lexique Étymologique de L'Irlandais Ancien*, vol. "B", edited by E. Bachellery and P.-Y. Lambert. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies; Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Vendryes, J., 1987. *Lexique Étymologique de L'Irlandais Ancien*, vol. "C", edited by E. Bachellery and P.-Y. Lambert. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies; Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Vendryes, J., 1996. *Lexique Étymologique de L'Irlandais Ancien*, vol. "D", edited by P.-Y. Lambert, Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies; Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.

Wei, J.L., 2005b. Counting and knotting: Correspondences between Old Chinese and Indo-European, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 162 (September), 1-71.

Wei, J.L., 2005d. Shang and Zhou: An inquiry into the linguistic origins of two

dynastic names, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 164 (October), 1-62.

Xing Yin Yi Zonghe Da Zidian 形音義綜合大字典 (An Epigraphical Dictionary of Chinese), 1979. Enlarged 3rd edition. Taipei: Cheng Chung Book Co.

Xu, Z. (ed.), 1988. *Jiagu wen zidian* 甲骨文字典 [*A Dictionary of Oracle Shell and Bone Graphs*]. Chengdu: Sichuan cishu chubanshe.

Yu, Taishan, 2000. A hypothesis about the Source of the Sai Tribes, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 106 (September).

Zhengzhang, Shangfang, 2000. *The Phonological System of Old Chinese*, translated by Laurent Sagart. Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Centre de Recherches Linguistiques sur l'Asie Orientale.

Zhengzhang, Shangfang, 2003. *Shanggu Yin Xi* 上古音系 (*Old Chinese Phonology*). : Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Zhou, Jixu, 2002a. *Hanyu Yinouyu Cihui Bijiao* 漢語印歐語詞彙比較 (*A Comparison of Words in Chinese and Indo-European*). Chengdu, Sichuan: Sichuan Minzu Chubanshe.

Zhou, J., 2002b. Correspondences of the basic words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 115 (April), 1-8.

Zhou, J., 2003a. Correspondences of cultural words between Old Chinese and Proto-Indo-European, *Sino-Platonic Papers* 125 (July), 1-19.

Zhou, J., 2003b. *Lishi Yuyanxue Lunwen Ji* 历史语言学论文集 (Collected Papers in Historical Linguistics). Chengdu, Sichuan: Bashu Shushe.

P.C. Perdue. *China Marches West: The Qing Conquest of Central Eurasia*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2005.

China Marches West is a masterful study of the dissolution of the last nomadic empire, Zunghar, and the partition of Central Eurasia in the 17th and the 18th centuries by the two superpowers, China and Russia. The Russian advance into Asia, already begun by the middle of the 16th century, did not stop until Kazakhstan and Siberia were incorporated into the imperial dominion, while the Qing dynasty, created only in the first half of the

17th century by the Manchus, succeeded in taking over the entire Mongolian steppe, the Tibetan plateau, and Eastern Turkestan (modern Xinjiang) within a century. The success of these conquests more than doubled the original size of both Russia and China and permanently changed the human geography of Central Eurasia and the international power balance of the entire Eurasian continent, leaving a legacy that persists to this day.

The historical significance of these fateful events, however, has not been fully appreciated by scholars in the fields of Chinese and Russian history. Historical vicissitudes in Central Eurasia have been regarded as belonging to "frontier" history and to be of only marginal importance. Scholars usually give their attention to the military aspects of expansion and conquest, the establishment of colonial rule, the "native" reactions, and so on. Moreover, although studies of Central Eurasia require more or less a holistic approach because of its inevitable connections with outer regions, scholars in the history of China, Russia, or Inner Asia hitherto have maintained perspectives that emphasize the independence of these regions. So we have been badly in need of studies that can provide us with an appropriate understandng of the importance of Central Eurasia, especially in relation to the emergence of the two continental empires of Russia and China in the context of world history.

Perdue's book not only fills this gap but also drastically raises the level of our understanding of the subject. A specialist in Chinese history, concentrating on the Ming-Qing period, Perdue boldly turns his eye to the Mongolian steppe and beyond. The turn of his focus from the "interior" to the "frontier" ia apparently a natural result of his conviction that the conquest and incorporation of Central Eurasisa formed essential a natural result of his conviction that the conquest and the incorporation of Central Eurasia were essential elements in the formation of the Qing imperial system. To him, however, they are essential not just because the annexation of that region enlarged the size of the empire but also because the preparation, the execution, and the management of the grand project of "gathering lands" decided the characteristics of the Qing state.

At the same time, he firmly believes that to appreciate the meaning of the Qing expansion adequately it should be placed in the larger picture of the partition of Central Eurasia, which means we need to view the events in juxtaposition with the expansion of Russia and the destruction of the Zunghars. And he feels that detailed reconstruction of

political events alone is not sufficient for the proper explanation of the success of the Qing military enterprise and the formation of imperial system. That is why he puts enormous effort into the structural analysis of the economic and environmental questions with which the Manchu rulers were confronted. Finally, to evaluate the Qing state formation in the context of world history, he mobilizes comparative history tools, comparing the case of the Qing with the emergence of nation states in Europe.

His book consists of five parts, and, as the author himself points out, it alternates between structural analysis and narrative. Part One, "The Formation of the Central Eurasian States," starts with a description of the environmental setting of Central Eurasia: its geographical distinctiveness (thick forest and vast expanse of steppe) and its isolation from the surrounding agrarian regions. Then he proceeds to explain the emergence of three competing states: Muscovy Russia, the Manchu Qing, and the Mongol Zunghars. Part Two, "Contending for Power," is a detailed and vivid description of the encounter of these three forces, which ended with the downfall of the Zunghars and the incorporation of Central Eurasia by the other two empires. Part Three, "The Economic Basis of Empire," analyzes the economic and environmental constraints the Qing empire had to overcome when it was confronted with the nomadic power based in the middle of the Central Eurasia steppe. According to the author, such constraints could be overcome only in the 18th century when the Qing system finally succeeded in getting over logistic barriers by various means: the assimilation and stabilization of frontier regions, immigration and colonization, reorganization and extension of merchant trade networks, and so on. In Part Four, "Fixing Frontiers," the author turns his focus on the ideological aspect of the conquest. He shows how imperial correspondence (especially Emperor Kangxi's letters), stone monuments, and maps were utilized to justify and legalize the conquest. Finally, as its title suggests, Part Five discusses the "Legacies and Implications" of the Qing conquest. It is remarkable that Chinese scholars from the early 19th century to this time, irrespective of their political propensity, have maintained with one voice that the Qing incorporation of Central Eurasia was simply a culmination of earlier "Chinese" dynastic projects. However, Perdue convincingly shows that the Qing achievement was actually not the terminus of any preordained linear development; rather, it was possible because the Qing, competing with powerful neighbors such as the

Zunghars and the Muscovy, succeeded in overcoming geographical and economic constraints. And that process, according to him, left indelible imprints upon the formation of the Qing state. In this sense, the historical process in China during this period took a line parallel with that of modern European states, which emerged, according to many scholars, in the midst of a competitive state system. Only from the late 18th century, when the expansion had stopped, did the Qing state structure began to stiffen, and then the divergence between China and Europe began.

This book is full of details, but the descriptions are not monotonous: vivid narration, keen remarks, and interpretative discussions render this thick volume (more than 700 pages) fascinating and readable. The details are firmly based on primary sources in the many different languages of Chinese, Manchu, Mongolian, and Russian. Perdue's scope of interest is amazingly broad, covering virtually the whole Eurasian continent, and his command of literatures in European history and social sciences is also astounding. It is no wonder that readers feel no awkwardness in his comparative historical discourse and are convinced of his conclusion that the formation of the Qing state was not much different from that of European states. Perdue's book should be recommended to all the students sitting in the classes of Asian as well as European history, and to all scholars of these regions besides. A large number of maps, pictures, and diagrams help readers in following the arguments without much difficulty. In sum, there is no doubt that this book is a brilliant achievement of modern American historical scholarship and will remain a serious challenge to future scholars in the discipline of historical analysis.

KIM Hodong

Deborah Cao. *Chinese Law: A Language Perspective*. Aldershot, Hants., England and Burlington, Vermont: Ashgate. 2004.

Overview

Studying Chinese law from a linguistic perspective, this book undertakes to examine meaning and language in Chinese law. Specifically, it investigates key notions and concepts of law, their evolutionary meanings and sources of confusion – all through

applying various levels of linguistic analysis. Significantly, Cao's study traces and links the inherited cultural and linguistic values to the contemporary Chinese legal system. This review intends to summarize Cao's central arguments in two broad categories. First examining the more linguistic-focused areas, then turning to Cao's overarching points which examine cultural features evidenced on a linguistic level.

Linguistic Features of Chinese Legal Language

It is generally acknowledged that contemporary Chinese law suffers from excessive generality and vagueness. Cao points that this "Chinese linguistic uncertainty" is multi-dimensional and is rooted in the general unclarity, relativity, inexplicitness and indexicality of Chinese as a language. Rather than pursuing any of these areas in technical depth Cao elects to focus her analysis on the "vagueness, generality and ambiguity" observable in Chinese legal language. Here she specifically cites examples where Chinese characters have one meaning and there are "lexical and structural or syntactic ambiguities". Beginning with several motivation examples where characters with dual/divergent interpretations lead to completely opposite possible overall sentence/meaning interpretations [1] Cao draws parallels to similarly confused legal terminologies/concepts in general usage. Examining contemporary Chinese criminal and civil legal codes in depth, the author finds numerous similar issues of linguistic ambiguity throughout, most distressingly on the level of foundational legal language and concepts.

Specific attention (indeed whole chapters) is devoted to the new legal and political words that were introduced and created in Chinese beginning in large part during the late 19th century through interaction with established Western legal thought – such as "human rights" and "rule of law". Cao points to the confusion/lack of clarity in these concepts and the related legal language as being rooted in three issues: (i) the inherent vagueness of Chinese (described in the preceding paragraph), (ii) difficulties posed by inter-lingual translation/transcription, and (iii) the absence of a formal tradition of legal language.

---

[1] 今还欠款 18500 元; Translation #1: Sun borrowed 20,500 yuan from Li; Translation #2: Now 18,500 yuan is still owing.

张义非我子也家财金玉我婿外人不得征占; Translation #1: Zhang Yi is not my son. The family property is to be entirely given over to my son-in-law and outsiders must not encroach upon it; Translation #2: Zhang Yifei is my son. The family property is to be entirely given over. My son-in-law is an outsider, and must not encroach upon it.

Here she points towards the inter-lingual translation difficulties resulting from the reflexive impact of the Chinese characters' semantic carrying capacity. Her points on this theme are interesting and warrant additional research, specifically looking at the difficulties involved in fitting Western legal concepts into China's character-based language and the semantic interference that results and complicates.

Regarding the difficulties posed by modern Chinese legal language and its lack of any standardization or lengthy tradition, Cao argues that contemporary China finds itself in an awkward situation. Essentially by trying to emulate the depth and specificity of Common and Civil law traditions in substance, but bound by the looseness of Chinese as a language, contemporary Chinese legal language is unable to provide detailed laws that are definite in their meaning. Particular attention is devoted to the difficulties and obstacles posed by Chinese's lack of a highly stylized/formalized legal language for expressing meaning. She reinforces her point by contrasting legal Chinese, very similar to regular Chinese, with legal English and its tradition as a long established and codified specialist language that a native English speaker requires a formal legal education just to understand.

Historical and Cultural Heritage of Contemporary Chinese Legal Language

Taking a step back from the more technical and specific linguistic analysis of the first half of the book which focuses on "how" Chinese is different/unique as a legal language, Cao in the second half of the book takes on the broader question of "why" it is different.

This section of the analysis begins with the basic assumption that language matters, and that linguistic signs as representations of the world and connections to the world are not neutral, but culture-specific and distinct. From here the underlying premise of Cao's argument is that Chinese cultural values expressed through language provide the context, the background and foreground in which Chinese law operates. The author's view that Chinese history is essentially a "continuum", with no major disruptive or "qualitative ruptures"[2], factors prominently in her argument. Cao contends that the dominant cultural

[2] Presumably, though not explicitly cited, by "qualitative rupture" Cao points to the development of Christianity/Judaism/Islam in the West/Middle East and the disruptive effect on cultural inheritance effected therein; or, the development/destruction of the Americas,... and the corresponding rupture between pre- and post-colonialization for both colonized and colonizers and the rupture of cultural traditions evident therein.

orientations of modern China are seen to have their origins in the distant past, and that these forces of Confucianism and Legalism figure prominently in framing legal thought as a result of an this cultural inheritance. Cao contends that in the Chinese tradition, classical writings and philosophical works from the pre-imperial period form the basic shared Chinese cultural components and facilitate the "continuum". Language plays a major role in sustaining these effects because language is the medium in which past and present are fused. Thus, Cao argues, Chinese culture and language are hereditary, and the influence and effects of cultural values and traditional notions manifest themselves in contemporary life, and they are visible in the Chinese legal language.

Predicated on this argument of inherited cultural values and concepts, Cao proceeds to examine the impact of the conceptual dichotomy posed by Confucian and Legalist inheritances as hand-coded into Chinese legal language. Simplistically, the author looks at the influence of each respective inheritance by maintaining that certain linguistic terms associated with Confucianism and Legalism are still evident today and associated with one inherited tradition or the other – here she focuses her analysis on the use of 应当 "yingdang" and 必须 "bixu", respectively. Because the Confucian system of moral order depended upon moral education and "right" behavior moral suasion factored prominently in maintaining social order -- the legal performative associated with the tradition in modern Chinese legal language is 应当 "yingdang"[3]. Likewise Legalism is characterized by compelling obedience with more stringent penalties and punishments – and is associated with the performative 必须 "bixu"[4]. Undertaking an examination of the usage of each Cao cites statistical and qualitative evidence to show that "yingdang" is more evident as the preferred performative in civil code, while "bixu" is more evident in criminal code and interestingly in law directed at foreigners. Essentially Cao suggests that Confucian and Legalist traditions are hand-coded into the language and that the linguistic inheritance of each is very much evident in modern Chinese legal language. That is, Confucian legal language is still used when referring to relations in civil society, while Legalist language comes out more in situations where the norms of civil society

[3] Meaning "should" or "ought to" but connoting obligation, but more persuasive than obligatory and carrying a moral overtone. Essentially carrying a sense of compelling action/inaction out of a sense of what is right and wrong.

[4] Meaning "should" or "ought to" but connoting obligation, implying a sense of legal command more than persuasion.

have been violated or for those outside and not having knowledge of civil society (foreigners). Moreover, Cao conjectures that these inheritances pose difficulties in attempting to render Western-type positivist legal philosophies that increasingly form the substance of modern Chinese law. Cao argues that the current state of much of China's legal system is ambiguous partially due to the incomplete effort to reconcile Confucian, Legalist and rendered Western positivist language into a cohesive whole. While her analysis on this point is a bit circuitous, the argument is stong.

Conclusions and Review

Applying her background in law, linguistics and cross-cultural translation Cao does a solid job in treating this largely un-researched area. Her work is important in approaching the issues related to Chinese legal language uncertainty at both micro- and macro-linguistic levels. This book serves as the pioneering comprehensive effort in the field, and serves to both lay a foundation of research and analysis as well as point out areas that warrant further work.

David Selvia

Don Snow. ***Cantonese as Written Language: The Growth of a Written Chinese Vernacular.*** Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005. xi, 320 pages

Long have I waited for someone to write this book, and now that it has at last appeared, I can only say that I am deeply grateful to the author for having written it. Since I have only a single complaint about this work, I might as well get it out of the way so that I can move on to the pleasant task of describing its contents and significance.

The sole major problem in the work under review is that the author perpetuates the bizarre practice of referring to the non-Mandarin Sinitic vernacular languages as "dialects." In linguistic discussions throughout the world, this strange usage is consistently reserved only for members of the Sinitic group. The author is certainly not unaware of the weirdness of this habit, since the very first note (p. 259) of his book is the following:

> In the Chinese context, the term "dialect" is used to refer to a variety of Chinese that differs significantly from Mandarin in pronunciation, vocabulary, and to some degree in grammar.

Aside from its manifest bow to a special standard for discussions of "Chinese," one that is different from that applied to all other languages on earth, the note is essentially incoherent, inasmuch as "significantly" and "to some degree" clash with each other, not to mention that "significantly" itself is hopelessly vague. Furthermore, if we look at the sentence on p. 1 of the book that note number 1 is supposed to clarify, we can see that – with or without the note – the sentence cannot withstand critical analysis:

> Hong Kong is far and away the largest and wealthiest Chinese community in the world that speaks a dialect[1] of Chinese to the almost complete exclusion of Mandarin (the variety of Chinese known in mainland China and Singapore as Putonghua, or the Common Speech, and in Taiwan as Guoyu, or the National Language).

What exactly is the author saying here? It would appear that he believes Cantonese is a "dialect" of Chinese, whereas Mandarin is a "variety" of Chinese. Yet this directly contradicts what he says elsewhere in the book, including note 1, where Cantonese itself is said to be a "variety" of Chinese. I could easily pick further holes in this sorry sentence, and in hundreds of other sentences in the book that reveal the pathetic inadequacy of current terminology for dealing with Sinitic branches, languages, dialects, and sub-dialects. However, I do not wish to make it seem as though I am needling the author, since – except for his disastrous adoption of the illogical usage of "dialect" when it is "language" that is at issue – I am actually very fond of this book. The problem is that he has simply followed along with the muddled usage pertaining to "Chinese" (i.e., Sinitic) languages that unfortunately is all too common, both among professional linguists and non-specialists alike. Still, because Snow was able to see that Cantonese is developing as a separate written vernacular that is unintelligible to monolingual speakers of Mandarin (see below), one is filled with regret that he was unable to draw the

inevitable conclusion that Cantonese and Mandarin are separate languages, not dialects of each other or of some unspecified *tertium quid.*

In addition, we find that, in the first note to chapter 3 (p. 262) and on pp. 46-47 of the main text, it is clear that the author is fully aware of the difficulties and liabilities surrounding the application of the term "dialect" to Cantonese, and is even familiar with the term "topolect" as a neutral translation of *fangyan*. Snow admits that linguistically Cantonese and Mandarin are effectively different languages, but his feeble excuses for continuing to call Cantonese a "dialect" are "because of its familiarity" and "because the social role of Cantonese… is more limited than that of Mandarin," neither of which holds water when measured against linguistic usage elsewhere in the world. If we always stick to what is "familiar," no progress would ever be made in linguistics, or in any other field, for that matter, and the social roles of languages are irrelevant when it comes to describing and classifying them. (For example, English plays many different roles in various societies throughout the world, but that does not mean it should be considered a "dialect" in contrast to the dominant languages of those societies.)

Ultimately, Snow follows political and cultural prejudice rather than impartial linguistic description and classification in determining that Cantonese is a dialect rather than a language. Following Mandarin chauvinists, Snow avers that "the term 'dialect' is accurate in describing the role of Cantonese within the Chinese language family "because of China's tradition of political unity, the traditional unity of its written language, and the subordinate position that Cantonese plays in this scheme of things." The absurdity of these claims can be readily exposed by comparing linguistic reality in India and China, and by pointing out that political unity is irrelevant to scientific linguistic classification (not to mention that "China" has not always been politically unified, whereas states that have been politically unified for far longer stretches of time than China often have a multiplicity of languages), that the supposed traditional unity of written language in China is not at all what it is claimed to be, and so forth and so on.

So as not to prolong my complaint unduly (though it is about a serious matter that causes our field to be perpetually engaged in making nonsensical statements), I shall mention only a few places where I have discussed this problem of terminology for dealing with Chinese languages at greater extent and in more detail: a. *Sino-Platonic*

Papers, 29: "What Is a Chinese 'Dialect/Topolect'? Reflections on Some Key Sino-English Linguistic Terms"; b. my introduction to the new *Hawai'i Reader in Traditional Chinese Culture*; c. my chapter on language and script for the *Columbia History of Chinese Literature*. I also wrote a review of Cheung Kwan-hin and Robert S. Bauer's book on *The Representation of Cantonese with Chinese* Characters in the *Journal of Chinese* Linguistics, 32.1 (2004), 157-166, and I have just finished another review on Henning Klöter's book on *Written Taiwanese* for the same journal. Both of these reviews also adopt the position that Cantonese and Taiwanese are languages, not mere dialects.

In these and other works, I have described exactly what a *fangyan* is and is not, why "dialect" is a disastrously poor translation of this Chinese term, and why "topolect" is a far superior and completely neutral translation for *fangyan*. It may be worthwhile pointing out that a precise, accurate translation of "dialect" in Chinese would be *tongyan* or *tongyu*, since the Greek roots of the word are *dia* ("between, over, through, across") and *legein* ("to speak"), clearly implying **a form of language that can be used for purposes of mutually intelligible conversation among its speakers (cf. "dialog[ue]," which comes from the same roots)**. Clearly this is not the situation among the so-called Chinese *fangyan*, where mutual unintelligibility is the order of the day (as between Pekingese and Cantonese, or between Taiwanese and Sichuanese).

In terms of linguistic classification, a dialect is one of the following two things: 1. a regional or social variety of a language distinguished by pronunciation, grammar, or vocabulary, especially a variety of speech differing from the standard literary language or speech pattern of the culture in which it exists; 2. a variety of language that with other varieties constitutes a single language of which no single variety is standard. According to number 1, it makes sense to say that "Cockney is a dialect of English," but not that "Cantonese is a dialect of Mandarin." According to number 2, it does **not** make sense to say that "Cantonese is a dialect of Chinese," since Mandarin is the standard Chinese (Sinitic) language at the present time. (Other definitions of "dialect," such as "the language peculiar to members of a group, especially in an occupation," "the manner or style of expressing oneself in language or the arts," are not applicable to the scientific classification of language (see *The American Heritage of the English Language* [4th ed., p. 500a]). Neither Cantonese nor Mandarin is a dialect according to definition number 1 or

number 2. Instead, they are, plain and simple, separate **languages** (or **branches**, if you consider that they themselves have **dialects** properly speaking) of the Sinitic **group**, and Mandarin is the current modern **standard** of the group.

We may observe, finally, that the gross misuse of the term *fangyan* is strictly a modern phenomenon occasioned by its application as a faulty translation for "dialect." Traditionally, as in the title of Yang Xiong's famous Han period book, it meant something quite different, viz., local lexemes. Before the disastrous mistranslation of "dialect" as *fangyan* was calqued in modern times, Chinese had their own way of referring to comparable linguistic phenomena, e.g., *xiangtan* ("village speech"), *xiangyin* ("village sounds"), *tuhua* ("patois," lit. "earthy speech"), and so forth.

Now that I have gotten all that off my chest, we may turn to an examination of Don Snow's considerable contributions in the volume under review. He begins by asking "Why study the development of written Cantonese?" To anyone who has an ounce of intellectual curiosity, the answer is abundantly self-evident. After the short introductory chapter in which he spells out his reasons for doing research on written Cantonese, the author turns to the meat of the book, which may be divided into three main parts.

The first part provides the background for the rest of the treatment, with chapter 2 placing the development of written Cantonese in the context of diglossia and chapter 3 examining the relationship of Cantonese to Mandarin. The second part presents an outline history of written Cantonese, with chapter 4 concentrating on the period from the late Ming dynasty until World War II. Chapter 5 outlines the history of the Hong Kong Topolect Literature Movement of the late 1940s, while chapter 6 follows developments up to 2004.

The term "diglosssia" was coined by Charles Ferguson in 1959, with Arabic as its defining case. It is unfortunate that Ferguson chose the signifiers High (H) and Low (L) to refer to the two different languages of a diglossia, since this immediately privileges the one and stigmatizes the other. The fact that so-called H is written and so-called L is not written may be purely an accident of history and have nothing whatsoever to do with the intrinsic quality of the languages involved. Vedic and Early Sanskrit, both of which are extremely sophisticated and elegant languages, resisted being written down even while interacting with written Persian and Aramaic, but this in no way implies that Sanskrit is

inferior to Aramaic and Persian. Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were originally orally composed and recited, while Northwest Semitic (Phoenician), which was in contact with the Greeks for commercial purposes, was already written, but this by no means implies that Homeric Greek was inferior to Phoenician. Quite the contrary, Homer's epics are universally recognized as among the greatest literary masterpieces of humanity, whereas Phoenician is known chiefly as a mercantile language.

I personally do not feel that Ferguson's diglossia is very suitable for the Cantonese case because of the existence of **three** commonly used languages in Hong Kong (English, Cantonese, and Mandarin), plus two scripts (the Roman alphabet and Chinese characters).

For purposes of comparison, the author briefly examines writing in Wu topolect and in Taiwanese (pp. 33-39). These are fair surveys, touching upon most of the difficulties faced by speakers of the regional Sinitic vernaculars when they attempted to forge written languages. It may be useful, however, to highlight some of the main problems: 1. a general unwillingness to write in pure forms of Wu or Taiwanese, but instead merely sprinkling in a few topolecticisms here and there; 2. tacit acceptance of the fundmental fallacy that these languages are intrinsically crude, a position imposed by central cultural authorities (one could only accept such a point of view if one held that all monolingual speakers of Wu and Taiwanese throughout their lives uttered only vulgar expressions, and that their languages are devoid of resources for saying anything refined or beautiful); 2. the inappropriateness of Chinese characters for writing Sinitic languages other than Literary Sinitic (Classical Chinese) and Mandarin; 3. the lack of leaders who would clearly recognize the feasibility of writing with an alphabet and energetically promote it (cf. Turkish, Vietnamese, etc.).

One of Snow's major findings in *Cantonese as Written Language* is that texts having 30% of marked Cantonese features may for all essential purposes be considered unintelligible to those who are non-speakers of the language. Snow highlights such distinctively Cantonese features by marking them in bold in sample texts, so they are easy to spot in the matrix of what is otherwise more or less standard *baihua* (Mandarin). A related finding is that the first attempts to write down elements of Cantonese (during the Qing and Republican periods) seldom had more than 10% of marked features. It

should be noted that Snow intentionally errs on the conservative side in only marking as Cantonese those features that are unmistakably not Mandarin or Literary Sinitic.

It would be an extremely valuable study if someone were to record formal and informal Cantonese speech in a variety of settings, and mark the proportions of distinctively Cantonese features in such samples. My expectation is that the proportion of uniquely Cantonese elements in such recordings would be far greater than the 30% at which most samples of written Cantonese peak. The reason for this is that speakers are not restricted by character usage, and even the thousand or so special characters devised for Cantonese cannot account for all possible morphemes used in spontaneous speech. Similar studies should also be carried out for Wu, Taiwanese, Shanghaiese, Sichuanese, and even spoken Pekingese, in all of which there exist numerous morphemes lacking appropriate character correspondences. In fact, Cantonese has gone further than any of the other non-standard Sinitic languages in devising special graphs for its distinctive morphemes.

I cannot, in the space of this review, do justice to the author's thorough coverage of the various mechanisms for writing Cantonese, the motivations for doing so, the history of attempts to record elements of Cantonese language (beginning probably in the late Ming), the role of Buddhism in legitimizing the writing of Cantonese, the proliferation of genres, the pedagogy of writing in Cantonese, the special position of Cantonese ballads and opera, the subtle dynamics of Cantonese-Mandarin interactions, political and cultural movements for and against the writing of Cantonese, the role of ethnolinguistic vitality in fostering the growth of written Cantonese, and so forth. Suffice it to say that for anyone who is interested in learning about all aspects of the history of writing in Cantonese, the book under review is an extraordinarily rich resource. The author has assiduously and conscientiously ferreted out a wealth of fascinating information about written Cantonese that will prove useful to scholars for decades to come.

Snow's book is accompanied by four photographs showing written Cantonese used in advertisements, a map of the Cantonese-speaking regions in the provinces of Guangdong, Guangxi, and Hainan, as well as five tables showing vocabulary differences between Cantonese and Mandarin, the range of specialized Cantonese vocabulary used in formal versus informal registers of speech, examples of variant graphic forms of selected

Cantonese words, the increased number of Cantonese features in newspapers of the late 1980s as opposed with the early 80s, and the average number of Cantonese features in Hong Kong's top ten newspapers.

The book is also provided with four appendices. Appendix 1 takes a closer look at the fourteen sample texts found in chapters 4-6, analyzing them in terms of the marked Cantonese found in them, giving complete translations, and discussing the sanction for Cantonese use in them. Appendix 2 is a list of interviews conducted and public lectures attended by the author in preparation for writing the book. Appendix 3 is a list of the titles of publications and published works employing written Cantonese that are mentioned in the book (*Love Dairy of the Big Man* on p. 251 should be *Love Diary...*). Appendix 4 is a list of characters for Cantonese and Mandarin terms occurring in the book. The appendices are followed by 25 pages of detailed notes, 20 pages of references, and a 13-page index. An unusual feature of the latter is the extremely elaborate arrangement for the citation of references to "written Cantonese" which runs on for four columns with scores of subheadings.

One aspect of the design of the book that leaves something to be desired is the cluttered profusion of headings in various sizes and styles: bold, italics, bold with italics. Instead of making clearer the relationships among the various sections of the book, the seemingly analytical use of these overly abundant design elements only serves to distract and confuse.

Snow closes his important book with an epilogue (chapter 8) on the future of written Cantonese. While predictions about the future are always fraught with imponderables, this is a vital question, and one that is worthy of being asked, for it is intimately related to the lives of all those who belong to the political and cultural spheres of "China." As Snow puts it, "Will the Growth of Written Cantonese Continue?" The author's carefully calculated answer is that, for the foreseeable future, written Cantonese will continue to gradually expand. I am not nearly so sanguine. Quite the contrary, I would predict that, so long as the People's Republic of China remains politically stable and retains its (proudly self-confessed) dictatorial one-party system, the eventual demise of written Cantonese is assured. Of course, Hong Kong supposedly has 42 more years of grace period before it is subject to the full force of Chinese central government laws and

policies, but already China has reneged on many of its promises and guarantees concerning the autonomy of Hong Kong (interference in elections, attempts to control the activities of the Catholic Church and Falun Gong, the stationing of large numbers of troops both inside and nearby the region at various times and places, manipulation of the press, etc.). Furthermore, one only need look at what is happening to local languages in such diverse places as Shanghai, Inner Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Tibet to realize that, once it assumes total power and authority in Hong Kong (and quite likely even before then), the Chinese central government will insist on the primacy of Mandarin and will surely not tolerate the development of a fully functioning written Cantonese. One of the aspects of the Taiwan situation that is most unsettling to the authorities in Beijing is the prospect for the development of an independent written language for the island. With Hong Kong firmly within the military grip of the mainland, it is inconceivable that the government would permit the expansion of written Cantonese into areas where it might compete with written Mandarin. Naturally, however, if the central government of the PRC should falter or if genuine multi-party democracy should emerge in China (which – barring massive turmoil to wrest it from the Communist Party – is highly unlikely during the next few decades), then the prospects for the continued growth of written Cantonese are much better.

Scholars have only recently begun to study seriously anything beside the phonology of the Sinitic ("Chinese") languages other than Mandarin. Snow's book is a great advance over everything that preceded it in considering all aspects of Cantonese as an independent language – except in failing to recognize explicitly that that is what it really is.[1] The linguistic situation in China is vastly more complex than the usual simplistic claims of there being only a single Chinese language with Cantonese as one of its dialects. This is borne out by the curiously interesting fact that the term *baihua*, which means "written vernacular" in Modern Standard Mandarin (MSM), signifies "spoken Cantonese" (pronounced *baakwaa*) in the area around Canton! – and thousands of other bits of evidence that certify the autonomous linguistic status of Cantonese. The path to the realization of a more accurate picture of the Sinitiic language group is painfully slow, but

progress is finally being made. We can be grateful to Don Snow for his major contribution embodied in *Cantonese as Written Language*.

Victor H. Mair

Notes

1. We should not, however, overlook the major studies of Robert S. Bauer (orthography) and of Stephen Matthews and Virginia Yip (grammar), which are listed among Snow's references. See also the reviews by Victor H. Mair mentioned above on the third page of this review.

Braj B. Kachru. ***Asian Englishes: Beyond the Canon. Asian Englishes Today.*** Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2005. xxiii, 333 pages.

This is the fourth volume in an exciting series called Asian Englishes Today. The titles of the previous volumes give a good idea of where the series is headed: *Hong Kong English: Autonomy and Creativity*; *Japanese English: Language and Culture Contact*; *China's English: A History of English in Chinese Education*. The aims of the series are spelled out even more clearly in the following statement by the editor:

> The volumes in this series set out to provide a contemporary record of the spread and development of the English language in South, Southeast, and East Asia from both linguistic and literary perspectives. Volumes in this series reflect themes that cut across national boundaries, including the study of language policies; globalization and linguistic imperialism; English in the media; English in law, government and education; 'hybrid' Englishes; and the bilingual creativity manifested by the vibrant creative writing found in a swathe of Asian societies.

The dedication of this book is among the most unusual I have ever seen, and also merits quotation:

Dedicated to

scholars and educators and creative writers

whose

inspiring and pioneering research and innovative teaching
contributed to
contextually realistic constructs of Asian Englishes:

Ahmed Ali; Mulk Raj Anand; Maria Lourdes S. Bautista;
Robert J. Baumgardner; Kingsley Bolton; A. C. Burnell;
Susan Butler; Phiroze Edulji Dustoor; Nissim Ezekiel;
Lloyd Fernando; John Rupert Firth; Andrew Gonzalez;
Nobuyuki Honna; Yamuna Kachru; P. Lal;
Shirley Geok-lin Lim; Teodoro A. Llamzon; Ramesh Mohan;
C. D. Narasimhaiah; Anne Pakir; John T. Platt;
Raja Rao; Larry E. Smith; Tariq Rahman; Salman Rushdie;
S. N. Sridhar; Mary W. J. Tay; Edwin Thumboo;
Arthur Yap; Henry Yule; Yan Zhiqiang

The names of many famous linguists, teachers, and writers are conspicuous in this long list.

Braj Kachru is Center for Advanced Study Professor of Linguistics and Jubilee Professor of Liberal Arts and Sciences Emeritus at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is a veteran of studies on global English, with many noteworthy books and articles to his credit, including *The Other Tongue: English across Cultures* (ed.; 1982; 1992, 2nd ed.), *The Indianization of English* (1983), *The Alchemy of English: The Spread, Functions, and Models of Non-native Englishes* (1986; 1999 rpt.).

The present volume brings together a range of Kachru's previously published material (though now substantially revised and updated) with new chapters written especially for it. The volume is composed of five main sections: Part I on contexts (Asian Englishes, South Asian English, English in Japan); Part II on convergence (contact linguistics and Englishization); Part III on "mantras" (literary creativity); Part IV on predation (English as a "killer" language); Part V on pedagogy (approaches to teaching and learning); and Part VI, Afterword (current debates and controversies). As pointed out by the series editor, Kingsley Bolton, in his Preface (p. xiv), "The scope of this book is innovative and

multidisciplinary, and moves from linguistic description to literary explication, from intercultural communication to critical commentary."

In his own Preface (p. xv), the author states that "This book is essentially about the Asianness in Asian Englishes and their gradual, yet marked, distinctness which has developed over a long history in contexts of language and cultural contact. It discusses the changing ideational and functional constructs of the presence of the English language in the Asian continent and the resultant linguistic turbulence."

But what are the "Asian Englishes" and "World Englishes" of which Kachru speaks? Do they really exist? And, if so, is it a good thing or a bad thing? The vitality and vibrancy of **the** English language are of such vast proportions that it is sometimes difficult to grasp them. Here is a language with a greater geographic spread, more total words, more borrowed words, more loaned words, more dialects, and more speakers than any other language on earth, so naturally it is bound to develop local varieties. The amazing thing about the well over a billion speakers of English is that their common tongue – especially when written, but largely even when spoken – is mutually intelligible no matter where on the face of the globe one travels. This is in stark contrast to the billion plus speakers of "Chinese," where the level of mutual intelligibility among all of its speakers (the vast majority of whom live within the country of China) is surely less than half, since even Mandarin speakers from different parts of China have serious difficulty understanding each other, and still today there is a worrying amount of illiteracy, particularly among women and in the countryside. The reason for this sharp difference is that "Chinese," which is usually erroneously referred to as a language having eight main dialects, is actually a language group (or family) having eight or so branches, and dozens of languages (mutually unintelligible forms of speech), whereas English – despite its many colorful varieties spread across the world – is a single, unified language. Therefore, the "Englishes" of which Kachru speaks in his book under review are actually just different varieties of a single language that spans the glove, not separate languages. The fact that so many different peoples belonging to so many different cultures and countries all now speak one international language – albeit with variants having local flavor – gives the lie to claims that language is coterminous with politics, ethnicity, and nationality. As for how this language from an island in the North Sea has

become the most important language transcending national borders in Asia, no one has done a better job of detailing its transformation than Braj Kachru, and *Asian Englishes* is his most important statement on the subject to date.

Incidentally, if the plural "Englishes" sounds at all natural nowadays, the credit is due to Braj Kachru, who, along with Larry Smith, insisted that the Pergamon journal *World Language English* be retitled as *World Englishes* (now published by Blackwell UK) when they assumed its co-editorship in 1985. He has been writing energetically about the presumed – or desired – multiplicity of English varieties ever since.

V.H. Mair

Elizabeth Wayland Barber and Paul T. Barber. *When They Severed Earth from Sky: How the Human Mind Shapes Myth.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004. xvii, 290 pages.

This is an unusual book with a strong thesis (myths encode reality), a variety of hypotheses in support of the thesis, and numerous principles (51, to be exact) that explain how myths evolve and function. Despite the fact that this is a serious work which aims to establish a new methodology for studying all the myths of the world, the authors' playfulness and wit are evident on virtually every page.n

The Barbers are out to "strip the veil of mystery" from mythology. At the very beginning of their complex investigation, they warn away those who are not interested in such an inquiry. But why would they systematically attempt to demystify one myth after another, in a quest that some would say deprives this body of lore both of its charm and its archetypal significance? The answer is simple: the Barbers believe that the sum total of mythology contains a precious record of the human past stretching back much further than the mere of 5,200 years since writing was invented. Contra Lord Raglan, the Barbers maintain that non-literate peoples do have an interest in the things of the past and that they possess means for transmitting meaningful information about significant events that occurred long ago.

Despite the witty, engaging style in which it was written, this is not an easy book to read. The main reason for the book's difficulty is the large amount of technical data and arcane details with which it is filled. Particularly challenging are the astronomical phenomena and calculations necessary for describing them. The proliferation of unfamiliar names from many unfamiliar cultures and words from numerous languages (some quite obscure) presents additional obstacles. Just when the poor reader starts to feel overwhelmed, however, the authors will insert one of their calming, reassuring Myth Principles. To convey a sense of their quality, here are a few examples (all 51 are gathered together in the Appendix [pp. 245-251]):

> MEMORY CRUNCH When all accumulated wisdom must be stored in the brain and transmitted orally (as in a nonliterate society), people reserve the formal oral tradition for transmitting the information they consider most important, often for survival.
>
> RELEVANCE COROLLARY Formal oral mythologies are neither unimportant and "off the wall" nor random in their content.
>
> BABY-WITH-THE-BATHWATER REFLEX Heavily literate cultures tend to disregard the truth of the earlier events reported in myths and legends, because they can't brook the explanations – that is, they ignore the phenomena described because they reject the mechanisms indicated.
>
> CAMERA-ANGLE PROBLEM To understand what a story is talking about, we may have to observe the situation from a very particular viewpoint.
>
> GOLDILOCKS PRINCIPLE Key words or phrases may evoke an entire narrative complex to the members of a particular culture.

And so forth.

Since even the simplest of the authors' explications is complex, I shall not attempt to convey the essence of one here. Indeed, the Barbers methodology for explaining myths is so unique that it must be experienced directly. Therefore, instead of making a feeble attempt to replicate even one of their exegeses, I shall merely mention a few of the myths, legends, and cults that receive surprising, new, and often highly convincing explanations in *When They Severed Earth from Sky*: Prometheus chained to the rocks, St. George (and others) slaying the dragon, Mithra slaying the bull, the Klamath tribe's account of the origin of Crater Lake in Oregon, Austrian dwarves, the recurrent mutilation of cattle and cats, vampires, mummies, the flood, and so forth.

The authors have kindly supplied forty-four illustrations (photographs, diagrams, charts) to enhance their text. Many of these make instantly clear what may have been almost impossible to grasp from verbal description alone.

As for misstatements, it is not correct to state (p. 94) that "Chinese for millennia have called non-Ḥan 'foreign devils.'" "Foreign devil" (*yanggui[zi]*) is a term of fairly recent vintage and refers primarily to Europeans. (This is not to say, of course, that the people of the East Asian Heartland lacked terms of opprobrium for non-Sinitic groups!) Several items listed in the Index could not be found in the text, and occasional references are opaque (e.g., "see S & D" – this, incidentally, must have been the authors' abbreviated message to themselves that was inadvertently permitted to slip into the text; it is actually a shortened citation to the brilliant study of Giorgio de Santillana and Hertha von Dechend entitled *Hamlet's Mill: An essay on myth and the frame of time* (Boston: Nonpareil / Godine [rpt.]), which clearly inspired the Barbers at many places and in many respects.

The point of the whole book is that, no matter how quaint and preposterous a myth may seem (there really aren't dragons, are there, much less ones that have foul breath and breathe fire?!), there are usually naturalistic reasons for all its salient details. The Barbers rely on their extensive knowledge of astronomy, vulcanology, physiology, and other sciences to unlock the hidden meanings of one myth after another. Once you have read their book, you will never be able to look at a myth the same way again.

V.H. Mair

Christopher Hutton and Kingsley Bolton, comp. ***A Dictionary of Cantonese Slang: The Language of Hong Kong Movies, Street Gangs and City Life.*** Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2005; London: C. Hurst, 2005. xxiv, 492 pages.

A common term of reference for Cantonese is that it is a type of *liyu*. The usual translation of *liyu* is "slang," That immediately raises the question of whether the Cantonese language consists wholly of vulgarisms. If that is what people imagine Cantonese to be, it is a strange state of affairs indeed when tens of millions of speakers of a language are thought to utter nothing but crudities. Surely Cantonese speakers must be able to voice tender, kind, elegant sentiments and verbalize brilliant, perceptive thoughts too.

The idea that the non-Mandarin Sinitic languages are fundamentally coarse is difficult to expunge, often even from the speakers of those languages themselves.[1] I have often heard speakers of the non-standard topolects declare self-deprecatingly that they are ashamed of their mother tongue because it is so unrefined. Thus it is only a slight surprise to find that the Foreword to the present volume was written by Ip Pau-Fuk, Chief Inspector of the Hong Kong Police Force (retired). "Real Cantonese" is somehow considered to be preeminently, or characteristically, the language of criminals and prostitutes. Thus it possible to assemble a large dictionary of nearly 500 pages that is full of foul, filthy words, and declare that it is a representative collection of Cantonese slang.

Such, I would beg to differ, is not at all the true state of affairs. Even the volume under review, which intentionally focuses on the dirtier, rougher aspects of Cantonese, contains a large proportion of innocuous, quotidian expressions. Now, it is interesting that the title of this dictionary in Chinese characters that appears on the cover is *Suyu zidian*, which bespeaks something rather different than slang, namely, common or popular language. In my estimation, the Chinese title of this work is more accurate than the English one.

The problem of complicity in the stigmatization of non-Mandarin speech aside, this is a welcome addition to the growing number of scholarly works that treat Cantonese as a worthy subject for serious study. The volume begins with an eleven page "Preface" that

is really more on the order of a short introduction. In the Preface, the authors explain the origins and aims of the dictionary, discuss methodological issues and sources of their data, delve into the convoluted realm of writing in Cantonese, briefly examine the history of studies of Cantonese, then narrow in on dictionaries of slang and idioms, and conclude with a look at the scholarship on secret languages. A "Guide to the Entries" follows, in which the Yale Romanization used by the authors is spelled out (and compared with the International Phonetic Alphabet).

Each entry of the dictionary consists of the Romanized form of the word in question, followed by its sinographic form (if known) and an English gloss in square brackets. After that come example phrases or sentences (both in Romanization and in characters) illustrating different uses of the word in the main entry. Most of the examples conclude with the specific source from which they were taken.

A look at the symbols employed in the dictionary is revealing. The first is ">", which indicates that the item in question is derived (or appears to be derived) from the corresponding English word. The number of words in Cantonese derived from English is astonishingly large, even though they are normally so sinographically and phonologically masked that no English speaker would ever recognize them, whether in speech or in writing. For example, *chàah bōu / chāa bòuh* is written with two characters that mean "tea pot," but who would ever guess that these two syllables hide the English word "trouble"?! The authors note that this term, which implies "troublesome," was made popular by a film starring Hong Kong actor Chow Yeun-fat. The dictionary is full of gems such as this.

The second frequently occurring "symbol" is "OS," which signifies "official source," and means that the item in question has been adopted from a list compiled by an agency of the Hong Kong government. Mysteriously, the authors also mention (p. xii) an unpublished source referred to in the body of the dictionary as *USi* that supposedly deals with the jargon of restaurant workers and taxi drivers, but they nowhere else identify it more clearly.

The third symbol, "→," indicates what the authors call "tail-less puns." These are actually what are known as *xiehouyu* in Mandarin, and what I refer to as "truncated

witticisms" in English. The first part of such sayings implies the usually unstated second part. They used to be more common among Mandarin speakers than now, when one seldom hears them any longer, but in Cantonese – which has its own special favorites (some of a multilingual nature) – they are still very popular.

A black square precedes quotations from comics, magazines, films, newspapers, fiction, and so forth. Precise citations are given in parentheses following the quotations. The works cited are referred to by abbreviations that are given in a list at the back of the dictionary (pp. 490-492).

The authors readily offer special Cantonese characters when they are known, but they do not hesitate to use empty boxes when there are no known characters for a particular word or morpheme. As one might well expect, there are numerous expressions in Cantonese for which no characters are known. On the other hand, sometimes a single character may be used to write many different Cantonese morphemes which are obviously not etymologically derived from it. For instance, *màaih* (Modern Standard Mandarin [MSM] *mái*) is glossed by the authors simply as "to bury," yet the examples they give show that it has many other meanings and functions in Cantonese, e.g., as in the expression *màaih dāan* ("ask for the bill," and, by extension, "to die," i.e., "to check out", which has now spread all over China [MSM *máidān*]), but which also is used in expressions where it means "join up," "get close to," "engage in," and so forth.

Sometimes roman letters are used in written Cantonese as though they were characters, but again with multivalent meanings. For instance, "D" can mean both "disco(theque)" and "drugs." Terms like "BB" ("baby") and "PR" ("public relations" [this might even refer to a night club hostess]) are very widespread in Hong Kong. In other cases, roman letters have begun to be used instead of inappropriate characters that had previously been used for certain Cantonese morphemes. For example, the character meaning "eggplant" (MSM *qié*) is pronounced *kē* in Cantonese and hence was used for the homophonous word meaning "excrement." Now, however, it is gradually being replaced by the roman letter "K". Often whole English words are adopted directly into Cantonese, without any particular attempt being made to provide a sinographic form for them, such as CHEAP (pronounced *chīp*) and CALL (pronounced *kō*). However, English words are frequently sinographically naturalized, such as COOL (pronounced *kū*), which the authors neglect to

note is widely written with the character meaning "cruel," "ruthless" (pronounced *kù* in MSM).

The vagaries of Cantonese terms can occasionally be so complex that it is almost impossible to figure out their derivation. The word *lāang* means "a person" but is written with the character meaning "cold" that is pronounced *lěng* in MSM. That, however, is not the end of the story, since – as the authors inform us – this *laang* originally came from a Chiu Chow (Chaozhou) word.

The volume closes with an index of characters arranged by total stroke count (to complement the main alphabetical ordering of the dictionary) and a seven page list of references.

V. H. Mair

Note

1.Of course, all of the local variants of Mandarin are themselves looked upon as crude in comparison with deracinated *putonghua / guoyu*. Even Pekingese, which is supposedly the language upon which *putonghua / guoyu* is most closely modeled, is associated with gangsters, rickshaw pullers, and so on – just as Cantonese is. I believe that this is all the result of which language happens to get written down, and which languages exist primarily or exclusively on the oral realm. To the extent that Cantonese or Pekingese (or Shanghaiese or Taiwanese, for that matter) are reduced to writing, they gain legitimacy and respectability thereby. Such is the esteem in which writing is held.

Tang, Sze-Wing and Chen-Sheng Luther Liu, ed. ***On the Formal Way to Chinese Languages***. Stanford: CSLI [Center for the Study of Language and Information] Publications, 2002. vii, 262 pages.

There are a number of striking (and mostly refreshing) things about this volume. First of all, even though it consists of highly technical papers on detailed aspects of Chinese linguistics with an abundance of cited example sentences, there is not one single

character within the covers of this book. The only character that appears on the cover of the book, *dao* ("Way"), is used primarily as a design element (and also to give the flavor of a bit of something traditionally Chinese, although that is about the extent of it for the entire book). This shows that it is entirely possible to carry out deep analyses of Sinitic languages without reference to the characters.

Secondly, the editors boldly choose to refer to "Chinese languages" in the plural, Although most scholars now privately recognize that the so-called "dialects" are actually separate languages, few would yet dare to say so publicly for fear of stirring up a hornet's nest of political objections. As a matter of fact, although the editors speak of "Chinese languages," the papers they have assembled deal almost exclusively with Mandarin (plus a little bit of Min), despite the apparent non-Mandarin background (judging from the spelling of their surnames) of several of the contributors. Indeed, non-Sinitic languages such as Hungarian, Romanian, Spanish, Italian, Albanian, Japanese, German, and, of course, English, are cited far more often (in total) than non-Mandarin Sinitic languages. Still, probably over 95% of all the example sentences illustrated in the book are taken from Mandarin, although one chapter deals with half a dozen or so "Northern Chinese Dialects" (varieties of what is known as "Mandarin" writ large [in contrast to Modern Standard Mandarin [MSM], *putonghua / guoyu*, which is the overwhelming focus of the book – albeit without any attention being paid to the significant differences between that language as spoken and written in various parts of China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore). Be that as it may, the editors are to be commended for stating the obvious (Chinese / Sinitic languages exist) without fanfare or song and dance, and then going straight to their business.

Thirdly, there are no tone marks indicated throughout the entire book. This is interesting in view of the claim of some that the tones are an integral part of the representation of Chinese words. However, from reading the papers that have been brought together in this volume, it is clear that their presentations and arguments are not hindered in the slightest by the lack of tone marks. In other words, the contributors are all focusing on grammar, syntax, and morphology, unlike most earlier studies of Chinese languages which tended to overlook these aspects in favor of phonology. Of the eleven chapters in this volume, nine are grouped in Part I: Syntax and Semantics, and just two

are placed under Part II: Phonology, yet even the latter two have to do with such phenomena as reduplication, markedness, segmentism, affixation, and suffixation.

Fourthly, it is obvious that the authors are addressing themselves not just to other scholars who are specialists in Chinese (which is what most Sinologists do), but to professional linguists as a whole. That is to say, they present their materials in such a way that linguists from other areas can follow their arguments and compare them fruitfully with data from the languages of those areas. It is significant that most of the references cited in the various chapters are from general linguistics, and not from Chinese linguistics alone.

This is not a volume for the casual reader or for the learner who wishes to improve his or her Chinese. Instead, it is for the professional in linguistics who is thoroughly familiar with terms such as "logophor," "long-distance binding," coronal," "adjunction," "atelic," and so forth. And what have the authors achieved with these formidable tools? Basically, they examine such linguistic phenomena as tense, reflexivity, relativization, word order, predemonstrative modifiers, serial verb construction, and so forth with a fine tooth comb. In order to extract the maximum explanatory power from their analyses, they stretch natural language to its limits. For example, one chapter is devoted to the minute explication of the following sentence: *Wo pao-le ge feikuai* ("I did a fast-as-flying running"). Although grammatically permissible, few native speakers would ever find the occasion to utter such a strained sentence. Yet, in order to "reanalyze" the classifier *ge*, the author of this chapter makes this the centerpiece of her chapter and comes up with even more far-fetched formulations, such as *xue ge xi* ("did an activity of studying"). This stretching the boundaries of permissibility to get at a grammatical or syntactical principle is a typical technique employed by many of the authors in this book. It is no wonder that one of the authors thanks five colleagues for "judgments"!

Another modus operandi used by authors of papers in the present volume is to take a simple sentence such as *Zhangsan he Lisi zai piping ziji* ("Zhangsan and Lisi are criticizing themselves") and then perform a sort of linguistic theme and variations on it, rewriting it this way and that, working countless subtle changes on the original "stuff" of the sentence, again pushing the limits of admissibility, with many of the made-up sentences being marked with asterisks to show that they are incorrect. I personally find

some of the made-up sentences that are not marked with an asterisk to border on the dubious, e.g., *Zhangsan he Lisi zai* $ziji_i$*-piping* t_i ("Zhangsan and Lisi are engaged in self-criticism"). Nonetheless, it is only through such operations, which may seem surpassingly strange to the non-linguist, that governing rules may be discovered.

Despite the abstract, theoretical, formal, and often decontextualized quality of much of the material in this book, there are occasionally surprisingly practical results put forward. For instance, before reading this volume I did not realize that children generally do not grasp the distinction between the focus adverbs *cai* and *jiu* before age six. Although this is stated merely as an empirically observable phenomenon, it causes me to wonder why (what in the psychological development of the brain) children are unable to make this distinction at a young age. I suppose that the answer would be similar to why most small children say "*busgetti" instead of "spaghetti"; the former is an error resulting from the inability to comprehend a grammatical distinction, while the latter is an error resulting from an inability to produce a phonological cluster. It would be both interesting and worthwhile to plot as many as possible of this type of errors in the acquisition of L1. I believe that such a study would reveal much about the nature of the brain in relation to language, more than the vast numbers of studies that have been carried out on all manner of L2 acquisition errors.

The volume closes with a minimalist (less than two full pages; pp. 261-262) index.

The papers in this book were originally delivered at a conference having the same name as the title of the book that was held at the Universitv of California, Irvine from December 12-14, 1997. The aim of the conference was to discuss theoretical approaches to Chinese linguistics (the editors' Preface states that it was "to provide a forum for discussion on Chinese linguistics in theoretical approaches," but I'm not sure exactly what that means). This has transferred into the aim of the book, which is to present "research on Chinese languages from the perspective of formal linguistics."

The slightly odd wording of the title indicates that, while the authors (Miao-Ling Hsieh, C.-T. James Huang, Yen-Hui Audrey Li, Andrew Simpson, Sze-Wing Tang, Alexander Williams, Ching-Huei Teresa Wu, Zoe Wu, Xiaolu Yang, Moira Yip, and Jie Zhang) of the papers in this volume are striving to apply formal, theoretical

linguistics to Chinese languages, they recognize that the field has not yet arrived at their ultimate destination. We may judge, however, that collectively they have made an outstanding contribution toward their goal.

V.H. Mair

Since June 2006, all new issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* have been published electronically on the Web and are accessible to readers at no charge. Back issues are also being released periodically in e-editions, also free. For a complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, with links to free issues, visit the *SPP* Web site.

www.sino-platonic.org