The LAC is the result of a five-year joint effort by the Australian Academy of the Humanities and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, in collaboration with the Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. The team of General Editors for the project is divided into the Australian Steering Committee (S. A. Wurm, W. Gungwu, B. T. Tsoo, D. Bradley, and J. Hardy), the Chinese Steering Committee (Liu Yongquan [Convenor], for the minority language sections). The Cartographer and Gungwu, Benjamin T’sou, David Bradley, and Rong, Xiong Zhenghui and Zhang Zhengxing for the Chinese dialect sections and Fu Maoji, Wang Jun, and Dob "Maps".

Rather than being a bound volume like the other volumes in the Pacific Linguistics Series, the Language Atlas of China (LAC) is a 15 1/2 x 21 1/2 (b00) of 57 unbound color maps (including a map that is the Key to Map Plates) and accompanying short texts. The maps are basically produced on strong, stiff, glossy white paper, while the accompanying texts, frontmatter, and index are printed on non-glossy blue paper of the same size, with generally one blue sheet of text corresponding to one map plate.

The LAC is the result of a five-year joint effort by the Australian Academy of the Humanities and the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, in collaboration with the Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University. The team of General Editors for the project is divided into the Australian Steering Committee (S. A. Wurm, W. Gungwu, B. T’sou, D. Bradley) and the Chinese General Editors (Liu Rong, Xiong Zhenghui and Zhang Zhengxing for the Chinese dialect sections and Fu Maoji, Wang Jun, and Dob "Maps".

The "Preface" states that the collaborators from China were mainly responsible for collecting the data on the languages inside China, while the international collaboration (the "Preface") means that the collaborators from Australia were responsible for compiling the map which shows the distribution of the different Chinese dialects and the 14C series maps are all of the minority languages. The C series includes two large-area maps (C-1, "Minority Languages in Northern China", C-6, "Minority Languages of Southern China"), four provincial maps (C-12 to C-14 — the latter including maps of Hainan Province and Taiwan on one plate), and nine maps of individual language groups or languages. The index is compiled of two parts: the letters of Chinese names A to B-15 (B-16 are not indexed); on the other side Maps C-1 to C-14 are indexed.

The "Notes" discuss the colors, symbols, and names on the maps. Each name is to be taken individually, with the colors and symbols used to identify languages on that map relevant to that map only. In general, this does not make much of a problem, though does make more work for the reader who is moving from map to map. The "Notes" say that on the maps of the minority languages an attempt was made to relate the degree of difference in color used to the degree of genetic relatedness, but at least in one case, where Tibeto-Burman and Austro-Asiatic languages appear together in some maps, the colors were chosen to be different enough to cause some confusion. In terms of the names used in identifying languages and peoples, it is said in the "Notes" that in general, names as used in China and outside China have been employed. In some instances, only Chinese names were used, especially in cases in which the name is in general use outside China. In this regard it might have been better to use only one type of name, for example, Chinese names in Chinese names, as in some cases a single name ends up with many spellings or forms. For example, the people called "Dulong" in Chinese are referred to as "Dulong" or "Drung" in the book, but said to speak "Derung" or "Druung" (even when they are identified in the "Notes" as speaking the same language). These spellings are meant to reflect the name [tʂuŋ] (the spelling "Trung" or "Trung" has been used before, but not "Druung" or "Derung"). The name of a particular county in southern Tibet that is sometimes transliterated "Shangri-La" or "Changri-La" in Chinese playbooks is variously written in the different parts of the book (sometimes in the same text!) as "Zayi", "Cha’yu", or "Chayu". The first of these is meant to reflect the Tibetan pronunciation, and the second one is a mistake in playin transmission. Given that people attempting to locate that county on a map, the basis for the maps in this book, will only find the correct playin form, that form should probably have been used throughout the book. Even within the same sentence there are sometimes mistakes. Similar problems arise of this occurs in the text which accompanies Map C-11, "Tibetan Dialects": in speaking about the distribution of the Amo dialects, it is said they are "spoken in various Zang Autonomous Prefectures in Gansu and Qinghai provinces ... and are referred to as "Zang Autonomous Prefecture ". In this case, "Zang Autonomous Prefecture" and "Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture" refer to the same thing, and so should have been given the same name. Further down the page, what is called "Aba Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture" in the quote just cited, is referred to as "Aba Zang Autonomous Prefecture". This sort of variation of names is confusing and unnecessary, though quite common in the book. A somewhat different problem with the names can be seen in the spellings of certain cities in Taiwan: the internationally recognized spellings "Taipei" and "Ehoku" are not generally used; instead, stylized spellings are used for these names throughout most of the book. The same is true of the names of the regions of the country which are sometimes transliterated with a B- prefix which seems to have been applied consistently. There are quite a few other inconsistencies in the book, such as in the form of headings, the spelling of people's names, etc., as well.

The "Notes" is another short text by S. A. Wurm entitled "The Overall Language Situation in China". It is not marked with a corresponding page number, and so seems to be part of the frontmatter. It is a discussion of Map A-1, "Languages in China". This is the only map that has two corresponding texts. This text makes many of the same points as the "Preface" and the other text about map A-1, by Li Rong, though the latter is more detailed. This text differs from Li Rong's note in a few places; in particular, the "Notes" deal with the names of Chinese names, as in some cases a single name ends up with many spellings or forms. For example, the people called "Dulong" in Chinese are referred to as "Dulong" or "Drung" in the book, but said to speak "Derung" or "Drung" (even when they are identified in the "Notes" as speaking the same language). These spellings are meant to reflect the name [tʂuŋ] (the spelling "Trung" or "Trung" has been used before, but not "Druung" or "Derung"). The name of a particular county in southern Tibet that is sometimes transliterated "Shangri-La" or "Changri-La" in Chinese playbooks is variously written in the different parts of the book....
population of China, broken down by province, and the nationality and number of speakers of a language, and a separate numbers within a single color. In the text that separates color or symbol, and the Chinese dialects are given 94 dual group or area maps. Each major grouping (Mongolic, nationality and number of speakers of a language. In the discussion that follows this table, it is mentioned that the minorities and speakers of the minority nationalities, not the number of speakers for each language. The map is generally clear, with the Jin and the Beifang (Jilu) Mandarin of Guangling county has been classified. The note must then have been added to emphasize the difference between dialects spoken by autochthons of the areas and those not spoken by autochthons, which makes me want to wonder if this dialect is assumed to be spoken by people who are not autochthons of the areas where they live (of course we know the Chinese have migrated, but how long do you have to be in a place to be considered an "autochthon")?

Map A-3 "National Minorities in China" shows the population distribution of all of the minority peoples of China. The map is generally clear, though there is one technical point relevant here that was not mentioned in the "Translator's Notes". Since the color scheme is a Phylum, Tubo-Burman is a Stock, and Yi is a Family. Austro-Tai is a Phylum, Tai-Austronesian a Division, Daic a Stock, Li-Kami-Tai a Branch, and Li a Family. Having "Branch" above "Family" is not a convention commonly accepted in the field of Sinology, though the divisions are basically those accepted by many linguists outside China. Here the Austronesian languages of Taiwan are given their individual names (though Yami is left out) instead of being lumped together under an Indo-European term "Gaoshan". As they are in the classifications given in the texts by the Chinese scholars.

Map A-2 "Chinese Dialects in China" gives a somewhat more detailed picture of all of the Chinese dialects and varieties. Several Y. R. Chao is identified (here and in the text) as "R. Y. Chao". In the "Translator's Notes", it is mentioned that the name "Tubos refers to a dialect spoken by the autochthons of an area", and mentions they require further investigation before they can be. In the body of the text "Tubos had almost "defined" words, suggesting the very clear and detailed the dichotomies of the Middle Chinese entering (ru) tone words. This is the only discussion of how the dialects are differentiate here, though there is no nationalities and number of speakers of a language. For example, in this text, there is a table entitled "Populations and speakers of the minority languages", but it only gives the population figures for the different minority nationalities, not the number of speakers for each language. In the discussion that follows this table, it is mentioned that the Manchu, Hui, and She peoples almost speak only Chinese, and a few examples of minorities that speak more than one language are given, but there is a mix-up in the discussion of the Jingpo people that could be very confusing. It is said that over 70,000 of the Jingpo people speak the Va language, when in fact they speak Zaria; Va (usually written "V", though the Chinese have migrated, but how long do you have to be in a place to be considered an "autochthon")?

Map A-3 "National Minorities in China" shows the population distribution of all of the minority peoples of China. The map is generally clear, though there is one technical point relevant here that was not mentioned in the "Translator's Notes". Since the color scheme is a Phylum, Tubo-Burman is a Stock, and Yi is a Family. Austro-Tai is a Phylum, Tai-Austronesian a Division, Daic a Stock, Li-Kami-Tai a Branch, and Li a Family. Having "Branch" above "Family" is not a convention commonly accepted in the field of Sinology, though the divisions are basically those accepted by many linguists outside China. Here the Austronesian languages of Taiwan are given their individual names (though Yami is left out) instead of being lumped together under an Indo-European term "Gaoshan". As they are in the classifications given in the texts by the Chinese scholars.

Map A-2 "Chinese Dialects in China" gives a somewhat more detailed picture of all of the Chinese dialects and varieties. Several
Middle Chinese rhyme series, instead of giving the character which identifies that series, the character "x" appears instead (indicating that when the character is pronounced, the feeling of the Hakka people toward their language.

Maps B-16a and B-16b, "Chinese Dialects Overseas: Indo-Pacific & Other Parts of the World" and their text, by Benjamín K. Y. Tso, are unlike any of the other maps and textblocks, but also are not of China, but of 150 places outside China where Hakka people are spoken. This was not done for any of the other languages, though it would have been helpful to show to what extent the language of China are also present outside China. This would have avoided the somewhat strange situations, such as on Map C-5, where there seem to be two distinctly separated islands of a language group (or in this case Manchu-Tungus) on a single map. It shows the distribution of the languages inside China, when in fact they are joined by contiguous speech communities just outside the border of China. The text which accompanies Maps B-16a and B-16b is much more sociolinguistically oriented than the other texts in this volume, discussing not only the number of speakers of the different languages, but dividing them into native and non-native speakers and their relative percentages, and discussing factors relevant to language preservation and loss. The article makes a number of interesting points. One is that the use of Chinese laborers in the expansion of the Dutch, British, and French colonial empires was the impetus for the spread of the Chinese language during this period. While different colonialists were not as much involved in the spread of Chinese. From my experience with the Chinese community in the Philippines, an old Spanish colony, I'm aware of the fact that the Spanish not only did not encourage the Chinese to develop in the Philippines, they periodically slaughtered those drudgery who tried to establish a community there. Also relevant to the Philippine situation is the comment in the text that the promontory of Mandarin as the medium of instruction has had little impact, though the new Chinese has hastened the linguistic shift away from Chinese to the dominant language of the community. This has happened in the Philippines. Before the mid-1970's official Chinese were not all that prominent in the schools. They spoke a variety of Southern Min at home, but learned Mandarin (as well as English and some Tagalog) at school. The Chinese part of the curriculum was essentially identical to that taught in Chinese as a second language in the Philippine public schools. The "philipization" of the Chinese schools that occurred after Chinese were allowed to become Philippine citizens in the mid-70's, only one or two hours of Chinese are allowed to be taught, and a few years ago, there was a legal change of Southern Min. Since the "philipization" of the Chinese schools that occurred after Chinese were allowed to become Philippine citizens in the mid-70's, only one or two hours of Chinese are allowed to be taught, and a few years ago, there was a legal change of Southern Min. The students could probably learn quite a bit even with only one hour per day, as there would be reinforcement in the home and the community, but as the text points out, teaching Chinese is a very general statement of the variety of Southern Min. The study shows that there is no use for it in the community outside the classroom, and losing their control of Southern Min, as it is not developed in any way other than in conversations with elders in the home. One last point I would like to mention from this text is the observation that there is a possibility that recognized varieties of Chinese will develop outside the area where a dialect was originally spoken, similar to the way Indian, Australian, and Latin American English developed. Something of this sort has happened in Taiwan. In the LAC, there is no discussion of the forms of "Mandarin" that have developed in different localities from the widespread use of the artificially created "National Language" or "Common Language", though this could have made an interesting addition. An example would be the case of Taiwan, where the National Language was brought to Taiwan by a minority of mainlander who themselves (especially those in positions of power) are native speakers of other dialects. They had learned the National Language as a second language, and not very well, than taught it to the Taiwanese (who are native Southern Min speakers). They required the Taiwanese even use the National Language among themselves. This then created a rather radical interlanguage situation, as there were very few native speakers to correct the Taiwanese (or most of the mainlanders, for that matter). This interlanguage, akin to a pidgin, was then learned by the sons and daughters of the mainlanders, as they did not learn, Wu or whatever dialect their parents spoke, and did not in general learn Taiwanese. They of course created the interlanguage into a full language, their native language. The Chinese text accompanying this map is one of the rarest of the texts in all of the works included in this volume, discussing not only the basic characteristics of the languages in general and some of the characteristics of the languages by which they differ. The number of speakers for each language is also given, although the genetic affiliations. One interesting point made in the text is that the words that are "in" and "out" as compared to "in" and "out" of the different subgroups. There is some section which discusses the influence of Mandarin and Min on the different subgroups of the languages. Maps B-10, "Chinese Dialects (Southern Anhui Area)", by Zhengzhang Shangfang, Map B-11, "The Chinese Dialects in the Provinces of Jiangxi and Hunan", by Yan Sen and Bao Hongying, Map B-13, "The Chinese dialects in Guangdong", by Xing Zhongzhi, and Map B-14, "Chinese Dialects: Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region", by Liu Cunfan (all the above mentioned maps/texts were edited by Li Long and Xiong Zhongzhi, and in the case of B-11, also for Zhang Zhenxiong), are all of a similar type, in that they do not focus on a particular group, but instead show the dialects within an area with a complex distribution. The text for Map B-10, aside from giving the population and geographic distribution, number of speakers, and main characteristics of the dialects in each area, while many of the dialects spoken about in these maps are from the same few groups (Min, Gan, Yue, Hakka, etc.), the discussions are relevant to the variations spoken in the individual areas, and so not redundant.

Map B-12, "Min Supergroup (Fujian, Taiwan, Eastern Guangdong, Hainan Island)" and its text are by Zhang Zhenxiong, Wang Xilin, and Xiong Zhongzhi. The text mainly focuses on the Min group, but also briefly discussed the Hakka and Shaojiang groups. The discussions of the subgroups are very brief, giving only the major characteristics of each group rather than all those within a certain area. There is nothing of the fine detail given for the languages in the area shown in the map, including the non-Chinese languages. The text which accompanies Maps B-11 and B-12, X-series "Chinese Dialects" (C-1), is spoken. This was not done for any of the other languages, though this could have made an interesting addition. The text which accompanies Maps B-15 and B-16, "Chinese Dialects in the Provinces of Jiangxi and Hunan", by Yan Sen and Bao Hongying, Map B-13, "The Chinese dialects in Guangdong", by Xing Zhongzhi, and Map B-14, "Chinese Dialects: Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region", by Liu Cunfan (all the above mentioned maps/texts were edited by Li Long and Xiong Zhongzhi, and in the case of B-11, also for Zhang Zhenxiong), are all of a similar type, in that they do not focus on a particular group, but instead show the dialects within an area with a complex distribution. The text for Map B-10, aside from giving the population and geographic distribution, number of speakers, and main characteristics of the dialects in each area, while many of the dialects spoken about in these maps are from the same few groups (Min, Gan, Yue, Hakka, etc.), the discussions are relevant to the variations spoken in the individual areas, and so not redundant.

Map B-11, "The Chinese Dialects in Guangdong", by Xing Zhongzhi, and Map B-14, "Chinese Dialects: Guangxi Zhuang Autonomous Region", by Liu Cunfan (all the above mentioned maps/texts were edited by Li Long and Xiong Zhongzhi, and in the case of B-11, also for Zhang Zhenxiong), are all of a similar type, in that they do not focus on a particular group, but instead show the dialects within an area with a complex distribution. The text for Map B-10, aside from giving the population and geographic distribution, number of speakers, and main characteristics of the dialects in each area, while many of the dialects spoken about in these maps are from the same few groups (Min, Gan, Yue, Hakka, etc.), the discussions are relevant to the variations spoken in the individual areas, and so not redundant.
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There is also a brief discussion of the speakers of these languages in the dialects of the languages are marked on the map, even the poorly documented languages, such as Huihui, and in terms of the peoples. There is no discussion of the characteristics of the Chinese scholars is due to a lack of information about those.
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Tranesianists). In the case of the latter, the view of the two classifications differ are in terms of the placement of the same for both classifications. Two other ways that these Austro-Tai Phylum in the translator's note. This does not sufficient detail about the languages of Taiwan, and so there are two texts that accompany this plate, one by Ouyang Jueyu, Zheng Yingqiu, and Zhang Jiusu (Faelian), and one by Chen Kang (Taiwan) (translated by Wang Fushi, Chen Kang, and Mei W. Lee). These maps give much more finely detailed classifications of the languages than presented on any of the other maps that mentioned these languages. The text of the accompanying Maps C-6 through C-11 follow a similar pattern for the languages: Guangxi and its accompanying Map C-6, "Bai-Yue" and its accompanying Map C-7, "Tarang-Deng" and its accompanying Map C-8, "Gilai-Tai". In the discussion of several of the language groups, a somewhat historical account of what divisions had been made by previous scholars takes up as much as half of the text, with the rest of the discussion being of the classification presented in the map. While it may be useful to mention very briefly what other scholars have attempted classifications, since there is no discussion of what criteria they used, there is no basis on which to evaluate the classifications presented. More profitable use could have been made of the space by expanding the discussion of the reasons for the classifications, and for the taxonomic categories. Thus, the discussion of the languages or dialects involved. In the case of the "Tibetan Dialects" discussion, the characteristics listed as having been used to differentiate the dialects by Qu Aitang is presented, and its text cover the same distribution and (somewhat-outdated) population figures for all the Li and Huihui languages. There is quite a bit of discussion of the many Li dialects and sub dialects, including in some cases characterizations of the individual Li sub dialects.

The bibliography is divided up by language.

Map C-13, "Minority Languages in Yunnan", and its text, by Zhang Yiqing, and Yan Qixing, is a recapitulation of information already on maps C-6, C-7, and C-8, but edited to be relevant only to Yunnan Province.

The last two plates, C-14, is really two maps, "Minority Languages in "Hainan Island", and its text, and "Minority Languages on "Taiwan Island", and its text. The text of the Taiwan map (and the map itself) gives the breakdown of the Austronesian languages according to the classifications (attributed to S. A. Warm) that were represented in the view of the scholars outside China, yet the accuracy of the text (and presumably the map) is Chen Kang, a Chinese scholar. Chen does mention following Raleigh Ferrel and Peng-Hsin Ting in terms of the classification used, but normally the classification used, which is accepted by at least this one Mainland Chinese scholar, the most knowledgeable about the languages of Taiwan. It is then puzzling why this classification was not used consistently throughout the book, rather than presenting two different views (one circa 1949). The outdated classification could have easily been edited out. In the text, the geographic distribution and (somewhat outdated) population figures for all the Li and Huihui languages. There is quite a bit of discussion of the many Li dialects and sub dialects, including in some cases characterizations of the individual Li sub dialects.
science related to China, such as linguistics, sociology, ethnology, demography, and history.

The two versions differ somewhat in terms of content as well as language. During the translation, the Chinese texts were in some cases edited and in some cases added in the form of translator’s notes. In particular, the alternate classification of the Sino-Tibetan languages and the Formosan languages given in several places in the English version does not appear in the Chinese version. The two texts by S. A. Wurm in the frontmatter of the English version were added to the Chinese version.

The index to the title of the b series maps states that it is only for Maps B-1 to B-14, but the index does include references to Map B-9.

As many of the texts refer to small administrative units in discussing the distribution of the different languages, and as these units are generally not marked on the language maps, it would have been helpful to have a copy of the Map of the People’s Republic of China.

The Appendices complement the chapters very well. Appendix 1 is a 22-page chronicle of language planning from 1949 to 1985. Each event is given typically in one printed line, and so a wealth of information is found here. Appendix 2 includes major official documents, starting with Zhou Enlai’s “The present task of language planning.” The remaining 292 pages contain documents such as the first List of Regularization of Variant Forms of Chinese Characters (1956), the Master List of Simplified Chinese Characters (1955), the First Scheme of Simplified Chinese Characters (1956), the Second Scheme of Simplified Chinese Characters (1977), the Regulation for Chinese Characters Used in Publications (1992), and Basic Rules of Pinyin Orthography (1988). This appendix is almost identical to the 1991 publication Pinyin Wenzi Guifan Shouce by Yuen Yu Publishing House in Beijing.

The treatment of bibliographies continues to be a weak area of academic writings in China. Indeed, a number of references are given in the footnotes, but they often lack publication names and the dates of publications. Furthermore, many expected references are not found.

Overall, this volume is an excellent treatment of the events of the establishment of Chinese language standards and policies. Arguments for and against specific views are given succinctly. However, I would like to see three additional areas dealt with fully.

The first one is the planning and policies for ethnic minority languages. The creation of Latin-based writing systems for several minority languages in the late 1950s and early 1960s; the unsuccessful attempts to replace Arabic writing with Latin letters in the Xinjiang region; the language equality question, and the teaching of ethnic languages in schools are all very important parts of the language planning in China and deserve a chapter to complement the coverage of the nine articles in this treatise.