

Introduction to Volume III: Sinitic

This volume of the set is devoted to articles about the Sinitic varieties, particularly the historical development of this branch of the family.

We begin in Section A with studies on Old Chinese, in particular the identification of word families (“groups of words which may be suspected of being cognate” Karlgren 1956: 1), a methodology followed by every major figure working on historical linguistics in Sino-Tibetan. The first application of this concept within Sino-Tibetan is probably Stuart Wolfenden’s 1928 article on word families in Tibetan, but as Walter Simon (1942: 3) mentions, Wolfenden’s work in this area got a boost from our first article in this volume, Bernhard Karlgren’s “Word families in Chinese” (1933). Karlgren’s basic insight is that “. . . Chinese does not consist of so and so many thousands of independent monosyllables, none of them cognate to any others; in Chinese, as in all other languages, the words form families, groups of cognate words formed from one and the same primary stem” (1933: 9). Because of this, in doing internal reconstruction and in doing comparative work we need to first identify as many members of a particular word family as possible, and then analyse all of the members of the word family in order to isolate the root and affixes, if possible, in doing internal reconstruction, and also to identify the correct cognate forms when comparing with other languages (see also Wolfenden 1937 in Volume 1). This paper deals only with the internal identification of word families in Old Chinese. Except for a short note at the very end that some of the alternations involve “different parts of speech or similar grammatical distinctions” (p. 119), Karlgren does not discuss the variations as derivation, though he develops this idea a bit more in Karlgren 1949, comparing it to inflection in Indo-European languages. Karlgren says this very long paper is just a “short preliminary note” (p. 10), and he will expound on word families at greater length later, but from this article we can see the tremendous amount of work that went into collecting and comparing the different words to group 693 of them into word families. We of course could disagree with certain of his decisions, and with his reconstructions of Archaic (Old) Chinese, which are what he is often basing his families on, but we cannot deny that this article led to a lot of very useful work in Chinese historical phonology and morphology, and is still a valuable resource on its own. Karlgren himself says (1933: 59), “The purport of the tables should not be misunderstood. I am very far from affirming that all the words in each group are cognate; I only mean to say they may be suspected of being cognate. In a few cases the affinity is absolutely obvious and

certain. In many more it is strongly probable. In the rest it is only possible and at least worth discussion. So each small “family group” has to be considered merely as a kind of frame, containing materials from which a choice will have to be made in future. Definite results can only be gained by comparative Sinitic researches, for the phonetic similarity can sometimes very well be deceptive.” And later (1956: 1) says of this paper, “My list was, of course, only tentative: in a great many of the cases adduced the affinity is obvious and undeniable, in other cases it is only probable or even merely possible and it was left to future research to determine which of the stem alternations proposed could be proved”.

The second article, Karlgren 1956, “Cognate words in the Chinese phonetic series”, is a short follow-up on Karlgren’s 1933 paper on word families, showing how the Chinese intellectuals who created the Chinese characters must have understood the word family relations among the members of many word families because of the way they used the same character to represent two words, or used similar characters to represent related words. He distinguishes cases where a element is used purely as a phonetic and cases where what might be considered the phonetic is in fact the basic root, for example he argues that 牙 ‘tooth’ and 芽 ‘sprout’ are the same word, and the second character is simply disambiguated by the addition of the ‘grass’ radical, but 訝 ‘to welcome, receive’ is different in that the ‘tooth’ character has been borrowed (假借) for its sound alone, and then later disambiguated from ‘tooth’ with the ‘to speak’ radical, and so only in this case can we talk about the character being a combination of phonetic and radical. He gives pairs of words that he argues are variants of the same root, organized by the type of variation in initial or final (all together 546 characters are discussed, but this involves more than 546 words, as Karlgren only gives one number to a character used for two different words).

Karlgren stopped at identifying the variations and argued the alternations were part of Archaic Chinese. In some cases that is all we can do, though in many cases we can identify the morphology involved in the variations. Although aware of tonal variations, he did not deal with them, saying, “It would not do simply to apply the Ancient Chinese tones to the Archaic Chinese words, and it is doubtful if we can ever arrive at a detailed knowledge of the Archaic Chinese tone system” (1933: 59). The third article in this set, Downer’s seminal article, “Derivation by tone change in Classical Chinese” (1959), does try to make sense of the tonal variations. It was inspired by Wang Li’s (1958) insight that at least some of the

tonal variation can be considered morphological derivation, with the *píng*, *shǎng*, and *rù* tones considered basic, and many of the *qù* tones considered derived.¹ Downer attempts to develop this idea. He gives a long list of forms broken down into the different types of semantic contrast between the two forms. He also mentions the alternation in voicing of initial segment in some pairs of words (including forms that also contrast in tone), and sees a similarity in the sorts of derivations found. Although he is aware of Haudricourt's suggestion of an *-s suffix as the source of the *qù* tone, he does not discuss that and sees the variants simply as a difference in tone. He seems to not accept the possibility of affixes in Chinese. In his discussion of the difference in voicing of initials he says “. . . it is difficult to account for the incidence of voiced and voiceless initials. It seems that here there is only alternation, no system of derivation being demonstrable” (p. 263).² Now the idea of an *-s suffix as the origin of the *qù* tone is generally accepted, and although there is still controversy about what affixes there were other than that and what they did, there is general agreement that affixation was a part of the earliest stages of Chinese, and Proto-Sino-Tibetan as well (see LaPolla 1994, 2017a).

The next article, Mei Tsu-lin's 1970 classic, “Tones and prosody in Middle Chinese and the origin of the rising tone” brings together evidence from modern dialects, Buddhist sources with descriptions of Middle Chinese, and old Sino-Vietnamese loans to support Pulleyblank's (1962) proposal that a glottal stop was the origin of the *shǎng* (rising) tone, a hypothesis that is now widely accepted. From the Buddhist sources Prof. Mei concludes that “the tonal system of Middle Chinese around the eighth century is found to be (1) level tone: long, level, and low; (2) rising tone: short, level, and high; (3) departing tone: longishness about to be lost and probably high in pitch and rising in contour; and (4) entering tone: short, with uncertain pitch and contour” (p. 110) and given that there are some Min varieties that still have glottal stop in the rising tone, and given that the old (Han era) Sino-Vietnamese loans also point to a final glottal stop in those loan words, and given that glottal stop has been

¹ Maspero (1935), Yu Min (1948) and Haudricourt (1954) had also argued that the variants involved derivation. Forrest (1960) followed Haudricourt's view of the *qù* tone being due to an *-s suffix and equated it with the -s suffix in Old Tibetan.

² One problem for Downer is his acceptance of Karlgren's reconstruction of a voiced stop final in cases where there is rhyming or *xiéshēng* “contact” between *rù* tone (stopped) and *qù* tone (non-stopped) words (instead of an affix added after the stop final that led to its loss, as Haudricourt had suggested), as it is then not a tonal or affixal difference but a difference in final. This limits his thinking on the matter.

shown in other related languages to develop into a high tone, he concludes that the rising tone should have originated in a glottal stop.³

Our fifth paper returns to the methodology of word families, in this case trying to find morphological explanations for the variant forms, unlike Karlgren, who thought there was no discernable pattern that could be identified. Prof. Edwin G. Pulleyblank has quite a few papers on this issue, and here we reproduce two of them. The first one is his “Some new hypotheses concerning word families in Chinese” (1973a), a follow-up to his two-part 1962 article on word families mentioned above in the discussion of Prof. Mei’s article. This article discusses the *-s suffix which is said to have resulted in the departing tone; a voiced glottal fricative prefix which he argues was the source of the voiced/voiceless initial alternations; an *s- prefix which in some cases has a causative or transitivising function; an *r- prefix with a causative sense; and a vocalic ablaut. Prof. Pulleyblank presents word families in Chinese and Tibetan to support the reconstruction of these features in Chinese, and to show the parallels in the morphology between the two branches of the family. He also gives evidence from Chinese renderings (transcriptions) of foreign terms (expounded on more fully in the next article) in support of the *-s suffix. In support of his idea of a voiced prefix as the source of the voiced/voiceless initial variants he equates this prefix with the Tibetan prefix འ, which appears often as prenasalisation before consonants in modern dialects, and has been argued to have been a voiced velar or glottal fricative in Old Tibetan (Coblin 2002, Hill 2009). As discussed in LaPolla 2017a, the association of this Tibetan prefix with the Chinese voicing distinctions is problematic, as the Tibetan form did not have that function, and the voicing alternations are independent of that prefix. Currently some scholars argue that the variants were due to an *s- prefix (e.g. Dai 2001, Gong 2000, 2001, Phua 2004, Mei 2012) while Sagart and Baxter (2010, 2012) argue for an *N- prefix as the cause of many of the voicing contrasts said by the others to be due to *s-. My own view, argued in LaPolla 2017a, is that “all three phenomena exist; while some of the voicing distinctions can be shown to be due to either an *s- prefix or a *nasal prefix, we need to also recognize the possibility that some of the voicing contrasts can’t be explained by either of these prefixes and so are an independent phenomenon” (p. 32). The *s- prefix in Chinese and its correspondence with a similar prefix in many Tibeto-Burman languages is well accepted, though as mentioned above, there is

³ See Sagart 1999a for a useful overview of the development of tones in Chinese and our understanding of them.

controversy about which particular words it applied to in Chinese. The next few items discussed by Pulleyblank are not so well accepted, but stimulated thought about the issues he is trying to address. The first is what he initially calls an “*-r- infix associated with causative meaning” (p. 118),⁴ but then a couple of lines down he says, “This could well reflect an original *r* prefix which has left its trace as retroflexion of the following dental initial” (p. 118), and he compares it with the *r*- prefix in Tibetan, so it seems he intends it to be a prefix in the proto-language. Next he talks about vowel variations or ablaut, though does not give any meaning associated with the differences, so this does not seem to be derivational morphology. One very important contribution of this article is the move beyond the more limited sense of word family of Karlgren and others to allowing any sort of variation. As Pulleyblank discusses, Karlgren limited his word families to words that had finals of the same kind, and he mentions Tōdō Akiyasu’s 1962 etymological dictionary of word families as being even more strict in terms of limiting the word families to words that were in the same rhyme category in the *Shījīng*. But there is no reason to be so strict. Pulleyblank gives a number of word families that show different types of variations, in initial, in final, or in vowel.⁵

The next article, also by Pulleyblank (1973b, “Some further evidence regarding Old Chinese *-s and its time of disappearance”) is also a follow-up on his 1962 article. In the 1962 article Prof. Pulleyblank had given evidence from Chinese translations of foreign words for the persistence of a sibilant final in some words in the departing (*qù*) tone until the third century CE, and in this article he presents more evidence to push that date back to the sixth century CE in some areas. He also gives a justification for the use of transcription (transliteration) evidence in historical linguistics, which up to that time had not been widely used. He hypothesises that in those finals where there was no longer the original *-s (< *-ts), there was still a final *-h (< *-s) at the time the tone categories were recognised (late 5th century), and all the words with sibilant finals were considered departing tone words.

The next article is only one of many I could have included from the many important works produced by W. South Coblin on the dialects of the Western and Eastern Han dynasty periods

⁴ Bodman (1980) and Sagart (1999b, 2001) accepted the idea of an *-r- infix. Bodman did not discuss its meaning; Sagart 1999b gives its meaning as ‘repeated or strenuous action’, but Sagart 2001 says it “derives nouns for plural objects and verbs of distributed actions” (p. 134).

⁵ See LaPolla 1994 for many examples where the forms differ only in the final consonant. See also Sagart 2017 for a more recent overview of the concept of word families in Chinese.

based on sound glosses, transcriptions, and other relevant materials (see the 15 works listed for Prof. Coblin between 1977 and 1994 in the references below). This was before he turned to looking at the dialects of the Tang period, the Qing period, and the modern period (e.g. Coblin 2005, 2011; see Simmons & Van Auken 2014 for a full listing of Prof. Coblin's publications up to 2014). The book *Fang Yan (The speech of different locales)* is an obvious source for people looking for dialect material, and Serruys had done important work on this (1955, 1959, et al.), but was criticised by Miller (1975) for assuming that the words in the *Fang Yan* were cognate. Prof. Coblin acknowledges that many of the sets are not cognate, but goes on to give lists of words that we could see as cognate, and compares them in terms of differing in initial, final, or tone, showing that there is regularity to the differences in the forms that could help us identify different dialects.

Up to this point, the work we have been looking at generally followed Karlgren's view that the *Qièyùn* (601 CE), on which Karlgren based his reconstruction of Ancient Chinese (now more often called "Middle Chinese") was a real language and was a direct descendant of Archaic Chinese (roughly 1000 BCE, now called "Old Chinese"), and so the latter could be reconstructed at least partly on the basis of working backward from the former. Our next article, Jerry L. Norman & W. South Coblin's, "A new approach to Chinese historical linguistics" (1996), breaks with that tradition, pointing out the problems with these assumptions and the whole methodology of relying solely on rhyme books and written materials rather than spoken dialect data in doing Chinese historical linguistics, and arguing for a more empirical approach to Chinese historical linguistics and dialect studies. It argues that the *Qièyùn* not only does not represent the Cháng'ān dialect of the Súi period, as Karlgren had assumed, it does not represent the phonological system of any single variety (as also argued by a number of the most eminent Chinese scholars), ". . . it is rather an inventory of a tradition of phonological glossing. As such, the *Chiehyunn* system is not really a language in any common sense of the term" (p. 580). As it does not represent the spoken language of any particular place or time, the *Qièyùn (Chiehyunn)* system cannot be the origin of the modern dialects. The modern dialects derive from earlier spoken languages. As Prof. Norman also argues in his 2014 article, the sources used for reconstructing Middle and Old Chinese are heterogeneous, and so can't reflect a single variety, and so we should work back from the spoken languages and reconstruct a much simpler proto-system. To do proper work on reconstructing Chinese, scholars need to collect full descriptions of modern and earlier

documented dialects, compare the different dialects using the comparative method, and also work out the migration history to try to explain how the varieties came to be the way they are.

These ideas were largely due to Prof. Norman,⁶ who was, to Prof. Coblin (2013: 222), “the most original thinker in the field of Chinese linguistics encountered in nearly fifty years spent in the field. Simply put, he changed forever the way we perceive and think about Chinese”.⁷ The ideas presented in this article, like some of Prof. Norman’s other ideas, were ahead of their time and did not go down well with many of those working within the established traditions, and so aside from some of Prof. Norman’s students and colleagues who have focused on natural dialect data (e.g. Prof. Coblin, Kevin O’Connor, Richard V. Simmons, David Prager Branner, Zev Handel—see also LaPolla 2001 on the migrations and their influence on the dialects), most in the field did not heed the call of this article and are still mainly working within the old tradition based on the old problematic assumptions.

The final two papers in this section are on the grammar of Old Chinese. As mentioned (and criticised) in Norman & Coblin’s paper, not much attention was paid to the grammar and lexicon of Old Chinese or later periods, as the focus was only on the phonology.

In Derek D. Herforth’s paper, “A case of radical ambiguity in Old Chinese: Some notes toward a discourse-based grammar” (1987), the point is not so much a description of the grammar, though some of that is included, but how readers of Old Chinese can understand expressions in context even though there is no redundancy in the language, and so all interpretation is context dependent. Although not mentioned by Herforth, the article is in line with W. von Humboldt’s view that Chinese “consigns all grammatical form of the language to the work of the mind” (1863[1988]: 230), and it presages David Gil’s work on Riau Indonesian, showing how little grammatical structure is necessary for communication (e.g. Gil 1994, 2008, 2013). It also presages the constructionist approach, as it argues that much of the interpretation is based on the overall construction of the expression (see LaPolla 2013 for a constructionist approach to Modern Mandarin). It was also influential in the development of the ideas initially expressed in LaPolla 1990, 1993, 1995. Working with Chinese and seeing

⁶ See also Norman 2014, for a more recent statement of these views, and Coblin 2013, which reproduces correspondence between Prof. Norman and Prof. Coblin on these matters. See also Handel 2010b for discussion of the differences in the two methodologies.

⁷ See also Sagart 2012 for an excellent summary and similar appreciation of Prof. Norman’s influence.

how different languages can be in terms of what they make explicit and what they don't lead me also to an understanding of communication that does not assume a coding-decoding model, but instead depends on abductive inference of the communicator's intention in performing an act that the communicator intends for the addressee to infer the intention of (e.g. LaPolla 2015). My one quibble with the article is that it makes a distinction between topic and subject on the basis of semantics rather than any grammatical features, and so argues that topics cannot be arguments of the verb. This is a very different use of the terms from the usual typological literature, where topic is a pragmatic notion, what the clause is about (whether or not it is an argument of the verb), and subject is a grammatical notion that must be shown to have grammaticalised in the language.

The last paper in this section, Sun Chaofen's "The adposition YI and word order in classical Chinese" (1991), discusses the history and distribution of phrases formed with *yǐ* 以, which Sun treats as an adposition (in Old Chinese it had verbal uses as well). He shows that within the adposition phrase (AP) *yǐ* can occur before or after its complement, i.e. as preposition or postposition, and the whole adposition phrase can occur before or after the verb, though the postpositional AP cannot appear postverbally. Based on topic continuity counts of the type used in Givón (1983), he argues that the position of the prepositional AP before or after the verb is related to discourse-pragmatic factors—the preverbal type is more likely to be used in contrastive contexts. Sun also suggests that the postpositional, preverbal AP is the archaic order, in contrast to some scholars who argued that it was a newer order.

In Section B we turn to the modern varieties of Sinitic.

The first paper, written entirely in the International Phonetic Alphabet, as was the custom for the journal of the International Phonetic Association, is the very famous and often cited but rarely read classic by Prof. Yuen Ren Chao introducing his system for transcribing tones and intonation. This system has become standard in Sino-Tibetan studies and beyond. It involves seeing the tones as being on a five-level scale, and so the tones can be represented using numerals that refer to the levels, e.g. 33 for a mid level tone, and 53 for a high falling tone. He also created "tone letters" for expressing the same concept, such as ˩ (= 33) and ˨ (= 53).

The second paper is also a classic by Prof. Chao, in this case a classic for Structuralist linguistics generally, and is not normally thought of as a paper on Chinese linguistics, even though it uses examples from Chinese varieties. It points out the fact that a phonemic analysis is a model of a language, and different models may be constructed for different purposes, and so an analysis is not correct or incorrect, but good or bad for particular purposes. Prof. Chao puts forward a new and broader concept of the phoneme: “A phoneme is one of an exhaustive list of classes of sounds in a language, such that every word in the language can be given as an ordered series of one or more of these classes and such that two different words which are not considered as having the same pronunciation differ in the order or in the constituency of the classes which make up the word” (pp. 39-40). Prof. Chao points out that this proposal “leaves unspecified the scope of the word ‘sound’ as regards size and kind, i.e. the degree of analysis into successive elements and the degree of differentiation into kinds” (p. 40), and so the phoneme is not limited to individual segments. This concept was echoed by Firth (1957), and has recently been developed in Chinese linguistics by Shen Ruiqing, building on the concept of emergent phonology. Another thing that sets Prof. Chao’s view apart from much modern work is his awareness of the temporal aspect of communicative interaction, something that was lost in the latter part of the 20th century, as scholars just worked with abstract symbols on paper (and so talk about “left edge” or “right edge” phenomena, showing how divorced they are from actual speech). Only recently have efforts within Interactional Linguistics attempted to bring temporality back into linguistic analysis (e.g. Auer 2009, Hopper 2011).

Prof. Chao’s article was considered very important in the development of Structuralist linguistics. Voegelin and Voegelin (1963:79) said that “one of the longest critical bibliographies in the history of 20th century linguistics will be concerned with tracing the reactions that followed Yuen-ren Chao’s stimulus”. Because of this importance it was selected for inclusion in Martin Joos’ *Readings in Linguistics* (1957), a selection of important works in the Structuralist tradition.⁸

We see in Prof. Chao’s paper an ability to think in an unbiased way about issues from different perspectives. One thing that strikes a reader of early 20th century linguistics articles

⁸ For more on the life and work of Prof. Chao, see Chao 1977 and LaPolla 2006a, 2017b (which contain somewhat different information).

is the free-thinking nature of the discussions. This changed in the latter part of the 20th century in the US, as Chomskyan dogma held sway. The next three articles are included here to show how differently people could think about certain issues, as discussed by Chao as well, in this case, how to analyse the phonemic system of the Beijing dialect of Chinese. The first one is Charles F. Hockett's "Peiping phonology" (1947), which argues for a different approach to phonology based on a non-traditional conception of distinctive features, where what is important is identifying a small set of "determining features" as opposed to "determined features", which allow us to create a minimal set of such features for distinguishing the different phonemes of the language. Like Chao and Firth, Hockett also argues for a non-linear approach to phonology, quite different from late 20th century phonology, which as I mentioned was based on left-to-right written data, and so depended quite a bit on linearity. Hockett says (p. 255), "Phonological description thus consists of: (a) a list of the determining features (with alternative statements if alternatives exist); (b) a statement of the arrangements in which determining features occur in utterances; (c) a statement of the circumstances under which each determined feature occurs".⁹ The rest of the article is an application of this approach to the Beijing dialect of Chinese.

The next is Fang-Kuei Li's short article, "The zero initial and the zero syllabic" (1966), which I have selected because of Prof. Li's status in the field,¹⁰ but also because it presents a rather radical analysis, even suggesting the possibility of a vowelless analysis of Mandarin.

The next is Michael Halliday's article, "A systemic interpretation of Peking syllable finals" (1992), which argues for an approach that is a combination of the traditional Chinese approach which Prof. Halliday learned from Wang Li and Luo Changpei with the prosodic approach which Prof. Halliday learned from J. R. Firth (cf. Firth & Rogers 1937). Prof. Halliday explains his four principles of analysis: "One is the Chinese phonological principle whereby all syllables are structured simply as initial plus final. The second is the Firthian prosodic principle whereby features such as posture (y/a/w) and resonance (nasal/oral) are

⁹ See also Hockett 1950. While it seems the system he is presenting is similar to the idea of distinctive features, the concepts do not seem to be the same, and there is no mention of Jakobson 1941 or the ideas therein.

¹⁰ See LaPolla 2006b and Li 1989 for the life and work of Prof. Li. It should be mentioned here for those new to the field that Prof. Chao and Prof. Li were the two major figures in the field of Chinese linguistics in the mid 20th century aside from Karlgren, and many of the other scholars whose papers appear here or are mentioned here were students or colleagues of one or both of these scholars, and were greatly influenced by them.

treated nonsegmentally. The third is the paradigmatic principle whereby features are interpreted as terms in systems, each system having a specified condition of entry . . . The fourth is the dynamic principle whereby the syllable is envisaged as a wave, a periodic pattern of movement characterized by a kind of ‘flow-and-return’” (p. 435). Prof. Halliday’s approach is highly original and insightful, and not based on segmental phonemes, and the article contrasts the prosodic approach and the traditional segmental approach. It also suggests a typology of features, but one that is quite different from that of Hockett, as it classifies the syllables in terms of the initial and final prosodic systems, the initial systems being “alignment (place)” (pointed vs. flat), “manner”, “voice onset” (early (unaspirated) vs. late (aspirated)), and “posture” (a-posture vs. y-posture vs. w-posture) and the final systems being “posture” (a-posture vs. y-posture vs. w-posture), “resonance” (oral vs. nasal), “aperture” (close, half-close, open), and “tone” (high level, mid rising, low rising, falling). “Posture shift” within the syllable is seen as yet another prosodic system.

We now turn to two articles on non-Mandarin varieties. The first is Jerry L. Norman’s “Tonal development in Min” (1973), which is relevant to Section A, as it was sort of a forerunner of the article by Norman & Coblin discussed there, but as it is about a single group, Min, it is included here. It uses the comparative method to reconstruct the system of initial stops in Proto-Min in order to explain the tonal and initial correspondences between the different Min dialects. In doing this it shows that a six-way system of initial stops (plus voiceless resonants) is needed to explain the correspondences, which implies that the *Qièyùn* system, which only has a three-way system of initial stops, cannot be the ancestor of the Min group. What has stimulated a lot of interest in this article is Norman’s reconstruction of a series of “softened initials”, which he suggests might have been due to some sort of prefix.¹¹ This has stimulated much work on this question, e.g. Handel 2003, 2010a-b, and Baxter 2014.

¹¹ See also Norman 1974 for reconstruction of the full set of initials, Norman 1986 for the view that the “softened initials” derive from prenasalised stops, based on comparison with Hmong-Mien loan data, and O’Connor 1976 and Norman 1986 for evidence of the distinction beyond Min. As Sagart (2012) points out, reaction to this article led to Prof. Norman working out the historical strata in Min (1979), which influenced work on other varieties in this regard (see the introduction to Volume 2 of this series).

Our next item, Mantaro J. Hashimoto's 1992¹² article "Hakka in *Wellentheorie* perspective", could have been included in Volume 2, as it deals with language contact, but as it is mainly about a single branch of Sinitic, Hakka, I have included it here. It is very much the sort of dialect geography discussed in the introduction to Volume 2 of this set, in this case as a way to identify what is unique about the Hakka varieties, and to show how the correspondences between initials and tones is due to a particular wave of migration out of the Central Plains, which forms a ring around the Central Plains (see the maps given in the article). This also ties in with Prof. Chao and Prof. Norman's work on the dialects, as it argues for the same empirical approach involving comparing existing varieties.

Next we have Anne Oi-kan Yue-Hashimoto's "The lexicon in syntactic change: Lexical diffusion in Chinese syntax" (1993a). I've mentioned above how little attention had been given to the grammar of Sinitic varieties other than Mandarin due to the nature of how fieldwork on the dialects simply involved asking people how to say certain characters so the researcher could see how that dialect related to Middle Chinese, plus there was the mistaken assumption that the grammar of the Sinitic varieties is basically the same, yet one researcher, Anne Oi-kan Yue-Hashimoto, has steadfastly been working on the grammar of the different varieties (see for example Yue-Hashimoto 1993b, Yue 2017), aside from her excellent work on Cantonese. A student of William S-Y. Wang and also of Yuen Ren Chao, she has taken from both teachers a concern for the non-Mandarin varieties of Sinitic and for an empirical approach. In this paper she argues for applying Prof. Wang's approach of looking at the spread of change through a language, generally discussed as "lexical diffusion" (e.g. Wang 1969, 1979; Wang & Lien 1993), but in this case applied to grammatical changes.¹³ She combines this with the geographical approach of Mantaro Hashimoto (her husband) and the language contact that is made manifest by looking at the distribution of forms to argue that there is stratification of language due to contact (see also Yue-Hashimoto 1991) and that the strata can influence each other and create hybrid forms, much like Prof. Wang and Prof. Lien had shown for phonology.

¹² This article was originally presented at a conference in 1986, and published posthumously, as Prof. Hashimoto passed away in 1987.

¹³ Although she calls what she is doing "lexical diffusion in Chinese grammar" in the article (p. 241), she is actually looking at constructions, and is in a sense ahead of her time in recognizing that grammaticalisation is of constructions, not individual words.

Our last article in this volume, Randy J. LaPolla's "Arguments against 'subject' and 'direct object' as viable concepts in Chinese" (1993), argues that the sort of restricted neutralisations in certain constructions that we associate with the ideas of "subject" and "direct object", to the extent that they exist, are grammaticalised, and so there is no certainty that all languages will have them, and they must be justified on grammatical grounds for such terms to be used. The article surveys a large number of constructions in Chinese usually associated with grammatical relations, and finds that Mandarin Chinese has not grammaticalised such restricted neutralisations, and so there is no validity in talking about grammatical relations in Chinese. As Yuen Ren Chao (1955, 1959, 1968) and Lü Shuxiang (1979) had argued, all clauses in Chinese are topic-comment, and so, as they pointed out, what they called "subject" or "zhǔyǔ" in Chinese is not a grammatical relation, but simply a topic. As argued in LaPolla 1990, 1995, 2009, and LaPolla & Poa 2005, 2006, word order is based on a simple principle of information structure, with topical elements occurring before the verb, and non-topical and focal elements occurring after the verb. This simple principle can explain all of the word order patterns in Mandarin Chinese. This expanded the typology of alignment systems to include language with no alignment, like Chinese. This view was not widely accepted when it was first proposed, as most linguists at the time simply imposed prefabricated generative metalanguages based on English (e.g. LFG, GPSG, HPSG, GB, etc.) onto Chinese, without questioning whether the categories assumed actually were manifested in the language. The work presented here actually developed out of an attempt to apply the Lexical Mapping Theory of LFG to Chinese. When done honestly, it didn't work, and this led to using a framework that did not assume grammatical relations as universals (Role and Reference Grammar) as a way to understand why Chinese was so different from other languages. Now there is more of a trend to analyse languages on their own terms, and so the view expounded here is becoming more accepted within the field of linguistic typology and also in the field of Chinese linguistics, including being supported in a recent paper by Prof. Shen Jiaxuan, Director of the Institute of Linguistics in the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (Shen 2017).

References

- Auer, Peter. 2009. On-line syntax: Thoughts on the temporality of spoken language. *Language Sciences* 31: 1-13.
- Baxter William H. 2014. Northern Mǐn ‘softened’ initials in borrowed vocabulary. In Simmons & Van Auken, eds. 2014, 53-72.
- Bodman, Nicholas C. 1973. Some Chinese reflexes of Sino-Tibetan *s*- clusters. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1: 383-96.
- Bodman, Nicholas C. 1980. Proto-Chinese and Sino-Tibetan: Data towards establishing the nature of the relationship. In *Contributions to Historical Linguistics*, ed. by F. Van Coetsem & L. R. Waugh, 34-199. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1930. A system of tone letters. *Le Maître Phonétique* 45: 24-27.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1934. On the non-uniqueness of phonemic solutions of phonetic systems. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 4: 363-397. Reprinted in *Readings in Linguistics*
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1955[1976]. Notes on Chinese grammar and logic. in: Anwar S. Dil (ed.), *Aspects of Chinese sociolinguistics: Essays by Yuen Ren Chao*, 237-249. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1959[1976]. How Chinese logic operates. *Aspects of Chinese sociolinguistics: Essays by Yuen Ren Chao*, ed. by Anwar S. Dil, 250-259. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1968. *A grammar of spoken Chinese*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Chao, Yuen Ren. 1977. *Yuen Ren Chao: Chinese linguist, phonologist, composer, and author. Oral history based on interviews by Rosemary Levenson*. Published by the Regional Oral History Office, a department of the Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley
- Coblin. W. South. 1977/78. The initials of the Eastern Han period as reflected in phonological glosses. *Monumenta Serica* 33: 207-247.
- Coblin. W. South. 1978. The initials of Xu Shen’s language as reflected in the Shuowen duruo glosses. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 6.1: 27-75.
- Coblin. W. South. 1979. The finals of Xu Shen’s language as reflected in the Shuowen duruo glosses. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 7.2: 181-245.
- Coblin. W. South. 1979/80. The finals of Cheng Hsüan’s language as reflected in phonological glosses. *Monumenta Serica* 34: 263-317.

- Coblin, W. South. 1981. Notes on the dialect of the Han Buddhist transcriptions. *Proceedings of the International Conference on Sinology: Section on Linguistics and Paleography*, 121-183. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Coblin, W. South. 1982. Notes on the Western Han initials. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 14: 111-133.
- Coblin, W. South. 1983. *A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Glosses*. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Coblin, W. South. 1984. The finals of Yang Xiong's language. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 12.1:1-52.
- Coblin, W. South. 1986a. Some sound changes in the Western Han dialect of Shu. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 14.2: 184-226.
- Coblin, W. South. 1986b. The finals of the *Shiming* language. *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*, ed. by John McCoy and Timothy Light, 283-344. Leiden: Brill.
- Coblin, W. South. 1986c. The rimes of Chang-an in Middle Han times, Part I: the late Western Han period. *Acta Orientalia* 47: 93-131.
- Coblin, W. South. 1986/87. Fangyan gleanings. *Monumenta Serica* 37: 113-143.
- Coblin, W. South. 1987. The rimes of Chang-an in Middle Han times, Part II: the early Eastern Han period. *Acta Orientalia* 48: 89-110.
- Coblin, W. South. 1993. BTD revisited—A reconsideration of the Han Buddhist transcriptional dialect. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology Academia Sinica* 63.4: 867-943.
- Coblin, W. South. 1994. Remarks on some early Buddhist transcriptional data from northwest China. *Monumenta Serica* 42: 151-169.
- Coblin, W. South. 2002. On certain functions of 'a-chung in early Tibetan transcriptional texts. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 25.2: 169-184.
- Coblin, W. South. 2005. *Comparative phonology of the Huang-Xiao dialects*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Coblin, W. South. 2011. *Comparative phonology of the Central Xiang dialects*. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Coblin, W. South. 2013. Jerry Norman: Remembering the man and his perspectives on Chinese linguistics history. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 41.1: 219-245.
- Dai, Qingxia. 2001. Zangmian yuzu yuyan shidong fanchou de lishi yanbian [Historical changes in the causative category of Tibeto-Burman languages]. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 29.1: 1-10.

- Downer, G. B. 1959. Derivation by tone change in Classical Chinese. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 22.2: 258-90.
- Firth, J. R. & B. B. Rogers. 1937. The Structure of the Chinese Monosyllable in a Hunanese Dialect (Changsha). *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 8.4: 1055-1074. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3488494>
- Firth, J. R. 1957. *Papers in linguistics 1934-51*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Forrest, R. A. D. 1960. "Les occlusive finales en Chinois archaïque," *Bulletin de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris* 55(1960).228-239.
- Gil, David. 1994. The structure of Riau Indonesian. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 17: 179-200.
- Gil, David. 2008. How much grammar does it take to sail a boat? (or, What can material artefacts tell us about the evolution of language?). In Andrew D. M. Smith, Kenny Smith & Ramon Ferrer I. Cancho (eds.), *The Evolution of Language*, 123-130. New Jersey: World Scientific.
- Gil, David. 2013. Riau Indonesian: A language without nouns and verbs. In J. Rijkhoff, & E. van Lier (eds.), *Flexible Word Classes: Typological studies of underspecified parts of speech*, 89-130). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Givón, T. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: an introduction. In T. Givón, ed., *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross Language Study*, 5-41. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Gong, Hwang-cherng. 2000. Cong Hanzangyu de bijiao kan Shanggu Hanyu de citou wenti [Looking at the problem of prefixes in Old Chinese through Sino-Tibetan comparisons]. *Language and Linguistics* 1.2: 39–62.
- Gong, Hwang-cherng. 2001. Shanggu Hanyu yu yuanshi Han-Zangyu dai r yu l fushengmu de gouni [A reconstruction of consonant clusters with -r- and -l- as the second elements in Old Chinese and Proto-Sino-Tibetan]. *Humanitas Taiwanica* 54:1-36.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1992. A systemic interpretation of Peking syllable finals. In P. Tench (ed.), *Studies in Systemic Phonology*, London & New York: Pinter.
- Handel, Zev. 2003. Northern Min tone values and the reconstruction of “softened initials” *Language and Linguistics* 4.1: 47-84.
- Handel, Zev. 2010a. Old Chinese and Min. *Chuugoku Gogaku* 中国語学 257: 34–68.
- Handel, Zev. 2010b. Competing methodologies of Chinese dialect fieldwork, and their implications for the study of the history of the Northern Min dialects. In Weldon South

- Coblin & Anne O. Yue-Hashimoto (eds.), *Studies in Honor of Jerry Norman*, 13–39. Hong Kong: Ng Tor-Tai Chinese Language Research Centre, Institute of Chinese Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1992. Hakka in *Wellentheorie* perspective. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 20: 1-48.
- Haudricourt, Andre-Georges. 1954. Comment reconstruire le chinois archaïque. *Word* 10: 351-364.
- Herforth, Derek D. 1987. A case of radical ambiguity in Old Chinese: Some notes toward a discourse-based grammar. *Suzugamine Joshi Tanki Daigaku Bulletin of Humanities and Social Science Research* 34: 31-40.
- Hill, Nathan W. 2009. Tibetan <h> as a plain initial and its place in Old Tibetan Phonology. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 32.1: 115-140.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1947. Peiping phonology. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 67.4: 253-267.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1950. Peiping morphophonemics. *Language* 26: 63-85.
- Hopper, Paul. 2011. Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In P. Auer & S. Pfänder (eds.), *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*, 22-44. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1863/1988. *On Language: The Diversity of Human Language-structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind (Über die Verschiedenheit des menschlichen Sprachbaues und ihren Einfluss auf die geistige Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts)*. Translated by Peter Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1941. *Kindersprache, Aphasie und allgemeine Lautgesetze*. Almqvist and Wiksells, Uppsals, Sweden [1968 *Child Language, Aphasia, and Phonological Universals*. Mouton, The Hague and Paris]
- Joos, Martin, *Readings in Linguistics: The Development of Descriptive Linguistics in America 1925–26*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1922. The reconstruction of Ancient Chinese. *T'oung Pao* 21: 1-42.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1933. Word families in Chinese. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 5: 9-120.
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1949. *The Chinese language: An essay on its nature and history*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1956. Cognate words in the Chinese phonetic series. *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* 28: 1-18.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1990. *Grammatical Relations in Chinese: Synchronic and Diachronic Considerations*. PhD dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1993. Arguments against 'subject' and 'direct object' as viable concepts in Chinese. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 63/4: 759-813.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. Variable finals in Proto-Sino-Tibetan. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* 65.1: 131-173.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. Pragmatic relations and word order in Chinese. In Pamela Downing & Michael Noonan (eds.), *Word order in discourse*, 297-329. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: Benjamins Pub. Co.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2001. The role of migration and language contact in the development of the Sino-Tibetan language family. In R. M. W. Dixon & A. Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: Case studies in language change*, 225-254. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2006a. Chao, Yuen Ren (1892-1982). In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd Edition*, 295-296. London: Elsevier.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2006b. Li Fang-Kuei (1902-1987). In Keith Brown (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics, 2nd Edition*, 153-154. London: Elsevier.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2009. Chinese as a Topic-Comment (not Topic-Prominent and not SVO) language. In Janet Xing (ed.), *Studies of Chinese linguistics: Functional approaches*, 9-22. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2013. Arguments for a construction-based approach to the analysis of Chinese. In Tseng Chiu-yu (ed.), *Human Language Resources and Linguistic Typology, Papers from the Fourth International Conference on Sinology*, 33-57. Taiwan: Academia Sinica.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2015. On the logical necessity of a cultural connection for all aspects of linguistic structure. In Rik De Busser & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *Language Structure and Environment: Social, Cultural, and Natural Factors*, 33-44. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- LaPolla, Randy J. 2017a. Overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages, Second edition*, 40-69. London and New York. Routledge.

- LaPolla, Randy J. 2017b. Chao Yuen Ren [Zhào Yuánrèn 趙元任] (1892–1982). In Rint Sybesma (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*. Leiden: Brill, 2017.
- LaPolla, Randy J. & Dory Poa. 2005. Jiaodian jiegou de leixing ji qi dui Hanyu cixu de yingxiang (The typology of focus structures and their effect on word order in Chinese). In Xu Liejiong and Haihua Pan (eds.), *Jiaodian jiegou he yuyi de yanjiu (Studies on the structure and semantics of focus)*, 57-78. Beijing: Beijing Foreign Studies University Press.
- LaPolla, Randy J. & Dory Poa. 2006. On describing word order. *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*, ed. by Felix Ameka, Alan Dench, & Nicholas Evans, 269-295. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Li, Fang-kuei. 1966. The zero initial and the zero syllabic. *Language* 42.2: 300-302.
- Li, Fang-Kuei 1989. *Linguistics East and West: Sino-Tibetan, Tai, and American Indian*, Oral history based on interviews by Randy J. LaPolla & Ning-ping Chan. Published by the Regional Oral History Office, a department of the Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley.
- Lü Shuxiang. 1979. *Hanyu yufa fenxi wenti (Questions in the analysis of Chinese grammar)*. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Maspero, Henri. 1935. Préfixes et dérivation en chinois archaïque. *Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 23.5: 313-327.
- Mei Tsu-lin. 1970. Tones and prosody in Middle Chinese and the origin of the rising tone. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 30: 86-110.
- Mei, Tsu-lin. 2012. The causative *-s- and nominalizing *-s in Old Chinese and related matters in Proto-Sino-Tibetan. *Language and Linguistics* 13.1: 1-28.
- Miller, Roy A. 1975. The Far East. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.), *Current Trends in Linguistics Vol. 13,2: Historiography of Linguistics*, 1213-1264. The Hague & Paris: Mouton.
- Norman, Jerry L. 1973. Tonal development in Min. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1.2: 222-238.
- Norman, Jerry L. 1974. The initials of Proto-Min. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 2.1: 27–36.
- Norman, Jerry. 1979. Chronological strata in the Min dialects. *Fangyan* 4: 268-274.
- Norman, Jerry L. 1986. The origin of Proto-Min softened stops. In John McCoy & Timothy Light (eds.), *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan studies*, 375–384. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Norman, Jerry L. 2014. A model for Chinese dialect evolution. In Simmons & Van Auken, eds., 2014, 1-26.
- Norman, Jerry L. & W. South Coblin. 1995. A new approach to Chinese historical linguistics. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115.4: 576-584.
- O'Connor, Kevin. 1976. Proto-Hakka. *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 11: 1-64.
- Phua, Chiew Pheng. 2004. Shanggu Hanyu zhong de qing-zhuo bieyi ji qi xiangguan de wenti [Alternations of voiced and voiceless initials in Old Chinese and its problems]. *Ding Bangxin Jiaoshou Rongxiu Jinian Lunwenji [Collected Essays in Honor of Professor Ting Pang-Hsin on his Retirement]*, 1 67. Hong Kong: Center for Chinese Linguistics, Division of Humanities, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1962. The consonantal system of Old Chinese. *Asia Major* 9: 9.58-144 and 206-255.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1973a. Some new hypotheses concerning word families in Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 1: 113-114.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1973b. Some further evidence regarding Old Chinese *-s and its time of disappearance. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 36.2: 368-73.
- Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1977-8. The final consonants of Old Chinese. *Monumenta Serica* 33: 180-206.
- Laurent Sagart. 1999a. The origin of Chinese tones. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.), *Proceedings of the Symposium/Cross-Linguistic Studies of Tonal Phenomena/Tonogenesis, Typology and Related Topics, December 10-12, 1998, Tokyo, Japan*. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 91-104.
- Sagart, Laurent. 1999b. *The Roots of Old Chinese*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2001. Vestiges of Archaic Chinese derivational affixes in Modern Chinese dialects. In Hillary Chappell (ed.), *Sinitic grammar: Synchronic and diachronic perspectives*, 123-142. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2012. Jerry Norman. *Cahiers de linguistique - Asie orientale* 41.2: 341-351.
- Sagart, Laurent. 2017. Word Families. In Rint Sybesma (General Editor), *Encyclopedia of Chinese Language and Linguistics*. London & New York: Routledge.
http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/entries/encyclopedia-of-chinese-language-and-linguistics/word-families-COM_00000455?s.num=4

- Sagart, Laurent [Shā Jiā'ěr] & William H. Baxter [Bái Yīpíng]. 2010. Shànggǔ Hànyǔ de N- hé m- qiánzhuì [The N- and m- prefixes in Old Chinese]. *Journal of Sino-Tibetan Linguistics* 4: 62–69.
- Sagart, Laurent & William H. Baxter. 2012. Reconstructing the *s- prefix in Old Chinese. *Language and Linguistics* 13.1: 29–59.
- Simmons, Richard VanNess & Newell Ann Van Auken, eds. 2014. *Studies in Chinese and Sino-Tibetan linguistics: Dialect, phonology, transcription and text (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series 53)*. Taipei: Academia Sinica Institute of Linguistics.
- Simon, Walter. 1949. The range of sound alternations in Tibetan word families. *Asia Major (New Series)* 1: 3-15.
- Serruys, Paul L-M. 1955. Prolegomena to the study of the Chinese dialects of Han time according to *Fang Yen*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Serruys, Paul L-M. 1959. The Chinese dialects of Han time according to *Fang Yen*. Berkeley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Shen, Jiakuan. 2017. Hanyu you meiyou “zhu-wei jiegou” [Does Chinese have a “subject-predicate structure”]. *Xiandai Waiyu [Modern Foreign Languages]* 40.1: 1-14.
- Sun, Chao-Fen. 1991. The adposition YI and word order in classical Chinese. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 19.2: 203-228.
- Voegelin, Charels F. and Florence M. Voegelin, “On the History of Structuralizing in Twentieth-Century America”, *Anthropological Linguistics* 5/1, 1963, 12–37; repr. in J.G. Fought, *Leonard Bloomfield. Critical Assessments of Leading Linguists*, vol. 1, *Biographical Sketches*, London: Routledge, 1999, 60–86.
- Wang Li. 1979. Tongyuanzi lun [On cognate words]. *Zhongguo Yuwen* 144.1: 28-33.
- Wang Li. 1982. *Tongyuan Zidian [Dictionary of cognate words]*. Beijing: Shangwu Yinshuguan.
- Wang, William S-Y. 1969. Competing sound change as a cause of residue. *Language* 45: 9-25.
- Wang, William S-Y. 1979. Language change - a lexical perspective. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 8: 353-71.
- Wang, William S-Y. & Chinfa Lien. 1993. Bidirectional diffusion in sound change. In Charles Jones (ed.), *Historical Linguistics: Problems and Perspectives*, 345-400. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Wolfenden, Stuart N. 1928. The prefix *m-* with certain substantives in Tibetan. *Language* 4: 277-80.

- Wolfenden, Stuart N. 1937. Concerning the variation of final consonants in the word families of Tibetan, Kachin, and Chinese. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland (New Series)* 69: 625–655.
- Yu Min. 1948. Lun guyun he, tie, xue, mo, he wubu zhi tongzhuan 《论古韵合怙屑没曷五部之通转》 [Official English translation: Word derivation in Archaic Chinese through the annexing of the suffix D]. *Yanjing Xuebao [Yenjing Journal of Chinese Studies]* 34, June, 1948: 29-48.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne Oi-Kan. 1991. Stratification in Comparative Dialectal Grammar: A Case in Southern Min. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 19.2: 172-201.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne Oi-Kan. 1993a. The lexicon in syntactic change: Lexical diffusion in Chinese syntax. *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 21: 213-253.
- Yue-Hashimoto, Anne Oi-Kan. 1993b. *Comparative Chinese Dialectal Grammar: Handbook for Investigators*. Paris : Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (CRLAO).
- Yue, Anne O. 2017. The Sinitic languages: Grammar. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages, Second Edition*, 114-163. London & New York: Routledge.