On scholarship in Sino-Tibetan linguistics: Review article on *Studies in Chinese and Sino-Tibetan Linguistics: Dialect, Phonology, Transcription and Text (Language and Linguistics Monograph Series 53)*, ed. by Richard VanNess Simmons and Newell Ann Van Auken. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica, 2014. xxxvii, 463 pp. ISBN: 978-9860403435

Randy J. LaPolla
Nanyang Technological University
randylapolla.net

This large book is a festschrift for one of greatest scholars of Sino-Tibetan linguistics, Professor Weldon South Coblin, in honor of his 70th birthday. When one reads the work of a great scholar such as Prof. Coblin (e.g. when I read Coblin 1981), one can't help but be impressed with the depth and breadth of his scholarship, and the painstaking attention to detail and rigorous argumentation in his work. Scholarship that took a very long time and a lot of effort to develop and close, detailed work that took a long time to produce, particularly to Prof. Coblin's exacting standards, and yet his tone is always modest and his conclusions conservative.[1]

This book is a fitting tribute to Prof. Coblin, as it includes a large number of high-quality works from the leading scholars in some of the different areas of Sino-Tibetan linguistics that Prof. Coblin is involved in.[2] It begins with an introduction by Simmons and Van Auken summarizing the chapters and explaining the reason for the volume, then Van Auken presents a short biography of Prof. Coblin and a list of his publications. The individual chapters of the volume are then divided into five sections (in the Table of Contents, but not in the book itself), based on different areas in which Prof. Coblin has made major contributions.

Section 1, **Chinese Historical Linguistics**, includes chapters from three of the top names in Chinese historical linguistics. The first chapter, "A model for Chinese dialect evolution", is the last article Prof. Jerry Norman ever wrote, finished just before he passed away in July 2012. Prof. Norman was a teacher, a colleague, and a close friend and collaborator of Prof.

---

[1] Nowadays scholars are either forced by their universities to crank out many papers each year for the sake of KPI's and yearly appraisal, or are personally so much in a hurry to become famous they produce a large number of papers based on little more than imagination. The recent trend in using mathematical techniques (phylogenetic algorithms) in historical linguistics is a symptom of this problem: people looking for shortcuts to be able to produce citable papers without having to do all the time-consuming hard work usually required in historical linguistics. So while appreciating the quality of work Prof. Coblin has done, there is a tinge of sadness that academia no longer allows for that sort of time to be spent on doing what is necessary to create such good work.

[2] I find the title of the book a bit odd, as Chinese is part of Sino-Tibetan, but it may simply be that the editors were trying to overcome a common misconception among people who work only in Chinese linguistics that Sino-Tibetan linguistics is about everything but Chinese. Also, some of the English translations of the Chinese chapter titles could have been a bit clearer by being less directly translated, but I have given the translations as they are in the book.

Coblin.[3] The chapter is something of a summary of the work Prof. Norman was best known for, trying to turn Chinese historical linguistics in a more empirical direction, using actual dialect data and the comparative method (as well as reference to the rime books) rather than just relying on the traditional method based only on the rime books. He begins with a discussion of the nature of the rime books, in particular the *Qièyùn,* and problems with the current way they are used. He suggests they be used only secondarily to natural language data, as they (and the rime categories and *xiéshēng* contacts traditionally used to reconstruct Old Chinese) are heterogeneous sources and so lead to the reconstruction of composite systems, not natural systems. Unlike the usual periodization and reconstructions of Chinese, which represent these composite systems, Prof. Norman reconstructs natural systems that are reflected in the modern dialect forms, what he calls Common Dialectal Chinese, which accounts for all the modern non-Min dialects, and Early Chinese, which is meant to account for the distinctions in the Qīng Dynasty system of *gǔyīn* (ancient sounds) found in the modern dialects. Some examples and discussion of finals from Early Chinese are included at the end of the chapter.

The second chapter, "史諱中的音韻問題 (Phonological problems in imperial naming taboos)", by Prof. Dah-an Ho (何大安), is built around a critique of a particular work on the history of words that were tabooed because of homophony with the names of emperors (Chén Yuán'ān's《史諱舉例》 *Examples of Imperial Naming Taboos*), but at the same time we get something of an introduction to the practices related to the taboos. Prof. Ho first corrects some errors in the book in terms of what should or shouldn't be considered "the same sound" and what should or should not be tabooed, based on his extensive knowledge of Chinese history and historical phonology, and then talks about the different techniques for avoiding taboos: changing to a word that sounds different but has the same meaning, changing to a similarly sounding word, or omitting the word. He also discusses how the historical records of such practices and their discussion can help us to confirm our understanding of Chinese historical phonology. Although a very technical article, Prof. Ho's prose is clear and elegant.

The third chapter, "漢與唐宋兩代若干常用動作動詞的比較 (A comparative study of frequently used action verbs in Hàn and Táng-Sòng times)", is by Prof. Pang-Hsin Ting (丁邦新), a former classmate of Prof. Coblin when they were both graduate students at the University of Washington studying with Prof. Li Fang-kuei. Prof. Ting looks at change in the use of action verbs in the period from the Hàn Dynasty to the Táng-Sòng period by comparing forms in the explanations of characters in the *Shuōwén Jiězì* (Hàn Dynasty) with those in the *Qièyùn* and *Guǎngyùn* (Táng-Sòng period). Although the different books are in most cases explaining the same characters, they do so in many cases differently, and so the forms in the explanations can be taken to reflect forms that an educated person of the time would be expected to easily understand. Prof. Ting lists a number of examples of action verbs, arranged in sets of characters with similar meanings, to discuss the characters used in a

---

[3] Evidence of the closeness of their relationship can be found in the long passages written by Prof. Norman about Prof. Coblin included in the biography by Van Auken.

particular time period to express that meaning, and finds four sets of verbs: 1. those where there has been little change from the Hàn Dynasty to the present; 2. those where there is consistent use between the Hàn and Táng-Sòng times but not currently; 3. those that began to be used in Táng-Sòng times and are still in use today; and 4. those used in the Hàn Dynasty that are still used today, but have acquired new meanings. Prof. Ting then uses the fact that the first type is the most prevalent, i.e. the fact that the use of verbs has been relatively stable, to argue against the idea of the Altaicisation of northern Chinese suggested by Mantaro Hashimoto (e.g. 1986).

Section 2 is **Chinese Dialects**. It includes five articles using evidence from different dialects for understanding Chinese historical phonology. The first article in this section, "Northern Mǐn 'softened' initials in borrowed vocabulary", is by William Baxter. It follows in the same vein as Coblin and Norman's work in showing that reliance on the *Qièyùn* system can be problematic. His example is the pairs of words that are pronounced with the same initial in the *Qièyùn* system, but are pronounced with different initials in Northern Mǐn. He argues that the difference is due to lenition in intervocalic position in forms that he reconstructs with a consonant-vowel syllable before the relevant stop consonant (he does not call it a prefix). He argues the modern distinctions reflect earlier distinctions that were lost in all but Northern Mǐn, and so should be taken into account in reconstructing Old Chinese, as he has done in adding the pre-syllable. That said, there are also some forms in the "literary" (borrowed) layer of lexical items in Northern Mǐn that also have such "softened" initials, and the rest of the chapter presents evidence that these forms are most likely borrowed from an early form of the Hángzhōu dialect. There is one confusing typo: in a section on p. 63-4 where an example of Zhū Xī's commentary on the *Shījīng* is used, the relevant form in Ode 16.2 should have a voiceless initial (敗 *paej* C in Middle Chinese), as Baxter correctly has it in Table 10, as it is the transitive, and not intransitive reading of 敗, but possibly because Zhū Xī's annotation is 蒲寐反, with a voiced initial, Baxter talks about it as "< MC *baej* C". It should still have been "< MC *paej* C".

The next chapter is "On the relationship between tones and initials of the dialects in the Shanghai area", by Zhongmin Chen, who did his MA at the University of Iowa under Prof. Coblin's supervision. In this chapter Chen discusses the correlations between initials as historically voiced or voiceless and their current tonal values in five tonal patterns found in the Shanghai area. He shows that what is often called the voiced series of initials in Wú dialects is actually devoiced when in initial position, though there is breathy phonation of the vowel.[4] He also argues that in one variety, Liàntáng, aside from the usual upper and lower register, there is a split in the upper (voiceless) *shǎng* (rising) category into two tones, and this tonal difference corresponds with a difference in aspiration.[5] His discussion assumes the

---

[4] This is a common stage in the devoicing of initials, and can be clearly seen in languages such as Dzonkha. It is often assumed that the breathiness of the vowel later leads to aspiration of the initial, as in many languages, e.g. Lhasa Tibetan and Mandarin Chinese, formerly voiced initials became aspirated after losing their voicing.

[5] I think his label for the tone that is found on words in the upper *shǎng* category with aspiration, "aspirated tone", is not the best, as it isn't the tone that is aspirated, and we don't know whether the aspiration caused the

aspiration caused the difference in tone, but he does not say where the aspiration came from. In many languages aspiration is a by-product of a loss of voicing, but as these are upper register words, we cannot assume that, and we cannot say which is primary, the difference in aspiration or the difference in tone. Chen then goes on to talk about implosives, which he calls pre-glottalized stops. He equates these two concepts, but pre-glottalized stops do not necessarily have ingressive airflow. The work that Li Fang-kuei did on these in Hainan Island in the 1930's showed clearly ingressive airflow (he invented an instrument to determine the direction of airflow—see Li 1989), and so his term, "voiced implosives" is more accurate, contra Chen's assertion that "pre-glottalized consonant" is better. There is a clear and well-known correlation between implosive consonants and higher pitch, that is, they pattern like voiceless stop initials, and this is supported by the Shanghai area data. Chen seems to be suggesting that the implosives are an old feature that is being lost, and talks about their development in Tai languages (reconstructed for Proto-Tai in Li 1977) as a parallel to what has happened in the Wú varieties, but he doesn't say if they should be reconstructed to some earlier stage of Chinese. Since they are found in words that are mainly in the *duān* (*t-) and *bāng* (*p-) initial groups, then either the reconstruction of these initials would need to take into account the Wú implosives, or the Wú implosives are secondary, and then it would be good to see at what point in the development of Wú they developed, and how they developed.

The following chapter is "南京方言知莊章三組歷時演變與年齡差異研究 (A study of diachronic evolution and age variation in the *zhī, zhuāng* and *zhāng* initial groups in the Nánjīng dialect)", by Gù Qián (顧黔) and Zhāng Zhìlíng (張志凌). This chapter presents a comparative study of 119 syllables in the Nanjing dialect which show variation in the pronunciation of initials belonging to the *Qièyùn* categories *zhī, zhuāng* and *zhāng* across different age groups. The pronunciations of four different age groups are compared to show how the sounds are evolving. What they found is interesting: in most of the Jiāng-Huái area there has historically been a trend towards the loss of the distinction between *tʂ-* and *ts-* in favor of *ts-,* and this can be seen in the progressive loss of *tʂ-* between the oldest generation and the middle-aged generation, but then there is a reverse trend between the middle-aged generation and the younger generations. The authors attribute this latter development to the influence of *Pǔtōnghuà,* the standard variety of Mandarin.

The fourth chapter in the Chinese Dialects section is "江西吉安縣雲樓方言同音字彙 (The homophone syllabary of Yúnlóu dialect in Jí'ān, Jiāngxī Province)", by Chāng Méixiāng (昌梅香). It is a description of the author's native language, the Gàn dialect variety spoken in Yúnlóu Township of Jí'ān County in Jiāngxī Province. It begins with an introduction to the place where it is spoken and the consultants involved in the study (her parents), and then there are brief chart and bullet-point introductions to the initials, finals, tones, and historical characteristics. The Gàn dialect is one of the least well-described varieties of Chinese, and it is very good not only that we get an overview of the system, but the addition of notes on

---

tonal difference or the tonal difference caused the aspiration, or whether there was some other factor, as correlation does not entail causation.

unusual characteristics and historical developments of the initials, finals, and tones is particularly helpful. The rest of the chapter is a list by initial and final of all of the words that have the same sound, including dialect words for which there is no available Chinese character. This latter point makes it more reflective of the actual use of the variety than the standard character lists for dialect studies.

Next is "A comparative look at Common Southern Jiāng-Huái and the southern Mandarin influences in Hé Xuān's *Yùnshǐ*", by Richard VanNess Simmons. This chapter is a detailed analysis of the early 19th century book *Yùnshǐ* (《韻史》 *History of Rhymes)* by Hé Xuān (何萱) to see if the much revised (compared to the *Qièyùn)* phonological system used there purely reflected Hé Xuān's own pronunciation or included other influences. The conclusion is that the system of initials closely follows that of the Rúgāo-Tàixīng area of Jiāngsū where Hé Xuān lived, and there are certain local dialect words and other local features, but other aspects of the phonology reflect influence from surrounding dialects and other varieties of Guānhuà. It also shows that the merger of voiceless aspirated initials and historically voiced initials found today in that area was completed already at the time of the compilation of the *Yùnshǐ.* There is a typo in (e) on p. 139, where "*qǐ"* should be "*bìng".*

Section 3, **Tibetan and Tibeto-Burman**, begins with "On Coblin's law", by Guillaume Jacques. It is an attempt to extend the application of one of the regularities of cluster simplification in the historical development of the initials of Tibetan verbs discovered by Prof. Coblin (1976) to nouns as well. He compares some animal names that have a historical velar prefix in Japhug Rgyalrong but don't in Tibetan, and suggests that the Tibetan forms may have lost the velar prefix (found in certain other animal names) due to cluster simplification similar to that found in the verbal system. He also talks about two other types of nominals where he thinks there has been cluster simplification. This is very imaginative, but there is no way to support such conjectures without, for example, some textual evidence in a variety of Tibetan that didn't undergo cluster deletion of this type, as there is no requirement that the nouns involved have such a prefix. Jacques also tries to add to the three rules that Prof. Coblin demonstrated with rule that deletes a cluster-medial nasal in a three-consonant cluster beginning with *s-. This rule is again based only on comparative evidence with Japug Rgyalrong (and only one word), not on Tibetan-internal data. This rule is of a different nature than Prof. Coblin's rules, in that what is said to be deleted is said to be part of the initial of the basic root and so the rule is not simply dropping a prefix, and it is not based on the sort of solid Tibetan-internal evidence Prof. Coblin's rules are.

"Tibeto-Burman *dz- > Tibetan *z-* and related proposals", by Nathan W. Hill, tries to make sense of what seem to be conflicting rules that have applied in the development of Tibetan initial fricatives and affricates by showing their relative chronology.[6] Hill shows that Old Tibetan *ź-* had three origins: < *j-, < *lj-, and < *rj-, and suggests on this basis that Proto-Tibeto-Burman did not include *ź-.

---

[6] He argues with examples for one particular ordering, but then adds a footnote saying that he had changed his mind and it should be a different ordering, but gives no justification, so the reader is left a bit confused.

The short chapter "A note on Tibeto-Burman bone words and Chinese pitch-pipes", by Laurent Sagart, points out what seems to be a correspondence between the Tibetan words *gra* 'bones of a fish' and *rus* 'bone' and the Chinese words 呂／旅 *[r]aʔ 'spine; even numbered pitch pipe' and 律 *[r]ut 'odd-numbered pitch pipe', respectively, and argues that the connection between bone and pitch pipe might be that they are both tubular objects.

"Using native lexical resources to create technical neologisms for minority languages", by James A. Matisoff, presents an attempt by the author and Aaron Tun, a native Lahu linguist, to create native terminology for talking about linguistics in Lahu. This is necessary because Lahu is spread over several countries, and borrowed vocabulary could come from many sources and therefore lack transparency. The chapter discusses some of the difficulties and principles/strategies involved in the work and then presents not only the long list of words created (Appendix C), but also gives some examples of how they can be used in complete sentences. There is also an appendix (A) which gives a brief overview of the phonology of Black Lahu, and one (B) that discusses alternative transcriptions for Lahu. Appendix D is a list of the words and morphemes used in the newly created terminology.

In "Typology of generic-person marking in Tshobdun Rgyalrong", Jackson T.-S. Sun, in his usual rigorous and clear style, takes us through a general discussion of the typology of the marking of generic person (e.g. *one* in English *One must be careful),* to contextualize the following discussion of the different ways this sort of marking is manifested in Tshobdun Rgyalrong, a Tibeto-Burman language of northern Sichuan. Most significant, particularly in the context of Sino-Tibetan, is the use of forms that grammaticalized initially as nominalizers (and still are used as nominalizers) as generic-person marking on verbs, without any sense of nominalization, and the use of the inverse marker with generic-person marking on the verb. As in some other languages, generic-person marking can also be used for 1st person reference for particular pragmatic purposes, but unlike in some other languages, it can't be used for 2nd person reference. The generic-person forms are fully integrated into the pronominal and verbal paradigms, and so represent a "fourth person" value in the system. The forms involved in the system also clearly differentiate human vs. non-human referents, showing the salience of this distinction in the cognitive system of the speakers.

Section 4, **Language Contact and Transcription**, begins with the excellent chapter "Phonological notes on Hàn period transcriptions of foreign names and words", by Axel Schuessler. It follows up on the substantial work of Prof. Coblin on the "Buddhist Transcriptional Dialect" of the Eastern Hàn Dynasty and other work on evidence from transcriptions of foreign words, but pushes this work back to the Western Hàn period, and finds interesting differences in the transcriptional practices in the two periods that tell us something about the nature of Chinese at each time period and to some extent other languages. For example, rarely were syllables with aspirated initials or *ə* used for transcribing Central Asian languages, implying the languages then did not manifest these sounds. Most interesting is the fact that *shǎngshēng* (rising tone) and *qùshēng* (departing tone) syllables

were avoided in transcribing words with no final consonants, but the former were used for words with velar or uvular stop finals and the latter were used for words that ended in *-s*. This lends support to reconstructions of the two tones as *-ʔ and *-s, or as Schuessler cautiously puts it in talking about *qùshēng* syllables, they "had apparently in the Former Hàn period a phonetic feature, carried over from O[ld] C[hinese], that did not favor their use in transcriptions of foreign sounds except for final *-s*" (p. 255). The fact that there was a difference between the two time periods in the rime category of words used for transcribing foreign *a,* with syllables in the *yú* (魚) rime category being used in the Western Han and syllables in the *gē* (歌) category in later periods, reflects changes in these two rimes. The chapter ends with an Appendix that gives the 569 transcriptions of Central Asian and Indian names and words used in the study and their reconstructions, broken down by historical period. There is a typo fives lines from the bottom of p. 250, where "吳孫" should be "烏孫".

The next chapter, "Why did Sin Sukju transcribe the coda of the *yào* 藥 rime of 15th century Guānhuà with the letter ㅸ <f>?", by Zev Handel, deals with the puzzle of why the 15th century Korean scholar Sin Sukju (申叔舟) used the symbol ㅸ to transcribe the coda in words that are seen as part of the *yào* 藥 entering tone rime category in his transcriptions of the pronunciation of Mandarin of the time, while marking all other entering tone words with ㆆ. Handel argues that it was due to Sin's understanding of the phonological system of Chinese and also the system of the newly created Hangul alphabet, which Sin used in his transcriptions: Sin used the symbols in coda position to systematically distinguish entering tone syllables from non-entering tone syllables, in both cases using single-stroke modifications of symbols used to represent zero coda and *-w* coda to represent what might have been a glottal stop coda and a *-wʔ* coda respectively. There is a typo in the examples at the top of p. 298, where 和 is marked as a departing tone syllable in the Hangul transcription.

"The *chē-zhē* syllables of Old Mandarin", by Zhongwei Shen, traces the history of certain sound changes in Chinese, showing that sound patterns found in the Zhōngyúan Yīnyùn (《中原音韻》; published in 1324) that differ from those of the *Qièyùn* are also reflected in transcriptions in Altaic scripts up to two centuries earlier. Shen argues that the pattern found (the *chē-zhē* 車遮 rime group) can be taken as representative of Old Mandarin, and his findings push back the dating of the formation of the Old Mandarin sound system by two centuries. He also argues that the further development of the vowel *-ɤ* out of certain members of several different rime groups, a sound change that wasn't completed until the end of the 19th century, can be taken as representative of the system of Modern Mandarin.

The next chapter, " 愚魯廬學思脞錄二則 (Trivial musings from Dull Lǔ's cottage study)", by Lǔ Guóyáo (魯國堯), starts off with a long explanation of why he is using the usually short and pithy genre of 箚記 (reading notes or reactions to something one has read) to write the following two pieces. The first of the two, which turns out to be rather long for the genre, quotes long passages from Qián Zhōngshū's 'The first Chinese translation of an English

poem, "A Psalm of Life", and a few related matters' and other works talking about the fad of learning English in the late Qīng Dynasty under the impression that it was the world's international language, and compares it to the rush today in China to learn English, again under the impression that it is the world's international language. It is a not very well veiled criticism of this rush to learn English, and it attempts to argue that English isn't very common internationally. The second piece is a short discussion of paired syllable words in Chinese (聯綿詞), and argues for a new expression, *yīn'ǒu* (音耦; as *ǒu* 耦 means 'to plow together', the sense is that the two syllables are working together), to cover any sort of pairing of syllables, including reduplication and words that have the same tone category in Middle Chinese (e.g. 長波、江河). Lu's neologism is reminiscent of the term used to talk about a similar phenomenon in Khmer, "attendant words" e.g. Sakamoto 2010.

The last article in this section, "The Ricci-Ruggieri *Dicionário Europeu-Chinês:* Linguistic and philological notes on some Portuguese and Italian entries", by Joseph Abraham Levi, discusses in great detail the etymologies and historical developments of some of the Portuguese and Italian entries in the first full European-Chinese dictionary (complied between 1583 and 1588), with a view to gaining insights into the history of the development of the phonologies and lexicons of Portuguese and Italian. What I found surprising in his discussion was the large number of Arabic loans and their reflexes in the modern languages.

Section 5, **Texts and Written Chinese**, is the last section of the book. It starts off with "Two competing interpretations: *cóng* 从 or *bì* 比 in oracle-Bone inscriptions", by Ken-ichi Takashima, another former classmate of Prof. Coblin at the University of Washington. The author takes issue with the interpretation by certain scholars of particular oracle bone inscription graphs as 比 *bì/bǐ* rather than 从 *cóng* (they were written in a very similar way until the creation of the character 從 for *cóng*), and presents evidence from what he calls "graphic pragmatics", that is, "how the graphs are used in a larger context" (p. 369), which includes collocation statistics, and "graphic intent or design", that is, what the original intent of the scribes was in creating the graphs, to show that 从 *cóng* was the more likely intended meaning in the relevant cases.

Another paper dealing with the graphs of Chinese is "The lingering puzzle of *yán* 焉: A problem of oral language in the Chinese reading tradition", by David Prager Branner. Branner is not satisfied with the traditional view of the origin of the character 焉 *yán/yān* as representing a kind of yellow bird found in the Jiāng-Huái region, and argues, following Kennedy (1940, 1953), that it is a ligature of the characters 於 + 是, but disagrees with Kennedy's view that it also represents an oral contraction of the two words these characters are used to represent. He also makes a strong distinction between the two pronunciations known for the character (*yán/yān),* saying they are two different words, and only later came to be seen as one. He argues the character is a "portmanteau" structure representing the meaning of the word *yán,* but was used to represent the word *yān* as well. In discussing the different possibilities in terms of the origin of both the character and the words, he discounts

the idea that Old Chinese manifested derivational morphology, as argued by Pulleyblank (1991) and Baxter (1992), among others (see also LaPolla 1994, 2003 for discussions of word families and morphology in Chinese within the broader Sino-Tibetan context). His reasons for doing so are problematic, though. He says (p. 385): "First, of itself, the script gives no signs whatever of having been used to write anything other than an isolating language, and we have no evidence of a discussion in the native tradition about the problems of writing a derivational language with an isolating script. Second, phonology, on which the internal reconstruction of derivational morphology rests, is documented for Chinese only in its existence as an isolating language; the earliest of the crucial Tibeto-Burman comparative evidence is some thousand years later than the prime early Chinese period . . . Third, many reconstructed morphological affixes are speculations assigned to a stage prior to what can legitimately be termed spoken Chinese." In the case of the first argument, he is assuming that a script must reflect all of the variant forms of the language, and this is of course not the case, but he also misses the fact that many of the word families in Chinese do include words written with different characters to reflect the different pronunciations. He also assumes that early Chinese scholars who knew nothing of alphabets would have complained about the problems of representing variant forms of their language with a single character. This does not seem to have been a problem for them, and this leads to the second point, that the distinctions for which scholars initially began talking about word families in Chinese and for which suggested morphology as a possible explanation were Chinese internal distinctions identified in Chinese data, such as the differences in pronunciation and use of a single character, either an initial voicing distinction, or tonal differences, or final consonant differences; they had nothing to do with Tibeto-Burman. By coincidence, Schuessler's paper for this volume very nicely shows that the evidence from Chinese translations of foreign words in the Western Hàn Dynasty supports the reconstruction of some sort of segmental difference between *shǎngshēng* words and *qùshēng* words that seems to correspond with the segmental suffixes proposed to explain the development of these tones. And this shows that the third objection is also unsustainable, as Schuessler is talking about an attested stage of Chinese.

"Textual criticism and the turbulent life of the *Platform Sūtra*", by Morten Schlütter (as well as the next chapter, by Newell Ann Van Auken), is the kind of careful, meticulous, and time-consuming research I find most impressive. Schlütter does a character-by-character textual criticism type of analysis of a number of different versions and editions of the key text of Chan/Seon/Zen linguistics, the *Platform Sūtra,* and also compares these versions with quotes from the *Platform Sūtra* found in other texts of various periods, to see which is the oldest version, and which versions were popular at different periods. He gives a detailed genealogy of the different versions and summarizes it in a *stemma codicum,* a sort of family tree of the texts. He shows that the "long" version that has been considered the orthodox version for many years is in fact a later embellishment of an earlier shorter version.

The last chapter in the volume, "*Spring and Autumn* use of *jí* 及 and its interpretation in the *Gōngyáng* and *Gǔliáng* commentaries", by Newell Ann Van Auken, is a close study of the

use of the characters 及 *jí* and 會 *hùi* in the book *Spring and Autumn* (《春秋》), comparing it with the patterns found in later commentaries and other works of the period, as in this book 及 *jí* is used where many other texts and later commentaries use 與 *yǔ* for showing a comititive relationship between two referents, and is the only such text to almost exclusively use 及 *jí* for this function. She systematically presents the different constructions where 及 *jí* is and is not used, and contrasts them with situations where 會 *hùi* is used in similar constructions, pointing out not only the grammatical differences but the pragmatic differences in their use, as the use of either of these particles seems to reflect the hierarchical structure of the society, with the particle more often used (as opposed to zero) when there was a status difference between the two referents and the one with the higher status was mentioned first. Van Auken argues that 及 *jí* is not a verb in the relevant uses discussed in her analysis, but is a comititive marker, and did not have the sense of 'reaching, coming up to' normally associated with the use of 及 *jí* as a verb, even though later commentaries tried to read it that way. She argues that the difference between the use of 及 *jí* in the *Spring and Autumn* and the later commentaries and other texts is due to a difference in dialect. She also talks about possible implications for grammaticalization theory. My only quibble when I was reading this chapter was that she seemed to insist on clear categorical boundaries between form classes, and only at the end of the chapter, in two footnotes (48 and 49) does she bring up the more likely situation, that the meaning of 及 *jí* as a verb is not so straightforward (she shows the word family it belongs to, which leads to questions about the meaning of 及 *ji),* and that grammaticalization is a gradual process, and so clear distinctions cannot always be drawn. She seems to also think that it is unusual for a form to grammaticalize in one construction and yet still be used as a verb in another construction, but there is nothing unusual about that, and that is not "layering", it is simply a reflection of the fact that grammaticalization is not of words, but of constructions. Compare the grammaticalization of prospective aspect marking in English using a construction involving the word *go,* for example in *I'm going to eat now,* vs. the use of the verb *go* in other constructions, such as *I'm going to the store* now. It isn't the <u>word</u> *go* that grammaticalized into prospective aspect marking, but the <u>construction</u> in which it appeared which came to be used for aspect marking, so there is no problem with the word *go* being used as a verb in other constructions. One other small point is that Van Auken largely assumes that the Chinese used in the text reflects the same form classes and grammatical relations as English, such as having distinctions between preposition and verb (though she recognizes that some scholars use "coverb" to show there isn't really a distinction), and she assumes there is something special about what she calls "subject elision", but this is simply not mentioning a referent that is inferable, and is due to information structure. English is the odd one typologically in requiring subjects in most clauses, and it does so because it uses the existence and position of subject relative to the finite element to mark the grammatical mood of the clause. Chinese generally, and Classical Chinese in particular, manifests a very different sort of grammatical system, and this needs to be recognized, so that it can be described on its own terms. (See for example Herforth 1987 on Classical Chinese, and LaPolla 2013 on using a construction-based

approach to understanding Chinese, which obviates the need to argue for or against particular word classes or grammatical relations.)

Going through the almost 500 A4 size pages of this book I learned quite a lot, and the careful scholarship (citation and footnoting) in some of the articles has given me leads for future research, so I can highly recommend this volume to those in Sino-Tibetan linguistics. It will be of use to those outside Sino-Tibetan linguistics as well, but those who are not familiar with Chinese and Chinese linguistics might find some of the chapters (and even this review) hard to understand. The fact that people working in Chinese linguistics generally find it hard to write in such a way that readers who are not familiar with Chinese (particularly Mandarin) can still understand it has limited the impact of Chinese linguistics on linguistics generally. For example, in editing the book *The Sino-Tibetan Languages* (Thurgood & LaPolla 2003), Graham Thurgood and I tried to find scholars who could describe non-Mandarin Sinitic varieties from a typological rather than Mandarin-based point of view, but found it very hard, and so that book is not as representative of Sinitic varieties as it should be, and that means that typologists will have less access to information about non-Mandarin Sinitic varieties.

References
Baxter, William H. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology.* Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Coblin, W. South. 1976. Notes on Tibetan verbal morphology. *T'oung Pao* 62:45-70.
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.
Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1986. The Altaicization of Northern Chinese. In J. McCoy and T. Light (eds.), *Contribution to Sino-Tibetan Studies,* 76-97. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
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.
Kennedy, George A. 1940. A study of the particle *yen. Journal of the American Oriental Society* 60.1: 1-22; 60.2: 193-207.
Kennedy, George A. 1953. Another note on *yen. Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 16.1-2: 226-236.
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. 2003. An overview of Sino-Tibetan morphosyntax. In Graham Thurgood & Randy J. LaPolla (eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*, 22-42. London & New York: Routledge.
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. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
Li, Fang-kuei. 1977. *A Handbook of Comparative Tai.* Hawaii: The University Press of Hawaii.
Li, Fang-kuei. 1989. *Linguistics East and West: Sino-Tibetan, Tai, and American Indian,* oral history of Prof. Fang-Kuei Li recorded and edited by Ning-ping Chan & Randy J. LaPolla. Published by the Regional Oral History Office, a department of the Bancroft Library, UC Berkeley, 1989. Available from http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb3489n99m&brand=calisphere&doc.view=entire_text
Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1991. Some notes on morphology and syntax in Classical Chinese. In Henry Rosemont (ed.), *Chinese Texts and Philosophical Contexts: Essays Dedicated to Angus C. Graham,* 21-45. La Salle: Open Court.
Sakamoto, Ayako. 2010. Attendant word complexes in Khmer (Cambodian). *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 33.1: 41-70.
Thurgood, Graham & Randy J. LaPolla. 2003. *The Sino-Tibetan languages.* London & New York: Routledge.