

Preface

This volume is a sequel to the *Interpretative Maps of Chinese Dialects* (hereafter called *Volume One*) published by Hakuteisha on December 30, 2009. This volume not only contains many kinship terms, which *Volume One* failed to include, but also has selected lexical items related to the entries in *Volume One* in order to establish a lexical system consistent in the two volumes. The present volume also attempts to deliver maps indicating a phonological system and the folkloric customs of certain entries.

A review of *Volume One* was written by Professor Zhiyun Cao at Beijing Language and Culture University, who is the main editor of *Hanyu Fangyan Dituji (Linguistic Atlas of Chinese Dialects)*, and published under the title “读岩田礼编《汉语方言解释地图》(A Review of *The Interpretative Maps of Chinese Dialects* edited by Ray Iwata)” in the Journal *Fangyan*, Vol. 4, 2010. Another review by Professor Rujie Shi from Kumamoto Gakuen University, who rendered us great assistance in its compilation, is scheduled to appear in the Journal *Yuyanxue Luncong* (Peking University). It is such an honor and so gratifying to know that our research is appreciated by researchers whose native tongue is Chinese.

However, our ‘interpretative’ work to reconstruct the linguistic history of the Chinese language based on dialect maps has only made its first step in the long tradition of Chinese historical linguistics, and thus presents a variety of issues.

First, our research methodology is still in the developmental stage. We regard it with exactly the same perception as Albert Dauzat did toward linguistic geography, when he stated “la géographie linguistique est une science qui se fait, un être jeune aux pas encore incertains (linguistic geography is a science which is in the process of being made, a young existence yet to be made certain)” (Dauzat 1922, p.44). Each time a new map is created, we discover a phenomenon which often requires a revision of our previous understanding and viewpoints. For instance, we originally assumed that many of the lexical forms exhibiting the “Yangtze River Type” distribution would have originated in the Jianghuai area. The forms that belong to this category are: *jintian* 今天 ‘today,’ *mingtian* 明天 ‘tomorrow,’ *bingbao* 冰雹 ‘hail,’ *bangzi* 膀子 ‘arm,’ *dabaizi* 打摆子 ‘to have Malaria’ in *Volume One* (Maps 3-2, 7, 24-2, 33-2 and 43-1, respectively). Lexical forms are hereafter indicated in Pinyin instead of IPA for simpler representation), as well as *ye* 爷 ‘father’s younger brother,’ *die* 爹 ‘father’s father,’ *maque* 麻雀 ‘sparrow’ in this volume (Maps 4, 6 and 20, respectively). It is highly likely, in fact, that these forms or their usages did originate in Jianghuai, along with other many lexical forms that constitute modern Putonghua. On the other hand, we learned from the form for ‘gecko’ and its related forms in this volume (Maps 25, 26) that: 1) In spite of its “Yangtze River Type” distribution, the Putonghua form *bihu* 壁虎 used to be widespread to the north of Jianghuai, and 2) It was later replaced by *xiehu* 蝎虎 and its distribution eventually shrunk as a result of paronymic attraction and homonymic collision with the words for ‘bat’ and ‘ant.’ Therefore, the

distributional concentration of a certain form along the Yangtze River does not readily determine its origin in Jianghuai.

The second issue concerns the modern linguistic oblivion of significant discoveries made by 20th century linguistic geography. This is caused by the proliferation of a certain prejudice that dialectology is only a subset of historical phonology, ignoring that linguistic geography can offer many clues to general linguistics, including cognitive linguistics.

In *Volume One* we emphasized the following two points regarding etymological searches and lexical changes:

- 1) The discontinuity of changes
- 2) The effect of non-mechanical factors on lexical changes

In an etymological search of dialect form A, finding character X in an old dictionary or other historic work, where X might be judged as the etymology of A, by no means represents the end of the search. This is because there is no guarantee that form A is the direct descendant of the word represented by X. This is exactly the pitfall of traditional etymological searches and lexical comparisons that rely on the similarity of sounds and semantics. There exist in the basic lexicon a group of largely mono-syllabic forms, such as *tian* 天 ‘heaven,’ *yu* 雨 ‘rain,’ *shan* 山 ‘mountain,’ *hu* 湖 ‘lake’ and *ma* 马 ‘horse,’ that have undergone from ancient times continuous changes according to phonetic change rules. This type of change can be called a ‘change in a sterilized room,’ as these words are simply arbitrary signs that are similar to the air which the speaker is not aware of under normal circumstances. On the other hand, the basic lexicon that is more closely related to everyday life has undergone more or less irregular changes. Our claim of discontinuous changes renounces the fixated notion that lexical forms change mechanically according to the rules governing phonetic changes. The most common factor that causes discontinuous lexical changes is folk-etymology. Another important factor for such changes is the speaker’s unconscious phonetic attraction (also referred to as ‘paronymic attraction,’ see the case of ‘gecko’ introduced above). These factors may be labeled as “contamination factors” that would obstruct continuous changes, but in fact it is in these factors where we can see a reflection of the vigorous linguistic creativity of human beings. The application of these factors in lexical changes is capricious, and that is why we term them as non-mechanical.

These non-mechanical factors, however, present a fatal problem inherent in linguistic geography. We can only determine case by case whether these factors affect a certain change by observing, or interpreting, maps. Unfortunately this act of interpretation is often regarded as intentional by our readers. The works of Jules Gilliéron, the founder of linguistic geography, is considered abstruse due to his lengthy examinations of possible changes through analogies and aphorisms to derive the most logical conclusions. This considerable amount of meandering for the sake of the historical reconstruction of a single word would apparently look less scientific than the comparative linguistic method, which can take the whole of an archaic language and restructure it into a simpler system based on certain formulae. We need to ask ourselves, however, how much truth this reconstruction in fact entails, discarding all those elements that could

otherwise be considered as factors for a change. When we claim in linguistic geography that “each word has its own history,” we recognize that different factors affected each word in its change process. Antoine Meillet, one of the great comparative linguists, clearly understood this point. While he warned of the danger of dialectology being lost in search of individual words, he appreciated the significance of geographical research (Meillet 1925:60-71). Hence, we hereby declare the following: 1) The mechanisms of linguistic change discovered in European languages as well as in Japanese exist in other languages of the world, including Chinese, and 2) The phenomena discovered in modern Chinese dialects also existed at any other time in the history of the Chinese language.

In his review mentioned above, Professor Zhiyun Cao made some concise and to the point comments about Map 30 ‘broad bean’ in *Volume One*. From these comments we can see that our research and explanations are still unconvincing in places, so here we shall provide further explanation using maps published in this work, in order to provide reference for readers.

1) Our interpretations must be based on the reality of the maps and of the linguistic facts

Any interpretation that deviates from what is indicated on the maps is nothing but pure fantasy. Let us begin with a simple example. Please refer to Map 37 ‘bicycle’ and Map 19 ‘eyelash.’ The following lexical forms appear in the middle and lower reaches of the Yangtze River and in Southern areas west of Jiangxi and Guangdong Provinces, and form continuous patterns of distribution respectively:

(1) ‘bicycle’: *danche* 单车, *xianche* 线车, *gangsiche* 钢丝车

(2) ‘eyelash’: *yanjiemao* 眼睫毛, *yanjingmao* 眼睛毛, *yanmao* 眼毛

Linguistic geography recognizes that if there are multiple lexical forms constituting a pattern of continuous distribution (In *Volume One* this is called ‘gradated distribution’), and furthermore, when they are either phonetically or semantically related, then these various lexical forms quite possibly originate from a common source. Takeshi Shibata 柴田武 (1969) calls this “the principle of contiguous distribution.” *Xianche* 线车 ‘wire vehicle’ and *gangsiche* 钢丝车 ‘steel vehicle’ possess a certain semantic relationship; *yanjie* 眼睫 and *yanjing* 眼睛 possess both a semantic relationship and phonetic similarity, the initial consonant of the second syllable in each case being a reflex of MC *ts. Because of this, we believe that the following changes occurred in this area:

(1) *xianche* 线车 > *gangsiche* 钢丝车; (2) *yanjie* 眼睫 > *yanjing* 眼睛

Perhaps this type of explanation is capable of gaining the acceptance of the majority of readers. However, in Map 37 the explanation goes on to claim that *xianche* 线车 comes from *danche* 单车; and the Map 19 explanation claims that *yanmao* 眼毛 is the result of the dropping of the second syllable in either *yanjiemao* 眼睫毛, or *yanjingmao* 眼睛毛. There will be people who object to these opinions, e.g., “There is very little semantic relationship between *danche* 单车 ‘single (wheel) vehicle’ and *xianche* 线车 ‘wire vehicle’ and because of this the emergence of *xianche* 线车 is unrelated to *danche* 单车.” This kind of difference in viewpoints is difficult to

avoid in linguistic geography, and there is no single correct reply to this, but what we want to further investigate is which of these opinions has the higher likelihood of being correct? If we take a careful look at Map 37, we can see that *xianche* 线车 has a tendency to be sandwiched by *danche* 单车 in Hunan and Jiangxi, i.e. the two exhibit ABA distribution (*danche* 单车- *xianche* 线车- *danche* 单车). We believe that this adds credence to the *danche* 单车 > *xianche* 线车 hypothesis (cf. *Volume One* Introduction, p. 20).

2) Degree of abstractness in classifying lexical forms vary by entry

The classification of lexical forms is a prerequisite for drawing maps (cf. *Volume One* Introduction, p. 12). ‘Bicycle’ and ‘eyelash’ are types of lexical entries that have fewer lexical variations, so whoever might carry out classification of this type of entry would obtain roughly the same results as anyone else. However, how to go about processing entries with greater numbers of lexical forms is where we most make an effort. The most prototypical entries are those for the bug names such as Map 27 ‘spider,’ Map 28 ‘dragonfly’ and Map 29 ‘cicada,’ for which the quantity of lexical forms can number in the hundreds. However, our task must be to pursue classification. For example, most of the lexical forms for ‘cicada’ are onomatopoeic in their origin. Therefore each locality would have independently generated similar lexical forms. However, we found that in the North, most lexical forms took either an “X+l-” or “X+n-” structure. Here X represents any morpheme (in a minority of cases, a modifying element precedes the X), with l- and n- representing any syllable taking either an l- or n- initial. Classifying these lexical forms in this way brings a surprising result, i.e. *zhiliao* 知了 (an onomatopoeic form) and *qiuliang* 秋凉 (meaning ‘autumn cool’) both belong to the same category (cf. Group A-1 in Map 29-1). They appear to be very different lexical forms, but they do possess a common “X+l-” structure. This perhaps hints at the fact that lexical forms of this type are all reflexes of a single proto-form. Additionally, analyzing the names for small animals, we find that tonal category is an extremely important piece of information in the classification process (cf. Maps 27-29 commentaries).

3) Every lexical form has a proto-form

The expression ‘discontinuous change’ may be misleading, in that any lexical form is considered to have a proto-form and its lexical change would therefore be ‘continuous,’ unless it has never changed from its original form since ancient times.

Newer objects such as ‘bicycle’ are phenomena in which both the name and the object itself have been introduced together. It is very difficult to imagine that when bicycles were first introduced in Jiangxi or Hunan bicycles did not have a name. In that case, what would they have been called? Based on geographical distribution we judge that name to have been *danche* 单车, and in the process of the popularization of bicycles, people changed its name to *xianche* 线车 and *gangsiche* 钢丝车.

Both Map 16, ‘magpie,’ in *Volume One* and Map 20, ‘sparrow,’ in the present volume are the work of Professor Yuko Kizu, though I once introduced both maps myself at a small seminar at my university. At that time I focused on discussing the situation in the Central Plain, with Henan

as its focus, noting that the words referring to ‘magpie’ included the syllable *ma* 麻, e.g. *mayique* 麻衣鹊, while the word referring to ‘sparrow,’ namely *maque* 麻雀, had lost the *ma* syllable, e.g. *xiaoque* 小雀, *xiaochong* 小虫. How could that have happened? A student voiced the following, “The term *mayique* 麻衣鹊 comes from the appearance of magpie; it is a bird that is wearing ‘sackcloth clothing’ (*mayi* 麻衣). Isn’t this all that happened to this word?” There is nothing at all wrong with this explanation. His folkloric etymology tells one side of the truth. However, if our exploration were to end with this type of ad hoc pondering, geographical linguistics would lose any existing rationale to serve as a subcategory of historical linguistics. Here we must reflect on the basis of a map and ask why the *ma* 麻 morpheme originally used for ‘sparrow’ could be ‘copied’ into lexical forms meaning ‘magpie.’ The term *mayique* 麻衣鹊 ought to be a later lexical form, so it ought to have a predecessor.

4) The effect of “non-mechanical factors” transcends the shackles of phonological rules

The lexical form *mayique* 麻衣鹊 for ‘magpie’ should come from either “鸦鹊”(*a ts^hiak) or “野鹊”(*ia ts^hiak). The reason for this lexical form acquiring the syllable *ma* 麻 in the Central Plain is due to the phonetic attraction it received from the form “麻雀”(*ma tsiak), meaning ‘sparrow.’ Furthermore, another result of this phonetic attraction is that the originally unaspirated syllable 雀 (*tsiak) of ‘sparrow’ came to be pronounced with an aspirated initial consonant (*ts^hiak), resulting in it becoming homophonous with the 鹊 (*ts^hiak) of ‘magpie.’ Additionally, Maps 25 and 26, for ‘gecko,’ ‘bat’ and ‘ant,’ display the progression of the phenomenon of paronymic attraction. Here there are many problems we wish to clarify, e.g. Why did the syllables *bian* 蝙 of ‘bat’ and *pi* 蚍 of ‘ant,’ both originally pronounced in Tone I (Ping tone) come to be pronounced instead in Tone IV (Entering tone), and How did the *bian* 蝙 of ‘bat,’ originally pronounced with an unaspirated initial consonant, come to be pronounced with an aspirated initial consonant instead, etc.?

The origination of folkloric etymology is often conditioned by phonetic similarity, e.g. ‘gecko’ in some Northern dialects is called *shehu* 蛇虎 ‘snake tiger,’ which from its distribution we can conclude that it came from *xiehu* 蝎虎 ‘scorpion tiger’ (c.f. Map 25-2). The occurrence of this change was conditioned by the phonetic similarity of 蝎 [çiə] and 蛇 [sə], both pronounced in Tone I, the former in Tone Ia, the latter in Tone Ib. However, in the case of these two morphemes, neither their respective initial consonants, nor their syllable finals or tones completely match one another. Because of this, we can say that the most crucial factor in the above change was semantic, i.e. with the speaker feeling that *she* 蛇 ‘snake’ is more suitable than *xie* 蝎 ‘scorpion’ to express the image of a gecko. As noted above, *yanjiemao* 眼睫毛 changed into *yanjingmao* 眼睛毛. In the process of this change the phonetic similarity between *jie* 睫 and *jing* 睛 must have been a factor, but the driving factor for this was the historical change of the form meaning ‘eye,’ from monosyllabic *yan* 眼 to bisyllabic *yanjing* 眼睛. In short, all lexical forms that possess a low degree of motivation can be easily affected by non-mechanical factors, and the effect of such factors can transcend the shackles of phonological rules.

5) When discussing lexical changes one must preserve the concept of a lexical system

The discussion above quotes the warning of Meillet that dialectology cannot bury its head in the study of individual words. Following this point of view, if a certain dialect uses the lexical stem *ye* 爷 as a term of address for ‘father,’ we cannot guarantee that this use of *ye* is a direct descendent of its use by the legendary Chinese heroine Mulan. This is because this type of *ye* could possibly have also been used as a term of address for ‘father’s older brother’ or ‘father’s younger brother’ and subsequently changed into a term of address for ‘father.’ In the history of Chinese dialects, the referential shift of a particular kinship term coming to refer to a different kinship category has frequently taken place. Proceeding from this point of view, the present work includes several typological maps, e.g. Map 1-1 (Patrilineal kinship system for elders), Map 32-3 (Honeybee and honey), Map 38 (Typology of ‘House’ and ‘Room’).

In November 2010, the 1st International Symposium on Chinese Geo-Linguistics was held at Beijing Language and Culture University (BLCU). This symposium was made possible through the great effort of Professor Cao and other people at BLCU, as well as the rising interest in linguistic geography research, inspired by the publications of the *Linguistic Atlas of Chinese Dialects* and our Interpretative Maps. Many of the research presentations given there discussed findings from maps concerning either the above-mentioned *Linguistic Atlas* or other dialects in various areas in China. Who would have imagined such a conference in 1994, when we published a Japanese translation of W. A. Grootaers’ *La Géographie Linguistique en Chine* (translation by Ray Iwata and Masako Hashizume)? The progress made over these years is remarkable.

Following in the footsteps of Xiaodong Huang, who assisted us in the creation of *Volume One*, three young researchers at BLCU, Lining Wang, Jiangang Zhi, Yongsheng Zhang (currently a teacher at Jiangxi Normal University), as well as Yan Liu from Kumamoto Gakuen University (currently a teacher at Shaanxi Normal University), contributed their articles to this volume as a product of their short- or long-term training at Kanazawa University. We are convinced that these talented individuals will lead the future of Chinese dialectology, and it was very exciting for us to be able to have direct ‘dialogues’ with them.

Just like *Volume One*, we relied on many people’s support for the publication of this volume. Professor Robert Sanders and Professor Rujie Shi kindly undertook the lengthy process of translating the texts and proofreading and correcting them. Graduate students at Kanazawa University, Fumi Kuroda, Yichun Chen, and Chiemi Hidaka, made great contributions to manuscript correction and language data input. We would like to express our gratitude to all the people concerned.

July 31, 2011

Ray Iwata