THE FAR SOUTHERN SINITIC LANGUAGES AS PART OF MAINLAND SOUTHEAST ASIA
(DRAFT: for MPI MSEA workshop. 21ˢᵗ November 2012 version.)

Hilário de Sousa
ERC project SINOTYPE — École des hautes études en sciences sociales
hilario@bambooradical.com; hilario.de-sousa@ehess.fr

Within the Mainland Southeast Asian (MSEA) linguistic area (e.g. Matisoff 2003; Bisang 2006; Enfield 2005, 2011), some languages are said to be in the core of the language area, while others are said to be periphery. In the core are Mon-Khmer languages like Vietnamese and Khmer, and Kra-Dai languages like Lao and Thai. The core languages generally have:

– Lexical tonal and/or phonational contrasts (except that most Khmer dialects lost their phonational contrasts; languages which are primarily tonal often have five or more tonemes);
– Analytic morphological profile with many sesquisyllabic or monosyllabic words;
– Strong left-headedness, including prepositions and SVO word order.

The Sino-Tibetan languages, like Burmese and Mandarin, are said to be periphery to the MSEA linguistic area. The periphery languages have fewer traits that are typical to MSEA. For instance, Burmese is SOV and right-headed in general, but it has some left-headed traits like post-nominal adjectives ('stative verbs') and numerals. Mandarin is SVO and has prepositions, but it is otherwise strongly right-headed. These two languages also have fewer lexical tones.

This paper aims at discussing some of the phonological and word order typological traits amongst the Sinitic languages, and comparing them with the MSEA typological canon. While none of the Sinitic languages could be considered to be in the core of the MSEA language area, the Far Southern Sinitic languages, namely Yuè, Pínghuà, the Sinitic dialects of Hǎinán and Léizhōu, and perhaps also Hakka in Guǎngdōng (largely corresponding to Chappell (2012, in press)'s 'Southern Zone') are less 'fringe' than the other Sinitic languages from the point of view of the MSEA linguistic area. Studies on the MSEA linguistic area would benefit from considering the Far Southern Sinitic languages (and perhaps also some neighbouring Sinitic varieties like Southern Mǐn) as part of the MSEA linguistic area.

The rest of the paper is structured as follow. In section 1, we will present a brief overview of the Sinitic languages, primarily on their history and the genealogical relationships within and beyond the Sinitic language family. In section 2, we will discuss the typological features that are canonical of MSEA, and Comrie's (2007, 2008a) discussions on this based on the

data from WALS. In section 3, we will discuss some of the MSEA-like phonological traits in the Sinitic languages. In section 4, we will discuss the variation in word order amongst the Sinitic languages. A conclusion will be presented in Section 5.

1.   The Sinitic languages

The Sinitic languages are the descendents of the historical Chinese language. The periodisation of the Chinese language differs amongst linguists, with historical syntactician often favouring terms like 'Archaic Chinese' and 'Medival Chinese', while historical phonologists often favouring terms like 'Old Chinese' and 'Middle Chinese'.[1] The earliest stage of the Chinese language with written record is Pre-Archaic Chinese, which is represented by the Shāng Dynasty oracle bone script (fourteenth to eleventh century BCE). The earliest phonologically reconstructable form of Chinese is Old Chinese, which was reconstructed with the help of the Book of Odes/ *Shījīng*, the earliest collection of rhyming texts composed between tenth to seventh century BCE (Western Zhōu and early Eastern Zhōu Dynaties). The diversity and time depth of the modern Sinitic language is comparable with that of the Romance languages (e.g. Norman 2003: 82). Around the same time that Vulgar Latin was spread by Roman conquests, Common Chinese was spread by the expansions of the Qín and Hàn Empires (221 BCE – 220 CE). Based on lexical and phonological innovations, Sagart (2011) dates the most recent common ancestor of the modern Sinitic languages to about third or second century BCE,[2] with Wǎxiāng 瓦鄉 being the earliest branch. The Sinitic languages are often called 'Chinese dialects'. The term 'dialect' is a translation of the Chinese term 方言 (Mandarin *fāngyán*), which literally means 'regional speech'. The Chinese term *fāngyán* is semantically wider than the Western notion of 'dialect', and readily includes what in the West would be considered separate languages of the same language family.

The Language Atlas of China (Zhāng et al. in press; Würm & Lǐ et al. 1987) classifies the Sinitic languages into ten main dialect groups, based primarily on phonological criteria. Each dialect group includes a number of dialects that are not mutually intelligible with each other. The ten main dialects groups are (Xióng and Zhāng 2008):
   – Jìn 晉;
   – Mandarin 官話;

---

[1] Historical syntacticians and phonologists of Archaic/Old Chinese deal with morphology in different ways. Historical syntacticians tend to only look at the syntax and morphology of the strings of characters in texts. Historical phonologists of Old Chinese often look into the linguistic properties of the many single-consonant affixes that probably existed in Old Chinese, but are not necessarily indicated in the writing system, e.g. 王 *ɢʷaŋ 'king', 王 *ɢʷaŋ-s 'be king' (Baxter and Sagart n.d.).
[2] More specifically, a time that is later than 330 BCE, the year that Alexander III of Macedon invaded Central Asia, and during or before the earlier stages of the Hàn Dynasty (202 BCE – 220 CE). See Sagart (2011) for details.

- Wú 吳;
- Huī 徽;
- Gàn 贛;
- Xiāng 湘;
- Mín 閩;
- Hakka (or Kèjiā) 客家;
- Yuè 粵; and
- Pínghuà 平話.

There are also other smaller Sinitic varieties which fall outside this ten-group classification:

- The patois (tǔhuà 土話) of Southern Húnán (Xiāngnán Tǔhuà 湘南土話), Northern Guǎngdōng (Yuèběi Tǔhuà 粵北土話) and Eastern Guǎngxī (Guìdōng Tǔhuà 桂東土話);[3]
- The Dānzhōu 儋州 dialect in Northeastern Hǎinán (somewhat Yuè-like, with influence from other Sinitic and non-Sinitic languages in lowland Hǎinán);
- The Wǎxiāng 瓦鄉 dialect in western Húnán (e.g. Wǔ and Shén 2010, Chappell forthcoming);
- The Sinitic first language of Blue Dress Miáo people in Southwestern Húnán and neighbouring Northern Guǎngxī (Qīngyī Miáo Rénhuà 青衣苗人話; Lǐ 2004); and
- The Sinitic first language of the Shē 畲 people (Yóu 2002) (somewhat Hakka-like).

Externally, the Sinitic language family is a member of the larger Sino-Tibetan language family. There are (at least) two sets of languages that are thought to be very close to the Sinitic languages in some ways. Firstly, there are the Bái 白 languages in Yúnnán. Some argue that Proto-Bái is a sister of Old Chinese (e.g. Starostin 1995; Zhèngzhāng 1999; Wāng 2006, 2012), while others argue that Bái is a family of Tibeto-Burman languages that has been heavily influenced by Chinese (e.g. Matisoff 2001b, Lee and Sagart 2008). Also in Southwestern China is the recently discovered Càijiā 蔡家 language (Bó 2004) on the Yúnnán–Guìzhōu border. Zhèngzhāng (2010) argues that Càijiā is a sister of Bái (and hence also genealogically related to Sinitic in his theory). Sagart (2011) considers Càijiā (or at least the Sinitic layer in Càijiā if Càijiā turns out not to be a Sinitic language) a sister of Wǎxiāng. Wǔ and Shěn (2010: 30–42) point out the lexical similarities amongst Wǎxiāng,

---

[3] In the first edition of the Language Atlas of China (Würm & Lǐ et al. 1987), the Northern Guǎngdōng Patois are called Sháozhōu Patois. Nowadays, this term only refers to the patois in Mid-Northern Guǎngdōng near Sháoguān 韶關. The term 'Eastern Guǎngxī Patois' is not actually used in the Language Atlas of China; this term is increasingly popular in referring to the Patois in Eastern Guǎngxī in the Hèzhōu 賀州 area (e.g. Chén and Liú 2009). These patois are considered a type of Northern Pínghuà in the Atlas. However, they are better viewed as a geographical continuation of the neighbouring Patois of Southern Húnán.

Old Chinese, Càijiā and Bái. Currently doing fieldwork on the Càijiā language is Shānshān Lǔ, a doctoral student of Hilary Chappell.

A number of factors contributed towards the distribution and diversity of the Sinitic languages. Firstly, there are the usual political and geographical factors which influence the distribution of languages in general. With the Sinitic language, their boundaries follow the boundaries of the historical prefectures or counties to some degree.[4] For instance, although nowadays the language area of Huī Chinese is split amongst the three modern provinces of Ānhuī, Zhèjiāng, and Jiāngxī, it corresponds largely to the historical prefectures of Huīzhōu 徽州 and Yánzhōu 嚴州. Waterways facilitate the migration of people and linguistic features along them, and mountains between drainage basins impede the migration of people and diffusion of features across them. For instance, Xiāng Chinese is largely confined within the drainage basin of Xiāng 湘 and Zī 資 Rivers (both tributaries of the Yangtze). Terrain is one major factor that caused the diversity of the Sinitic languages to be concentrated in Southern China, rather than Northern China, where the Chinese language originates. Southern China is mountainous, and the linguistic diversity is relatively high. In Northern China there is the North China Plain, where one language, Mandarin, is spoken. In Northern China, there is also the Jìn dialect area which is linguistically very diverse; correlating with this fact is the unevenness of the terrain of that area, which is not part of the North China Plain. Then there is the complicated migration history. In the case of Mandarin, Mandarin expanded outward from the North China Plain area rapidly within the last few centuries. Towards the northeast, the ban on Hàn Chinese people settling in Manchuria began to relax in 1860. Towards the northwest, Northern Xīnjiāng Mandarin formed in about 1780 (Liú 1993:4). Towards the southwest, Mandarin speakers arrived during the Míng Dynasty (1368–1644).

The Sinitic languages are also notable for that the bulk of their speakers have been united under unified single regimes for most of their history. Chinese people in general recognise the hegemony of the Common Chinese language, of which the latest stage is Standard Mandarin. Even when China is not unified, people use varieties of the same Common Chinese language as a lingua franca. The concept of there being a Common Chinese language began as early as the Western Zhou dynasty (11th century BCE – 771 BCE); it is based on the language of the contemporary or preceding political centre of China, which is usually in the North China Plain, neighbouring Wèi River Valley, or Lower Yangtze Region. The diversity amongst the modern Sinitic languages is partially caused by them having preserved linguistic material from various historical stages of Common Chinese. For instance, out of the major branches of Sinitic, only Mín retained a phonological layer from

---

[4] County is one level below prefecture, and prefecture is one level below province. Unlike India, China has an informal policy of not allowing provincial boundaries and linguistic boundaries to coincide.

Old Chinese. Early Middle Chinese, the stage of Common Chinese represented by the language of the rime dictionary *Qièyùn* 切韻 (published in 601 CE during Suí Dynasty), has wiped out all phonological diversity amongst the Sinitic languages other than Mín. The tree model is ill-fitted to the Sinitic languages, as some have preserved multiple layers of phonological material from Common Chinese (see Wáng 2009). Not only with phonology, the Sinitic languages have accumulated various layers of lexicon and grammar from various historical stages of Common Chinese ('stratification' in Chappell 2012). To complicate the matter even further, the non-standard Sinitic languages often create hybrid constructions from native material and material from Common Chinese ('hybridisation' in Chappell 2012). Other than influence from Common Chinese, there has been diffusion amongst the various non-standard Sinitic languages (e.g. the influence of Cantonese on Hakka and Mín in Guǎngdōng Province), making the classification of the Sinitic languages a notoriously difficult job.

The last major factor that contributes to the diversity of the Sinitic languages is the variation in areal influence from neighbouring non-Sinitic languages. This is where MSEA linguistics comes into Sinitic linguistics. Hashimoto (1978) and (1986) are the first major works that discuss the Altaic influence on Northern Chinese, and Tai and Hmong-Mien influence on Southern Chinese. The historical interactions between Chinese people and their northern versus southern neighbours were drastically different. Northern China was dominated by various North Asian and Tibeto-Burman peoples for more than one thousand years, intermittently, during the last two millennia. The most influential dynasties were Mongolic (e.g. the Khitan Liáo Dynasty, 907–1125 CE) or Tungusic (e.g. the Jurchen Jīn Dynasty, 1115–1234 CE). The latest North Asian dynasties, the Mongol Yuán Dynasty (1279–1368 CE) and the Manchu Qīng Dynasty (1644–1912 CE), governed the entirety of China rather than just Northern China. There were also dynasties headed by Turkic people (e.g. the various Shato Turk Dynasties during the Five Dynasty period, 907–979 CE), Qiangic people (e.g. the Tangut Xīxìa Dynasty, 1038–1227 CE), and people of other Northern or Western ethnicities.[5] Northern Chinese was influenced greatly by the North Asian languages, Mongolic and Tungusic languages in particular, due to the North Asian languages being politically powerful, and also that many of the North Asian people shifted into speaking

---

[5] During the Sixteen Kingdoms period (304–439 CE), there were various polities headed by the Dī 氐 people, whose descendents might be the modern Baima Tibetans (but see counter-arguments in Chirkova (2008)), who speak a Bodic language (e.g. Sun 2003). There were also the Jié (<*kiat) 羯 people, the leaders of the Later Zhào state (319–351 CE), who were probably Yeneseian (Pulleyblank 1963: 264; Vovin 2000). There were also kings of other ethnicities. King Gāo Yún 高雲/ Ko Un 고운 (reign 407–409) of Later Yān (384–409) or Northern Yān (407–436) was a descendent of the Goguryeo royal family (≈ Korean) adopted into the Yān royal family. The Táng Dynasty General Ān Lùshān 安祿山, who founded the short-lived Yān 燕 Kingdom (756–763 CE), had a father who was perhaps of Sogdian origin, and a mother who was a Turkic Zoroastrian priestess.

Chinese. For instance, under Altaic influence, in Mandarin and Jìn there are less tones, less classifiers, and many syntactic environments where clauses are verb final (Sinitic languages are normally verb-medial). In northwestern China, under the influence of neighbouring Turkic, Mongolic and Tibetan languages, there are even varieties of Mandarin with post-positional case markers and often SOV, namely the Far-Western Central Mandarin dialects of Línxià 臨夏 (a.k.a. Hézhōu 河州) and Xīníng 西寧 areas (e.g. Dede 2007), and the Tángwàng 唐汪 language (Djamouri forthcoming).[6]

Huàngshuǐ Mandarin (Xīníng area)
1. 狗   肉   哈   吃   了
    dog   meat [OBJ] eat   PFT
    'The dog ate the meat.' (Dede 2007: 867)[7]

The situation with Southern China was the opposite: Chinese people cause disturbance to the Southern non-Sintic people more often than the reverse. Before the arrival of Chinese people, in Southern China there were Kra-Dai, [8] Hmong-Mien, Austronesian and Austroasiatic-speaking people.[9] China first set up administrative bases in the Pearl River region and in the lower Red River regions during Qín Dyasty (221–207 BCE). From then onwards, the vast majority of migration movements for Chinese people had been from Northern China to Southern China. The migration of Chinese people to Southern China intensified whenever Northern China was ravaged by natural disaster or war (Chinese had many wars with North Asians). The southward migration of Chinese people caused the southward migration of the Southern indigenous people deeper into Southeast Asia. Some of the indigenous population of Southern China were absorbed into the migrant Chinese

---

[6] Nearby there is also the mixed language Wǔtún 五屯 (e.g. Janhunen, Peltomaa, Sandman and Dongzhou 2007) of which the vocabulary is over 50% Mandarin, and the grammar is mostly Tibetan. The phonology and lexicon in Wǔtún is not as obviously Sinitic-like as Tángwàng. See Zhōng (2007) on the language contact situation in this area.

[7] Linguistic publications in the Chinese world often have examples with only Chinese characters and no phonological transcription of the characters. In this paper I try to include examples with phonological transcription as much as possible. With no phonological transcriptions, it is not always easy to determine whether a particular Chinese character is used for a morpheme because: a) it is a reflex of the same character in older stages of Chinese; b) it is homophonous with that character but the morphemes etymologically different; or c) they have the same meaning but the morphemes are etymologically different, and they are not even homophonous.

[8] Kra-Dai is an increasing-used term (e.g. Ostapirat 2000, 2005; Pittayaporn 2009) for the language family usually called Tai-Kadai.

[9] Ostapirat (2005) argues for the close relationship between Kra-Dai and Austronesian, and Sagart (2004) argues that Kra-Dai people were Austronesian back-immigrants from Taiwan. That some conservative Kra languages have sesquisyllabic forms matching the disyllabic forms in Austronesian languages is a strong support for the link between Kra-Dai and Austronesian families. Many Kra tribes have legends of their ancestors coming from the east (i.e. from Guǎngdōng and Fújiàn type of direction) and having crossed the sea in big boats (Lǐ 1999: 2). If Sagart's viewpoint is correct, this 'sea' could well be the Taiwan Strait. If not, perhaps this 'sea' refers to a larger crossing like the Mouth of the Pearl River.

population. Genetically, it is known that the patrilineage of many Southern Chinese men is of Northern Chinese origin, while the matrilineage of most Southern Chinese people is of Southeast Asian origin (Wen et al. 2004). There is also a study on the Northern Pínghuà speakers, which concluded that Northern Pínghuà speakers are genetically primarily Southeast Asian on both their patrilineage and matrilineage (Gan et al. 2008). [10] Linguistically, many Southern Sinitic languages are claimed to have Southeast Asian substrata. For instance, Cantonese has an obvious Tai substratum (e.g. Ōuyáng 1989, Bauer 1996). Nearly all Southern Sinitic languages have been argued to have at least some Kra-Dai vocabulary (see Lǐ 2002: 94–149). Roughly corresponding to modern day Wú-speaking area was the Yuè 越 kingdom (? – 222 BCE), which was probably Kra-Dai-speaking, judging by the transliterated lyrics of the sixth century BCE Song of the Yuè (*Yuèréngé* 越人歌; Wěi 1981, Zhengzhang 1991)[11] and words in other sources. Hakka is often said to be a Gàn-like Sinitic language that was influenced by the Hmong-Mien language originally spoken by the Shē 畬 people (e.g. Sagart 2002).[12] Mín is argued by Norman and Mei (1976) to have an Austroasiatic substratum (but this theory is criticised by Sagart (2008)). There are still islands of non-Sinitic languages in Southern China that have not (yet) been totally engulfed by the surrounding Sinitic languages. There are two such languages in Guǎngdōng: the Kam-Sui language of Biāo (Liáng 2002) which is surrounded by Yuè, and the Hmongic language of Ho Ne (Ratliff 1998), which is surrounded by Hakka. Given that many non-Sinitic MSEA people were absorbed into the Chinese community, it is not surprising that the Southern Sinitic languages bear similarities with languages in the core of MSEA.

In the rest of this paper, we shall outline the typological features of the Sinitic languages in reference to the surrounding typological zones, and concentrate on the linguistic features in the Southern Sinitic languages that are typical of MSEA.

2.   The typology of the MSEA linguistic area and the Sinitic languages

The MSEA linguistic area is commonly understood to include the following groups of languages (e.g. Matisoff 2003; Bisang 2006; Enfield 2005, 2011):

–   Mon-Khmer languages (perhaps not including far-flung ones like Khasic(?));

---

[10] Gan et al. (2008) make their claim for Pínghuà people in general. However, all but one of their sampling locations are Northern Pínghuà-speaking.

[11] There are competing theories in Vietnam that the language in *Yuèréngé* (*Việt Nhân Ca* in Vietnamese) is Vietic.

[12] Shē people these days speak Sinitic dialects closely related to Hakka, with layers of Hmong-Mien and Kra-Dai vocabularies, and influences from their current Mín- and/or Wú-speaking neighbours (Yóu 2002). The Ho Ne people in Southern Guǎngdōng, who speak a Hmongic language (Ratliff 1998), are considered by the government to be the last remaining people who still speak the original Hmong-Mien language of the Shē people (Máo and Méng 1986). However, there are doubts that the Ho Ne people are actually Shē, based on the many cultural differences between Ho Ne and Shē Proper. Culturally, Ho Ne resembles Yáo (≈ Mien) in Northern Guǎngdōng the most, and Ho Ne people do in fact consider themselves Yáo, according to Yóu (2002: 8–10).

- Kra-Dai languages;
- Hmong-Mien languages;
- Chamic languages (perhaps not including Achenese);
- Some of the surrounding Sino-Tibetan languages, e.g. Karen, Lolo-Burmese, some nearby Sinitic languages.

The Sino-Tibetan languages and the strongly Chinese-influenced varieties of Kra-Dai and Hmong-Mien languages can be said to be on the periphery of the MSEA linguistic area.

We will start by discussing Comrie (2007, 2008a), which present a measurable framework in comparing the typological profiles of languages (albeit with pitfalls, as admitted in Comrie (2007, 2008a)). Most studies on language areas begin by having preconceptions of what linguistic features are common in a linguistic area, and then the geographical extend of the said features are determined. Comrie (2007) takes a different approach. Instead of having a preconceived list of typological features, all features in the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS; Haspelmath, Dryer, Gil, and Comrie 2005) were examined to see whether there are typological features that distinguish MSEA from other areas. The results of Comrie (2007) are largely congruent with the conclusions in other research on the MSEA linguistic area: there is a 'core' to the MSEA linguistic area with languages like Thai, Khmer, and Vietnamese which possess more canonical MSEA typological features, and a 'periphery', including languages like Indonesian, Burmese, and Mandarin which possess fewer canonically MSEA features. Comrie (2008a) follows similar methods, but concentrates on the Sinitic languages. The Sinitic languages are compared with both MSEA and North Asia in Comrie (2008a). There are twenty features that are said to be canonical of MSEA, and another set of twenty features that are said to be canonical of North Asia. Mandarin achieves a score of 8 out of 20 for MSEA features (the lowest scored language out of the surveyed languages),[13] and 11 out of 20 for North Asian features (the lowest scored language out of the surveyed languages, together with Nivkh). The conclusion is that Chinese is typologically between MSEA and North Asia.[14] The following are the twenty features that are said to be canonical in the MSEA linguistic area (Comrie 2008a):

- Having implosives;
- Velar nasal used as onsets;

---

[13] Comrie (2007) has an extra MSEA feature that is not featured in Comrie (2008a): feature 45A 'Politeness Distinctions in Pronouns'.

[14] Of cause one could also say that the MSEA and North Asian languages are typologically half-like the Sinitic languages. However, I suppose MSEA and North Asia serve as good typological standards of comparison as their word order typological profiles are more normal: the MSEA languages are rather consistently left-headed, while the North Asian languages are very strongly right-headed. The Sinitic languages have typologically unusual profiles of being SVO but otherwise strongly right-headed, as discussed in the rest of this paper.

- No front rounded vowels;
- Complex tone systems;
- Little affixation;
- Having plural words;
- No distributive numerals;
- Obligatory use of numeral classifiers;
- The perfect marker is synchronically a word meaning 'finish';

A number of left-headed traits:
  - o Verb – Object order;
  - o Preposition – NP order;
  - o Noun – Genitive order;
  - o Noun – Adjective order;
  - o Noun – Demonstrative order;
  - o Noun – Numeral order;
  - o Noun – Relative clause order;
  - o Adjective – Degree word order;
- 'Topic' predicative possession construction ("possessor-TOPIC exist possessum);
- Verbal encoding for predicative adjectives; and
- Different markings for nominal and locative predication.

For this section, I have repeated the exercise using the twenty MSEA features in Comrie (2008a), with data from the newer 2011 online edition of WALS (Dryer and Haspelmath 2011), and added the following languages: Cantonese, Hakka, Eastern Kayah Li, Hmong Njua, and Mien. Since this paper focuses on the Sinitic languages, it would preferable to include more data from the Sinitic languages. However, since there is a general lack of data from the Sinitic languages in WALS (and in Western Linguistics in general), only two non-Mandarin Sinitic languages with a reasonable amount of data in WALS — Cantonese and Hakka — are included in this exercise. Eastern Kayah Li is chosen as a representative of the Karen languages; the Karen languages are interesting from a Sinitic point of view as both Sinitic and Karen families are SVO with mixed left-headed and right-headed typological profiles. Gaps in the WALS data are filled with the help of Matthews and Yip (2011) for Cantonese, Lo (1988) for Hakka, Solnit (1997) for Eastern Kayah Li, Wáng (1985) for Hmong, and Máo, Méng, and Zhèng (1982) for Mien. Based on the set of criteria used in Comrie (2007, 2008a), Cantonese, Hakka, and Mien, which score 9, 10, and 11 respectively, are comparable to Burmese (which scores 10) in terms of the distance between their typological profile and the MSEA typological canon. Eastern Kayah Li and Hmong scores 14 and 13 respectively, which are closer to the score of 16 achieved by Khmer in the core of MSEA. (Amongst the Hmong-Mien languages, the Hmongic languages are in general less

influenced by Chinese, and are hence typologically more like the core MSEA languages than the Mienic languages (e.g. Ratliff 2010: 239–240).)

Map	Feature	Thai	Khmer	Vietnamese	Indonesian	(EKayahLi)	Burmese	(Hmong Nj)	(Mien)	(Cantonese)	(Hakka)	Mandarin
7A	Cˀ	No	**Implosives**	**Implosives**	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
9A	ŋ	**Initial**	No initial	**Initial**	**Initial**	**Initial**	**Initial**	No initial	**(Initial)**	**Initial**	**(Initial)**	No initial
11A	y ø œ	**None**	**None**	**None**	**None**	**None**	**None**	**None**	**None**	/y œ/	**None**	/y/
13A	Tone	**Complex**	No	**Complex**	No	**Complex**	**Complex**	**Complex**	**Complex**	**Complex**	**Complex**	**Complex**
26A	-fix in inflc. morph.	**Little af-**	**Little af-**	**Little af-**	Strong suf-	**Little af-**	Strong suf-	**Little af-**	**Little af-**	**Little af-**	**(Little af-)**	Strong suf-
33A	Noml Pl.	?	**Pl. word**	**Pl. word**	Plural redup	No plural	**Pl. word**	(No plural)	No plural	No plural	(No plural)	Plural suf-
54A	Distrib. Num	**No**	?	**No**	**No**	?	suffix	?	?	**No**	**No**	**No**
55A	Num. Clf	**Obligatory**	Optional	**Obligatory**	Optional	**Obligatory**	**Obligatory**	**(Obligatory)**	**(Obligatory)**	**Obligatory**	**(Obligatory)**	**Obligatory**
68A	Perfect	'Finish'	'Finish'	Other	'Finish'	('Finish')	'Finish'	No perfect	(Other)	Other	(Other)	Other
83A	Obj & Verb	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**	OV	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**	**VO**
85A	Adpos & NP	**Prepos.**	**Prepos.**	**Prepos.**	**Prepos.**	No dom. order	Postpos.	**Prepos.**	No Adpos.	No dom. order	(No dom. order)	No dom. order
86A	Gen & N	**N-Gen**	**N-Gen**	**N-Gen**	**N-Gen**	Gen-N	Gen-N	Gen-N	Gen-N	Gen-N	(Gen-N)	Gen-N
87A	Adj & N	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	**N-Adj**	Adj-N	(Adj-N)	Adj-N
88A	Dem & N	**N-Dem**	**N-Dem**	**N-Dem**	**N-Dem**	**N-Dem**	Dem-N	**N-Dem**	Dem-N	Dem-N	Dem-N	Dem-N
89A	Num & N	**N-Num**	**N-Num**	Num-N	Num-N	**N-Num**	**N-Num**	Num-N	Num-N	Num-N	Num-N	Num-N
90A	Rel & N	**N-Rel**	**N-Rel**	**N-Rel**	**N-Rel**	(Rel-N)[15]	Rel-N	**N-Rel**	(Rel-N)	Rel-N	Rel-N	Rel-N
91A	Deg & Adj	**Adj-Deg**	**Adj-Deg**	(Deg-Adj)	Dem-Adj	**(Adj-Deg)**	Deg-Adj	**Adj-Deg**	**Adj-Deg**	Deg-Adj	No dom. order	Deg-Adj
117A	Predicative Possession	**Topic**	**Topic**	**Topic**	**Topic**	**(Topic)**	Locational	**(Topic)**	**(Topic)**	**(Topic)**	**(Topic)**	**Topic**
118A	Predicative Adjectives	**Verbal**	**Verbal**	**Verbal**	**Verbal**	**(Verbal)**	**Verbal**	**(Verbal)**	**Verbal**	**(Verbal)**	**(Verbal)**	**Verbal**
119A	Noml and Loc Pred.	**Different**	**Different**	**Different**	**Different**	**(Different)**	**Different**	**(Different)**	**Different**	**(Different)**	**(Different)**	**Different**
	Total +:	18	16	17	13	(14)	10	(13)	(11)	(9)	(10)	7

Table 1   Some typological features in Sinitic and MSEA languages (based on Comrie 2008a; added information are put in parentheses)

---

[15] Eastern Kayah Li is coded in WALS as N–Rel. This is problematic. Eastern Kayah Li has two constructions that resemble externally headed relative clauses. The one referred to in WALS, called 'postposed attributive clause' (Solnit 1997: 253–258), is more like participial construction: the number of arguments that this participial can take is very restricted. What is structurally more like a relative clause is the 'preposed attributive clause' (Solnit 1997: 249–252), which is a clause with much less restrictions. However, the unusual trait of this preposed attributive construction in Eastern Kayah Li is that the head must be a classifier (and the coreferential noun can occur within the relative clause).

In the rest of this paper, we shall discuss further some of the phonological and word order issues discussed in Comrie (2007, 2008a) and some other related issues. I shall take this opportunity to introduce Chappell (2012, in press)'s division of the Sinitic languages into four macro-areas (Chappell 2012: 5–6), with my own alterations (due to differences in linguistic criteria used) and simplifications.[16]

– Northern zone:

Běijīng Mandarin, Northern (Jìlǔ) Mandarin, Peninsular (Jiāoliáo) Mandarin, Northeastern Mandarin, Northwestern (Lányín) Mandarin, Central (Zhōngyuán) Mandarin (?), and Jìn.

– Transitional zone:

Central (Zhōngyuán) Mandarin (?), Southeastern (Jiānghuái) Mandarin, Southwestern Mandarin, Xiāng, Wǎxiāng, Gàn, and Western Mín.

– Southeastern zone:

Mín, Wú, Huī.

– Far-Southern zone (≈ Chappell's "Southern Area"):

Yuè, Pínghuà, Hakka, and the Mín exclaves in Léizhōu Peninsula and Hǎinán.

Amongst the four zones, the one with most verb-medial traits is unsurprisingly the Far-Southern zone, as many of these languages still have strong interactions with Kra-Dai languages. Expectedly, the Northern zone has a number of verb-final traits, being in contact with the North Asian languages. However, putting the aforementioned Far-Western Central

---

[16] Some of the differences between the four typological zones in this paper and Chappell (2012)'s four macro-areas are:

– the term 'Far-Southern zone' is used here instead of Chappell's 'Southern area'; 'Southern Sinitic' has a number of different meanings, including the non-Northern Sinitic languages, or the Southern non-Mandarin Sinitic languages;

– Northern Wú and Huī are included in the same Southeastern zone as Mín and Southern Wú. Northern Wú and Huī are more strongly influenced by Mandarin, and are hence sometimes treated differently from Southern Wú;

– the Mín exclaves in Léizhōu Peninsula and Hǎinán, which are spoken to the south of Yuè, are grouped together with Yuè in the Far-Southern zone. The Mín dialect of Hǎinán (a.k.a. Hainanese) is strongly influenced by the Kra-Dai language Ong-Be (i.e. the lowland indigenous language of Hǎinán), and the Mín dialect of Léizhōu Peninsula is closely related to that of Hǎinán. Yuè and Pínghuà have also been strongly influenced by Kra-Dai languages;

– Western Mín is a Mín dialect that is strongly influenced by Gàn, and is here included in the same Transition zone as Gàn, rather than being in the Southeastern Zone together with other Mín dialects.

Chappell (2012)'s division of the Sinitic languages into four macro-areas is a refinement on Norman (1988: §8.1)'s division of the Sinitic languages into the typological zones of North (Mandarin), South (Yuè, Hakka, Mín), and Central (Xiāng, Gàn, and Wú). The four macro-areas in Chappell (2012) were based on the distribution of the various grammaticalisation pathways of the passive and object marking constructions. However, it is noted that (2012: 6) the boundaries amongst the four macro-areas are approximate, and the boundaries would change slightly depending on the typological criteria used. The boundaries between the four typological zones proposed in this paper are approximate, due to the paucity of data. The membership within each zone is sometime speculative, again due to the paucity of data.

Mandarin dialects aside, the zone with the most verb-final traits is, surprisingly, the Southeastern zone.

In the rest of this paper, unless specified, data from Sinitic languages are provided by the seven members of the ERC Sinotype project, based on their fieldnotes, their first-language knowledge, or their heritage-language knowledge. The following are the list of the team members and the data they contributed.

- Hilary Chappell: Gŭzhāng Wǎxiāng (fieldnotes);
- Wěiróng Chén: Huìān Southern Mín (first language and field notes);
- Yùjié Chén: Zhōukǒu Central Mandarin (first language and field notes);
- Xūpíng Lǐ: Yichūn Gàn (fieldnotes);
  Fùyáng Wú (first language);
- Sing Sing Ngai: Shàowǔ Western Mín (fieldnotes);
  Fúqīng Eastern Mín (heritage language);
  Standard Cantonese (first language);
- Hilário de Sousa: Nánníng Southern Pínghuà (fieldnotes),
  Standard Cantonese (first language);
- Jiàn Wáng: Jīxī Huī (fieldnotes);
  Suīníng Central Mandarin (first language).

3.   Phonology

In this section, we will discuss the following phonological phenomina in the Sinitic languages and the MSEA languages to the south:

- Tones and onsets;
- Codas;
- Implosives; and
- Front rounded vowels.

Some maps from the "Phonetics" volume of the Linguistic Atlas of Chinese Dialects (LACD; Cáo et al. 2008) will be shown. Notation like "Map P117" refers to Map 117 in the Phonetics ("P") volume of LACD.

3.1   Tones and onsets

Most MSEA languages have phonemic use pitch and/or phonational differences, which are two closely related suprasegmental features. In this paper, 'tone' refers to systems where at least pitch contrasts have been phonemicised. Many of these systems also include phonational contrasts. (Languages where only phonational contrasts, but not pitch contrasts, have been phonemicised are not considered to be 'tonal'.)

Many languages in East and MSEA are tonal. Many language families in this area had a stage where there were three tones for sonorant-ending syllables, and no tonal contrasts (or 'one tone') for obstruent-ending syllables. This set of tonal contrasts is notated here as "3 + 1" tones. The earlier languages with 3 + 1 tones include:

– Proto Kra-Dai;
– Proto Hmong-Mien;
– Middle Chinese;
– Proto Mín;
– Proto Việt-Mường;
– Proto Bái;
– Proto Lolo-Burmese; and
– Proto Karen.

The development of the three tones for sonorant-ending syllables is clear in some cases: one tone is related to an earlier *-h (< *-s), another to an earlier *-ʔ, while the third is related to the lack of an obstruent at the end of a syllable. Haudricourt made this observation when comparing the tones in Vietnamese with other Mon-Khmer languages (Haudricourt 1954). The Sino-Tibetan languages have Written Tibetan as a reference. (Classical Tibetan was most probably non-tonal; there are still Tibetan dialects in the periphery which are non-tonal.) Written Burmese in fact still often marks the high tone with ◌ः, which is related to the Indic sign *visarga* ः (-h), suggesting the high tone came from an earlier *-h. There is also the case of Utsat, which, when compared with the other Chamic languages, developed tones in similar ways: basically a high tone developed out of *-h, mid and low tones developed out of syllables with no obstruent ending, and rising and falling tones developed out of the plosive codas including *-ʔ (Thurgood 1993).

Most of these languages have moved beyond this 3 + 1 tone system. What usually happens is that the voicing contrast of the onset causes the tones to develop a (pitch-wise) higher allotone and a lower allotone. When the contrast between modal voiced and modal voiceless obstruent onsets is lost, the two sets of allotones become separate phonemes. Theoratically a language with 3 + 1 tones would thus end up with 6 + 2 tones. However, most languages have other splits and mergers between these tones. For instance, Northern Vietnamese has 6 + 2 tones, Standard Lao has 5 + 4, while Central Thai has 5 + 3 tones. Amongst the Sinitic languages, the Far-Southern languages, being closest to the core of MSEA, have the most tones. The Southeastern languages have a bit fewer tones (a tangent fact is that this is the zone with the most rampant tone sandhi), the Central languages have even fewer tones, and the Northern languages, being closest to North Asia, have the least tones. Prototypically:

– Yuè and Southern Pínghuà dialects have 6 + 3 tones;
– Mín and Wú dialects have 6 + 2 or 5 + 2 tones;

14

- (The number of tones in Gàn dialects varies hugely);
- Hakka dialects have 4 + 2 tones;
- Xiāng dialects have 5 + 1 tones;
- Southeastern Mandarin dialects have 5 + 1 or 4 + 1 tones;
- Jìn dialects have 4 + 1 tones;
- Other Mandarin dialects have 4 + 0 or 3 + 0 tones.

LACD Map P001 shows the number of tones amongst the Sinitic languages. The languages with the highest number of tones are clearly in Far-Southern China, the area closest to the core of MSEA. Mandarin has the least number of tones, especially Northwestern Mandarin. (Notice that in Chinese linguistics, tones in sonorant-ending syllables and obstruent-ending syllables are counted separately. Other allotones are also counted separately.)

LACD Map P001

One trait that the hallmark of Kra-Dai-ness in Yuè and most Southern Pínghuà dialects is the split of tone D (the tone for obstruent-ending syllables) based on vowel length.[17] This split in tone D is near universal amongst Kra-Dai languages, universal in Yuè-dialects, and common in Southern Pínghuà dialects. The only other non-Kra-Dai language that I know of with this trait is Kim Mun (Mienic) in Hǎinán (Lǐ 2003: 694–697), which perhaps is an influence from Hlai.

The losing of voicing contrast (for plosives) has also occured in the many Mon-Khmer languages, which are mostly non-tonal. For instance, in Mon, the old voicing contrast of the onsets is now expressed by a phonational contrast of modal versus breathy. The phonational contrast caused a changed the vowel qualities (e.g. Jenny ___). In Khmer, not only has the onset voicing contrast been lost, the phonational contrast has also been lost in most dialects. This phonemicised the vowel quality contrasts (e.g. Wayland and Jongman 2002).[18]

---

[17] Southern Pínghuà dialects in Nánníng and to the west split the tone D not by vowel length, but by the sonority of the initial consonant in Middle Chinese, e.g. Nánníng Wèizǐlù Pínghuà /wət²³/ 域 'region' (< *wik), /wət²/ 活 'live' (< *ɣwat). See de Sousa (forthcoming).

[18] There are also some tonal languages which have split vowel qualities based on tones, presuambly through an intermediary stage with phonational difference which has since been lost:
- Mang (Máshān 麻山 Miáo, Western Hmongic; tones B2 and C2 versus others) (Wáng 1985: 107; Ratliff 2010: 196);
- About half of the Eastern Mín dialects, e.g. Fúzhōu, Fúqīng (tones C2, C1 and D1 versus others; D1 has lower pitch than D2).

The commonality is that tone C developed out of -h, which 'encourages' breathiness phonation, and tone 2, which correlates with voiced onset and lower pitch, which also 'encourages' breathiness phonation.

It is interesting to note that there are languages in MSEA where the voicing-related tone-splitting has not happened:

– Burmish languages like Burmese, Achang and Xiāndǎo;
– Nusu (Loloish);[19]
– A-Hmyo dialects (Luóbóhé 羅泊河 Miáo, at, e.g. Fúquán 福泉; Western Hmongic; tone D has partially or totally merged to tone A) (Ratliff 2010: 185; Lǐ 2003: 686–688).

There are also languages where tone-splitting has occurred, but the tone-splitting has not been phonemicised, as the original contrast between modal voice and modal voiceless onsets is still largely intact. (The original modal voiced onsets may have changed into something else like breathy voiced, but they are still distinct from the modal voiceless onsets.) These languages include:

– Wú dialects, including some neighbouring Wú-influenced Mín varieties as in:
   o Eastern Min in Cāngnán, Zhèjiāng;
   o Southern Mín in Guǎngfēng, Jiāngxī;
   o Northern Mín in Pǔchēng, Fújiàn (Zhèngzhāng 1995);[20]
– Southern Xiāng dialects ('Old Xiāng');
– Wǎxiāng and some nearby Mandarin dialects;
– A few Northern Gàn dialects, e.g. Wǔníng (Zhū et al. 2009);
– A few Northern Yuè dialects, e.g. Liánshān, Yángshān (Zhèngzhāng 1995);
– A-Hmao dialects ("Northeastern Yunnan" Miao, at, e.g. Shíménkǎn 石門坎 in Wēiníng 威寧; Western Hmongic; developed noun versus non-noun contrasts with tones B2 and C2/D2) (Ratliff 2010: 185; Lǐ 2003: 708).

The phonemicising of (further) suprasegmental features based on the lost of the original contrast between modal voiced and modal voiceless onsets seems to be the norm in MSEA. This is summarised in table 2 in §3.2.

3.2   Consonantal codas

Many proto languages in East and MSEA are reconstructed with at least six consonantal (i.e. non-glide) codas. For example:

– Pre-Angkorian Khmer (Jacob 1993): *-p -t -c -k -m -n -ñ -ṅ -r -l -v -s -h*;
– Proto Hmong–Mien (Ratliff 2010): *-p -t -k -m -n -ŋ*;
– Proto Tai (Pittayaporn 2009):   *-p -t -c -k -m -n (-ɲ) -ŋ -l*; and

---

[19] Other Burmish languages have shown signs of tone-splitting: Zaiwa/Atsi, Maru/Langsu and Lashi. As for Loloish languages, most have departed from the ancestral 3+1 tone system (e.g. Lǐ 2010: 56).
[20] One important feature that distinguishes Wú and Huī is that Huī dialects have phonemicised the splitting of tones.

– Middle Chinese (Baxter 1992):   *-p -t -k -ʷk -m -n -ŋ -ʷŋ.*

In some languages there is a dramatic loss of coda distinctions. For instance, while Mien has preserved *-p -t -k -m -n -ŋ* (Máo, Méng and Zhèng 1982: 16), Hmong has lost all the plosive codas, and all nasal codas have collapsed into one *-ŋ* or vowel nasalisation (Wáng 1985: 18). Most Kra-Dai, Mienic and Mon-Khmer languages have at least three plosive codas and three nasal codas. In the table 2 below I divide the sampled languages based on two criteria: a) having more than one contrastive plosive coda; and b) having more than one contrastive nasal coda.[21] It is the norm in MSEA to have at least two plosive codas and two nasal codas (usually more). With the Sinitic languages, LACD Map P121 shows the distribution of *-m -n -ŋ*, and LACD Map P124 shows the distribution of *-p -t -k -ʔ -l* in the Sinitic languages.

LACD Map P121

LACD Map P124

Having two or more plosive codas are largely confined to the following Sinitic languages in or near Far-Southern China, which is closest to the core of MSEA:
– Southern Mín (including Mín in Hǎinán and Léizhōu Peninsula);
– Yuè;
– Southern Pínghuà;
– Hakka in Guǎndōng;
– Some Gàn dialects.

The same sets of Sinitic languages satisfy the criterion of having *-m* and one other nasal codas. Many Mandarin dialects have *-n -ŋ* or just one of these.

The following is a summary of the typological features discussed in §3.1 and §3.2.

	Thai	Khmer	Vietnamese	E Kayah Li	Burmese	Hmong Njua	Mien	Cantonese	Nánníng Pínghuà	Huì'ān S Mín	Fúqīng E Mín	Shàowǔ W Mín	Yíchūn Gàn	Fùyáng Wú	Jìxī Huī	Gǔzhàng Wǎxiāng	Suīníng C Mandarin
Having "Complex tones" (WALS)																	
	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
*P̬ → P̥, phonemicised ᵀ or ⸜																	

---

[21] The syllabic nasals that exist in many Southern Sinitic languages are not included in the criterion of having more than one nasal coda.

+	(+)	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	+

1 < contrastive plosive coda

+	+	+	−	−	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−

1 < constrasive nasal coda/ Ṽ

+	+	+	−	−	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	+

Table 2   Some onset, coda and suprasegmental features in Sinitic and MSEA languages

((+): Most Khmer dialects have lost the original phonation contrast.)

3.3   Implosives

Many MSEA languages have the implosive consonants *ɓ* and *ɗ* (but no *ɠ*, as voicing is more difficult to maintain when the distance between the glottis and the oral closure is short). Examples include Khmer, Vietnamese, Lao, and Thai. Some other MSEA languages are said to have *b* and *d* which are not implosives (e.g. Eastern Kayah Li; Solnit 1997). As for the Sinitic languages, neither Middle Chinese nor Old Chinese were reconstructed with implosive consonants. However, some modern Sinitic languages have implosives. LACD Map P044 shows the ditribution of implosive onsets in the Sinitic languages.

LACD Map P044

Acccording this map, implosives are found in:

- Mín in Hǎinán and Léizhōu Peninsula;
- Dānzhōu dialect (the Yuè-like language in Northeastern Hǎinán);
- Some of the Gōulòu Yuè dialects near the Guǎngxī–Guǎngdōng border;
- Some Southern Wú dialects; and
- Some Northern Wú dialects around Shànghǎi.

The most famous example is Hainanese, which is in general very strongly influenced by Ong Be, the lowland Kra-Dai language in northern Hǎinán. Across the Hainan straight, there are some of the Gōulòu Yuè dialects which have implosive *ɓ* and *ɗ*. (However, in some localities they are becoming *p t*.) Further away to the northeast, there are implosives in some of the Wú dialects.

Their origins differ. In Hǎinán and Léizhōu Mín, *ɓ* and *ɗ* developed out of *p and *t after *b and *d lost their voicing and merged into *p and *t (Southern Mín speakers settled in Hǎinán and Léizhōu relatively late), whereas in the other Sinitic languages (including the Yuè-like Dānzhōu dialect in Hǎinán) *ɓ* and *ɗ* developed out of *p and *t when *b and *d

was still distinct. Around Shanghai, a new ɡ' has developed out of *g (unlike ɓ and ɗ which developed out of *p and *t).

There are also some other Southern Sinitic dialects where the Middle Chinese onsets *b and *d underwent sound changes different from *g and other voiced obstruents. For instance, in many patois of Southern Húnán and Northern Guǎngdōng, *b *d became voiceless unaspirated, whereas other voiced obstruents became voiceless aspirated (see Qín 2007: 185 for a full list of localities where this happened). This suggests that the Middle Chinese *b and *d onsets, perhaps under the influence of MSEA languages, were pronounced as implosives in these Sinitic dialects, whereas the other voiced obstruents were pronounced as non-glotallic.

See Zhū (e.g. 2006b, et al. 2009) on imposives in Sinitic languages, including some newly developed implosives in Northern Gàn dialects and Cháoshàn Mín dialects (e.g. Shàntóu/ Swatow). The existence or non-existence of ɓ ɗ ~ b d is summarised in table 3 in §3.4.

3.4   Front rounded vowels and back unrounded vowels
A common trait in MSEA is the lack of front rounded vowels. This is also generally the case with the following Southern Sinitic languages:
   – Southern Mín, including Mín of Hǎinán and Léizhōu Peninsula;
   – most Hakka dialects and some neighbouring Southern Gàn dialects;
   – most Yuè dialects not in the Pearl River Drainage Basin;
   – Most Southern Pínghuà dialects;
   – Some Southern Mandarin dialects, especially in Yúnnán and Guìzhōu.
Map P117 in LACD is a map on the distribution of /y/ in Sinitic dialects.

<mark>LACD Map P117</mark>

A more useful diagnostic feature of the core of MSEA is perhaps having non-low back unrounded vowels (including [ɨ] that is non contrastive with [ɯ]). Unrounded non-low back vowels are also found in some Sinitic languages.

The following table is a summary of §3.3 and §3.4.

	Thai	Khmer	Vietnamese	E Kayah Li	Burmese	Hmong Njua	Mien	Cantonese	Nánníng Pínghuà	Huì'ān S Mǐn	Fúqīng E Mǐn	Shàowǔ W Mǐn	Yíchūn Gàn	Fùyáng Wú	Jìxī Huī	Gǔzhàng Wǎxiāng	Suìníng C Mandarin
ɓ ɗ ~ b d (but no ʄ ~ g)																	
	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Rounded front vowels																	
	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	+	−	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Unrounded non-low back vowels																	
	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	+	−	−	−	+	+	+	+

Table 3   Some onset and vowel features in Sinitic and MSEA languages

4.   Word order

The core MSEA languages are SVO, and they are more strongly left-headed than the usual SVO language (see, e.g. Dryer 2001 on Mon-Khmer word order). The Sinitic languages are also basically SVO. However, the Sinitic languages are otherwise strongly right headed: noun phrases are strongly right headed, and most adjuncts are placed before the verb. Contrast the word order in the following sentences from Northern Zhuang (Tai) and Cantonese (Sinitic).

Northern Zhuang

SVO order

2.   *de   gai   byaek   youhcaiq   gai   noh*
      3SG   sell   vegetable   as:well   sell   meat
      'S/he sells vegetable and sells meat.' (Wéi and Qín 2006: 198)

Head noun left of most modifiers

3.   *go oij   [duz vaiz   gou caij   laemx henz roen]   haenx raek   lo*
      CL sugar_cane   CL buffalo 1SG step fall   side road   that   break   FP
      'The sugar cane that my buffalo trempled on the side of the road snapped.'
      (Wéi and Qín 2006: 251)

Standard Cantonese

SVO order

4.   佢   賣   菜   又   賣   肉
      kʰɵy¹³   maɪ²²   tʃʰɔi³³   jɐu²²   maɪ²²   jʊk²

3SG   sell   vegetable as:well sell   meat

'S/he sells vegetable and sells meat.'

Head noun right of modifiers

5.   我   隻   牛   喺   路   邊   踩   冧   嗰   碌 <u>蔗</u>   斷咗

$[ŋɔ^{13}$ $tsɛk^3$ $ŋɐu^{11}$ $hɐi^{25}$ lou^{22} pin^{55} ts^hai^{25} $lɐm^{33}]$ $kɔ^{25}$ $lʊk^5$ <u>$tsɛ^{33}$</u> t^hyn^{24}-$tsɔ^{25}$

1SG CL bovine at   road side step fall DEM CL cane break-PFV

'The sugar cane that my buffalo trempled on the side of the road broke.'

This created some extraordinarily rare co-occurrence of word order in the Sinitic language. For instance, the co-occurrence of the VO order and the Relative clause–Noun order is nearly unique to the Sinitic languages (WALS feature 96A).[22] The Sinitic languages are the only VO languages with obliques predominantly placed in front of verb in WALS (feature 84A).[23] Having the Adjective–Noun word order (feature 81A) for SVO languages (feature 87A) is also very rare in the region.[24]

Looking at the word order typological profiles of the languages in the vicinity of the Sinitic languages provides hints as to why the Sinitic languages developed such an unusual mixed of VO order and strong right-headed traits. The Sinitic languages had the most interactions with the following three neighbouring word order areas:

Area A.

The verb-medial MSEA zone to the south. The prototypical MSEA languages are SVO and more left-headed than the average SVO languages. Included in this zone are the Hmong-Mien, Kra-Dai, Mon-Khmer and Chamic languages;

---

[22] Of the 879 languages sampled in WALS feature 96A, five have the co-occurrence of VO and Rel–N. Cantonese, Hakka and Mandarin are Sinitic. Bai is strongly influenced by Sinitic languages. Amis is also geographically close-by, but this co-occurrence in Amis is probably independent of Chinese (Comrie 2008b). As quoted in Comrie (2008b: 729–730), having Rel–N order in SVO languages might aid processing when the object is relativised, as having a SV relative clause in front of the relativised object head resembles the normal SVO word order (Yip and Matthews 2007). There are indeed cases like Pwo Karen where relativised objects can have a prenominal relative clause, and relativised subjects must have a postnominal relative clause (Kato 2003: 641), resembling normal SVO word order in both cases.

[23] Of the 500 languages sampled in WALS feature 84A, only the three Sinitic languages sampled have the word order of XVO.

[24] Based on WALS feature 81A (SVO) and 87A (Adjective–Noun), there are 347 SVO languages with the Noun–Adjective order, and 66 SVO languages (including the Sinitic and Bai) with Adjective–Noun word order. This latter co-existence is mostly concentrated in Europe (20 languages) and Central Africa (15 languages). In Asia, including Western Austronesia, there are only two languages other than Sinitic and Bái which are marked as SVO and Adjective–Noun in WALS: Kashmiri and Palauan. However, the status of both being SVO is questionable. Kashmiri is verb-second (e.g. Wali and Koul 1996, Koul and Wali 2006). With Palauan, the slot in front of the verb can only be occupied by a subject agreement marker; subject nominals are placed after the object (i.e., VOS; Georgopoulos 1986). This leaves the Sinitic languages and Bai as being the only SVO and Adjective–Noun languages in Asia.

Utsat (Chamic; strongly Chinese influenced)

6. *ʔa¹¹thai¹¹ se¹¹ phai³³siaŋ¹¹ ho¹¹lien¹¹ ʔa¹¹kai³³ sa³³ ta¹¹ se⁵⁵,*
    l.sister CL very feel:sorry old.man MOD one CL
    kian³³ ʔa¹¹kai³³ ni³³ sa³³ ta¹¹ se⁵⁵ ten³² pa³³,
    know old.man this MOD one CL stomach hungry
    'The little sister was very sorry for the old man, and knew that the old man was hungry,' (Zhèng 1997: 238)
    (*phai³³siaŋ¹¹ ho¹¹lien¹¹* are Chinese loanwords in Chinese word order: 非常可憐.)

Green Hmong (Hmong-Mien)

7. *kuv nyam tug txivneej kws ncaws pob*
    1SG like CL man REL kick ball
    hab tug txivneej kws moog rua Fresno
    and CL man REL go to Fresno
    'I like the man who plays soccer and the man who went to Fresno.' (Li 1989: 120)

Area B (and Area A~B).

The verb final Tibeto-Burman zone to the west. These languages are SOV, primarily right-headed but not very strongly right-headed (e.g. Tibetan and Burmese are SOV and have N–Num and N–Adj word order). The Tibeto-Burman languages are verb final, except for the following SVO languages, which, like the Sinitic languages, exhibit interesting mix of VO and OV properties ("Area A~B"): the Karen languages, Bái languages, and Mru (Peterson 2005);[25]

Burmese

8. *thu di hsei: thau' me*
    3 this medicine drink IRR
    'He's going to take this medicine.' (Myint Soe 1999: 132)

9. *thu. le' nyi'=pa' ne. nga. ḳou la tou. te*
    3GEN hand dirty with 1 OBJ come touch RLS
    '(He) touched me with his dirty hands.' (Myint Soe 1999: 256)

---

[25] Tibeto-Burman languages that have SVO word order are often assumed to have acquired SVO word order under the influence of neighbouring SVO languages. Mru is an interesting case because it is totally surrounded by verb-final languages (Chittagonian, Rakhine, and Kuki-Chin languages). It is also spoken very far away from verb-medial languages like the Khasic or Palaungic languages, and there seems to be no Mon-Khmer lexical borrowings in Mru (Löffler 1966). See more discussions in Djamouri, Paul and Whitman (2007).

Eastern Kayah Li (Karenic)

10. *phremɔ̀ méthʌ phrekhū sí nʌ̄*
    woman look:see man   CL two
    'Some women saw two men.' (Solnit 1997: 181)

11. *ʔa khē̄ təlwá sɔklʌ̄ né sɔkhō̄*
    3 paddle pass boat PREP snag
    'He paddled the boat past the snag (fallen log).' (Solnit 1997: 159)

Area C.
The verb final North Asia zone to the north. These languages are SOV and strongly right-headed. In and near China are the following families of SOV languages: Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic, Korean and Japanese-Ryūkyūan.[26]

Uyghur (Turkic)

12. *sɛn bu kino-ni kør*
    2SG this film-ACC see[IMP]
    'You watch this film!' (Abulimit 2006: 239)

13. *top ojna-watqan bala bizniŋ sinip-ta oqu-jdu*
    ball play-CONT boy 1PL:GEN class-LOC study-3.NPAST
    'The boy who is playing with a ball studies in our class.' (Abulimit 2006: 324)

The SVO word order in the Sinitic languages resembles that of the verb-medial MSEA zone to the south, while the strong right-headedness in the Sinitic languages resembles that of the verb-final North Asian zone to the north. In fact, the strong right-headedness of the Sinitic languages makes them typologically more similar to the North Asian languages than their relatives — the Tibeto-Burman languages — to the west.

We shall discuss the syntax at the noun phrase level first, and then at the clause level.

4.1   *Word order in noun phrases*

In or close to the core of MSEA, most modifiers follow the head noun (e.g. Simpson 2005).

---

[26] There are also the following typological zones in and around China that the Sinitic languages had less contact with: a) the Formosan–Philippines languages, which are mostly verb initial; b) the languages of the Indic area, which are verb final and strongly-right headed, except Kashmiri which is verb-second; c) Sarikoli and Wakhi in Western Xīnjiāng (Gawarjon 1985) are verb final and more strongly right-headed than other Iranian languages, but they still have the Iranian trait of having prepositions (although they also have some Uyghur-like postpositions).

Lao

14. *khon2   suung3*
     person   tall
     'tall person' (Enfield 2007: 93)

15. *khaw5   niaw3*
     rice   sticky
     'sticky rice' (Enfield 2007: 93)

Khmer

16. *civeut   ti: pi: rabawh   knjom*
     life   place two   of   me
     'my second life' (Haiman 2011: 168)

Eastern Kayah Li

17. *ʔiswí   nλ̄   bēlɔ̀   du*
     curry   two   bowl   big
     'two big bowls of curry' (Solnit 1997: 180)

Burmese, which is verb final, has some post-verbal modifiers, like the nominalised stative verb *a-thi'* 'new' and stative verb *hklei:* 'small' in the following example. (Attributive nouns like *thi'tha:* 'wood' have to precede the head noun.)

Burmese

18. *thi'tha: ein   a-thi'   hkalei:*
     wooden   house new   small
     'small new wooden house' (Myint Soe 1999: 44)

Looking into the history of Chinese, noun phrases were already mostly right headed in Pre-Archaic and Archaic periods.

Pre-Archaic Chinese (14th to 11th century BCE)[27]

19. 上甲　　惠　　王　　報　　　　用　　<u>五　　伐</u>

---

[27] As is the convention in the West and most of China, historical Chinese texts are transcribed and pronounced in modern Mandarin pronunciation. The pronunciation of the characters in Pre-Archaic Chinese (fourteenth to eleventh century BCE) is earlier than the earliest reconstructable phonological form of Chinese (Old Chinese: tenth to seventh century BCE) anyway.

shàngjiă huì wáng bào yòng wǔ fǎ

Shangjia FOC king *bao*:sacrifice use five human:victim

十 小 牢

shí xiǎo láo

ten little sacrificial:sheep

'As for (the ancestor) Shangjia, it must be the king who addresses (him) with a *bao* sacrifice by using five human victims and ten little sacrificial sheep.'

(Djamouri 2001: 162; Jiágǔwén Héjí 924)

Early Archaic Chinese

20.　天　　不　庸　釋　　　于　文　　王　　受　　命

　　　tiān　bū　yóng shì　yú [[wén　wáng　shòu]　mìng]

　　　heaven　not then relinquish to [[Wen king receive] destiny]

　　　'Then Heaven will not relinquish [the destiny which King Wen received].'

　　　(Aldrige, to appear; Shàngshū, Jūnshì 君奭; approx 8th century BCE)

21.　非　　時　　伯夷 播　　　　刑　　之　　迪?

　　　fēi　[[shí　bóyí bō]　xíng] zhī　dí?

　　　not.be [[then Boyi promulgate] law] GEN guide

　　　'Is it not the laws promulgated by Boyi which guide (you)?'

　　　(Aldrige, to appear; Shàngshū, Lǚxíng 呂刑; approx 8th century BCE)

However, there were some post-nominal modifiers in the earliest stages of Chinese. SVO languages typically have some pre-nominal and some post-nominal modifiers, and the earlier stages of Chinese had more post-nominal modifiers than the modern Sinitic languages. Numerals, in particular, were placed variously in front or after the head noun.

Pre-Archaic Chinese (14th to 11th century BCE)

22.　子　　央　　歲　　　于　丁

　　　zǐ　yāng　suì　yú dīng

　　　prince Yang immolate to Ding

　　　'The prince Yang [will] immolate something for the ancestor Ding.'

　　　(Djamouri 2001: 146; Jiágǔwén Héjí 3018)

23.　獲　　唯　鳥　七

　　　huò　wéi niǎo qī

　　　capture COP bird seven

　　　'The catch is seven birds.'

(Djamouri 2001: 151; Jīnzhāng suǒ cáng Jiágǔ Búcí 742)

(Numerals were more often prenominal than postnominal in Pre-Archaic Chinese.)

The earliest classifier-like words more often follow rather than precede the head noun.

Pre-Medieval Chinese

24. 分　　　與　文君　　<u>僮　百　　人</u>
　　　fēn　　*yǔ*　*wénjūn*　<u>*tóng bǎi　rén*</u>
　　　distribute　give　Wenjun　slave　hundred　people
　　　'(He) distributed a hundred slaves to Wenjun.'
　　　(Chappell and Peyraube 2007; Shǐjì, Sīmǎ Xiāngrú Lièzhuǎn 司馬相如列傳, approx 1st century BCE)

Early Medieval Chinese

25. 時　跋 跋提　國　　送　<u>獅子 兒　兩　頭</u>　與　乾陀羅　　王
　　　shí bá bátí　*guó*　*sòng*　<u>*shīzi ér　liǎng tóu*</u>　*yǔ*　*gāntuóluó*　*wáng*
　　　time　?　Bactria　country　offer　lion　child　two　CL'HEAD'　give　Gandhāra　king
　　　'At that time, the kingdom of Bactria offered two lion cubs to the king of Gandhāra.'
　　　(Chappell and Peyraube 2007; Luòyáng Qiélánjì 5 洛陽伽藍記 5; 6th century CE)

These post-nominal classifier-like words in earlier stages of Chinese were argued to be not part of the noun phrase of the preceding noun (e.g. Peyraube 1988). However, it can also be argued that the post-nominal classifiers do not form a phrase with the preceding noun in some MSEA languages, e.g. Lao, where a phrase can often intervene between a [NUM + CL] phrase and the preceding noun which it modifies in a semantic sense.

Lao

26.　　*kuu3　sùù4　paa3　sòòng3　too3*
　　　　1SG　buy　fish　two　CL
　　　　'I bought two fish.' (Enfield 2007: 120)

27.　　*kuu3　sùù4　paa3　juu1　talaat5　sòòng3　too3*
　　　　1SG　buy　fish　be.at　market　two　CL
　　　　'I bought fish at the market, two (of them).' (= 'I bought two fish at the market')
　　　　(Enfield 2007: 120)

("This is a perfectly normal way of saying 'I bought two fish at the market', and has nothing of the pragmatically marked quality shown by the first English free translation [...]." (Enfield 2007: 121))

Looking at the modern Sinitic languages, their noun phrases are even more strongly right-headed than the ones in older stages of Chinese.

Nánníng Pínghuà
28.　我　　個　　對　　舊　　皮　　　鞋
　　　ŋa¹³　kə⁵⁵　tɔi⁵⁵　kəu²²　pəi¹¹　　hai¹¹
　　　1SG　DEM　pair　old　　leather　shoe
　　　'My pair of old leather shoes.'

Nevertheless, there are typically some non-productive left-headed compounds in the Southern Sinitic languages, e.g. Cantonese 魚生 *jy¹¹ saŋ⁵⁵* (fish raw) 'raw fish', 菜乾 *tsʰɔi³³ kɔn⁵⁵* (vegetable dry) 'dried vegetable', 人客 *jɐn¹¹ hak³³* (person guest) 'guest', 熊人 *huŋ¹¹ jɐn¹¹>²⁵* (bear person) 'brown bear (child's word)'. (See also, e.g., the many left headed compounds in Wēnzhōu Wú (Zhèngzhāng 2008: 232)) More productive are the gender affixes for animals. The general trend is for the Northern Sinitic languages to have gender prefixes, resembling the right-headed word order in North Asia, and the Southern Sinitic languages to have gender suffixes (Nánníng Pínghuà is a major exception), resembling the left-headed word order in MSEA. Some Sinitic dialects in the middle have prefix for one gender and suffix for the other gender.

Standard Mandarin (prefixes)
29.　公豬 *gōng-zhū*　　　(male-pig)　　'boar'
30.　母豬 *mǔ-zhū*　　　　(female-pig)　'sow'

Wǎxiāng (prefixes and suffixes)
31.　○豬 *ɕiaŋ²⁵-tiɒɯ⁵⁵*　(male-pig)　　'boar'
32.　豬娘 *tiɒɯ⁵⁵-n̻iẽ⁵⁵*　(pig-female)　'sow'

Fùyáng Wú (prefixes and suffixes)
33.　雄雞 *'ɦioŋ-'tɕi*　　　(male-fowl)　'rooster'
34.　雞娘 *'tɕi-'niã*　　　　(fowl-female)　'hen'

Shàowǔ Western Mín (suffixes)
35.　雞公 *kɛi²¹-kuŋ²¹*　　(fowl-male)　'rooster'
36.　雞嫲 *kɛi²¹-ma²²*　　　(fowl-female)　'hen'

Fūqīng Eastern Mín (suffixes)

37.　雞公 *kiɛ³²-kuŋ⁵³*　　(fowl-male)　'rooster'

38.　雞母 *kiɛ³²-mɔ̌³*　　(fowl-female) 'hen'

Cantonese (suffixes)

39.　雞公 *kɐi⁵⁵-kuŋ⁵⁵*　　(fowl-male)　'rooster'

40.　雞𤲃 *kɐi⁵⁵-na²⁵*　　(fowl-female) 'hen'

Nánníng Pínghuà (prefixes)

41.　公雞 *kʊŋ⁵³-kɐi⁵³*　　(male-fowl) 'rooster'

42.　母雞 *mu¹³-kɐi⁵³*　　(female-fowl) 'hen'

(Pínghuà dialects to the west also have gender prefixes, e.g. Chóngzuǒ (Lǐ and Zhū 2009: 177).)

The following table summarises the noun phrase features discussed in this §4.1.

	Thai	Khmer	Vietnamese	E Kayah Li	Burmese	Hmong Njua	Mien	Cantonese	Nánníng Pínghuà	Huì'ān S Mǐn	Fúqīng E Mǐn	Shàowǔ W Mǐn	Yíchūn Gàn	Fùyáng Wú	Jīxī Huī	Gǔzhàng Wǎxiāng	Suīníng C Mandarin
N – Genitive																	
	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
N – "Adjective" (e.g. chicken – big)																	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
N – Noun (e.g. egg – chicken)																	
	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
N – Gender (e.g. chicken – male)																	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	±	±	±	−
N – Demonstrative																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
N – Numeral																	
	+	+	−	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
N – Relative clause																	
	+	+	+	−	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
Total:	7	7	6	4	3	5	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	½	½	½	0

Table 4   Left-headed-ness on the noun phrase level in some Sinitic and MSEA languages

4.2   Word order in clauses

On the clause level, there has been the assumption that Chinese had more verb-final traits the further one goes back into the history of Chinese (Li and Thompson 1974a: 208, LaPolla 1994), due to the rare cooccurence of SVO word order and strong right-headedness in the modern Sinitic languages, and also that the vast majority of Tibeto-Burman languages being verb-final. However, looking at the written records of Chinese up till fourteenth century BCE, the opposite was true: the further one goes back into the history of written Chinese, the more verb-medial traits there were (Djamouri, Paul, and Whitman 2007). First of all, Pre-Archaic Chinese was clearly a SVO language: looking at Pre-Archaic Chinese texts (Shang Dynasty oracle bone script), 93.8% of clauses with two place predicates were (S)VO in Djamouri's corpus (2001: 146); OV order only occurred in specific syntactic environments.[28] Pre-Archaic and Archaic Chinese also had wh-movement (to a position between the subject and the verb), which is a trait very rare with OV languages (e.g. Dryer 1991). In WALS, the modern Sinitic languages are the only VO languages that predominantly place oblique phrases in front of the verb (i.e. XVO order; WALS feature 84A). However, Pre-Archaic is a relatively normal VO language for that it usually places obliques after the object (i.e. VOX word order).[29]

Pre-Archaic Chinese

43.   呼   多   犬   网   鹿   于   辳
      hū   duō   quǎn   wǎng   lù   yú   nóng
      order numerous dog.officer net   deer at   Nong
      'Call upon the many dog-officers to net deer at Nong.'
      (Djamouri, Paul, and Whitman 2007: 3; *Jiágǔwén Héjí* 10976 recto.)

The same VOX is also expectedly the norm in the core of MSEA. The following are some examples.

Lao

44.   *phen1 lin5 phaj4 juu1   talaat5*

---

[28] In Pre-Archaic Chinese and Archaic Chinese, OV order only occurred in: a) cleft constructions: {COP ... O V} (the copula was obligatory in Pre-Archaic Chinese, but became optional in the Early Archaic period); b) negative sentences with an accusative pronoun: {NEG O V} (in Pre-Archaic Chinese this was restricted to the negator 不 *bù* (Djamouri, Paul and Whitman 2007: 4), but in Archaic Chinese this applies to other negators as well); and c) wh-questions; the non-subject question word is placed between the subject and the verb: {S Q V?}. See Aldrige (to apper).

[29] Other than the post-object position, another common position for locative phrases, for temporal phrases in particular, is the pre-subject position (Djamouri 2001: 147–148).

3POL   play cards be.at   market

'She is playing cards at the market.' (Enfield 2007: 390)

Khmer

45. *knjom tradaw: sra:j krama: pi: cangkeh*

    I   struggle untie scarf   from   waist

    'I struggle to untie the scarf from my waist.' (Haiman 2011: 204)

In contrast to Pre-Archaic Chinese, which is a relatively normal SVO language, two related tendencies developed amongst the modern Sinitic languages (e.g. Zhāng 2010, Liú 2012, Bisang 2012):

– the Sinitic languages accept postverbal constituents less readily; and

– in many Sinitic languages, the association of postverbal constituents with new information/ indefiniteness became stronger.[30]

This created many more verb-final sentences in the modern Sinitic languages than older stages of Chinese. These traits are relatively weak in the Far-Southern Sinitic languages like Cantonese, and are thus relatively close to the core of MSEA in terms of word order. The Northern Sinitic languages understandably have many verb-final traits; there are even the Far-Western Central Mandarin dialects which have postpositions and often SOV. However, putting the SOV Mandarin dialects aside, the Sinitic languages with most verb-final sentences are surprising not the Northern Sinitic languages, but the Southeastern Sinitic languages. It is rare for more than one constituent to occur after the verb, and M. Qián (2008) summarises the following situations where sentences have to be verb final in Níngbō Wú (with my reinterpretation and with the help of the description of the tense and aspect system of Níngbō Wú in N.R. Qián 2008):

– Sentences with a post-verbal tense-aspect marker (e.g. present perfective, past perfective, durative, simultaneous, experiential; these markers are often gramaticalised from locative words);

– Some Irrealis sentences, e.g.:

    o Negative sentences (S – O – NEG – V);

    o Yes-no questions (S – O – V – Q);

    o Rhetorical questions (S – O – V – Q);

    o Imperative sentences (except that [NUM–CL] phrase and verbal complements can occur post-verbally);

---

[30] For Mandarin, Li (2011) characterises postverbal constituents as primarily conveying new information. There are also accounts which characterise postverbal constituents in Mandarin as focused (LaPolla 1995) or indefinite (Li and Thompson 1975). While the information status account seems to model the situation in Mandarin well, in other Sinitic languages definiteness may be the primary motivating factor. More studies are needed on the variation in word order amongst the Sinitic languages.

- Emphatic existential sentences (S – O – exist – EMP);
- 'Go' (e.g. I place go);
- 'From' (e.g. I place from go);
- Transitive sentences with a definite object.

In the following subsections, we will discuss the various situations where non-subject constituents have to be preverbal in the Sintic languages. We will be discussing:
- Position of adverbials and adpositions (§4.2.1);
- Position of modifiers of verbs (§4.2.2);
- Position of objects (§4.2.3);
  - o The object marking construction (§4.2.3.1);
  - o Preverbal and Postverbal definite objects (§4.2.3.2);
  - o Word order in clauses with three place predicates (§4.2.3.3).

4.2.1 Position of adverbials and adpositions

Modern Sinitic languages in general allow post-verbal constituents less readily than Archaic Chinese and MSEA languages. One word order trait that is probably universal amongst the modern Sinitic languages is that most adverbials are placed in front of the main verb, especially for temporal phrases.

Nánníng Pínghuà

46. 我　　太早　　　住　　屋頭　　看了　　　一　　出　　戲
$ŋa^{13}$　$tai^{22}tʃau^{33}$　$tʃəi^{22}$　$uk^3təu^{11}$　han^{25}-$lə^{33}$　$ɐt^3$　$tʃʰət^3$　$həi^{25}$
1SG　just:now　at　home　watch-PFV　one　CL　film
'I watched a film at home just now.'

Wǎxiāng

47. 我　　朝頭　　　○　　三　　個　　餈
u^{25}　$tiɑu^{55}ta$　$ʑiəɯ^{13}$　so^{55}　$kəɯ^{33}$　$tɕi^{13}$
1SG　morning　eat　three　CL　bun
'I ate three buns this morning.'

Standard Mandarin

48. 我　　明天　　　在　站台　　　上　　等　你
$wǒ$　$míngtiān$　$zài$ $zhàntái$　$shàng$　$děng$ $nǐ$
1SG　tomorrow　at　platform　on　wait　2SG
'I will wait for you at the platform tomorrow.'

MSEA languages, on the other hand, usually have many adverbials which can be placed after the object.

Vietnamese

49. *bố   cháu   đã   từng dạy   học   ở Ha-oai*
    father 1SG   ANT EXP teach   study   in   Hawaii
    'My dad has taught in Hawaii.' (Nguyễn 1997: 158)

Thai

50. *s‌ɨ̂a   kàw   ca   aw   pay   bɔricàak   phrûŋníi*
    clothes   old   will   take   go   donate   tomorrow
    'I'll give away the old clothes tomorrow.' (Smyth 2002: 117)

While most adverbials are placed in front of the verb, most Sinitic languages have some location phrases that are placed after the verb (as arguments or adjuncts, depending on the verb). This is especially the case with destinations (and also some locations).

Cantonese

51. 我   今日   去   台北
    ŋɔ²⁵   kɐm⁵⁵jɐt²   hɵy³³   tʰɔi¹¹pɐk⁵
    1SG   today   go   Taipei
    'I am going to Taipei today.'

Fúqīng Eastern Mín

52. 我   今晏   去   北京
    ŋua³²   kiŋ⁵³naŋ²¹   kʰyɔ²¹   peʔ⁵kiŋ⁵³
    1SG   today   go   Beijing
    'I am going to Beijing today.'

However, some Sinitic languages require even destinations to be placed before the main verb. This is the case with Wú and many dialects in the Northern Zone. The destination precedes the verb, and the destination is at least preceded by a preposition. In Northern Wú dialects, the preposition is usually elided, resulting in what appears to be a SOV sentence.

Wǎxiāng

53. 你   到   何○   去？
    ɳɿ²⁵   tau³³   uo¹³ɳɿ⁴¹   kʰəɯ³³?
    2SG   to   where   go

'Where are you going?' (There are also examples with only 到 *tau³³* 'to'.)

Pínglì Central Mandarin

54.　你　　到　　哪兒　　去　　耶?　　我　　到　　城　　裏頭　　去

n̠i⁴⁴　*tau²³*　*lar⁴⁴⁵*　*tɕʰɻ̩²³*　*iɛ?*　　*ŋo⁴⁴*　*tau²³*　*tʂʰən⁵²*　*li⁴⁴⁵tʰou*　*tɕʰɻ̩²⁴*

2SG　to　where　go　Q　　1SG　to　city　in　go

'Where are you going? I am going to the city.' (Zhōu 2009: 408)

Wēnzhōu Wú (Southern Wú)

55.　我　　走　　　溫州　　　　　去

ŋ̍³⁴　*tsau⁴⁵⁾⁰*　*ʔjy³³⁾¹¹tɕəu³³*　*kʰei⁴²⁾⁰*

1SG　to　　Wenzhou　　go

'I am going to Wenzhou.' (Zhèngzhāng 2008: 340)

Fùyáng Wú (Northern Wú)[31]

56.　我　　今朝　　（到）　　上海　　　去

ŋɤ　*'kintsɔ*　*('tɔ)*　*zɔŋhɛ*　*tɕʰi*

1SG　today　to　　Shanghai　go

'I am going to Shanghai today.'

(It is more common to omit *'tɔ* 'to'.)

The Sinitic languages have both prepositions and postpositions. Having postpositions in a SVO language is itself not too surprising if the postposition is grammaticalised from a noun, and when genitives occur in front of the noun. So to indicate location, instead of having a left headed structure like the following from Northern Zhuang:

Northern Zhuang

57.　*youq*　*gwnz*　*taiz*

at　　above　table

'On the table'

Sinitic languages have a preposition, and a postposition of which the semantics is more specific. In Sinitic languages, the postnominal locative word is usually no longer a free noun.

Nánníng Pínghuà

---

[31] A proper analysis of the tonal system in Fùyáng Wú is yet to be done. There are two or three contrastive word melodies (and various allo-melodies).

58. 住　　　檯　　　上

$ts\partial i^{22}$　tai^{11}　$\textltailt eŋ^{22}$

at　　table　　above

'On the table'

Similar structures exist in Karenic languages, which also have mixed VO and OV typological profiles like the Sinitic languages. However, in Eastern Kayah Li at least, the locative word is still a noun.

Eastern Kayah Li

59.　　$d\acute{ɤ}$　$l\bar{ɛ}$　　$k\bar{u}$

　　　　at　ravine　interior

　　　　'in the ravine' (Solnit 2007: 209)

60.　　$d\acute{ɤ}$　$pj\bar{a}$　　$k\bar{u}$

　　　　at　bag　　interior

　　　　'in the bag' (Solnit 2007: 209)

61.　　$d\acute{ɤ}$　hi　　$l\bar{e}$

　　　　at　house　bottom

　　　　'Under the house' (Solnit 2007: 211)

62.　　$d\acute{ɤ}$　$d\bar{ɔ}$　　$l\bar{e}$

　　　　at　village　bottom

　　　　'Below (downhill from) the village' (Solnit 2007: 211)

What is surprising in the Sinitic languages is how dominant the locative postposition has become in some Sinitic languages, especially in some Wú dialects (e.g. Liú 2003; 2012: 11–12). Cantonese is a language where such postposition is less obligatory. In Cantonese, an expression like 'in the library' usually only requires a preposition.

Cantonese

63.　　喺　　　圖書館

　　　　$hɐi^{25}$　　$tou^{11}sy^{55}kun^{25}$

　　　　at　　　library

　　　　'At the library'

In Mandarin, having the postposition is common, but not obligatory.

Mandarin

64.　　在　　　圖書館　　　(裏)

　　　zài　　túshūguǎn　　(lǐ)

　　　at　　library　　　in

　　　'At/in the library'

The postposition is compulsory in most Wú dialects (Liú 2012: 12).

Sūzhōu Wú

65.　　掛　　勒　　客廳　　　　*(裏)

　　　*ko⁵²　　ləʔ⁵⁵　　kʰaʔ⁵⁵tʰin²³　　*(li⁴⁴)*

　　　hang　　at　　living.room　　in

　　　'Hung up in the living room' (Lǐ 1998: 164)

In fact the preposition is often optional, or even made into a postposition in some Northern Wú dialects.

Níngbō Wú[32]

Preposition usually omitted for preverbal adverbials

66.　　賊骨頭 (來) 厠坑間 裏 幽　該

　　　thief　　(at)　toilet　　in　hide　FP

　　　'The thief hid in the toilet' (Liú 2003: 272)

67.　　老師　　(來該)　黑板　　　上　寫　　字

　　　teacher　(at)　　black:board　on　write　word

　　　'The teacher wrote on the black board' (Liú 2003: 272)

Prepositions made into postpositions

68.　　圖書館 裏　來該

　　　library　in　at

　　　'At the library' (Liú 2003: 272)

In Níngbō Wú (and most other Northern Wú dialects), 'go to' is usually expressed with no adpositions, whereas 'come from' is usually epxressed with a postposition 'from'. The

---

[32] The Níngbō Wú examples come without romanisation. It is is the norm in Chinese linguistic work that only characters are given.

Northern Wú dialects (especially ones outside of Shanghai) are in general rather verb-final like.

Níngbō Wú

69. 囡囡　　幼兒班　　　去
    baby　kindergarten　go
    'Baby goes to kindergarten.' (M. Qián 2008: 136)

70. 我　學校　介　　來
    1SG　school　from　come
    'I came from the school.' (M. Qián 2008: 136)[33]

4.2.2 Position of modifiers of verbs

Attributors of verbs are overwhelmingly placed in front of the verb.

Shanghainese (Wú)

71. 捄個　　　人　　　討飯　　能介個　　　樣子　　　　立辣　　　依答
    geq-geq　njin　thaovae　nenkaxeq　xiangtsir　liq-laq　iìtaq
    this-CL　person　beggar　like　appearance　stand-PROG　there
    'The man stood there like a beggar.' (Zhu 2006a: 155)[34]

Standard Cantonese

72. 佢　　慢慢　　　行
    k^{h}ɵy^{13}　man^{22}man^{25}　haŋ^{11}
    3SG　slowly　walk
    'S/he walk slowly.'

Wǎxiāng

73. 你　快　　○手
    n̠i^{25}　k^{h}uɑ^{33}　tsau^{25}ɕiəuɪ^{25}
    2SG　quick　move:hand
    'Hurry up and get moving,'

Standard Mandarin

---

[33] M. Qían (2008: 136) describes 介 as a postposition meaning 'from'. However, Zhū et al. (1996), the Níngbō dictionary, only lists 介 /*ka^{44}*/ as being a demonstrative meaning 'like this' or a particle meaning '-like' (1996: 40–41). I would like to thank my colleage Xūpíng Lǐ for questioning the status of 介 being a postposition.

[34] Wú languages have tonal domains that are longer than a syllable. In Shanghainese, except for toneless syllables, there are two contrastive tonal melodies. Zhu (2006) notates the 'marked' melody with a grave accent.

74. 你　先　吃　吧　　多　吃　一點
　　nǐ　xiān　chī　ba　　duō　chī　yīdiǎn
　　2SG　first　eat　FP　　more　eat　a:bit
　　'Eat first. Eat a bit more.'

(Sometimes adjectives appear after a verb, but they are part of a verbal complement, where the complement predicates the verb.

Standard Cantonese

75. 行　　得　　　慢吞吞
　　haŋ¹¹　tɐk⁵　　man²²-tʰɐn⁵⁵tʰɐn⁵⁵
　　walk　MANNER　slow-IDEO
　　≈ '(Someone) walks (and the walking is) so slow.'

76. load　到　　仲　　慢過　　　龜速
　　lou⁵⁵　tou³³　tsuŋ²²　man²²-kʷɔ³³　kʷɐi⁵⁵tsʰʊk⁵
　　load　EXTEND　even　slow-surpass　turtle:speed
　　≈ '[The mobile internet] loads (to the extend of being) even slower than turtle speed.' (m.eprice.com.hk/mobile/talk/3149/33856/1/2/0/; 7 Nov 2012))

However, many non-Mandarin Sinitic languages (other than Mín in the Southeastern zone including Western Mín) have a few adverbs which are placed after the verb (either immediately after the verb, or at the end of the clause).

Fùyáng Wú

77. 杭州　　　到　　快　　喋。
　　ɦiãtsɤ　'tɔ　'kʰua　diɛ
　　Hángzhōu　arrive　soon　COS
　　'We are arriving in Hángzhōu soon.'
　　(This 快 *'kʰua* may be a prospective marker. 快 *'kʰua* meaning 'fast' is placed in front of the verb.)

Yíchūn Gàn

78. （再）　去　幾　個　湊
　　(tsæ⁴⁴)　tɕʰiɛ⁴⁴　tɕi⁵³　kɔ⁴⁴　tsʰɛu⁴⁴
　　again　go　few　CL　more
　　'Send a few more people.'

79.　食　　多　　發積
　　　$t\varphi^h i\widehat{?}^5$　to^{34}　$fa\widehat{?}^5\text{-}t\varphi i\widehat{?}^5$
　　　eat　　more　bit-DIM
　　　'Eat a bit more.'

80.　你　食　飯　　先
　　　ηi^{34}　$t\varphi ia\widehat{?}^5$　fan^{213}　$sien^{34}$
　　　2SG　eat　rice　first
　　　'You eat your meal first.'

Hakka

81.　坐　　一　下　添
　　　$ts^h o^{24}$　it^2　ha^{55}　$t^h iam^{24}$
　　　sit　　one　CL　more
　　　'Sit a bit more.' (Lo 1988: 301–302)

82.　著　少　　一　領　　衫
　　　$tsok^2$　seu^{31}　it^2　$lia\eta^{11}$　sam^{13}
　　　wear　less　one　CL　　clothes
　　　'Wear one piece of clothing less.' (Lo 1988: 303)

Standard Cantonese

83.　食　埋　　雪糕　　添　　　啦
　　　sik^2　mai^{11}　$syt^3 kou^{55}$　tim^{55}　la^{55}
　　　eat　as_well　ice:cream　in_addition　FP
　　　'Have ice cream too!'

84.　打　多　兩　行　字
　　　ta^{25}　$t\mathfrak{o}^{55}$　$l\mathit{œ}\eta^{13}$　$h\mathfrak{o}\eta^{11}$　$ts\mathit{ɿ}^{22}$
　　　hit　more　two　line　word
　　　'Type two more lines.'

85.　我　行　先　啦。
　　　$\eta\mathfrak{o}^{13}$　$ha\eta^{11}$　sin^{55}　la^{33}
　　　1SG　go　first　COS
　　　'I am going now.'

(See, e.g., Peyraube 1996, who discusses the post-verbal adverbs in Cantonese.)

MSEA languages usually have adverbials after the verb.

Northern Zhuang

86. *gou   bae   gonq.*
    1SG   go   first
    'I am going now.'

87. *gou   gwn   vanj   haeux   dem.*
    1SG   eat   bowl   rice   in_addition
    'I eat another bowl of rice.' (Wéi and Qín 2006: 208)
(The word *dem* itself is perhaps a Chinese loan, c.f. Cantonese 添 *tʰim⁵⁵* 'add'.)

Thai

88. *raw   paythîaw   mɯaŋ   thay   bɔ̀ybɔ̀y.*
    1PL   go:trip   country   Thai   often
    'We visit Thailand often.' (Smyth 2002: 104)

Green Hmong

89. *tuam   moog   rua   suavteb   hab*
    Tuam   go   to   China   too
    'Tuam went to China too.' (Li 1989: 121)

Khmer

90. *knjom   kampung   raut   lee:ng   ja:ng   sa'ba:j*
    I   engage.in   run   play   kind   happy
    'I was running along happily.' (Haiman 2011: 216)

91. *knjom   skoal   koat   cbah   nah*
    I   recognize   3   clear   very
    'I recognized him very clearly.' (Haiman 2011: 216)

4.2.3 Position of objects

Not only are adverbials mostly placed in front of the verb, objects are also sometimes placed in front of the verb in the Sinitic languages. Although the Sinitic languages could be said to be SVO in general, constituents that can occur postverbally are restricted. In the Far-Southern zone, languages like Cantonese is relatively free to have two or more constituents after the main verb. In the Southeastern zone, often only one constituent is allowed after the verb, and the postverbal position is strongly associated with new information or

indefiniteness, so much so that definite noun phrases basically have to be preverbal. Other Sinitic languages like Mandarin are somewhat in between these two extremes.[35] Although it is known that in SVO languages, there are correlations between the pre-verbal position and definitness, and the post-verbal positions and indefiniteness (Keenan and Comrie 1977), it is rare for the correlation to be as strong as those in the Southeastern Sinitic languges.

There are three main ways in which the object is preposed to a pre-verbal position, and different Sinitic languages have different preferences for which ones they use if the object is to be placed in front of the verb:

– topicalisation; the surface order could, grammatically speaking, freely alternate between SOV and OSV;
– passivisation: {undergoer – PASS – actor – verb};
– object marking, or 'disposal' construction: {subject – OM – object – verb}

The syntax of these construction varies amongst the Sinitic languages. We shall discuss briefly the object marking construction first.

4.2.3.1   The object marking construction

The object marking construction is also knowns as the 'disposal' construction or the pre-transitive construction. The object marker is most commonly grammaticalised from a verb meaning 'to take', and the most common syntactic configuration is {subject – OM – object – verb}. (There are other grammatical pathways, and other configurations, see Chappell 2006, in press.) The object marking construction in Mandarin is well discussed (Li and Thompson 1981: §15, Sybesma 1992, Ding 2007, amongst many others). In Mandarin it is used primarily to highlight the change of state or change of location of the undergoer. Somtimes an object-marked sentence and its SVO counterpart are both grammatical. Internet search results indicate that with the following examples, the object-marked construction is more prevalent than the SVO counterpart, but both are frequently used.

Standard Mandarin
92.   關上   門   了
       guān-shàng mén   le
       close-up   door   PRF
       '(Someone) locked the door'
       ("關上門了" on Google: 1,690,000 results; 3 Nov 2012)

---

[35] Li characterises the post-verbal position in Mandarin as new information. Others have characterised the postverbal position in Mandarin as indefinite (Li and Thompson 1974b) or focal (LaPolla 1995).

93. 把　　門　　關上　　　　了
    bǎ　　mén　guān-shàng　le.
    OM　　door　close-up　　PRF
    '(Someone) locked the door.'
    ("把門關上了" on Google: 1,970,000 results; 3 Nov 2012)

In Mandarin, the marked object is usually definite, but not necessarily. An innovation in Mandarin is that the object marking construction can be used with intransitive predicates (see Chappell in press).

The Far-Southern Sinitic languages require the preposing of objects far less often. The object marking construction is absent in many Far-Southern Sinitic dialects (e.g. Pínghuà in Chōngzuǒ (Lǐ and Zhū 2009: 193, Liáng and Lín 2009: 322); Nánníng Cantonese (Lǐ and Qín 2008: 346–348)). Some other Far-Southern Sinitic dialects have object marking constructions, but their usage are restricted and infrequent (e.g. Cheung 1991 on Standard Cantonese). In the case of Hainanese, they are restricted to inanimates (Lee 2009). The following examples from Cantonese and their search frequencies on the internet is a demonstration of the rarity of the object marking construction in Cantonese in comparison with the Mandarin examples above.

Standard Cantonese
94. 閂咗　　　門
    san^{55}-tsɔ^{25}　mun^{11}
    close-PFV　door
    '(Someone) closed the door(s).' or 'They (shops etc.) are closed.'
    (Google search of the string "閂咗門": 11,000 results; 3 Nov 2012)

95. 閂咗　　　[度/　道]　門
    san^{55}-tsɔ^{25}　[tou^{22}/ tou^{22}]　mun^{11}
    close-PFV　CL　　CL　　door
    '(Someone) closed the door.'
    (Google search of the string "閂咗度門": 1,410 results; "閂咗道門": 277 results; 3 Nov 2012)

96. ? 將　　　(度/　道)　門　　閂
    tsœŋ^{55}　(tou^{22}/ tou^{22})　mun^{11}　san^{55}
    OM　　CL　　CL　　door　close

41

(Google search of the string "將門閂": 0 results; "將度門閂": 9 results, "將道門閂": 3 results; 3 Nov 2012)[36]

The syntax of the object marking construction varies greatly amongst the Sinitic languages. Mandarin towards the northwest (Western Central Mandarin, Northwestern Mandarin) and the Southeastern Sinitic lanugages in general have less constraints with their object marking constructions than Standard Mandarin. For instance, Standard Mandarin and Cantonese do not allow the object marking construction to be used with monosyllabic predicates, nor with negative predicates. However, such verb-final sentences can be found in the northwest and southeast Sinitic languages.

Dungan (Western Central Mandarin in Central Asia)

97.   ба   гу   кан   бу   жян   ли,
      pa^{24} kou^{51} $k^h\tilde{æ}^{44}$+ pu^{24}+ $tɕi\tilde{æ}^{44}$ li
      OM   dog   look+   NEG+   achieve   PRF
      '[He] could not see the dog anymore,' (Lín 2003: 312)

98.   ба   та   бу   кэщин   сы   ли   ма?
      pa^{24} t^ha^{51} pu^{24} $k^h\varepsilon^{24}ɕiŋ^{24}$ sz^{51} li ma
      OM   3SG   NEG   happy   die   PRF   Q
      'Wouldn't it be so unhappy?' (Lín 2003: 313)

(Similar structures exist in Western Central Mandarin dialects in China as well; see, e.g., Bié 2005.)

Fùyáng Wú

99.   伊   ○   我   打
      $ɦi$ $k^hə?$ $ŋɤ$ $'t\tilde{æ}$
      3SG   OM   1SG   hit
      'S/he hit me.'

Taiwanese Southern Mín

100. $goan^2$ kia^{n2} ka^7 goa^2 $chim^1$
      1SG:GEN   son   OM   1SG   kiss
      'My son kissed me.' (Lee 2009: 480)

---

[36] Using other classifiers like 對 $tøy^{33}$ and 隻 $tsɛk^3$ yielded negligible number of search results (less than 10).

(On the other hand, Hǎinán Mín, a Far-Southern Sinitic language, would use a normal SVO sentence, as the object marking construction cannot be used with animates:

Hainanese

101.   *i⁴⁴   soi²¹   gua²¹*

    3SG   kiss   1SG

    'He kissed me.' (Lee 2009: 480))

Similar object marking construction also exists in many Hmong-Mien languages. Unlike Sinitic languages like Mandarin and Cantonese where the object markers are no longer used as verbs, in White Hmong the object marker is synchronically still used as a main verb meaning to 'take'.

White Hmong

102.   *nws* <u>*muab*</u> *pojniam   nrauj   lawm*

    3SG   <u>take</u>   woman   divorce   PRF

    'He has divorced his wife.' (Jarkey 1991: 249; quoting Heimbach 1979:174)

The object marking construction in most Sinitic languages, including Mandarin and Cantonese, came from the Medival Chinese 'take' serial verb construction, where the verb 'take' has not yet been grammaticalised. (The take verb started to be gramaticalised when the last coreferential pronoun, as shown in the following example, became optional; Peyrabe 1996: 169–170.)

Medeval Chinese

103.   船者   乃 <u>將</u> 此 蟾 以 油 熬 之

    chuánzhě   nǎi <u>*jiāng*</u> *cǐ   chán   yǐ   yóu   áo   zhī*

    boat:person   then   take   this   toad   with   oil   fry   3SG

    'Then the boatman took the toad and fried it.'

    (Chappell 2006; quoting Peyraube 1988, 1996)

Similar 'take' serial verb constructions exist in MSEA languages. The choice between the 'take' and 'non-take' construction is usually (but not always) a stylistic choice in the how the event is presented, rather than a grammatical preference or requirment as in most Sinitic languages.

Lao

104.   *man2   thim5   ngen2*

    3   discard   money

'She discarded (the) money.'

105. *man2 qau3   ngen2   thim5*
      3   take   money   discard
      'She took the money (and) discarded (it).' (Enfield 2007: 381)

Vietnamese

106. *tôi tặng cho bạn   một miếng gà   rán*
      1   gift DAT friend one CL   chicken fried
      'I gave you a piece of fried chicken.'

107. *tôi lấy một miếng gà   rán   tặng cho bạn*
      1   take one CL   chicken fried gift DAT friend
      'I took a piece of fried chicken (and) gave it to you.' (John Phan p.c.)

The Far-Southern Sinitic dialects also often employ the MSEA-type of ungrammaticalised 'take' constrcution.

Nánníng Pínghuà

108. 佢   一   拋   個   隻   煎餅   呢
      kəi¹³   ɐt³   pʰau⁵³   ə⁵⁵   tʃət³   tʃin⁵³pən³³   nɛ⁵⁵
      3   once   throw   DEM   CL   pan:cake   TOP
      就   跌落   大象   隻   煎鍋
      tʃəu²²   tit³＋lɐk²³   tai²²tʃɛŋ²²   tʃət³   tʃin⁵³ku⁵³
      then   fall＋descend   elephant   CL   frying:pan
      'He [the mouse] threw the pancake, and it fell on the elephant's frying pan.'

109. 佢   抓   燒餅   來   一   拋
      kəi¹³   ɲa⁵³   ɬiu⁵³pən³³   lɐi¹¹   ɐt³   pʰau⁵³
      3   take   pan:cake   come   once   throw
      燒餅   就   跌落   地下
      ɬiu⁵³pən³³   tʃəu²²   tit³＋lɐk²³   təi²²ja²²
      pan:cake   then   fall＋descend   ground
      'He [the mouse] took the pancake and threw it, and the pancake fell on the ground.'

4.2.3.2   *Preverbal and Postverbal definite objects*

The Southeastern languages have strong requirements for definite noun phrases to not exist after the main verb. (Indefinite noun phrases are usually, but not necessarily placed after the main verb.)

Fúqīng Eastern Mín

110. 老板　　　買○　　　　蜀　　架　　車
　　　lɔ³²peŋ⁵³　　mɛ³²-lau²¹　　θoʔ²　kɑ²¹　tɕʰia⁵³
　　　boss　　　　buy-PFV　　one　　CL　　car
　　　'The boss bought a car.'

111. 許　蜀　架　車　　　老板　　　買○
　　　hy³²　θoʔ²　kɑ²¹　tɕʰia⁵³　lɔ³²peŋ⁵³　　mɛ³²-lau²¹
　　　that　one　CL　car　　　boss　　　　buy-PFV
　　　'The boss bought the car.'

Fùyáng Wú

112. 個　老板　買得　　部　車子
　　　kɤ　'lɔpæ̃　ma-lə　　bu　'tsʰotsz
　　　CL　boss　buy-PFV　CL　car
　　　'The boss bought a (/*the) car.' (Li and Bisang 2012: 336)

113. 個　老板　部　車子　　買得回來　　　　　喋
　　　kɤ　'lɔpæ̃　bu　'tsʰotsz　ma-lə-'uɛ-lɛ　　die
　　　CL　boss　CL　car　　　buy-PFV-return-hither　COS
　　　'The boss bought the car.'

114. 我　去　放　兩　　件　衣裳　得　大　衣櫃　裏
　　　ŋɤ　tɕʰi　fã　'niã　dʑi　izã　lə　da　idʑy　ni
　　　1SG　go　put　several　CL　clothes　to　big　closet　inside
　　　'I put several clothes into the big closet.'

115. 我　兩　　件　衣裳　去　放　放　得　大　衣櫃　裏
　　　ŋɤ　'niã　dʑi　izã　tɕʰi　fã　fã　lə　da　idʑy　ni
　　　1SG　several　CL　clothes　go　put　put　to　big　closet　inside
　　　'I put the several clothes into the big closet.'

One counterexample in the Southeast is Wēnzhōu Wú, where [CL + N] noun phrases mark definiteness by changing the tone of the classifier to tone D (tone 7 or 8), and such definite noun phrases can occur postverbally.

Wēnzhōu Wú

116. η^4 $\wp i^3$ ma^4 $pa\eta^3$ $s\dot{i}^1$
      I   want   buy   CL$_{volume}$ book
      'I want to buy a book.' (Cheng and Sybesma 2005: 266)

117. η^4 $\wp i^3$ ma^4 $pa\eta^7$ $s\dot{i}^1$
      I   want   buy   CL$_{volume}$ book
      'I want to buy the book.' (Cheng and Sybesma 2005: 266)

Classifiers which are already underlying tone 7 or 8 do not change their tones, and they can be interpreted as either definite or indefinite.

118. η^4 $\wp i^3$ ha^7 $y^7/$ $li\varepsilon^7$ $thu\jmath^1$
      I   want   drink   CL$_{volume}$/ CL$_{PL}$ soup
      'I would like to drink a bowl of soup/ some soup.'
      or: 'I would like to drink the soup.' (Cheng and Sybesma 2005: 266)

In other Sinitic languages, there is no requirements for definite noun phrases to not occur post-verbally. In Standard Mandarin, it is still quite common to prepose definite objects.

Standard Mandarin

119. 把   車子   買   了
      bǎ   chēzi   mǎi   le
      OM   car   buy   PRF
      'Bought the car.'
      ("把車子買了" on Google: 247,000 results; 12 Nov 2012)
      (The marked object is definite by default.)

120. 買   了   這   輛   車子
      mǎi   le   zhē   liàng   chēzi
      buy   PFV   this   CL   car
      'Bought this car.'
      ("買了這輛車子" on Google: 278,000 results; 12 Nov 2012)

With the Sinitic languages in the Central and Far-Southern zone, they allow definite noun phrases post-verbally. The Far-Southern Sinitic languages allow the preposing of objects much less readily than the Central Sinitic languages.

Shàowǔ Western Mín

121. 老板　　　買了　　蜀　架　車
lau⁵⁵pan²¹　miɛ⁵³-ə　çi⁵　kɑ³⁵　tɕʰia²¹
boss　　　buy-PFV　one　CL　car
'The boss bought a car.'

122. 老板　　　買了　　○　　蜀　架　車
lau⁵⁵pan²¹　miɛ⁵³-ə　tɕioŋ⁵³　çi⁵　kɑ³⁵　tɕʰia²¹
boss　　　buy-PFV　this　　one　CL　car
'The boss bought this car.'

(Very Strange:

123. ?? 老板　　　拿　○　　蜀　架　車　　買了
?? lau⁵⁵pan²¹　na²²　tɕioŋ⁵³　çi⁵　kɑ³⁵　tɕʰia²¹　miɛ⁵³-ə
　boss　　OM　this　one　CL　　car　　bought-PFV
'The boss bought this car.')

Cantonese

124. 個 老板　　　買咗　　　架　車
kɔ³³ lou¹³pan²⁵　mai¹³-tsɔ²⁵　ka³³　tsʰɛ⁵⁵
CL　boss　　　buy-PFV　　CL　car
'The boss bought the/a car.' (Li and Bisang 2012: 336)
("買咗架車" on Google: 43,900 results; 13 Nov 2012)

(Very strange:

125. ?? 個　老板　　　將　　架　車　　買咗
?? kɔ³³　lou¹³pan²⁵　tsœŋ⁵⁵　ka³³　tsʰɛ⁵⁵　mai¹³-tsɔ²⁵
　CL　boss　　OM　　CL　car　　buy-PFV
'The boss bought the car.'
("將架車買" on Google: 4 results; 13 Nov 2012))[37]

---

[37] In both Cantonese and Western Mín, the 'acquiring' meaning of 'buy' conflicts with the 'disposal' meaning of the object marking construction. Replacing these sentences with 'sell' would make the object marking construction more acceptable.

The Far-Southern Sinitic languages are like the other MSEA languages in not prohibiting postverbal definite objects. Below are examples of various preverbal and postverbal [classifier–noun] noun phrases all being definite in non-Sinitic MSEA languages.

Green Hmong

126. *khi <u>tug dlev</u> ces   <u>tug miv</u>   lug*
     tie   CL   dog   [and.then]   CL   cat   come
     'Tie up the dog and subsequently the cat will come!' (Li 1989: 122)

Ong Be

127. *lai^{33} vən^{55} hə^{33} sai^{55}tsu^{33} biaŋ^{33} <u>tuaŋ^{55} hu^{55}</u>   uk^5 mia^{55},*
     exist   day   one   rich:man   release   goat   CL   out   come
     <u>*ma^{13} hu^{55}*</u>   *[...]*   *huk^3*   <u>*tuaŋ^{55} hu^{55}*</u>   *dai^{13}*   *vɔi^{33}*.
     dog   CL   make   goat   CL   die   FP
     '[There was a rich man who kept a goat...] One day the rich man released the goat, the dog [...] caused the goat to die.' (Liú 2009: 97)

4.2.3.3   Word order in clauses with three place predicates

MSEA languages in general have fewer instances of double object constructions. In the most extreme case, Enfield (e.g. 2007: 355–382) argues that there are no 'real' double object constructions in Lao. Some ways to avoid having two unmarked objects after the main verb in Lao are eliding an object, topicalising an object, put them in a serial verb construction (e.g. the 'take' serial verb construction), or make one of the objects an oblique object. The main point is that the prohibition is towards having two unmarked objects after the verb; it is not a prohibition towards having more than one constituent, as you could sometimes have both an unmarked object and a preposition-marked object after the verb.

Lao

Noun incorporation (not 'real' double object construction)

128. *laaw2   <u>thaa2 sii3</u>   hùan2 lang3 nii4*
     3SG.FAM   apply   paint   house   CL   DEM
     'She painted (i.e., 'applied paint (to)') this house.' (Enfield 2007: 357)

129. ** laaw2   thaa2 sii3   lùam5   hùan2 lang3 nii4*
      3SG.FAM   apply   paint   shiny   house   CL   DEM   (Enfield 2007: 357)

Topicalisation

130. <u>*hùan2   lang3   nii4*</u> *laaw2   thaa2   sii3   lùam5*

house   CL   DEM 3SG.FAM apply paint shiny
'This house, she applied shiny paint (to).' (Enfield 2007: 358)

131.   *sii3   lùam5   laaw2   thaa2 hùan2 lang3 nii4*
        paint   shiny   3SG.FAM apply house   CL   DEM
        'Shiny paint, she applied (to) this house.' (Enfield 2007: 358)

Serial verb construction
132.   *laaw2   qaw3 sii3   lùam5 thaa2 hùan2 lang3 nii4*
        3SG.FAM take paint shiny   apply house   CL   DEM
        'She took shiny paint (and) applied (it to) this house.' (Enfield 2007: 358)

Oblique strategy
133.   *laaw2   thaa2 hùan2 lang3 nii4   duaj4   sii3   lùam5*
        3SG.FAM apply house CL   DEM   with   paint shiny
        'She applied this house with shiny paint.' (Enfield 2007: 358)

Khmer also has restrictions towards having two unmarked objects after the verb. The following is an exmple this being resolved by a 'take' serial verb construction.

Khmer
134.   * *kɔ̀ət ha:l   khaoʔa:v   thŋay*
          he   expose clothes   sun

135.   *kɔ̀ət yɔ̀:k khaoʔa:v tɤ̀u ha:l   thŋay*
        he   take clothes   go   expose sun
        'He put the clothes out in the sun.' (Bisang 2012: 12)

The syntax of three-place constructions varies considerably across Sinitic languages. The Southeastern Sinitic languages have rather strong dispreference of having two constituents after the verb; one of the objects has to be placed in front of the verb somehow.

Huì'ān Southern Mín
Theme topicalised
136.   伊   一   叢   筆 與   我
        i¹   tsit⁸⁾⁴   tsaŋ²⁾⁴ pet⁷ kʰɔ⁵   ua
        3SG one   CL   pen give   1SG
        'S/he gave me a/one pen.'

(This is the most preferred word order; S – V – IO – DO order is also possible, but not often used. The agent is often omitted. Notice that in Huì'ān Southern Mín even indefinite noun phrases are often topicalised.)

Theme topicalised, plus object marking construction with a resumptive pronoun

137.　我　　冊　　共　　伊　　○　　咧　　桌　　咧

　　　ua³　　tsʰeʔ⁷　　ka⁵˃⁴　　i¹　　hio⁵˃⁴　　leʔ⁷˃⁸　　tɔʔ⁷　　leʔ

　　　1SG　　book　　OM　　3SG　　put　　at　　table　　LOC

　　　'I put the book on the table.'

(The additional object marking construction is optional.)

Fùyáng Wú

138.　*　伊　　親得　　我　　一　　口

　　　*　ɦi　　'tɕʰin-lə　　ŋɤ　　iəʔ　　kʰiu

　　　　3SG　　kiss-PFV　　1SG　　one　　CL_mouth

　　　(親 *'tɕʰin* 'kiss' is a three-place predicate in Fùyáng Wú)

Passivised

139.　我　　撥　　伊　　親得　　一　　口

　　　ŋɤ　　pəʔ　　ɦi　　'tɕʰin-lə　　iəʔ　　kʰiu

　　　1SG　　PASS　　3SG　　kiss-PFV　　one　　CL_mouth

　　　'I was kissed by him/her once.'

Object marking construction

140.　伊　　○　　我　　親得　　一　　口

　　　ɦi　　kʰəʔ　　ŋɤ　　'tɕʰin-lə　　iəʔ　　kʰiu

　　　3SG　　OM　　1SG　　kiss-PFV　　one　　CL_mouth

　　　'S/he kissed me once.'

In Wǎxiāng, the most commonly used ditransitive construction involves a marked indirect object placed in front of the main verb.

Wǎxiāng

141.　就　　跟　　它　　放　　到　　○　　裏

　　　tɕiəɯ²⁵　　kaɪ⁵⁵　　tʰa⁵⁵　　fɤŋ³³　　tau³³　　pi¹³　　la²⁵

　　　then　　OM　　3SG　　place　　to　　jar　　in

　　　'[...] then put it in the jar.'

142. ○ 跟 我 得 件 衣
zɤ³³ kai⁵⁵ u²⁵ tɤ³³ tɕʰia²⁵ i⁵⁵
3SG DAT 1SG give CL clothes
'He gave me a shirt.'

On the other hand, the Far-Southern Sinitic languages are relatively free in having two constituents after the main verb, like the core of MSEA.

Cantonese
143. 佢 錫咗 我 一 啖
kʰɵy¹³ sɛk³-tsɔ²⁵ ŋɔ¹³ jɐt⁵ tam²²
3SG kiss-PFV 1SG one CL
'S/he kissed me once.'

144. 佢 畀咗 啲 藥 我
kʰɵy¹³ pei²⁵-tsɔ²⁵ ti⁵⁵ jœk³ ŋɔ¹³
3SG give-PFV CL;MASS medicine 1SG
'S/he gave me the/some medicine.'

145. 個 阿婆 收埋咗 啲 錢 喺 櫃桶 底
kɔ³³ a³³pʰɔ¹¹ sɐu⁵⁵mai¹¹-tsɔ²⁵ ti⁵⁵ tsʰin²⁵ hɐi²⁵ kʷɐi²²tʰʊŋ²⁵ tɐi²⁵
CL o.woman hide-PFV CL;MASS money at drawer under
'The old woman hid the/some money under the table.'

Nánníng Pínghuà
146. 佢 系了 的 藥 系 我
kəi¹³ hɐi²⁵-lə³³ tɪk⁵ jɛk²³ hɐi²⁵ ŋa¹³
3SG give-PFV CL;MASS medicine DAT 1SG
'S/he gave me the/some medicine.'

147. 你 放了 我 個 手機 住 那的?
nəi¹³ fʊŋ⁵⁵-lə³³ ŋa¹³ kə⁵⁵ ɬəu³³kəi⁵³ tʃəi²² na³³tɪk⁵?
2SG put-PFV 1SG MOD mobile.phone at where
'Where did you put my mobile phone?'

Hainanese (Hǎinán Mín)
148. 我 分 蜀 ○ 冊 (至) 伊
gua²¹ ɓun⁴⁴ dziak³³ ɓui²¹ seʔ⁵⁵ (ti¹¹) i⁴⁴

51

1SG give one CL book to 3SG
'I gave a book to him.' (Lee 2011: 502-503)

The following are examples showing some non-Sinitic MSEA languages not having problems with having two constituents after the main verb.

Ong Be

149. *beu³³ jua³³ nɜ²¹ hiu⁵⁵ (jɔu³³) hau⁵⁵*
deliver clothes that CL to 1SG
'Pass me that shirt/ Pass that shirt to me.' (Liú 2009: 35)

Khmer

150. *aoj cee:k cru:k muaj camnuan*
give banana pig one amount
'[G]ive the pig some bananas.' (Haiman 2011: 207)

151. *aoj cee:k muaj camnuan dawl cru:k*
give banana one bunch towards pig
'[G]ive a bunch of bananas to the pig.' (Haiman 2011: 207)

The following table summarises the clause-level word order traits discussed in this §4.2.

	Thai	Khmer	Vietnamese	E Kayah Li	Burmese	Hmong Njua	Mien	Cantonese	Náníng Pínghuà	Huì'ān S Mǐn	Fúqīng E Mǐn	Shàowǔ W Mǐn	Yíchūn Gàn	Fùyáng Wú	Jìxī Huī	Gǔzhàng Wǎxiāng	Suīníng C Mandarin
VO: bought the car																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	+	+	−	−	+	±
VO: bought a car																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
VO: hit me																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	±	+	+	+	−	?	+	+
VO(P)O: give me the book																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	−	?	−	?
VO(P)O: give me a book																	

	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	−	?
VOPO(P): put the book on table																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	?	−	−
go DESTINATION																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−
at inside LOCATION																	
	+	+	+	±	−	+	±	±	±	±	±	±	±	±	±	±	±
VOX: play ball LOCATION																	
	+	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
walk slow																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−	−
go first																	
	+	+	+	+	−	+	+	+	−	−	−	−	+	−	±	−	−
eat more																	
	+	+	+	+	+	+	?	+	+	−	−	−	+	±	±	−	−
Total:	12	12	12	11½	1	11	8½	9½	8½	3	5½	6½	8½	3		3½	

Table 5   Left headedness on the clause level (for the most-common construction in each category)
(± adpositions: both preposition and postposition. other ±: both order are prevalent)

In the table above, the absolute value of the total scores have little significant, as the criteria are hand-picked to demonstrate some of the word order differences amongst the Sinitic languages. Nevertheless, the relative scores amongst the Sinitic languages does show the relative difference in left-headedness on the clause level amongst the Sinitic languages, with the Far-Southern Sinitic languages being relatively left-headed, more similar to the core of MSEA, and the Southeastern Sinitic and Northern Sinitic languages being relatively right-headed, more similar to North Asia.

5.   Conclusions and discussions

In this paper we have discussed some of the phonological and word order traits in the Sinitic languages. The Far-Southern Sinitic languages (roughly Yuè, Pínghuà, Hakka in Guǎngdōng, the Sinitic languages of Hǎinán and Léizhōu) are the most similar with the core of MSEA: highly tonal, conservative with codas, and relatively normal as SVO languages. In terms of word order, the least SVO-like languages are surprising not the Northern Sinitic languages, but the Southeastern Sinitic languages (roughly Mín, Wú and Huī). The strong prevalence of verb-final clauses in the Southeastern Sinitic languages is primarily an internal

development. It cannot be a direct influence from North Asia, as North Asia is so far away, and the Central and Northern Sinitic languages in between are in genenral not as strongly right-headed as the Southeastern Sinitic languages.

The summary tables (tables 2 to 5 above) sometimes show the Far-Southern Sinitic languages as having higher scores of 'MSEA-ness' than other Sino-Tibetan languages like Burmese and Southern Mín. They do not indicate that the Far-Southern Sinitic languages are more MSEA-like than these other Sino-Tibetan languages: they only indicate that the Far-Southern Sintic languages have some traits that are more MSEA-like than Burmese and Southern Mín. There are many other typological traits, for instance grammaticalisation pathways, which would indicate the strong link from the core of MSEA to languages like Burmese and Southern Mín (see, e.g., Matisoff 1991, 2001a). What this paper is trying to argue is that, just as there are criteria which firmly place Burmese in the MSEA linguistic area, there are also many criteria which firmly place the Far Southern Sintic languages in the MSEA linguistic area. The Burmish languages and the Far Southern Sinitic languages are both at the periphery of the MSEA linguistic area, but neither are as 'frindge' as Northern Mandarin. Studies of the MSEA linguistic area would benefit immensely if data from the Southern Sinitic languages are always included in the MSEA linguistic area.

Abbreviations
ABCD   something

Bibliography
Abulimit, Azgül 阿孜古丽阿布力米提 Àzīgǔlì Ābùlìmǐtí. *Wéiwúěryǔ Jīchǔ Jiàochéng* 维吾尔语基础教程 [Uyghur Basic Course]. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.
Aldrige, Edith. to appear. Chinese Historical Syntax: Pre-Archaic and Archaic Chinese. *Language and Linguistic Compass: Historical & Comparative.*
Bauer, Robert S. 1996. Identifying the Tai Substratum in Cantonese. In *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and*

Linguistics V: 1806–1844. Bangkok: Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University.

Baxter, William H. 1992. *A Handbook of Old Chinese Phonology*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Baxter, William and Laurent Sagart. n.d. Baxter-Sagart Old Chinese reconstruction. crlao.ehess.fr/document.php?id=1217; accessed 10 Nov 2012.

Bié, Mǐn'gē 别敏鸽. 2005. Guānzhōng fāngyán tèshū "bǎ"zìjù tànyuán 关中方言特殊 "把" 字句探源 [Searching the origins of the special Bǎ construction in Guānzhōng dialect]. Journal of Huainan Normal University 2005(1): 127–128.

Bisang, Walter. 2006. Southeast Asia as a linguistic area. In Keith Brown et al. (eds.). *Encyclopedia of Languages & Linguistics*, vol. 11 (2nd edition): 587–595. Oxford: Elsevier.

Bisang, Walter. 2012. Chinese from a typological perspective. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Sinology. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Bó, Wénzé 薄文泽. 2004. Càijiāhuà Gàikuàng 蔡家话概况 [Sketches of the Càijiā Language]. *Mínzú Yǔwén* 2004(2): 68–81.

Cáo, Zhìyún 曹志耘 et al. (eds.). 2008. *Hànyǔ Fāngyán Dìtújí 汉语方言地图集 Linguistic Atlas of the Chinese Dialects*. Běijīng: The Commercial Press.

Chappell, Hilary. 2006. From Eurocentrism to Sinocentrism: the case of disposal constructions in Sinitic languages. In Felix Ameka, Alan Dench and Nicholas Evans (eds.). *Catching Language: the Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*: 441–486. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Chappell, Hilary. 2012. The role of language contact and hybridization in Sinitic languages. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Sinology. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Chappell, Hilary. in press. Pan-Sinitic object markers: morphology and syntax. In Guangshun Cao, Hilary Chapple, Redouane Djamouri, and Thekla Wiebusch (eds.). *Breaking Down the Barriers: Interdisciplinary Studies in Chinese Linguistics and Beyond*. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Chappell, Hilary. forthcoming. *A Grammar of Waxiang, a Sinitic language of Northwestern Hunan*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Chappell, Hilary and Alain Peyraube. 2007. The diachronic syntax of the dative construction from Medieval Chinese to early Southern Min (Sinitic). Talk presented at Conference on Ditransitive Constructions. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology.

Chén, Hǎilún 陈海伦 and Cūnhàn Liú 刘村汉. 2009. *Yuèyǔ Pínghuà Tǔhuà Fāngyīn Zìhuì — Dìèrbiān: Guìběi Guìdōng jí Zhōubiān Pínghuà Tǔhuà Bùfèn 粤语平话土话方音字汇 — 第二编: 桂北桂东及周边平话土话部分* [Dialectal Pronunciation of Characters in Yuè, Pínghuà and Patois — 2nd Volume: Pínghuà and Patois in Northern Guǎngxī, Eastern Guǎngxī and Surrounding Areas]. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Education Publishing House.

Cheng, Lisa L.-S. and Rint Sybesma. 2005. Classifiers in four varieties of Chinese. In Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*: 259–292. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Cheung, Samuel Hung-nin. 1992. The pretransitive in Cantonese. In 中國境內語言暨語言學 *Chinese Languages and Linguistics* 1: 241–303.

Chirkova, Katia 齊卡佳 Qí Kājiā. 2008. Báimǎ Zàngyǔ wéi Dīzú shuō zhīyǐ 白馬藏族為氏族 說質疑 The Baima Tibetans and the Di people of Chinese historical records: Challenging the link. *Bulletin of Chinese linguistics* 3(1): 167–180.

Comrie, Bernard. 2007. Areal typology of Mainland Southeast Asia: what we learn from the *WALS* maps. *Manusya* special issue 13: 18–47.

Comrie, Bernard. 2008a. The areal typology of Chinese: between North and Southeast Asia. In Redouane Djamouri, Barbara Meisterernst, and Rint Sybesma (eds.). *Chinese Linguistics in Leipzig*, *Chinese Linguistics in Europe* 2: 1–21. Paris: Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l'Asie Oriental, École des hautes études en sciences sociales.

Comrie, Bernard. 2008b. Prenominal relative clauses in verb-object languages. *Language and Linguistics* 9(4): 723–733.

Dede, Keith. 2007. The origin of the anti-ergative [xa] in Huangshui Chinese. *Language and Lingusitics* 8(4): 863–881.

Ding, Picus Sizhi. 2007. *Studies on Bǎ Resultative Construction: A Comprehensive Approach to Mandarin Bǎ Sentences*. Lincom Studies in Asian Linguistics 62. Munich: Lincom.

Djamouri, Redouane. 2001. Markers of predication in Shang bone inscriptions. In Hilary Chappell (ed.). *Sinitic Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives*: 143–171. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Djamouri, Redouane. forthcoming. Tángwàng Language.

Djamouri, Redouane, Waltraud Paul, and John Whitman. 2007. Reconstructing VO constituent order for Proto-Sino-Tibetan. Paper presented at The 18th International Conference on Historical Linguistics. Université du Québec à Montréal.

Dryer, Matthew S. 1991. SVO languages and the OV/VO typology. *Journal of Linguistics* 27: 443–482.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2001. Mon-Khmer Word Order from a Crosslinguistic Perspective. In Karen L. Adams and Thomas John Hudak (eds.). *Papers from the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society 1996*: 83–99. Tempe: Arizona State University Program for Southeast Asian Studies.

Dryer, Matthew and Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2011. *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. http://wals.info/

Enfield, N. J. 2005. Areal linguistics and Mainland Southeast Asia. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34: 181–206.

Enfield, N. J. 2007. *A Grammar of Lao*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Enfield, N. J. 2011. Linguistic diversity in Mainland Southeast Asia. In N. J. Enfield (ed.). *Dynamics of Human Diversity*: 63–79. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Gan, Rui-Jing, Shang-Ling Pan, Laura F. Mustavich, Zhen-Dong Qin, Xiao-Yun Cai, Ji Qian, Cheng-Wu Liu, Jun-Hua Peng, Shi-Lin Li, Jie-Shun Xu, Li Jin, Hui Li, and The Genographic Consortium. 2008. Pinghua Population as an Exception of Han Chinese's Coherent Genetic Structure. *Journal of Human Genetics* 53: 303–313.

Gawarjon 高尔锵 Gāo Ěrqiāng. 1985. *Tǎjíkēyǔ Jiǎnzhì 塔吉克语简志* [Sketch of the Tajik Language]. Běijīng: The Ethnic Publishing House.

Georgopoulos, Carol. 1986. Palauan as a VOS language. In Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington, and Stephen A. Wurm (eds.). *FOCAL I: Papers from the Fourth International Confernece on Austronesian Linguistics*: 187–198. PL C-93. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Haiman, John. 2011. *Cambodian: Khmer*. London Oriental and African Language Library 16. Amsterdam; Philadephia: John Benjamins.

Hashimoto, Mantarō 橋本萬太郎. 1978. *Gengo Ruikei Chili Ron 言語類型地理論* [Thesis on Geography of Language Typology]. Tōkyō: Koubundou 弘文堂.

Hashimoto, Mantaro. 1986. The Altaicization of Northern Chinese. In McCoy, John and Timothy Light (eds.). *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*. Cornell Linguistic Contributions, V: 76–97. Leiden: Brill.

Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie (eds.). 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haudricourt, André-Georges. 1954. De l'origine des tons en Vietnamien. *Journal Asiatique* 242: 69–82.

Heimbach, Ernest E. 1979. *White Hmong – English Dictionary*. 1979 revised edition. Linguistic Series IV, Data Paper 75. Ithaca, New York: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University.

Jacob, Judith M. 1993. An examination of the vowels and final consonants in correspondences between Pre-Angkor and Modern Khmer. In David A. Smyth (ed.). *Cambodian Linguistics, Literature and History*: 87–102. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

Janhunen, Juha, Marja Peltomaa, Erika Sandman, and Xiawu Dongzhou. 2008. *Wutun*. Munich: Lincom.

Jarkey, Nerida. 1991. Serial verbs in White Hmong: a functional approach. PhD thesis. University of Sydney.

Kato, Atsuhiko. 2003. Pwo Karen. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*: 632–648. London, New York: Routledge.

Koul, Omkar N. and Kashi Wali. 2006. *Modern Kashmiri Grammar*. Springfield VA: Dunwoody Press.

Lee, Yeon-Ju and Sagart, Laurent. 2008. No limits to borrowing: the case of Bai and Chinese. *Diachronica* 25(3): 357–389.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1994. On the change to verb-medial order in Proto-Chinese: evidence from Tibeto-Burman. In Hajime Kitamura, Tatsuo Nishida and Yasuhiko Nagano (eds.). *Current Issues in Sino-Tibetan Linguistics*: 98–104. Ōsaka: Organizing Committee of the 26th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics.

LaPolla, Randy J. 1995. Pragmatic relations and word order in Chinese. In Pamela Downing and Michael Noonan (eds.). *Word Order in Discourse*: 297–329. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Lee, Hui-chi. 2009. On the object marker *BUE* in Hainan Min. *Language and Linguistics* 10(3): 471–487.

Lee, Hui-chi. 2011. Double object construction in Hainan Min. *Language and Linguistics* 12(3): 501–527.

Li, Chao. 2011. Postverbal constituents in Mandarin Chinese. In Zhuo Jing-Schmidt (ed.). *Proceedings of the 23rd North American Conference on Chinese Linguistics*, volume 2: 30–37. Eugene: University of Oregon.

Li, Charles N. 1989. The origin and function of switch reference in Green Hmong. In Leiv Egil Breivik and Ernst Håkon Jahr (eds.). *Language Change: Contributions to the study of its Causes*. Trends in Linguistics Studies and Monographs 43: 115–129. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Li, Charles N. and Sandy Thompson. 1974a. An explanation of word order change SVO → SOV. *Foundations of Language* 12: 201–214.

Li, Charles N. and Sandy Thompson. 1974b. The semantic function of word order: a case study in Mandarin. In Charles N. Li (ed.). *Word Order and Word Order Change*: 164–195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Li, Charles N. and Sandy Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar*. Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press.

Lǐ, Jǐnfāng 李锦芳. 1999. *Bùyāngyǔ Yánjiū 布央语研究* [Studies of the Bùyāng Language]. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.

Lǐ, Jǐnfāng 李锦芳. 2002. *Dòng-Tái Yǔyán yǔ Wénhuà 侗台语言与文化* [Kam-Tai Language and Culture]. Běijīng: The Ethnic Publishing House.

Lǐ, Lán 李蓝. 2004. *Húnán Chéngbù Qīngyī Miáo Rénhuà* 湖南城步青衣苗人话 [The People's Speech of Blue Dress Miáo in Chéngbù, Húnán]. Běijīng: China Social Sciences Press.

Lǐ, Liánjìn 李连进 and Yàn'ě Zhū 朱艳娥. 2009. *Guǎngxī Chóngzuǒ Jiāngzhōu Zhèyuánhuà Bǐjiào Yánjiū* 广西崇左江州蔗园话比较研究 *[Comparative Studies of the Sugarcane Field Dialect in Jiāngzhōu, Chóngzhǒ, Guangxi]*. Guìlín: Guangxi Normal University Press.

Lǐ, Yǒngsuì 李永燧. 2010. Miǎn-Yíyǔ: yīzhǒng shēngdiào zúyǔ 缅彝语：一种声调语言 [Lolo-Burmese: a type of tonal proto language]. In Zhāomíng Dài 戴昭铭 and James Matisoff 马提索夫 Mǎtísǒfū (eds.). *Hànzàngyǔ Yánjiū Sìshínián: Dì Sìshíjiè Guójì Hànzàng Yǔyán jì Yǔyánxué Huìyì Lùnwénjí* 第40届国际汉藏语言暨语言学会议论文集 [Forty years of Sino-Tibetan Research: Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics]: 47–57. Harbin: Heilongjiang University Press.

Lǐ, Xiǎofán 李小凡. 1998. *Sūzhōu Fāngyán Yǔfǎ Yánjiū* 苏州方言语法研究 [Research on the Syntax of the Sūzhōu Dialect]. Běijīng: Peking University Press.

Li, Xuping and Walter Bisang. 2012. Classifiers in Sinitic languages: from individuation to definiteness marking. *Lingua* 112: 335–355.

Lǐ, Yúnbīng 李雲兵. 2003. Miáo-Yáoyǔ shēngdiào wèntí 苗瑤語聲調問題 [The question of tones in Miáo-Yáo languages]. *Language and Linguistics* 4(4): 683–712.

Liáng, Mǐn 梁敏. 2002. *Biāohuà Yánjiū* 标话研究 [Studies on the Biāo Language]. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.

Liáng, Wěihuá 梁伟华 and Yì Lín 林亦. 2009. *Guǎngxī Chóngzuǒ Xīnhé Zhèyuánhuà Yánjiū* 广西崇左新和蔗园话研究 *[Studies of the Sugarcane Field Dialect in Xīnhé, Chóngzhǒ, Guangxi]*. Guìlín: Guangxi Normal University Press.

Lín, Tāo 林涛. 2003. *Zhōngyà Dōnggānyǔ Yánjiū* 中亚东干语研究 Жуня Дунганйу Янжю [Studies of the Dungan Language of Central Asia]. Hong Kong: Hong Kong Educational Press.

Lín, Yì 林亦 and Fèngyǔ Qín 覃凤余. 2008. *Guǎngxī Nánníng Báihuà Yánjiū* 广西南宁白话研究 *[Studies of Nánníng Cantonese of Guangxi]*. Guìlín: Guangxi Normal University Press.

Liú, Dānqīng 刘丹青. 2003. *Yǔxū Lèixíngxué yǔ Jiècí Lǐlùn* 语序类型学与介词理论 [Typology of Word Order and Theories on Adpositions]. Běijīng: The Commercial Press.

Liú, Dānqīng 刘丹青. 2012. Gǔjīn Hànyǔ de jùfǎ lèixíng yǎnbiàn: kuā-fāngyán de kùcáng lèixíngxué shìjiǎo 古今汉语的句法类型演变：跨方言的库藏类型学视角 [Changes in the syntactic typology in diachronic and synchronic Chinese: viewpoints from pan-dialectal inventory typology]. Paper presented at the Fourth International Conference on Sinology. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Liú, Jiànsān 刘剑三. 2009. *Lín'gāoyǔ Huàyǔ Cáiliàojí* 临高语话语材料集 [Corpus Material Collection of the Lín'gāo Language]. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.

Liú, Lìlǐ 刘俐李. 1993. Xīnjiāng Hànyǔ fāngyán de xíngchéng 新疆汉语方言的形成 [The formation of Chinese dialects in Xīngjiāng]. *Fāngyán* 1993(4): 265–274.

Lo, Seo-Gim 羅肇錦. 1988. *Kèyǔ Yǔfǎ* 客語語法 [Grammar of the Hakka Language]. Taipei: Taiwan Student Book Co.

Löffler, Lorenz G. 1966. The contribution of Mru to Sino-Tibetan linguistics. *Zeitschrift der Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 116(1): 118–159.

Máo, Zōngwǔ 毛宗武 and Cháojí Méng 蒙朝吉. 1986. *Shēyǔ Jiǎnzhì 畲语简志* [Sketch of the Shē Language]. Běijīng: The Ethnic Publishing House.

Máo, Zōngwǔ 毛宗武, Cháojí Méng 蒙朝吉 and Zōngzé Zhèng 郑宗泽. 1984. *Yáozú Yǔyán Jiǎnzhì 瑶族语言简志* [Sketch of the Language of the Yáo Nationality]. Běijīng: The Ethnic Publishing House.

Matisoff, James. 1991. Areal and universal dimensions of grammatization in Lahu. In Elizabeth C. Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.). *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, vol. II: 383–453. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Matisoff, James. 2001a. Genetic vs. contact relationship: prosodic diffusibility in South-East Asian languages. In Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald and R. M. W. Dixon (eds.). *Areal Diffusion and Genetic Inheritance: Problems in Comparative Linguistics*: 291–327. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matisoff, James. 2001b. On the genetic position of Bai within Tibeto-Burman. Paper presented at the 34th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. Kūnmíng: Yunnan Nationalities Institute.

Matisoff, James. 2003. Southeast Asian languages. In William Frawley and Bernard Comrie (eds.). *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*, 2nd edition, vol. IV: 126–130. New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matthews, Stephen and Virginia Yip. 2011. *Cantonese — A Comprehensive Grammar*. 2nd edition. Abingdon[-on-Thames]; New York: Routledge.

Nguyễn, Đình -Hoà. 1997. *Vietnamese: Tiếng Việt Không Son Phán*. London Oriental and African Language Library 9. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Norman, Jerry. 2003. The Chinese dialects: phonology. In Graham Thurgood and Randy J. LaPolla (eds.). *The Sino-Tibetan Languages*. Routledge Language Family Series: 72–83. London; New York: Routledge.

Norman, Jerry and Tsu-lin Mei. 1976. The Austroasiatics in Ancient South China: some lexical evidence. *Monumenta Serica* 32: 274–301.

Ostapirat, Weera. 2000. Proto-Kra. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 23(1): 1–251.

Ostapirat, Weera. 2005. Kra-Dai and Austronesian: notes on phonological correspondences and vocabulary distribution. In Laurent Sagart, Roger Blench, and Alicia Sanchez-Mazas (eds.). *The Peopling of East Asia: Putting Together Archaeology, Linguistics and Genetics*: 107–131. London; New York: Routledge-Curzon.

Ōuyáng, Juéyà 欧阳觉亚. 1989. Hànyǔ Yuèfāngyán lǐ de Gǔ Yuèyǔ chéngfèn 汉语粤方言里的古越语成分 [Elements of the Ancient Yuè Language in the Yuè Dialect of Chinese]. In Shūxiāng Lǚ 吕叔湘 (ed.). *Yǔyán Wénzì Xuéshù Lùnwénjí — Qìngzhú Wáng Lì Xiānshēng Xuéshù Huódòng Wǔshí Zhōunián 语言文字学术论文集 — 庆祝王力先生学术活动五十周年* [Academic Proceedings of Language and Writing — Celebrating the Fiftieth Anniversary of Professor Wáng Lì's Academic Activities]. Běijīng: Knowledge Publishing House.

Peterson, David A. 2005. Initial observations on Bangladesh Mru morphosyntax. Paper presented at the 38th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Language and Linguistics. Xiàmén: Xiamen University.

Peyraube, Alain. 1988. *Syntaxe Diachronique du Chinois: Évolution des Constructions Datives du XIVe Siècle av. J.-C. au XVIIIe Siècle*. Paris: Collège de France, Institut des Hautes Études Chinoises.

Peyraube, Alain. 1996. Le Cantonais est-il du chinois? *Perspectives Chinoises* 34: 26–29.

Pulleyblank, Edwin George. 1963. The consonantal system of Old Chinese. Part II. *Asia Major* 9: 206–265.

Qián, Méng 钱萌. 2008. Níngbō fāngyán zhōng de SOV jù 宁波方言中的SOV句 [SOV sentences in Níngbō dialect]. In Linguistic Association of Shanghai and Chinese Linguistic Association of Hong Kong (eds.). *Wúyǔ Yánjiū: Dìsìjiè Guójì Wúfāngyán Xuéshù Yántǎohuì Lùnwénjí* 吴语研究：第四届国际吴方言学术研讨会论文集 [Studies of Wú Language: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Wú Dialects]: 134–140. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Education Publishing House.

Qián, Nǎiróng 钱乃荣. 2008. Níngbō fāngyán de shítài 宁波方言的时态 [Tense and aspect in Níngbō dialect]. In Linguistic Association of Shanghai and Chinese Linguistic Association of Hong Kong (eds.). *Wúyǔ Yánjiū: Dìsìjiè Guójì Wúfāngyán Xuéshù Yántǎohuì Lùnwénjí* 吴语研究：第四届国际吴方言学术研讨会论文集 [Studies of Wú Language: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on Wú Dialects]: 121–126. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Education Publishing House.

Ratliff, Martha. 1998. Ho Ne (She) is Hmongic: one final argument. *Linguistics of the Tibeto-Burman Area* 21(2): 97–109.

Ratliff, Marth. 2010. *Hmong-Mien Language History*. PL 613. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Sagart, Laurent. 2002. Gan, Hakka and the formation of Chinese dialects. In Dah-an Ho (ed.). *Dialect Variations in Chinese, Papers from the Third International Conference on Sinology, Linguistics Section*: 129–153. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Sagart, Laurent. 2004. The higher phylogeny of Austronesian and the position of Tai-Kadai. *Oceanic Linguistics* 43(2): 411–444.

Sagart, Laurent. 2008. The expansion of *Setaria* farmers in East Asia: a linguistic and archaeological model. In Alicia Sanchez-Mazas, Roger Blench, Malcolm D. Ross, Ilia Peiros, and Marie Lin (eds.). *Past Human Migrations in East Asia: Matching Archaeology, Linguistics and Genetics*: 133–157. London; New York: Routledge.

Sagart, Laurent. 2011. Classifying Chinese dialects/Sinitic languages on shared innovations. Talk given at CRLAO, Norgent sur Marne.

Shěn, Míng 沈明. 2006. Jìnyǔ de fēnqū (gǎo) 晋语的分区（稿） [The classification of Jìn (draft)]. *Fāngyán* 2006(4): 343–356.

Simpson, Andrew. 2005. Classifiers and DP Structure in Southeast Asia. In Guglielmo Cinque and Richard S. Kayne (eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*: 806–838. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Smyth, David. 2002. *Thai: An Essential Grammar*. London; New York: Routledge.

Soe, Myint. 1999. A grammar of Burmese. PhD dissertation. University of Oregon.

Solnit, David B. 1997. *Eastern Kayah Li: Grammar, Texts, Glossary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Starostin, Sergej. 1995. The historical position of Bai. *Московский Лингвистический Журнал* 1: 174–190.

Sun, Hongkai. 2003. Is Baima a dialect or vernacular of Tibetan. *Cahiers de Linguistique – Asie Orientale* 32(1): 61–81.

Sybesma, Rint P. E. 1992. Causatives and accomplishments: the case of Chinese ba. PhD dissertation. Universiteit Leiden.

Thurgood, Graham. 1993. Phan Rang Cham and Utsat: tonogenetic themes and variants. In Jerald A. Edmondson and Kenneth J. Gregerson (eds.). *Tonality in Austronesian Languages*. Oceanic Linguistics Special Publication 24: 91–106. Honolulu: University of Hawaiʻi Press.

Vovin, Alexander. 2000. Did the Xiongnu speak a Yeniseian language? *Central Asiatic Journal* 44(1): 87–104.

Wali, Kashi and Omkar N. Koul. 1996. *Kashimiri: A Cognitive-Descriptive Grammar*. London, New York: Routledge.

Wang, Feng. 2006. *Comparison of languages in contact: the distillation method and the case of Bai*. Language and Linguistics Monograph Series B: Frontiers in Linguistics III. Taipei: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.

Wāng, Fēng 汪锋. 2012. *Yǔyán Jiēchū yǔ Yǔyán Bǐjiào: yǐ Báiyǔ wéi Lì 语言接触与语言比较:以白语为例* [Language Contact and Language Comparison: using Bái as an example]. Běijīng: The Commercial Press.

Wáng, Fùshì 王辅世. 1985. *Miáoyǔ Jiǎnzhì 苗语简志* [Sketch of the Miáo Language]. Běijīng: The Ethnic Publishing House.

Wáng, Hóngjūn 王洪君. 2009. Jiāngù yánbiàn, tuīpíng hé céngcì de Hànyǔ fāngyán lìshǐ guānxì móxíng 兼顾演变、推平和层次的汉语方言历史关系模型 [A historical relationship model of Chinese dialects which encompasses change, leveling and stratification]. *Fāngyán* 2009 (4): 204–218.

Wayland, Ratree P. and Allard Jongman. 2002. Registrogenesis in Khmer: a phonetic account. *Mon-Khmer Studies* 32: 101–115.

Wéi, Jǐngyún 韦景云 and Xiǎoháng Qín 覃晓航. 2006. *Zhuángyǔ Tōnglùn 壮语通论* [Common Theories on the Zhuàng Language]. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.

Wéi, Qìngwěn 韦庆稳. 1981. Yuèréngé yǔ Zhuàngyǔ de guānxì chūtàn 越人歌与壮语的关系初探 [First discussions on the relationship between Yuèréngé and the Zhuàng language]. In Editorial board of Mínzú Yǔwén 民族语文编辑部 (eds.). *Mínzú Yǔwén Lùnjí 民族语文论集* [Essays in Ethnic Languages]. Běijīng: China Social Sciences Press.

Wen, Bo, Hui Li, Daru Lu, Xiufeng Song, Feng Zhang, Yungang He, Feng Li, Yang Gao, Xianyun Mao, Liang Zhang, Ji Qian, Jingze Tan, Jianzhong Jin, Wwei Huang, Ranjan Deka, Bing Su, Ranajit Chakraborty, and Li Jin. 2004. Genetic Evidence Supports Demic Diffusion of Han Culture. *Nature* 431: 302–305.

Wǔ, Yúnjī 伍云姬 and Ruìqīng Shěn 沈瑞清. 2010. *Xiāngxī Gǔzhāng Wǎxiānghuà Diàochá Bàogào 瓦乡话调查报告* [Survey Report on the Wǎxiāng Language in Gǔzhāng, Western Húnán]. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Wurm, Stephan Adolphe, Rong Li, Theo Baumann, and Mei W. Lee (eds.). 1987. *Language Atlas of China*. Hong Kong: Longman.

Xióng, Zhènghuī 熊正辉 and Zhènxīng Zhāng 张振兴. 2008. Hànyǔ fāngyán de fēnqū 汉语方言的分区 [Classification of the Chinese dialects]. *Fāngyán* 2008(2): 97–108.

Yip, Virginia and Stephen Matthews. 2007. Relative clauses in Cantonese-English bilingual children: typological challenges and processing motivations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 29(2): 277–300.

Yóu, Wénliáng 游文良. 2002. *Shēzú Yǔyán 畲族语言* [The language of the Shē Nationality]. Fúzhōu: Fujian People's Publishing House.

Zhāng, Mǐn 張敏. 2010. "Dònghòu xiànzhì" de qūyù tuīyí jí qí shízhí "動後限制"的區域推移及其實質 The postverbal constraint as a geographical continuum. Talk presented at the International Symposium for Comparative and Typological Research on Languages of China, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.

Zhāng, Zhènxīng 张振兴 and Zhènghuī Xióng 熊正辉 et al. (eds.). in press. *Zhōngguó Yǔyán Dìtújí 中国语言地图集* [Atlas of Languages of China], new edition. Běijīng: The Commercial Press.

Zhangzhang, Shangfang. 1991. Decipherment of Yue-Ren-Ge (song of the Yue boatman). *Cahiers de Linguistique — Asie Orientale* 20(2): 159–168.

Zhèng, Yíqīng 郑贻青. 1997. *Huíhuīhuà 回辉话* [The Huíhuī Language]. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Far East Publishers.

Zhèngzhāng, Shàngfāng 郑张尚芳. 1995. Gàn, Mín, Yuèyǔ lǐ gǔquánzhuó shēngmǔ jīndú zhuóyīn de fāngyán 赣、闽、粤语里古全浊声母今读浊音的方言 [The Gàn, Mín and Yuè dialects where Middle Chinese voiced obstruent onsets remained voiced]. In Tsu-Lin Mei 梅祖麟 (ed.). *Wúyǔ hé Mínyǔ de Bǐjiào Yánjiū 吴语和闽语的比较研究 Comparative Studies among Wu and Min Dialects*: 13–17. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Education Publishing House.

Zhèngzhāng, Shàngfāng 郑张尚芳. 1999. Bǎiyǔ shì Hàn–Bái Yǔzú de yīzhī dúlì yǔyán 白语是汉白语族的一支独立语言 [Bái is an independent language in the Sinitic–Bái language family]. In Shí, Fēng 石锋 and Wǔyún Pān 潘悟云 (eds.). *Zhōngguó Yǔyánxué de Xīn Tuōzhǎn 中国语言学的新拓展* [New Expansions in Linguistics in China]: 19–73. Hong Kong: City University of Hong Kong Press.

Zhèngzhāng, Shàngfāng 郑张尚芳. 2008. *Wēnzhōu Fāngyán Zhì 温州方言志* [Records of the Wēnzhōu Dialect]. Běijīng: Zhonghua Book Company.

Zhèngzhāng, Shàngfāng 郑张尚芳. 2010. Càijiāhuà Bǎiyǔ kuānxì jí cígēn bǐjiào 蔡家话白语关系及词根比较 [The relationship between Càijiā language and Bái language, and comparison of word roots]. In Wǔyún Pān 潘悟云 and Zhōngwěi Shěn 沈钟伟 (eds.). *Yánjiū zhī Lè 研究之乐 The Joy of Research II*: 389–400. Shànghǎi: Shanghai Educational Publishing House.

Zhōng, Jìnwén 钟进文. 2007. *Gān–Qīng Dìqū Tèyǒu Mínzú Yǔyán Wénhuà de Qūyù Tèzhēng 甘青地区特有民族语言文化的区域特征 Area Features of Minorities Language and Culture Unique to Gansu and Qinghai Provinces*. Běijīng: The Central University of Nationalities Press.

Zhōu, Zhèng 周政. 2009. *Pínglì Fāngyán Diàochá Yánjiū 平利方言调查研究* [Investigative Study on the Pínglì Dialect]. Běijīng: Zhonghua Book Company.

Zhu, Xiaonong. 2006a. *A Grammar of Shanghai Wu*. Munich: Lincom Europa.

Zhū, Xiǎonóng 朱晓农. 2006b. Nèibàoyīn 内爆音 On Implosives. *Fāngyán* 2006(1): 16–21.

Zhū, Xiǎonóng 朱晓农, Zémín Liú 刘泽民, and Fùqióng Xú 徐馥琼. 2009. Zìfā xīnshēng de nèibàoyīn — láizì Gànyǔ, Mínyǔ, Hāníyǔ, Wúyǔ de dìyīshǒu cáiliào 自发新生的内爆音 — 来自赣语、闽语、哈尼语、吴语的第一手材料 [Recently developed implosives: new findings from Gàn, Mín, Hani and Wú]. *Fāngyán* 2009(1): 10–17.

Zhū, Zhāngnián 朱彰年, Gōngmù Xuē 薛恭穆, Wéihuī Wāng 汪维辉, Zhìfēng Zhōu 周志锋 (eds.). 1996. *Níngbō Fāngyán Cídiǎn 宁波方言词典* [Dictionary of the Níngbō Dialect]. Shànghǎi: Chinese Dictionary Publishing House.