

WHAT IS A KÈJIĀ DIALECT?*

Jerry Norman

University of Washington

The Kèjiā dialects have been discussed numerous times in works dealing with Chinese dialect classification.¹ In this paper, I will examine the various features that have been proposed as classificatory criteria for this dialect group and attempt to establish a more rigorous framework for distinguishing the Kèjiā dialects from some of the surrounding groups.

In searching for classificatory criteria, it is highly desirable to find features that are both necessary and sufficient. Wú dialects, for example, are often said to be characterized by the possession of voiced obstruent initials. This may be viewed as a necessary condition for defining a Wú 吳 dialect, but it is not a sufficient condition since other dialects (those of the Shīāng group) also possess such initials. In attempting to establish major dialect groups, one should try if at all possible to find criteria that will serve to characterize dialect groups in a unique fashion. Ideally, one would like to find a single criterion of this type, but this may not be possible in every case. An attempt should be made, nonetheless, to find the smallest number of criteria on which to establish the major dialect groups. Another useful distinction to keep in mind is that between diachronic and synchronic criteria. A diachronic criterion refers to an earlier stage of the same language and is stated in terms of some sort of evolutionary development: e. g., "in dialect X, earlier velars palatalize before high front vowels" is an example of a diachronic criterion. A synchronic feature, on the other hand, makes no reference to earlier historical stages of the language or dialect: "dialect X lacks high front rounded vowels" is an example of this kind of criterion. Such a feature might also be called typological. Clearly a genetic classification (one that purports to be based on historical descent) must be based on diachronic criteria.

I take it as evident that all Chinese dialect classifications, at least implicitly, are intended to be genetic; that is, the groups arrived at in each classification are in some sense to be considered as groups of dialects sharing a common origin. Wú dialects, for example, are viewed as being descended from a common

* Work on this paper was supported in part by a grant from the Committee on Scholarly Communication of the National Academy of Science.

¹ See, for example, Li (1937), Forrest (1948), T'üing (1953), Yuán (1960), Yang (1967), Zhān (1981), Hashimoto (1973), O'Connor (1976), and Ting (1982).

ancestral form which can be called proto-Wú. Such a view is certainly implicit in Y. R. Chao's 1928 monograph, *Studies in the modern Wú dialects*, in which he sets up an "abstract" or general Wú phonological system which is in fact a sort of proto-Wú (1928: vi). It is by analogy with the biological sciences that such classifications are called genetic. In fact since the most ancient times, biological genealogies have been taken as the exemplar of all classification; this can be seen in the very term *genus* (from Greek *genos* 'race, descent') and even in English where a class is often called a *kind* and objects considered to be related in a single class are said to be *akin* (Jevons 1905: 718). Languages and dialects, to be sure, are not the same thing as living organisms, but genetic descent is undeniably one of the most important aspects of linguistic development.² A classification that purports to be genetic represents a theory about the origins of the things being classified. A careful classification of Chinese dialects is consequently an important preliminary to understand how the diversification of an original linguistic unity in China has come about. To serve this end, it cannot be arbitrary or purely utilitarian, a kind of placing things in convenient cubby holes for easy retrieval, but should be constructed on the basis of well-defined principles.

It is important that Chinese dialect classification be based on the actual spoken forms of dialects and not on lists of character readings. Such lists, although they can reveal important features of a given dialect, especially if they are extensive and incorporate so-called colloquial readings, almost always omit important forms of the everyday spoken language, some of which are etymologically obscure, at least at first sight. The danger of what one might call the "character approach" is that one frequently misses the most critical forms for establishing the proper classification of the dialect being studied. It seems to me that it is useful to make a distinction between *colloquial* and *popular* forms in studying Chinese dialects. Colloquial should be reserved for characterizing current usage and popular should be used to describe a word's historical status. In the Peking dialect, for example, the word *dé* 'obtain' is a free verb of high frequency in the everyday spoken language and could thus be described as 'colloquial', nonetheless, looked at from a historical point of view, *dé* is actually a literary borrowing; the older "popular" form, that is, the form that, so to speak, has always been in the dialect and is hence native to it, is *dǎi* 'catch, capture'. When attempting to establish the proper classificatory position of the Peking dialect among the other

² See William S-Y. Wang's (1982) remarks on the application of biological analogies to linguistics; as he points out, genetic descent is only one of several paths of language transmission; peer to peer, teacher to pupil and other paths of transmission are equally important. The well known tree diagrams of historical and comparative linguists undoubtedly do represent one important aspect of linguistics development and are useful as long as one keeps in mind the other factors that may lead to formation of languages and dialects.

Mandarin dialects, the form *dǎi* is the more valuable and relevant one. This distinction is perhaps even clearer in the case of the Mǐn 閩 dialects; in the current dialect of Fóochōw 福州, the “colloquial” word for ‘rain’ is *y³*, but when we compare other Mǐn forms for ‘rain’ Shiàmén 廈門 *hɔ⁶*, Cháochōw 潮州 *hou⁴*, Jiànyáng 建陽 *xy⁵*, etc., we can see that this is not the real local development of the ancient Chinese word for ‘rain’ brought to Fúkièn 福建 in the earliest times, but a “colloquialization” of the literary readings for the character. 雨 in Fóochōw (cf. the literary readings for ‘rain’ in Shiàmén, *u³*, and Cháochōw, *u³*). That is so can be seen from the fact that the genuine popular form *huo⁶* survives in Fóochōw in the special sense of ‘summer shower’ and in the phrase *huo⁶ lau² teik⁷* 雨流滴 ‘rainwater leaks from the eaves’ (Maclay and Baldwin 1870: 1011; Chén and Lǐ 1983: 77, note 26).³

In earlier articles (Norman 1973, 1986), I have defined the Mǐn dialects in a very precise manner on the basis of the patterning of aspirated and unaspirated initials in lower register tone words as well as by a set of unique lexical items. On the basis of these criteria (and others as well), I have placed the Shàuwǔ 邵武 dialect, which some scholars have classified as Kèjiā, in the Mǐn group (Norman 1982). It seems to me that the Mǐn group, looked in the way I have proposed, is a perfectly delimited group; any Chinese dialect can unambiguously be classified as Mǐn or non-Mǐn. Since I was initially led to this conclusion by a rigorous consideration of the affinity of the Shàuwǔ dialect, which some had considered a variety of Kèjiā, I would now like to turn my attention to this latter group and attempt to determine whether it can be classified as neatly as the Mǐn group can be. To do this, I will first examine the traits that have been proposed hitherto as classificatory criteria and present in some detail the characteristics which I consider to be the best for identifying a Kèjiā dialect. To do this I will use material from the following dialects:

1. Méishàn 梅縣. This dialect is often considered to be the type which defines the group as a whole. It has been described by Hashimoto (1972, 1973); it is included in both the *Hànyǔ fāngyán tǐzhùèi* (Běijīng Dàshìuè 1962) and the *Hànyǔ fāngyán tǐzhùèi* (Běijīng Dàshìuè 1964). It is well documented lexicographically (MacIver 1926).

2. Hǎilù 海陸. This Kèjiā variety, in its Táiwan 臺灣 form, has been described by S. F. Yang (1957). In origin Hǎilù is a Kwǎngtǔng 廣東 dialect spoken in the counties of Hǎifēng 海豐 and Lùfēng 陸豐.

3. Chángtǐng 長汀. This Fúkièn dialect is described in *Fújiànshěng hànyǔ fāngyán*

³ The reason for this replacement is interesting; in the Fóochōw dialect, *huo⁶* ‘rain’ became homophonous with 禍 *huo⁶* ‘disaster’ as a result of regular phonological processes; *tauŋ⁶ huo⁶* ‘rain falls, it is raining’ then became homophonous with ‘disaster is falling’, a homophonic clash unacceptable to most Fóochōw speakers.

diàuchátzǔ (1962).

4. Yǔngdǐng 永定. This dialect, spoken in southwestern Fúkièn like Chángtǐng, has been described by Huáng Xuézhēn (1982, 1983a, 1983b, 1983c).

While there exists a considerable body of information on other Kèjiā dialects, I believe the present four dialects represent a sufficiently varied sample to test adequately any theory of Kèjiā classification. The Kèjiā dialects of Kwángtūng are particularly close to one another and little is gained by citing numerous forms from dialects so intimately related. Note, however, that the Hǎilù dialect possesses a special importance because it retains a distinction between the upper and lower *chiù* 去 tones (a distinction otherwise rare in the Kèjiā dialects of Kwángtūng and Táiwān); this feature is critical to some of the arguments presented below.

Zhān Bóhuì (1981: 152-53) in his book *Shiàndài hànǚ fāngyán* lists 10 features which he considers typical of Kèjiā dialects; while he does not explicitly give them as classificatory criteria, they can be taken as a rather typical characterization of this group. I would like to examine each of these features and comment on them in terms of their usefulness as classificatory criteria.⁴

1. In Kèjiā dialects, the *chiuánjuó* 全濁 initials (voiced stops and affricates) of the *Chièyùn* 切韻 system become voiceless aspirates in all tonal categories. This is undoubtedly the most widely cited feature of Kèjiā, but as I pointed out in Norman (1974), this feature, while it can be considered a necessary condition for identifying a Kèjiā dialect, is not a sufficient condition. This means that all Kèjiā dialects possess this feature but since it also appears in dialects which are not considered to be members of this group, it is not a unique trait of Kèjiā. As Hashimoto (1973: 439) has pointed out, the shift of the old voiced stops and affricated to voiceless aspirates in all four tonal categories is a feature found in a wide range of dialects. In addition to Bóbái 博白 (Yuè 粵) and Shàuwǔ (Mǐn) cited by Hashimoto, reference can also be made to the following dialects:

Húngtúng 洪洞 (Shānsī 山西) (Qiáo 1983)

Wànrúng 萬榮 (Shānsī) (Wú 1984)

Língbǎo 靈寶 (Hónán 河南) (Yang and Ching 1971)

Tàijōu 泰州 (Kiāngsū 江蘇) (Jiāngsūshěng hé Shànghǎishhè fāngyán diàuchá jǐdǎutzǔ 1960)

Rúgāu 如皋 (Kiāngsū) (ibid.)

Nántūng 南通 (Kiāngsū) (ibid.)

Jishī 績溪 (Ānhwēi 安徽) (Chao and Yang 1965)

In addition to these dialects, it is well known that a great majority of the dialects of Kiāngsī 江西 as well as a number of dialects of Eastern Húnán 湖南 also exhibit this feature. This has led some to place the Kèjiā and Gàn 贛 dialects

⁴ These features are somewhat paraphrased for the sake of simplicity.

together in a larger Gàn-Kèjiā group (Lǐ 1937; Ló 1958). This is a question I will return to later.

One might well ask why not place all the dialects that exhibit this particular feature into one large group. The difficulty with such a procedure would be that this feature does not correlate strongly with any other set of classificatory criteria including those that will be discussed below. It is better to view the uniform and unconditional shift of older voiced stops and affricates to voiceless aspirates in various regions of China as cases of parallel development lacking any strong diagnostic value in the classification of Chinese dialects. I would even go so far as to say that the development of the old voiced stops in Chinese dialects is in general a weak classificatory criterion and that its main value is as a secondary corroborative trait which can be used in the case of some dialect groups but not others. In the case of the Kèjiā dialects, the most one can say is that the aspiration feature is found in all the dialects of the group, but since it is also found commonly elsewhere it is not a sufficient criterion for placing a dialect in the Kèjiā group.

2. In general *ts*, *ts'*, *s* and *tʃ*, *tʃ'* and *ʃ* are not distinguished. This represents an example of describing one variety of a dialect group (albeit a major variety) as the ideal type of the group as a whole. Such statements, while perhaps useful in popular characterizations, have no value as classificatory criteria. In the present case, for example, two of the dialects which I am employing in this paper (Hǎilù and Chángtīng) do distinguish these two series of sounds.

3. The old velar fricatives *shǎu* 曉 and *shíá* 匣 become *f* when they occur in *hékǒu* 合口 words. Again, this feature is by no means limited to Kèjiā dialects; it is found in Yuè, Gàn, Far Western Mǐn (Shàuwǔ, Jiānglè 將樂) Shīāng 湘, and Southwestern Mandarin. It has no diagnostic value in distinguishing major groups.

4. Kèjiā preserves a number of bilabial initials in words which had *chingchúen* 輕唇 initials in the earlier language. This feature is also found in all Mǐn dialects. It is not a sufficient criterion for identifying a Kèjiā dialect, but it is important in distinguishing Kèjiā from certain other groups.

5. Velars in many Kèjiā dialects are preserved before high front vowels. This is also true of Mǐn and Yuè dialects; moreover, velars do palatalize before high front vowels in Chángtīng; this phenomenon also appears to be widespread in Kiāngsi Kèjiā dialects (Yán 1986). Obviously this cannot be used as a classificatory criterion for Kèjiā.

6. Almost all Kèjiā dialects have voiced labiodental fricative *v*. This is true, but initial *v* is by no means limited to Kèjiā dialects; it can also be found in Wú and some Mandarin dialects.

7. Nasal initials are numerous; in addition to *m-*, *n-* and *ŋ-*, a palatal *ɲ-* is

also found. A number of other dialects also have four nasal initials including a palatal nasal: Jī-nán 濟南, Shī-ān 西安, Chéngdū 成都, Sōochōw 蘇州 (Běijīng Dàshíuè 1962). Clearly this is not a sufficient condition for identifying a Kèjiā dialect.

8. Finals do not contain high, front rounded medials. Such a situation can be observed in many areas of South China outside the Kèjiā region: Canton 廣州, Cháochōw, Shiàmén.

9. The old final stops -p, -t and -k are preserved intact. This is true only of some Kèjiā dialects such as those of Méishìàn and Hǎilù. It is not true of Chángtīng in Fúkièn or Liángshuēijǐng 涼水井 in Szèchwān 四川 (Tǔng 1948). Furthermore, this is found in Mìn, Yuè and the Gàn dialects as well.

10. Most Kèjiā dialects have six tones. While six tone systems are common, Kèjiā dialects with seven tones (Hǎilù) and five tones (Shíchéng 石城 in Kiāngsi) are also reported.

It is quite clear that none of the characteristics given Zhān is sufficient in and of itself to serve as a classificatory feature for Kèjiā. Clearly there is a need to reexamine the Kèjiā dialects in order to determine which feature or features can be used to distinguish this dialect group from other groups unambiguously.

Hashimoto (1973: 440), after reviewing a number of alleged Kèjiā features (some of which were examined above), concluded that the shift of the *yángshàng* 陽上 tonal category to the *yīnpíng* 陰平 category is the only feature of Kèjiā that is unique to this group. This feature can be used to differentiate Kèjiā from Mìn (Norman 1982) and Yuè and several other dialect groups. Whether it serves to distinguish Kèjiā from Gàn will be examined later in this paper.

Below I will list and discuss a number of features which I consider to be critical to the determination of the classificatory status of the Kèjiā dialects. These features are the following: 1) retention of bilabials where most other dialects have developed labiodentals, 2) retention of stops for the *Chièyùn shéshàngyīn* 舌上音 (reconstructed by Karlgren as palatal stops but as retroflexes by Ló Ch'áng-p'ei), 3) the development of the *yángshàng* tonal category, 4) evidence for two contrasting sets of sonorants, and 5) the Kèjiā lexicon.

As Zhān Bóhuì (1981) and others have pointed out, Kèjiā dialects have preserved a significant number of words of the *chingchuén* type (labiodentals) as bilabials. The following list, while not exhaustive, gives a good idea of the situation in Kèjiā.

	Chièyùn	Méishìàn	Hǎilù	Chángtīng	Yúngdìng
扶	bju	phu ²	—	—	—
符	bju	phu ²	phu ²	phu ²	—
斧	pju:	pu ³	pu ³	phu ³	—
脯	pju:	phu ³	phu ³	—	—

	Chièyùn	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtíng	Yǔngdìng
痞	phju:	phu ³	—	—	phi ³
肺	phjwèi-	phui ⁵	—	—	phei ³
柿	phjwèi-	phui ⁵	—	—	—
吠	bjwèi-	phoi ⁵	—	—	—
飛	pjwei	pui ¹	pui ¹	pe ¹	—
肥	bjwei	phui ²	phui ²	phe ²	phei ²
癩	pjwei-	pui ⁵	—	pe ⁵	pei ³
沸	pjwei-	pui ⁵	—	—	—
浮	bjəu	pho ²	—	—	—
伏	bjəu-	phu ⁵	phu ⁶	—	phi ⁶
翻	phjwən	phon ¹	—	—	—
飯	bjwən	—	—	phū ⁶	phɔn ⁶
髮	pjwet	—	—	pue ²	—
發	pjwet	pot ⁷	pot ⁷	pue ²	pot ⁷
分	pjuən	pun ¹	pun ¹	peŋ ¹	pun ¹
墳	bjən	phun ²	—	—	—
糞	pjuən-	pun ⁵	pun ⁵	peŋ ⁵	pun ³
坊	pjwang	—	—	piɔŋ ¹	—
枋	pjwang	pioŋ ¹	pioŋ ¹	—	piɔŋ ¹
紡	phjwang:	phioŋ ³	phioŋ ²	—	—
放	pjwang-	pioŋ ⁵	pioŋ ⁵	piɔŋ ⁵	piɔŋ ³
縛	bjwak	phiok ⁸	—	phio ⁶	phioʔ ⁸
楓	pjung	—	—	—	puŋ ¹
腹	pjuk	puk ⁷	puk ⁷	pu ²	puʔ ⁷
複	pjuk	puk ⁷	—	—	—
伏	bjuk	phuk ⁸	phuk ⁷	—	—
蜂	phjwong	phuŋ ¹	phuŋ ¹	—	phuŋ ¹
縫	bjwong	phuŋ ²	—	phon ²	—
縫	bjwong-	phuŋ ⁵	phuŋ ⁵	—	—

Less well preserved in Kèjiā dialects are cases where dental stops are attested for the *shéshàngyǐn* of the *Chièyùn* system. The pronunciation *ti¹* for 知 (CY *tje*) is universal in this dialect group but a few other scattered cases should also be noted:

	Chièyùn	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtíng	Yǔngdìng
知	tje	ti ¹	ti ¹	ti ¹	ti ¹
翳	thje	thi ¹	—	—	—
追	twi	tui ¹	tui ¹	—	—
野	ʔák	tok ⁷	tok ⁷	—	toʔ ⁷

	Chièyùn	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtīng	Yǔngdìng
啄	ták	tuk ⁷	tuk ⁷	—	tu ⁷
琢	ták	tok ⁷	—	—	—
擇	ḍek	thok ⁸	thok ⁸	—	—
中	tjung	—	tuj ¹	—	tuj ¹

O'Connor in his 1976 article on Proto-Kèjiā (51 ff.) correctly stressed that the tonal correspondences found among the dialects of this group require the recognition of two sets of Proto-Kèjiā sonorants, one of which conditions upper register tones and the other lower register tones. This phenomenon is strikingly similar to the situation found in the Min dialects (Norman 1973, 1982) where one must also recognize the earlier existence of two contrasting series of sonorants.⁵ Even more striking is the fact that for the most part, the distinction in Kèjiā and Min pertains to the same set of lexical items. Below are listed example of words having sonorant initials in the upper *ping* 平, *chiù* and *rù* 入 tones; for the sake of contrast, two examples of common words with lower register words with sonorant initials for each tonal category are given. Shǎng 上 tone words present a special problem and will be discussed below.⁶

Píng tone words

	Chièyùn	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtīng	Yǔngdìng
毛	mâu	mau ¹	mo ¹	mo ¹	mou ¹
籃	lâm	lam ¹	lam ¹	(laŋ ²)	(laŋ ²)
鱗	ljen	lin ¹	lin ¹	—	lin ¹
蚊	mjuən	mun ¹	mun ¹	meŋ ¹	mun ¹
鯉	lung	luŋ ¹	luŋ ¹	(loŋ ²)	luŋ ¹
籠	lung	luŋ ¹	luŋ ¹	(loŋ ²)	(luŋ ²)
□ ⁷	—	ma ²	ma ²	ma ²	ma ²
來	lài	loi ²	loi ²	lai ²	loi ²

Chiù tone words⁸

罵	ma-	ma ⁵	ma ⁵	ma ⁵	ma ³
露	luo-	lu ⁵	lu ⁵	—	li ³

⁵ For further elucidation of the situation in Mǐn, see the excellent article by Nicholas Bodman, "The reflexes of initial nasals in Proto-Southern Min-Hinghua" (1985). For examples of comparable forms in Mǐn, I refer the reader to my 1973 and 1982 articles as well as to the Bodman article just cited.

⁶ Words with tonal disagreements are placed in parentheses; such forms are undoubtedly from the learned stratum of the lexicon.

⁷ This is a suffix for female creatures: Méishiàn tsu¹ ma² 'sow'.

⁸ Méishiàn has merged the upper and lower *chiù* tones; here the merged category is designated as tone 5. In Yǔngdìng the upper *shǎng* and upper *chiù* have merged into a single category 3.

	Chièyùn	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtīng	Yǔngdìng
墓	muo-	mu ⁵	mu ⁵	mu ⁵	mu ³
奶	nai:	nen ⁵	nen ⁵	nen ⁵	lɛn ³
妹	muəi-	mui ⁵	moi ⁵	mue ⁵	moi ³
艾	ngái-	ŋioi ⁵	—	ŋai ⁵	ŋei ³
面	mjän-	mien ⁵	mian ⁵	miē ⁵	miɛn ³
夢	mjung-	mun ⁵	mun ⁵	mon ⁵	mun ³
健	ljän-	lon ⁵	(lon ⁶)	—	lɔn ³
問	mjuən-	mun ⁵	mun ⁵	meŋ ⁵	mun ³
賣	mai-	mai ⁵	mai ⁶	me ⁶	mei ⁶
路	luo-	lu ⁵	lu ⁶	lu ⁶	li ⁶

Rù tone words⁹

笠	ljəp	lip ⁷	(lip ⁸)	(ti ⁶)	—
襪	muât	mat ⁷	mat ⁷	mai ²	mat ⁷
日	nʒjet	nit ⁷	nit ⁷	ni ²	ni ⁷ ?
物 ¹⁰	mjuət	mak ⁷	(mak ⁸)	—	ma ⁷ ?
麥	mək	mak ⁷	—	(ma ⁶)	mat ⁷
箬	nzjak	niak ⁷	(niak ⁸)	—	—
額	ngək	niak ⁷	niak ⁷	—	nia ⁷ ?
目	mjuk	muk ⁷	muk ⁷	mu ²	mu ⁷ ?
木	muk	muk ⁷	muk ⁷	mu ²	mu ⁷ ?
六	ljuk	liuk ⁷	liuk ⁷	tɕw ²	liu ⁷ ?
肉	nʒjuk	niuk ⁷	niuk ⁷	niɕw ²	niu ⁷ ?
□	—	mut ⁷	mut ⁷	—	mut ⁷
'rotten'					
入	nʒjəp	nip ⁸	nip ⁸	ne ⁶	ni ⁸ ?
落	lâk	lok ⁸	lok ⁸	lo ⁶	lɔ ⁸ ?

As O'Connor (1976) has already pointed out, on the basis of forms like these, it is necessary to recognize two contrasting series of sonorants at the Proto-KĕjiĀ level, one giving rise to upper register tones, the other to lower register tones. The most obvious explanation for this situation would be that the series that conditions upper register tones was in some way voiceless and the other series voiced. The remarkable thing about this state of affairs is the degree to which it agrees with the comparable situation in the Mĭn dialects. Just to take one example, all the words in the list which have an upper register tone with initial

⁹ In Chángtīng, the *ylnrù* merges with the *yángpíng* tone and the *yánggrù* with the *yángchiù* category.

¹⁰ This morpheme occurs in the KĕjiĀ word for 'what': Méishiàn mak⁷ kai⁵ 物個; mak⁷ undoubtedly goes back to an earlier *mat⁷, the present final -k being due to assimilation. For the etymology, cf. Zhāng (1982).

l-, have s- in the Western Mǐn dialects; it is precisely on the basis of this reflex in Western Mǐn that I have proposed that Proto-Mǐn had a contrast of *l- (giving l- or n- in all Mǐn dialects) and *lh- (giving s- or š- in Western Mǐn but l- or n- in the Eastern group). The following forms illustrate this phenomenon:

	Proto-Mǐn	Méishàn	Yǔngdìng	Jiànyáng	Shàuwǔ	Shiàmén
籃	*lh	lam ¹	(lan ²)	saŋ ²	san ⁷	nā ²
鱗	*lh	lin ¹	lin ¹	saŋ ²	sen ⁷	lan ²
鯤	*lh	luŋ ¹	luŋ ¹	soŋ ²	suŋ ⁷	laŋ ²
籠	*lh	luŋ ¹	(loŋ ²)	— ¹¹	—	laŋ ²
露	*lh	lu ⁵	li ³	so ⁶	so ⁵	lo ⁶
健	*lh	lon ⁵	lon ³	—	son ⁵	nuā ⁶
笠	*lh	lip ⁷	—	se ⁸	sen ⁷	lue ⁷ ⁸
六	*lh	liuk ⁷	liu ⁷ ⁷	so ⁸	su ⁷	lak ⁸
來	*l	loi ²	loi ²	le ²	li ²	lai ²
路	*l	lu ⁵	li ⁶	—	—	lo ⁶
落	*l	lok ⁸	lo ⁷ ⁸	lo ⁸	lo ⁶	lo ⁷ ⁸

The same holds true for the other initials. For example, Proto-Mǐn *mh give rise to upper register tones in the Shàuwǔ and Jiānglè dialects; moreover, in certain Mǐnnán 閩南 dialects, in words originally lacking a nasal ending as a component of the final, an “irregular” nasalization is found.¹² The following examples illustrate this.

	Proto-Mǐn	Méishàn	Yǔngdìng	Shàuwǔ	Cháochōw (Jiēyáng)
毛	*mh	mau ¹	mou ¹	mau ⁷	mō ²
罵	*mh	ma ⁵	ma ³	ma ⁵	mē ⁶
墓	*mh	mu ⁵	mu ³	mio ⁵	— ¹³
妹	*mh	mui ⁵	moi ³	mei ⁵	muē ⁶
物	*mh	mak ⁷	ma ⁷ ⁷	—	muē ⁷ ⁸
目	*mh	muk ⁷	mu ⁷ ⁷	mu ⁷	māk ⁸

In the case of the other nasals a similar convergence can also be observed. In Southern Mǐn dialects, *nh- and *ŋh- become h- before palatal vowels: Proto-Mǐn

¹¹ Cf. Yǔng-ān 永安 saŋ²; the form is from Lǐ (1983: 270).

¹² For details, see Norman (1973) and Bodman (1985). Note that one dialect may provide evidence for a voiceless sonorant without there being corroborating evidence in the other areas. This is generally caused by the infiltration of heterogeneous lexical material from later strata or by borrowing from neighboring dialects. For example 襪 ‘stockings’ has an upper register tone in Kèjiā and Shàuwǔ and Jiānglè but fails to show the expected irregular nasalization in any Southern Mǐn dialect. From this, we much conclude that there were two competing forms for this word, one with initial *mh, the other with *m; one or the other of the forms finally prevailed in different regions.

¹³ Cf. Shiàmén boŋ⁶ where the irregular final nasal is a reflex of the original voiceless nasal.

*ŋhian 硯 'inkstone', Shiàmén hi⁶. The correlation between this feature and Kèjiā words having upper register tones with the initials n- and ŋ- is high as the following forms demonstrate:

	Proto-Mǐn	Méishìàn	Yǔngdìng	Shàuwǔ	Cháochōw (Jiēyáng)
艾	*ŋh	ŋioi ⁵	ŋei ³	ni ⁵	hiā ⁶
箸	*nh	ŋiak ⁷	—	nio ⁷	hio ⁷ ⁸
額	*ŋh	ŋiak ⁷	ŋia ⁷	nia ⁷	hia ⁷ ⁸
肉 ¹⁴	*nh	ŋiuk ⁷	ŋiu ⁷	ny ⁷	nēk ⁸

The shift of words in the *yángshǎng* tone category to the *yǐnpíng* category is a very distinctive Kèjiā trait which sets these dialects off sharply from the neighboring Mǐn and Yuè dialects. The following list contains some of the most common words exhibiting this feature:

	Chièyùn	Méishìàn	Hǎilù	Chángtīng	Yǔngdìng
坐	dzuā:	tsho ¹	tsho ¹	tsho ¹	tshou ¹
簿	buo:	phu ¹	phu ¹	—	—
苧	ɖjwo:	tshu ¹	—	tshu ¹	—
柱	ɖju:	tshu ¹	—	tshu ¹	—
弟	diei:	thai ¹	thai ¹	the ¹	thei ¹
被	bje:	phi ¹	phi ¹	phi ¹	phi ¹
舐	dʒje:	se ¹	se ¹	—	sei ¹
倚	gje:	khi ¹	khi ¹	tshi ¹	khi ¹
舅	gjøu:	khiu ¹	khiu ¹	khiu ¹	—
淡	dâm:	tham ¹	tham ¹	—	thaŋ ¹
旱	ʒan:	hon ¹	hon ¹	—	hɔn ¹
鱔	ʒjän:	sen ¹	—	—	sen ¹
斷	duân:	thon ¹	thon ¹	thū ¹	thɔn ¹
吮	dʒjuæn:	tshion ¹	tshion ¹	—	tshien ¹
近	gjøn:	khiun ¹	khiun ¹	kheŋ ¹	khun ¹
体 ¹⁵	buæn:	phun ¹	phun ¹	—	phun ¹
動	ɖung:	thuŋ ¹	thuŋ ¹	—	thuŋ ¹
重	ɖjung:	tshuŋ ¹	tshuŋ ¹	tshoŋ ¹	tshuŋ ¹

In addition to this development, which is characteristic of popular words, a shift of *yángshǎng* words to the *yángchiù* can be observed in all the Kèjiā dialects cited here; this change is clearly to be attributed to a late reading tradition that

¹⁴ Jiēyáng shows an irregular nasalization in this form; the Ding-ān 定安 dialect of Hǎinán 海南 has hiuk⁸; for further comments on Southern Mǐn forms for 'meat', see Bodman (1985: 18—note 24).

¹⁵ 体蒲本切粗也. This is the word for 'thick' in Méishìàn and Hǎilù.

penetrated the Kèjiā region after the shift described above had taken root. In the above list all the forms cited originally had stop or affricate initials. What about words with sonorant initials? Just as in the case of sonorant initials in the other three categories, a split can be observed in the *shǎng* category as well. The question naturally arises as to whether this split is also caused by the earlier distinction of sonorant initials into two types, one voiced and one voiceless. Unfortunately, in the case of the Mǐn dialects, it is impossible to establish this distinction with any certainty on the basis of tonal behavior in the *shǎng* category. In the case of the contrast between *1- and *lh-, however, the initials themselves evolve in a very different way irrespective of which tonal category they belong to. This gives us a useful way to test whether the Kèjiā tonal split in the *shǎng* category is in any way determined by the voiced/voiceless distinction. In all four of the Kèjiā dialects examined in this paper, *shǎng* tone words with sonorant initials are either in the *yīnpíng* category or in the *yīnshǎng* category.

Of all the words reconstructed with initial *lh- in Mǐn, four belong to the *shǎng* category: 李 'plum', 老 'old', 卵 'egg', and 兩 'two'. We can compare this list of forms to a list of words which definitely did not have voiceless initials in Proto-Mǐn, *i. e.*, words with initial *1-. The following four words are common popular words employed both in Mǐn and Kèjiā: 鯉 'carp', 滷 'brine', 瀾 'saliva', 懶 'lazy'. As the chart below shows, the words which had initial *lh in Proto-Mǐn all have tone three (*yīnshǎng*) and those with initial *1- all have tone one (*yīnpíng*). This suggests that in Kèjiā the pattern found in the *píng*, *chū* and *rù* tones is also present in the case of the *shǎng* tone and those with voiced sonorant initials follow the other *yángshǎng* words into the upper *píng* tone. This hypothesis can be checked in still another way. As indicated above, Proto-Mǐn words with the initials *nh- and ɲh- develop an initial h- in Southern Mǐn dialects when they occur before a high front vowel. The two words in my material that fall into this category both have tone 3 in Kèjiā. The relevant forms are shown in the following list:¹⁶

Proto-Mǐn *lh

	MS	HL	CT	YD	JY	JO	FC	SM
李	li ³	li ³	ti ³	li ³	se ⁵	se ⁶	li ³	li ³
老	lau ³	lo ³	lo ³	lou ³	seu ⁵	se ⁶	lau ⁶	lau ⁶
卵	lon ³	lon ³	lu ³	lon ³	suŋ ⁵	soŋ ⁶	lauŋ ⁶	ŋŋ ⁶
兩	lioŋ ³	lioŋ ³	tiŋ ³	liŋ ³	sŋŋ ⁵	(liŋ ⁴)	laŋ ⁶	ŋŋ ⁶

¹⁶ The following abbreviations are used: MS=Méishìàn, HL=Hǎilù, CT=Chángtīng, YD=Yǔngdīng, JY=Jiànyáng, JO=Jiànōu, FC=Fóochōw, SM=Shiàmén, CYS=Chièyùn system.

Proto-Min *l

	MS	HL	CT	YD	JY	JO	FC	SM
鯉	li ¹	li ¹	—	li ¹	loi ⁵	ti ⁴	li ³	li ³
滷	lu ¹	lu ¹	—	—	lo ³	lu ³	lou ⁶	lo ⁶
瀾	lan ¹	lan ¹	—	lan ¹	lueŋ ⁵	lueŋ ⁴	laŋ ³	nuā ⁶
懶	lan ¹	nan ¹	laŋ ¹	lan ¹	lyeŋ ⁵	tyeŋ ⁴	tiaŋ ⁶	tuā ⁶

Proto-Min *nh

耳	ni ³	ni ³	ni ³	hn ³	noiŋ ⁵	neŋ ⁴	ŋei ⁶	hi ⁶
---	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------

Proto-Min *ŋh

瓦	ŋa ³	ŋua ³	ŋua ³	ŋua ³	ua ⁵	ua ⁴	ua ⁶	hia ⁶
---	-----------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------	-----------------	------------------

On the basis of this evidence, I would like to propose that in Kèjiā words of popular origin, *shǎng* words with Proto-Kèjiā voiced sonorant initials followed other *yángshǎng* words into the upper *píng* tone; words with voiceless sonorant initials, on the other hand, went into the *yínshǎng* category. The general Kèjiā tonal development then is as follows:

	<i>píng</i>	<i>shǎng</i>	<i>chiù</i>	<i>rù</i>
voiceless initials	1	3	5	7
voiced initials	2	1	6	8

In looking at this chart, one must remember that the voiced/voiceless opposition applies to sonorants as well as to obstruents. It is also important to note that when the sonorant initials are included, this pattern of development is uniquely Kèjiā since in the Gàn dialects there is no evidence for a separate set of voiceless sonorant initials; in Gàn sonorant initials in the *shǎng* tonal category uniformly become *yínshǎng*.

The Kèjiā lexicon, hitherto little studied, provides a very rich area for comparative work. Perhaps the most interesting thing about the lexicon of these dialects is that there are very few lexical items that can be considered purely Kèjiā. This is in part to be explained by the fact that Kèjiā is surrounded on all sides by dialects of other groups and that it has lived in a symbiotic relationship with these dialects for many centuries. Two words that, as far as I have been able to determine, are uniquely Kèjiā are the words for 'son' and 'mother':

	Méishiàn	Hǎilù	Chángtǐng	Yǔngdìng
'son'	lai ⁵	lai ⁶	lai ⁵	lai ³
'mother'	oi ¹	oi ¹	ue ¹	oi ¹

Both words are of uncertain etymology. To this short list one might add a verb meaning 'to carry on the shoulder': MS *khia*², HL *khia*², YD *khia*². All three of these words appear to have rather high diagnostic value.

When one looks at the Kèjiā lexicon in general, he discovers that it falls into two basic categories. One of these represents an archaic stratum that shows significant links to forms found in the Mǐn dialects. This body of words is not large; the larger part of the Kèjiā lexicon belongs to a later and more general variety exhibiting strong bonds to the popular lexicon of the other non-Mǐn dialects of the Southeast. The following list of forms reflects the older, archaic stratum. For the sake of convenience, Méishìàn forms are compared with forms from several Mǐn dialects, chiefly from Northern Fúkièn.¹⁷

1. □ MS khem⁵ 'boxes with lids, a lid'. FC khai⁵ 'to cover'; FA khem⁵ 'id.'
2. □ MS khiuŋ⁵ 'rainbow' (Běijīng Dàshìuè 1965: 7). FC khøiŋ⁶ 'id.'; FA khoŋ⁶ 'id.'. Cf. SM kheŋ⁶ 'id.'
3. □ MS khuan⁵ 'carry in the hand'. FC kuaŋ⁶ 'id.'; FA kuan⁶ 'id.'; SM kuā⁶ 'id.'
4. 瀾¹⁸ MS lan¹ 'saliva'. FC laŋ³ 'id.'; FA lan³ 'id.'; JY lueŋ⁵ 'id.'
5. 健¹⁹ MS lon⁵ 'young hen'. SM nuā⁶, Jiēyáng 揭陽 (Cháochōw) nuā⁵, Jiānglè 薑萊⁵.
6. □ MS mi⁵ 'dive'. FC mei⁶ 'id.'; FA mei⁶ 'id.'; JY me⁶ 'id.'
7. □ MS miaŋ¹ 'to cover over', miaŋ² 'to cover over'. FC maŋ² 'id.'; FA maŋ¹ (Ibañez 1941-43: 335) 'id.'; JY maŋ² 'id.'
8. 芒 MS mioŋ² 'grass cut on the hills for cow's food, thatch, etc'. FC møiŋ² 'rush or straw'; FA mœŋ² 'id.'. Cf. SM baŋ² 'stalk of grass'.
9. □ MS mok⁷ 'to calculate, reckon, guess'. FC mo?⁷ 'to say at a venture, to guess'.
10. 目珠 MS muk⁷ tsiu¹ 'eye'. FC møik⁸ tsiu¹ 'id.'; FA mœk⁸ tsiu¹ 'id.'. Cf. SM bak⁸ tsiu¹ 'id.'. Note that only Kèjiā and Mǐn retain the old word for 'eye'; it is also noteworthy that in both dialect groups, a second syllable meaning 'sphere, pearl' is suffixed to the base morpheme.
11. □ MS mut⁷ 'rotten'. FC mauk⁷ 'soft, tender, rotten, decayed'; FA møk⁷ 'id.'
12. □ MS nan⁵ 'a small boil or pimple'. FC neiŋ¹ 'hard lump in the skin'; FA nen¹ 'id.'; JY nueŋ⁶ 'bump'.
13. □ MS nim⁵ 'the lobes of oranges'. FC leiŋ⁵ 'id.'; FA lem⁵ 'id.'

¹⁷ Méishìàn forms are cited from MacIver (1926); Fóochōw forms are chiefly from Maclay and Baldwin (1870); Shiàmén forms are from Douglas (1899). Fúān and Jiànyáng are from my fieldnotes. Note the abbreviations: FC=Fóochōw, FA=Fúān, JY=Jiànyáng, SM=Shiàmén.

¹⁸ 瀾, *Jiyùn* 魯早切潘也. The character 潘 means 'water in which rice has been washed'; it is metaphorically applied to 'saliva' in Mǐn and Kèjiā.

¹⁹ For discussion of this word, see Norman (1983: 206).

14. MS thiam³ 'press down, with the forearm'. FC thiaŋ³ 'push with the hand'.
15. MS tsaŋ¹ 'heel, elbow'. FC taŋ¹ 'id.'; JY tiaŋ¹ 'id.'. Cf. SM ti¹ 'id.'.
16. MS tshaŋ² 'to shine on'. FC taŋ² 'id.'; FA taŋ² 'id.'.
17. MS tshi² 'chicken louse, small destructive insect'. FC tai² 'id.'; FA tai² 'id.'; JY loi⁹ 'id.'. Cf. Shàuwǔ (Western Fùkièn) thu² 'id.'.
18. MS tshut⁸ 'to wipe away'. FC souk⁸ 'rub with the hand'; JY tsui⁸ 'wipe'. Cf. SM tsut⁸ 'wipe up'.
19. MS tsin¹ 'thin, watery'. FA tsen¹ 'id.'; JY loiŋ⁹ 'id.'.
20. MS tsun¹ 'shiver' (Běijīng Dàshuǐé 1965: 327). FA tson¹ 'id.'. Cf. SM tsun¹ 'shiver, shake, as with cold'.

When the Kèjiā and Mǐn lexicons are compared on a large scale, one discovers that where Mǐn dialects employ a very distinctive set of forms for some of the most common everyday objects, Kèjiā dialects tend to use more general, wide-spread designations. The forms given below illustrate this situation:

1. For 'cooking pot', Mǐn dialects employ the word 鼎 (CYS tieng-): FC tiaŋ³, JY tiaŋ³, SM tiā³. Kèjiā dialects use the more general Southern word 鑊 (CYS ōwāk): MS vok⁸ theu² (~頭), YD vɔʔ⁸ theu².²⁰
2. 'House' in Mǐn is 戙 (CYS śju-): FC tshio⁵, JY tshio⁵, SM tshu⁵. Kèjiā dialects employ 屋: MS vuk⁷, YD vu⁷.
3. For 'to wear (clothing)' the Mǐn dialects use a distinctive set of forms: FC sphiŋ⁶, JY tseŋ⁶, SM tshen⁶ (? <用 CYS jiung-). Kèjiā uses the more general term 著 (CYS tjak): MS tsok⁷, YD tsɔʔ⁷.
4. The general Mǐn word for 'leaf' is 箬 (CYS nǝjak): FC nio⁸, JY nio⁸, SM hio⁸. Kèjiā uses 葉 (CYS jiäp): MS jap⁸, YD ia⁸. (箬 survives in Méishiàn in the word 箬笠 niak⁷ lip⁷ 'rainhat'—see MacIver 1926: 562).
5. For the word 'mouth', Mǐn dialects have a *chiù* tone word with an aspirated initial: FC tshui⁵, JY tshy⁵, SM tshui⁵. Kèjiā has the widespread word 嘴: MS tsoi³, CT tsei³.
6. Mǐn dialects employ 解 (CYS ōai-) as an auxiliary verb meaning 'can, able to': FC a⁶, JY hai⁵, SM ue⁶. Kèjiā dialects use 會 (CYS ōuài-): MS voi⁵, YD voi⁶.

Even from this rather cursory examination it can be seen that the Kèjiā lexicon falls into two distinct types, one a more archaic type showing links to the Mǐn dialects and another later type, having links to Gà, Wú and Yuè. These two types of vocabulary can be viewed as two different lexical strata. For

²⁰ In this list Kèjiā forms are cited from the Méishiàn and Yǔngding dialects because the lexical sources for these two dialects are more extensive than those for Hǎilù and Chángtīng.

convenience, let us call the older, archaic type stratum A, and the later (and more general) type stratum B. As I have proposed elsewhere (Norman 1983: 209-210), the older stratum A goes back to the Chín-Hàn era and represents an ancient popular form of Chinese spread by the first imperial conquests. Stratum B, I believe, owes its origin to a later wave of Chinese, historically connected with the massive immigration of northerners into the region south of the Yangtze in the Eastern Jin period. Mǐn and Kèjiā differ from one another essentially in the degree to which they have retained elements from each of these strata. Whereas in Mǐn, stratum A material predominates and forms the very core of the various dialects, in Kèjiā stratum A elements for the most part are vestigial and restricted to a narrow sphere of familiar, everyday vocabulary.

In light of this dichotomy revealed in the lexicon, let us reexamine the phonological features discussed above. The retention of bilabial initials in a large number of words having labiodental initials in northern and central dialects is a feature shared with Mǐn. From the point of view of comparative dialectology, it definitely seems that this feature belongs to stratum A and that the development of labiodentals belongs to stratum B (and a still later stratum of northern origin reflected in the modern Mandarin dialects). Against this view, one could argue that the *Chiyùn* system, thought by many to reflect the literary text reading tradition of the late Nánběicháu period, lacks evidence for a separate series of labiodentals; consequently, while stratum A words clearly lack labiodentals, the mere presence of an unshifted bilabial does not necessarily mean that a given word should be assigned to this stratum since stratum B most likely had also not developed labiodentals. The solution to this impasse depends on when labiodentals began to appear. This change is usually placed relatively late; Shào Róngfēn (1979: 61) says that the first documentary evidence of such a change dates to the mid-eight century *fānchiè* of Jāng Shēn's 張參 *Wǔjīng wénzì* 五經文字. Zhōu Zǔmó (1966: 305) has argued that the original *fānchiè* of the *Yùpiān* 玉篇 (as preserved in fragments and in the *fānchiè* of Kūnghǎi 空海 *Wànshàng míngyì* 萬象名義) show that this distinction had already begun to develop in the sixth century. It must also be remembered that developments in the vernacular normally precede the appearance in written records of the same developments; in my opinion, it is quite possible that the development of labiodentals began already in the Southern dynasties and that the retention of bilabials in words of the *chīngchuán* category should be considered a feature of stratum A. The same would hold true of the retention of stops for the *shèshàngyīn*.²¹

²¹ Zhōu Zǔmó (1966: 307) also maintains that the distinction between the *shétóuyīn* and *shèshàngyīn* was found in the *fānchiè* of the original *Yùpiān*. Shào Róngfēn (1982: 10 ff), who generally takes a very critical view of Zhōu's analysis of the *Yùpiān fānchiè*, does not believe that the *shétóu* and *shèshàng* initials had already split at the time of the original *Yùpiān*.

I believe that if we view the dialects of Southeastern China as the end product of several major waves of sinicity, the classificatory position of the Kèjiā dialects will begin to fall into place. The first wave was due to the extensive conquests of the Chín and Western Hàn. The language of this wave was a popular spoken language, perhaps a sort of military koine, that was implanted in many newly conquered areas especially in the South of China.²² The core vocabulary of the Mǐn dialects derives for the most part from this earlier stratum. I believe that Kèjiā originally also belonged to this early dialectal milieu.

The second major wave of sinicity is associated with the mass migration to the South at the end of the Western Jìn dynasty. This migration brought in its trail a new, more evolved variety of Chinese, closely associated with the educated upper levels of society; its geographical base was almost certainly the area of Lòyáng where the capital city of Eastern Hàn, Wèi and Western Jìn was located. This language subsequently became the most prestigious form of Chinese in the Southern dynasties period; it replaced or profoundly influenced many of the older dialects of the South. In more remote and inaccessible areas of the South, the older dialects dating back to the Chín-Hàn period retained a great deal of vitality and were able to resist being thoroughly inundated by this powerful new linguistic wave from the north. But even these dialects were not able to resist this new pressure altogether. At present the Mǐn dialects are the major witness to the older sinicity, but traces of it live on in other dialect groups. As I have shown above, the Kèjiā dialects agree with Mǐn in a number of important respects; this is due to their early common origin. Of the features discussed in this paper, the retention of bilabials for words in the *chingchuén* category, the retention of stops for words with *shéshàng* initials, and the presence of large numbers of words having sonorant initials in upper register tones can be attributed to this early wave of Chinese.

While the Mǐn area was able to offer strong resistance to the second wave of sinicity, Kèjiā proved to be much weaker and absorbed new elements on a massive scale. In later ages it participated in a number of wide-ranging innovations issuing from eastern Kiāngsī. The chief of these new innovations was the devoicing and aspiration of the old voiced stops and affricates in all tones. This change subsequently spread even to some Mǐn dialects like those of Shàuwǔ and Jiānglè. Another important feature acquired by diffusion from eastern Kiāngsī was the shift of the *yángshǎng* to the *yingping*; in this case, however, the innovation was more local in nature, being found only in a circumscribed zone in east central

²² A similar dialect also seems to be at the root of the earliest Chinese loans in Korean, Vietnamese, Miao-Yao and Tai. I earlier (Norman 1983) referred to this language as Old Southern Chinese; I now think it was not limited to South China but may have been carried to other conquered areas as well.

Kiāngsī.²³ In the area of lexicon, Kèjiā dialects preserve a considerable stock of items going back to the earliest stratum, but, when compared to dialects of the Mǐn group, it is seen very clearly to have suffered profound inroads from the later wave of sinicity, bringing it close to the typical lexical pattern found in Gàn and Wú and to some extent in Yuè as well. This mixed nature of Kèjiā is what ultimately distinguishes it from dialects of the Gàn group.

Let us now return to the central problem of this paper: is there any criterion by which Kèjiā dialects can be uniquely characterized? Hashimoto's claim that the shift of *yángshǎng* words to the *yīnpíng* category is such a unique criterion, appears to be endangered by the discovery of dialects in eastern Kiāngsī exhibiting the same feature. A careful examination of the situation, however, shows that this criterion can still be salvaged. In the Kiāngsī dialects in which one finds the *yīnpíng* tone in words which belong to the traditional *yángshǎng* category, it turns out that they are limited to words with voiced obstruent initials (*chiuánjuó* in the traditional terminology); words with sonorant initials (*tszjuó*) initials always appear in the *yīnshǎng* tone in the Gàn dialects in question. In Kèjiā dialects, on the other hand, words with sonorant initials split into two types: one type becomes *yīnpíng* like the other words with voiced initials; a second type behaves like words with voiceless initials and become *yīnshǎng*. As was shown above, this split depends upon a very important feature of Proto-Kèjiā, namely, the presence of two contrasting series of sonorants, one voiced and the other voiceless.

To determine whether a dialect is Kèjiā or not, one should examine *shǎng* tone words having sonorant (nasal and lateral) initials. If the dialect is truly Kèjiā, such words will fall into two groups, one in the *yīnpíng* category, and the other in the *yīnshǎng* category; the incidence of one tone or the other will be determined lexically; for example, 懶 'lazy' and 尾 'tail' will be *yīnpíng*, but 老 'old' and 網 'net' will be *yīnshǎng*. The following list give a diagnostic sampling of such words; for the sake of comparison a number of words from the *shǎng* tone with *chiuánjuó* initials are also given. To demonstrate that Gàn dialects behave differently from Kèjiā forms from two typical Gàn dialects, Línchuān 臨川 (Ló 1958) and Nánchéng 南城 (Wàn 1985) are given; in addition, Shàuwǔ forms are given to show that it does not participate in this crucial Kèjiā development.

	MS	HL	YD	LC	NC	SW
坐	tsho ¹	tsho ¹	tshou ¹	tsho ⁶	tho ¹	tshoi ³
簿	phu ¹	phu ¹	—	phu ¹	phu ¹	phu ⁶

²³ The zone includes such *shìàn* as Nánchéng 南城, Jīnshíán 進賢, Líchūān 黎川, and Chiānshān 鉛山. It includes most of Yán Sēn's Fǔ-Guǎng 撫廣 area and the southeastern part of his Yīng-Yī 鷹弋 area. See Yán's map (1986) on page 20.

	MS	HL	YD	LC	NC	SW
被	phi ¹	phi ¹	phi ¹	phi ¹	phi ¹	phei ³
倚	khi ¹	khi ¹	khi ¹	t̚chi ⁶	t̚chi ¹	khi ³
淡	tham ¹	tham ¹	tham ¹	tham ⁶	han ¹	than ⁶
斷	thon ¹	thon ¹	thon ¹	thon ⁶	hon ¹	thon ³
近	khiun ¹	khiun ¹	khun ¹	t̚chin ⁶	t̚chin ⁶	khyen ³
重	tshuŋ ¹	tshuŋ ¹	t̚shuŋ ¹	thuŋ ⁶	thuŋ ¹	thuŋ ³
馬	ma ¹	ma ¹	ma ¹	ma ³	ma ³	ma ³
買	mai ¹	mai ¹	mei ¹	mai ³	mai ³	mie ³
暖	non ¹	non ¹	lon ¹	lon ³	non ³	non ³
鯉	li ¹	li ¹	li ¹	—	ti ³	li ³
懶	lan ¹	nan ¹	lan ¹	lan ³	lan ³	lan ³
咬	ŋau ¹	ŋau ¹	ŋau ¹	ŋau ³	ŋau ³	ŋau ³
網	mioŋ ³	mioŋ ³	mioŋ ³	moŋ ³	moŋ ³	moŋ ³
耳	ni ³	ni ³	hn ³	ɐ ³	ey ³	nin ³
兩	lioŋ ³	lioŋ ³	lioŋ ³	tioŋ ³	tioŋ ³	lioŋ ³
卵	lon ³	lon ³	lon ³	lon ³	lon ³	son ³
瓦	ŋa ³	ŋua ³	ŋa ³	ŋua ³	—	ua ³
五	ŋ ³	ŋ ³	ŋ ³	ŋ ³	ŋ ³	ŋ ³

To sum up, Kèjiā can be uniquely characterized by the tonal behavior of words with sonorant initials in the *shǎng* tone. The words given above, while far from being an exhaustive enumeration, can serve as a diagnostic list for determining whether a given dialect is Kèjiā or not. It should be stressed that, like the aspiration criterion of lower register words which I have employed for Mǐn dialects, the lexical incidence of the *yīnpíng* or *yīnshǎng* tone in this scheme is crucial. For a dialect to be truly Kèjiā, it must not only show the split in the *shǎng* tone, it must also exhibit essentially the same lexical pattern of incidence.

With the Mǐn dialects, Kèjiā has in common (1) the retention of bilabials for *chīngchuén* initials, (2) the retention (at least vestigially) of stops for *shéshàng* initials, and (3) evidence for an earlier contrast between voiced and voiceless sonorant initials. With Gàn, Kèjiā shares (4) a shift of *shǎng* tone words with voiced stop and affricate initials to the *yīnpíng* tone, and (5) the change of voiced stop and affricate initials to voiceless aspirates in all tones. These features can be plotted on a chart using a plus for the presence of the trait in a given dialect group and a minus for its absence:

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Gàn	—	—	—	+	+
Kè	+	+	+	+	+
Mǐn	+	+	+	—	— ²⁴

²⁴ The Mǐn dialects of Shàuwǔ and Jiānglè are exceptional in having aspirates for these initials in all tonal categories.

In general, features which link Mǐn and Kèjiā are archaic and can be traced back to a very early wave of sinicity. Those linking Gàn and Kèjiā are more recent, reflecting a later wave of sinicity and in some cases more local developments emanating from Eastern Kiangsi. Kèjiā is thus seen to the result of a marriage between two different chronological strata. When and how this happened is a subject for future research.

References

- Běijīng Dǎshìué 北京大學
 1962 *Hànyǔ fāngyán tǐzhuèi* 漢語方音字彙. Peking: Wéntǔ Gǎigé Chūbǎnshè.
 1964 *Hànyǔ fāngyán tǐzhuèi* 漢語方言詞彙. Peking: Wéntǔ Gǎigé Chūbǎnshè.
- Bodman, Nicholas
 1985 "The reflexes of initial nasals in Proto-Southern Min-Hinghua." *Oceanic Linguistics*, Special Publication no. 20 (For Gordon Fairbanks), 2-20.
- Chao Yuen Ren
 1928 *Studies in the Modern Wu dialects*. Tsing Hua College Research Institute, monograph no. 4. Peking.
- Chao Yuen-ren and Yang Shih-feng
 1965 "Dialects of Ling-pei, Chi-hsi Anhui." *BIHP* 36: 11-13.
- Chén Zhāngtài and Lǐ Rúlóng 陳章太, 李如龍
 1983 "Luèn Mǐn fāngyán de yíjìshìng" 論閩方言的一致性. *Jūngguó Yǔyánshìué Bào* 1: 25-81.
- Douglas, Carstairs
 1899 *Chinese-English dictionary of the vernacular or spoken language of Amoy*. London: Presbyterian Church of England.
- Egerod, Søren
 1956 *The Lungtu dialect: a descriptive study of a South Chinese idiom*. Copenhagen: Ejnar Munksgaard, Ltd.
- Forrest, R. A. D.
 1948 *The Chinese language*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Fújiàn fāngyán diàuchátǔ 福建方言調查組
 1962 *Fújiànshěng hànyǔ fāngyán gàikuàng* 福建省漢語方言概況. Fóochōw.
- Hashimoto, Mantaro J.
 1972 *Kakkago kiso goishū*. Tokyo: Tokyo Gaikokugo Daigaku.
 1973 *The Hakka dialect: a linguistic study of its phonology, syntax and lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huáng Xuězhēn 黃雪貞
 1982 "Yǔngdǐng (shìyáng) fāngyán shíngóngtǐ de tǔ-wěi" 永定(下洋)方言形容詞的子尾. *Fāngyán* 3: 190-195.
 1983a "Yǔngdǐng (shìyáng) fāngyán tǐzhuèi" (1) 永定(下洋)方言詞彙(-). *Fāngyán* 2: 148-160.
 1983b "Yǔngdǐng (shìyáng) fāngyán tǐzhuèi" (2). *Fāngyán* 3: 220-240.
 1983c "Yǔngdǐng (shìyáng) fāngyán tǐzhuèi" (3). *Fāngyán* 4: 297-304.
- Ibañez, Ignacio
 1941-43 *Diccionario español-chino: dialecto de Fu-an (houc an)*. Shanghai: Imprimerie Commerciale —"Don Bosco" School.
- Jevons, W. S.
 1905 *The principles of science: a treatise on logic and scientific method*. London: Macmillan & Co.
- Jiāngsūshěng hé Shànghǎishì fāngyán diàuchá Jǐdǎutzǔ 江蘇省和上海市方言調查指導組
 1960 *Jiāngsūshěng hé Shànghǎishì fāngyán gàikuàng* 江蘇省和上海市方言概況. Nanking: Jiāngsū Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
- Karlgren, Bernhard
 1954 *Compendium of phonetics in Ancient and Archaic Chinese*. *BMFEA* 26: 211-367.

- Li Fang-kuei
1937 "Languages and dialects of China." *The Chinese Year Book*. Shanghai: Shangwu. Reprinted with revisions in *JCL* (1973) 1: 1-13.
- Lǐ Rúlóng 李如龍
1983 "Mǐn shīběi fāngyán 'lái' mǔ zì dú s- de yánjiù" 閩西北方言「來」母字讀 s- 的研究. *Jūngguó Yǔwén* 4: 264-271.
- Ló Ch'áng-p'ei 羅常培
1958 *Línchuān yīnshì* 臨川音系. Peking: Kēshuì Chūbǎnshè.
- MacIver, D.
1926 *A Chinese-English dictionary: Hakka dialect as spoken in Kwang-tung province*. Shanghai: Presbyterian Mission Press.
- Maclay, R. S. and C. C. Baldwin
1870 *An alphabetic dictionary of the Chinese language in the Foochow dialect*. Foochow: Methodist Episcopal Mission Press.
- Norman, Jerry
1973 "Tonal development in Min." *JCL* 1: 222-238.
1974a "The initials of Proto-Min." *JCL* 2: 27-36.
1974b "The Shaowu dialect." *Orbis* 23: 328-334.
1982 "The classification of the Shaowu dialect." *BIHP* 53: 543-583.
1983 "Some ancient Chinese dialect words in the Mǐn dialects." *Fāngyán* 3: 202-210.
1986 "The Mǐn dialects in historical perspective." Paper presented at the Conference on Languages and Dialects of China, Oakland, California, January 15-19, 1986.
- O'Connor, Kevin A.
1976 "Proto-Hakka." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 11: 1-64.
- Pulleyblank, E. G.
1984 *Middle Chinese: a study in historical phonology*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Qiáo Quánshēng 喬全生
1983 *Hóngtóng fāngyánjì* 洪洞方言志. Taiyuan: Shānshī Shèhuì Kēshuìyuàn.
- Shào Róngfēn 邵榮芬
1979 *Hànyǔ yǔyīnshǐ jiǎnghuà* 漢語語音史講話. Tientsin: Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.
1982 *Chèyàn yánjiù* 切韻研究. Peking: Jūngguó Shèhuì Kēshuìyuàn.
- Ting Pang-hsin, ed. 丁邦新
1974 *Dǐng Tánghé shīānshēng yǔyánshuì luènwén shuǐxǐ* 董同龢先生語言學論文選集. Taipei: Shíhuò Chūbǎnshè.
1982 "Hànyǔ fāngyán chiūfēn de tiáojiàn" 漢語方言區分的條件. *Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n. s., 14: 257-274.
- Tǔng Túng-hó 董同龢
1948 "Huáyáng Liángshuǐjǐng kèjiāhuà jīyīn" 華陽涼水井客家話記音. *BIHP* 19: 81-201. Reprinted in Ting (1974).
1953 "Jūngguó yǔyán" 中國語言. *Jūngguó wénhuà luènjí* 中國文化論集, 33-41.
- Wàn Bō 萬波
1985 "Nánchéng fāngyán de yǔyīn shìtǔng jí tèdiǎn" 南城方言的語音系統及特點. Paper presented to the 1985 National Conference on Dialectology, Shíjōu, Shānsī.
- Wang, William S.-Y.
1982 "Variation and selection in language change." *BIHP* 53: 495-519.
- Wú Jiànshēng 吳建生
1984 *Wànrúng fāngyánjì* 萬榮方言志. Taiyuan: Shānshī Shèhuì Kēshuìyuàn.
- Yán Sēn 顏森
1986 "Jiāngshī fāngyán de fēnchū" 江西方言的分區. *Fāngyán* 1: 19-38.
- Yang, Paul
1967 "Elements of Hakka dialectology." *Monumenta Serica* 26: 305-301.

Yang Shih-feng 楊時逢

1957 *Táiwān táuyuán kèjiā fāngyán* 臺灣桃園客家方言. Academia Sinica, Institute of History and Philology monograph, series A, no. 22. Taipei: Academia Sinica.

Yang Shih-feng and Eugene Ching

1971 "The Ling Pao dialect." *The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, n. s. 9: 106-147.

Yuán Jiāhuá 袁家驊

1960 *Hànyǔ fāngyán gàiyào* 漢語方言概要. Peking: Wéntà Gǎigé Chūbǎnshè.

Zhān Bóhù 詹伯慧

1981 *Shìdàidài hànyǔ fāngyán* 現代漢語方言. Hupeh: Rénmín Chūbǎnshè.

Zhāng Huìyīng 張惠英

1982 "Shì 'shénme'" 釋「什麼」. *Jāngguó Yǔwén* 4: 302-305.

Zhōu Zǔmó 周祖謨

1966 *Wènshuǐ jí* 問學集. Peking: Jūnghuá Shūjiú.