

SOME RECENT SOUND SHIFTS IN CHAOZHOU AND OTHER SOUTHERN MIN DIALECTS

Nicholas C. Bodman

Professor Chao Yuen Ren's broad scholarship in so many aspects of linguistics, attested in his numerous works of outstanding value, has provided a most challenging model of excellence; scholars in the field of Chinese linguistics especially are much indebted to him for stimulating contributions, but will miss him also for his warm human qualities and inimitable wit. It is fitting in honoring the memory of this eminent linguist that an offering for this volume can, at least in a small way, make use of data that Professor Chao himself gathered many years ago, but which have remained unpublished until now. They form a part of the *Liang-Yue Fangyan Diaocha* 兩粵方言調查 of 1928 and 1929 that A. Hashimoto described so well in 1970.¹

These materials are significant because the dialect of Chaoan 潮安 (now usually called Chaozhou 潮州)² that was described had a pair of distinctions where modern Chaozhou has but one category. The present-day dialect has the

1. In her article, *The Liang-Yue Dialect Materials*, A. Hashimoto tells of the plans of publishing these materials (of which only the Guangzhou 廣州 and Taishan 臺山 parts had hitherto come out). Unfortunately, none of these plans were ever realized. What I deal with here is a very small part indeed that was written in one notebook. A. Hashimoto 1970: 38 mentions that two speakers are recorded for the Chaoan materials. Professor Chao himself has a brief paragraph (1975:5) on his unpublished notes (reprinted in 1976, Dil's collection of Chao's essays, p. 28-9). In December, 1981 I wrote Professor Chao for information on the Chaoan notes, including the status and location of the speakers, thinking perhaps that they came from an outlying village, but Professor Chao could not remember. Since then, I have tried to obtain the original notes to have another look, but up to now no one seems to know where they are. Despite this lack of some pertinent details, I have decided that it was still worthwhile to discuss the Chaoan notes in this short paper.
2. Although Chaoan and Chaozhou refer to the same place, when discussing Professor Chao's material, I shall use his term, i.e. Chaoan; elsewhere the modern name Chaozhou will be used. The term Swatow (Shantou 汕頭) which is the nearby seaport for Chaozhou was the name used by Western writers, such as the missionaries who compiled dictionaries and teaching materials from the middle of the nineteenth century up to the present. (See References). However, these foreign writers usually said that they were using the prestige dialect of Chaozhoufu as the standard speech of the area.

final that is often written as $-uŋ$, and the Amoy (Xiamen 廈門) dialect likewise has a similar final, the syllabic velar nasal usually written as $-ŋ$ with no preceding vowel symbol.³ In the Chaoan dialect that Professor Chao recorded, $-uŋ$ (after all initials except labials) and $-uŋ$ (after labials)⁴ contrasted with $-uŋ$ which occurred after all initials. Some Southern Min (SM) dialects, such as that of Zhangzhou 漳州 maintain a similar contrast to this day.

The lexical list from which I have abstracted the pertinent examples, maintaining the original order for the most part, consists of three parallel columns in a narrow phonetic transcription of the three dialects of Wenchang 文昌 of Hainan Island, and of Chaoan and Jieyang 建陽.⁵ All are SM dialects, but Wenchang is more distant from the other two, and also more conservative: it has $-ui$ corresponding to Chaoan $-uiŋ$ (Chaoan $-uŋ$ after labials), and $-o$ where Chaoan has $-uŋ$. Of course Chaoan and Jieyang are very closely related. I reconstruct Proto-Southern Min (PSM) prototypes of $*-uiN$ and $*-oN$; there are other forms of SM that preserve a distinction in these categories. The feature of nasalization that occurs with several vowel finals is represented where it occurs in modern dialects and in reconstructed forms as N. Like some other SM dialects,

3. Since Chaozhou has the final $-u$ it is not surprising to find this final written phonetically as $-uŋ$; however, Li 1959 renders it as $-ɤŋ$, and Choy 1976 simply as $-ŋ$, a syllabic velar nasal. For dialects like Chaoyang 潮陽 and Amoy that do not have the high back unrounded vowel u , nor even a schwa, it is only appropriate to render it as $-ŋ$. My own usage here is to use the digraph ng when transcribing. This phoneme in Amoy may occur after any initial. When occurring with zero initial or with $h-$, as in ng^2 'yellow' 黃 or hng^2 'garden' 園, $-ng$ alternates between the full velar nasal and a value where velar contact is not quite attained, in this case sounding more like an indeterminate nasalized vowel. In SM the velar nasal has somewhat of a parallel with the syllabic labial nasal: this is much rarer, occurring only with zero or $h-$ initial, as in Amoy m^6 'not' 呒 or hm^3 'marriage go-between' 媒.
4. The Chaoan final $-uŋ$ also goes back to PSM $*-un$ as in $ɘhuŋ$ 'cloud' 雲. The general Chaozhou final in such words is $-uŋ$. In Chaoan labial initial words from PSM $*-uiN$ and standard Chaozhou today agree in having $-uŋ$.
5. Jieyang, where Chao's notes have $-uŋ$, is analyzed by Dong Tonghe as $-ŋ$; Norman (who writes Kityang for Jieyang) follows Dong in this transcription. As to the Wenchang forms, there are many gaps in Chao's list, but fortunately the few forms he has agree well with more complete descriptions as found in M. Hashimoto 1960 and especially Woon 1979; other SM dialects of Hainan differ hardly at all. See William S. -Y. Wang and Norman, H. -P. Zhang, and Y. H. Zhang in References.

Wenchang has lost this feature of nasalization.⁶ Table 1 follows with the items I have abstracted from the Chao list; I have added the PSM reconstructed finals and a few elucidating notes.

TABLE 1

	PSM *-uiN (<**-ueN)			
	<u>Wenchang</u>	<u>Chaoan</u>	<u>Jieyang</u>	
斷	'dui	^ɛ tuiŋ	^ɛ tuŋ	'break off'
算	tui ^ɔ	suiŋ ^ɔ	sŋ ^ɔ	'to count'
園	^ɛ wui	^ɛ hŋ	^ɛ hi̇	'garden' ⁷
勸	---	k 'uiŋ ^ɔ	k 'uŋ ^ɔ	'coax, persuade'
拳	---	^ɛ k 'uiŋ	^ɛ k 'uŋ(L)	'fist' ⁸
卷	---	kuiŋ ^ɔ	---	'scroll'
晚	---	^ɛ muŋ	^ɛ muŋ	'late'
飯	---	puŋ ^ɔ	pŋ ^ɔ	'cooked rice'
本	---	^ɛ puŋ	^ɛ pəŋ	'a volume' ⁹
門	^ɛ mui	^ɛ muŋ	^ɛ məŋ	'door'

6. A. Hashimoto 1976: 2-5 gives a few examples of the SM dialect of Suiqi 遂溪 on the Leizhou 雷州 peninsula; she has also kindly provided me many more examples from her notes. Like the Hainanese dialects, Suiqi has lost the SM feature of nasalization of vowels. In initials, Suiqi agree well with most SM dialects, and disagreeing in this respect with the very marked difference that Hainanese shows in its initial inventory. I would place Suiqi in one subgroup with Hainanese and surmise that Min settlers from the Leizhou area brought their language into Hainan. At least one variety of Chaozhou spoken in Bangkok, Thailand has also lost vowel nasalization, (My own field notes). Another very interesting SM group colonized the Sam heung (Sanxiang 三鄉) area of Zongshan Xian 中山縣 in Guangdong 廣東. This region has a number of very closely related SM dialects, all lacking nasalized vowels (and all strongly influenced by Zongshan Cantonese). (My own field notes).
7. The words 'garden' and 'yellow' (see note 10) are mentioned in note 3 as having alternate pronunciations in Amoy. We should expect Chaoan ^ɛhuiŋ and ^ɛuiŋ in these words. Is this a case of dialect borrowing or special development with zero and h- initials? Note also the unusual rendering of the Jieyang word with two nasalization markers.
8. In the word for 'fist' the Jieyang form is from the literary (character pronunciation) stratum. Note that Amoy colloquial has ^ɛkun, unaspirated initial and an aberrant final.
9. Although the Amoy cognate here has literary 'pun, several SM dialects have ^ɛpuiN or ^ɛpŋg as colloquial forms, sometimes only in the meaning of 'capital (money)'.

黄	ɛ ² uaŋ(L)	ɛ ² ŋ	ɛŋ	'yellow' ¹⁰
		PSM *-oN		
(刺)	---	ts'uaŋ'	ts'uaŋ'	'to prick' ¹¹
湯	---	ɛ ² t'uaŋ	ɛ ² t'uaŋ	'soup' ¹²
糖	ɛXo	ɛ ² t'uaŋ	ɛ ² t'uaŋ	'sugar'
桑	---	ɛ ² swaŋ	ɛ ² swaŋ	'mulberry'

Some other features in which Chao's Chaoan differs from his Jieyang and from modern Chaozhou dialects that I have heard or read about are small points: where Jieyang has initial h-, he transcribes the Chaoan equivalent as x- in several cases, but where Jieyang velar initials are followed by i, the Chaoan form usually appears as a palatal, e. g.: Chaoan ɛ²ç²ia, Jieyang ɛ²k²iA 騎 'ride a horse'. This is not of course a phonological difference. Where Jieyang in rusheng has a clear glottal stop ending, the Chaoan equivalent merely uses the rusheng tone marks which may indicate a phonetic difference, e. g. Chaoan poi₂, Jieyang poi₂? 拔 'pull out'. An unusual development is shown in the word for 'meat, flesh' 肉: Chaoan neŋ₂ where Jieyang has the usual Chaozhou nek². In this word, and others where the initial is a nasal, I have often heard the following vowel as very strongly nasalized. The Chaozhou word for 'woman' 女 'nuŋ, although a shangsheng not a rusheng word, shows a similar development of this unexpected nasal final. Finally, to conclude this section, I should mention that in both Chaoan and Jieyang, indeed prevalent in the Chaozhou area, is the lack of the dental finals -n and -t which formerly existed but now have completely merged with finals -ng and -k. (See note 4). Karlgren (1926:12) cites Gibson 1886 as his Swatow source - here final -n and -t are retained. Egerod 1956:16 in his phonemic analysis of Swatow and in his valuable article Swatow Loan Words in Siamese, p. 139 states that his informants included speakers from Swatow, Bangkok

10. The Wenchang form is literary. Hainanese colloquial has ɛui.

11. There is no standard character for the Chaozhou word 'to prick', nor have I found SM cognates in my dialect materials.

12. There are several more examples of this Chaozhou dialect final which I did not take from Chao's notes since both the Chaoan and Jieyang forms were identical; the reflexes of PSM *-oN are regular and quite numerous.

and Malaya; his Swatow forms likewise include -n and -t; the corresponding Thai loans have -n and d; vowel nasalization is lost in the Thai loans. Further evidence from older works shows the retention of -n and -t in Fielde 1878, Duffus 1883 and Lim 1886. Fielde 1883 begins to show a difference: here only -ang and -ak occur (and -iang, -iak), and where one expects -uan and -uat, these finals are spelled -wn and -wt (contrasting with -uang, uak). Duffus 1883: Remarks, has a significant statement: 'k and t as finals are so much alike as to be scarcely distinguishable.' We can assume the same to be true of -n and -ng. I have not seen Ashmore's dictionary, but a reference to this problem is cited by Giffin 1961: viii: 'The Ashmore Dictionary is very unusual ... even though it was printed as early as 1880. There are, however, a few differences which we should note: ... 2) There are some endings that are definitely 'ng' endings, but Ashmore has listed them as 'n' endings, which might be due to the local dialect (Ten Hái). Be sure to check carefully with the teacher on such endings...'. Note that Giffin 1961 was published in Thailand. Another missionary production, Koons 1967, shows no -n and -t finals; all descriptions by modern Chinese linguists such as Li 1959, and Yuan 1960 show the merger into -ng and -k as does the Chao material and Dong in his section on Jieyang. The same is true of the present-day Chaoyang dialect (S. Y. Zhang 1981); Chaoyang is definitely in the Chaozhou subgroup. Nakajima 1979 also has no -n and -t in his analysis of Chaoyang in his lexicon of Min dialects. From these sources, we can infer an older period before -n and -t had merged with -ng and -k, and then the fluctuation between them, starting with these finals following the low vowel a; finally the complete merger ensued.

This inference can be confirmed by field work I did while in Hong Kong between December 1968 and March 1969 on the dialect of a group of fishermen living outside of Hong Kong in Taipouh (Tapu 大埠)¹³ who some fifty years

13. I take this occasion to thank Professor Marjorie Topley, anthropologist of Hong Kong University, who was very helpful in giving background information on Min speakers in the Hong Kong area; I am also very grateful to Mr. Horace Lei of the Hong Kong Agriculture and Fisheries Department who personally introduced me to this group of fishermen, helped me to select the speakers and provided a meeting place on the wharf where I did my interviewing.

before had come from Aotou 澳頭 Hweiyang 惠陽 Xian. According to their own tradition, told by my informants' great-grandfather, they left Chaoyang approximately two hundred years ago. Their place of origin, in their own words, was tioN² ioN² hai³ khau³ 潮陽海口, the seaport of Chaoyang. Like Chaoyang, Aotou has -u corresponding to Chaozhou -u; more important, it still has -n and -t as in bin⁶ 'face' 面, pit⁷ 'writing brush' 筆 cun² 'boat' 船, kut⁸ 'slippery' 滑, gin² 'silver' 銀; there was vacillation between uan² and uang², literary word for 'king' 王; everywhere else the earlier -n had merged to -ng after the low vowel a: sang³ 'lean, thin' 瘦, sak⁷ 'louse' 蚤 tang² 'surname Chen' 陳; otherwise the phonology is typically of the Chaozhou sort with occasional examples more like Amoy.

During this same stay in Hong Kong, I also worked on what is known locally as Hai³ lok⁸ hong¹ 海陸豐, a term which includes the places of Hailu 海陸 and Haifeng 海豐.¹⁴ My informant came from the village of Shangbu 上埠 lying midway between Hailu and Haifeng. One of the particular features of the Hailokhong dialect is the distinction of e and ei as in be³ 'horse' 馬 and bei³ 'buy' 買. In fact my Aotou speakers told me this fact - in their area, the Hailokhong people were largely merchants. The final -ei, corresponding to Chaozhou -oi, Amoy -ue and Zhangzhou -e, was discovered to exist in the 16th century Dominican text, the *Doctrina*. This is most interestingly discussed by van der Loon 1967:127. The *Doctrina* finds its closest dialect relative in modern Zhangzhou, and it is with this group (and not with Chaozhou) that one must classify Hailokhong. Neither Li 1959 (pp. 2-4) nor Choy 1976:8, 18-26 mention Hailokhong as a Chaozhou dialect. Hailokhong has almost exactly the same distribution of final nasals as does Aotou; no examples need be added; like Aotou, former -n and -t merge with -ng and -k when the low vowel precedes. As in its relative Zhangzhou, Hailokhong has the final -uiN which contrasts with

14. In Hong Kong, I was fortunate to be able to stay at Robert Black College of Hong Kong University, and thank the personnel there for their courtesy. My informant for Hailokhong was an employee of Robert Black College. Of course this Min dialect is quite distinct from the Hakua spoken in the same general area.

the syllabic velar nasal -ng.¹⁵ van der Loon (op. cit. p.131 and footnotes 103-4) comments on the dialect variation in olden days between -uiN and -ng. It appears that the various dialect forms of several hundred years ago have not changed very much, but their regional distribution may have changed.¹⁶

I would now like to include data on some much earlier historical changes.

We have talked at length about SM nasalized vowel finals in various dialects. SM nasalized vowels followed by glottal stop occur in sets of three, as in the SM finals a, aN and aʔ. These finals are of course in contrast with am/ap, an/at and ang/ak. It is unusual in Chinese dialects to have contrasts between nasalized vowels and vowels followed by consonantal nasals, and likewise to have -p, -t and -k in contrast with glottal stop. I assume that in Proto Coastal Min (including Northeastern Min, Hinghua and Southern Min) that nasals and stops occurred after four high, and three low vowels:

i	y	ə	u
e		a	o

In the conservative dialects of Northeastern Min, the vocalism was largely unchanged except for the merger of ə and a; -m/-p, -n/-t and -ng/-k also were retained. In Fuzhou 福州 the nasals merged to -ng and the stops to -k (phonetically glottal stop). I have grouped Hinghua (Xinghua 興化) and SM together in an historical subgroup Proto Southern Min-Hinghua (PSMHH). In this stage, the nasal consonants and stops remained after the four high vowels

15. Apart from my main informant, I very briefly interviewed a few Hailokhong fishermen. Instead of -uiN, they, like Chaozhou speakers, had -ng. This indicates a good bit of dialect mixture, and is not surprising, especially among fishermen and boat people who have moved from one place to another with great frequency.

16. I venture here a remark on the name Amoy. This spelling, unlike the modern English pronunciation of əmoi or æmoi, must have indicated the same sound as represented in the French spelling Émoui. Either the early cartographers used the Zhangzhou pronunciation, e⁵ muiN², or else the pronunciation in Amoy itself in these earlier days was like that of Zhangzhou. The oldest reference I have found is *Begin ende Voortgangh*, 1646, Amsterdam p. 44 Oost-Indische Reyse gedaen, no author given with a map of Amoy Bay and reference to 'de Stadt Aymoy'. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the pronunciation e⁵ mng² had been established as evidenced by a missionary primer TŨG oē HOAN JĪ CHHO · HĀK done at their Amoy Office (Ē-Mŭg Khek) in 1852.

but after the low vowels, the development was to nasalized vowels and to glottal stop¹⁷; after this stage, the high mid vowel lowered to a. Many SM dialects reflect this system; Hinghua has merged final nasals to -ng and final stops to -k (like Fuzhou, -k is phonetically glottal stop). Hinghua follows SM in keeping a distinction between oral and nasalized vowels, but has lost final glottal stop. (And the Putian 莆田 dialect of Hinghua has also lost the contrast of oral and nasalized vowels). (Y. H. Zhang 1972).

Let us return briefly to PSM *-oN which has the reflex -ng in many SM dialects. It is interesting that in Changtai 長泰 van der Loon mentions that the value -oN is kept. (Op. cit. p. 132). This I have confirmed in recent field work. The final reconstructed as *-uiN presents greater difficulties since we must assume an earlier stage **-ueN; this forms a set with **-ue and **-ue? and goes back to a very early SM stage as well as being assumed for PSMHH.¹⁸

This paper has suggested that not all phonological differences are due to diachronic change. It is well recognized today that the problem of dialect variation may often be due to the establishment of one of two or more competing forms. The Min problem is aggravated by the great mobility of many Min speakers having migrated from one area to another, many from north to south, but some from south to north.¹⁹ We may assume that much of the Min area has dialects that gradually shade into each other, as one often finds in a con-

17. See Y. H. Zhang 1972, especially pp. 4-5. Norman 1980 in describing Proto-Min adds that the high vowels are assumed to be close and rather short and the low vowels open and phonetically longer (p. 35 and 36 and footnotes 1 and 2 where Norman kindly acknowledges suggestions I had made in personal correspondence).

18. PSMHH **-ueN > *-uiN, contrasts with another final which in Chaozhou and Quanzhou 泉州 (or Jinjiang 晉江) has the value -uiN, in Amoy -uaiN, and in Zhangzhou -uang or -uan (the latter especially in Taiwanese dialects derived from the Zhangzhou dialect system). A good example of this correspondence set is the common Min word for 'high' 懸 Chaozhou kuiN², Amoy kuaiN² and Zhangzhou kuang² or kuan². It can be seen that the tendency for *-n to become *-ng is not limited to the Chaozhou area.

19. Yuan 1960 p. 241 and passim points out that SM dialects are also spoken in Zhejiang 浙江. Recently, Li and Chen 1982 have discussed a dialect of Zhangzhou type now spoken in the Mindong area.

tinental region; the dialect problem is made more difficult by having to assume the frequent migration of one group to another place by sea; a colony may be established and then splinter into groups that could go in any direction. An old colony can beget new colonies.

REFERENCES

- Ashmore, William 1880 *Primary lessons in Swatow grammar*. English Presbyterian Mission Press, Swatow.
- Chao, Y. R. 1975 My field work on the Chinese dialects. *Computational Analyses of Asian & African Languages* No. 2. pp. 3-8.
- Choy, Chun-ming 1976 *A Dictionary of the Chau-chou Dialect* San-min Shu-jyu, Taipei.
- Comelin, Isaak, ed. 1646 *Begin ende Voortganch*, Amsterdam.
- Dil, Anwar S. 1976 *Aspects of Chinese Socio-linguistics. Essays by Yuen Ren Chao*. Stanford University Press, Stanford
- Dong Tong-he 1959 Sige Minnan fangyan. (Four South Min dailects). *BIHP* 30: 729-1042.
- Duffus, William 1883 *English-Chinese vocabulary of the vernacular or spoken language of Swatow*. English Presbyterian Mission Press, Swatow.
- Egerod, Søren 1956 *The Lungtu dialect. A descriptive and historical Study of a South Chinese idiom*. Ejnar Munksgaard, Ltd. Copenhagen.
- Egerod, Søren 1957 Swatow loan words in Siamese. *Acta Orientalia* XXIII 3-4: 137-156.
- Fielde, A. M. 1878 *First lessons in the Swatow dialect*. Swatow Printing Office Co., Swatow
- Gibson, John C. 1886 *A Swatow index to the Syllabic dictionary of Chinese by S. Wells Williams and to the Dictionary of the vernacular of Amoy by Carstairs Douglas*. English Presbyterian

- Mission Press, Swatow.
- Giffin, Louise 1961 *Beginning Chinese Lessons. Teochiu (Swatow) Dialect.* pp. 1-70. Mimeographed. Bangkok.
- Hashimoto, Anne Yue 1970 The Liang-Yue dialect materials. Unicorn pp. 1-18.
- Hashimoto, Oi-kan Yue 1976 Substratum in Southern Chinese - the Tai connection. Computational Analyses of Asian and African Languages No. 6: 1-9.
- Hashimoto, Mantarō 1960 The Bonshio (文昌) dialect of Hainan. Gengo Kenkyu 38: 25-32.
- Karlgren, Bernhard 1915-1926 *Études sur la phonologie chinoise.* K. W. Appelberg, Uppsala & E. J. Brill, Leiden.
- Koons, Alvin D. 1967. *Spoken Swatow.* American Baptist Mission, Hong Kong
- Li Rulong and
Chen Zhangtai 1982 Linguistic changes in Wǎnyáo, an isolated South Min dialect in the east of Fújiàn, during the past two centuries. Zhōngguó Yǔwén 1982. 5: 354-370.
- Li Yong-ming 1959 *Chaozhou Fangyan.* Zhonghua Shuju, Peking
- Lim, Hiong Seng 1886 *A handbook of the Swatow vernacular.* Kohn Yen Hian Press, Singapore.
- van der Loon, Piet 1967 The Manila Incunabula and early Hokkien studies. Asia Major. New Series. Vol. XIII. 1-2, Part 2, pp. 95-186.
- Norman, Jerry 1980. The Proto-Min finals. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Sinology sponsored by Academia Sinica. pp. 35-73.
- Wang, William S. -Y. *Five Fairies in Hainan.* (Produced in the 60's, mimeographed and Norman Jerry graphed and privately circulated.)
- Woon, Wee-Lee 1979 A synchronic phonology of Hainan dialect, Parts 1 and 2, JCL 7. 1: 65-100 and 7. 2: 268-302.
- Yuan, Jiahua 1960 *Hanyü Yanjiu Gaiyao.* Wenzhi Gaige, Peking.

Some Recent Sound Shifts in Chaozhou and other Southern Min Dialects

- Zhang, Shengyu 1981 An outline of Cháoyáng phonology. Fāngyáen 1981. 1 pp. 27-39.
- Zhang, Xianbao 1976 *The Haikou dialect*. MA thesis of National Taiwan University.
- Zhang, Yuhong 1972. *The Hingwa dialects of Fukien. A descriptive linguistic study*. Cornell Ph.D. thesis. University Microfilms.