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Revisiting Starostin’s list of Altaic loanwords in Old Chinese

Bingcong DENG
Archaeolinguistic Research Group, Max Planck Institute of Geoanthropology, Jena
deng@shh.mpg.de

Sergei Starostin proposed a list of loanwords in 2008 (Starostin 2008) that contains 41 lexical items which he considered comparable in (Proto-)Altaic and Old Chinese. In his framework, “Altaic” is the terminology designated for the unity of five language families: Korean, Japanese, Turkic, Mongolian, and Tungus-Manchu. The understanding of these language families and the prehistoric speech communities has improved significantly in the past decade (among others: Baxter & Sagart 2014, Hill 2019, M. Zhang et al. 2019, Sagart et al. 2019, H. Zhang 2020, and Robbeets et al. 2021). This calls for a re-evaluation of Starotin’s original proposal of the lexical loans from Altaic into Old Chinese, yet there is little research done on this topic to date.

In this paper I aim to answer these research questions: (1) How many of the lexical comparisons can be accepted as valid loans? (2) What is the likely borrowing direction and date and what languages were involved in the borrowing process? (3) What can we learn about the interaction dynamic between the speech communities from their lexical exchange?

To answer these questions, a database is compiled concerning the lexical items discussed in Starostin (2008). It includes the Sino-Tibetan cognates, when available, to the Old Chinese forms based on the data from STEDT, and their comparanda in the languages in Starostin’s Altaic unity. With the help of this database, loanwords are identified through the process of elimination: if similarities are unlikely to the result of inheritance (cognates), chance resemblance, or universals (e.g., the mama-papa words), it is likely to be the result of language contact. This research also draws evidence from various disciplines, especially genetics and archaeology, to observe genetic admixture and exchange of material culture that could suggest borrowing direction and date.

Preliminary findings suggest that only a small number of lexical borrowings could be accepted, and the borrowing date is also later than Starostin's original proposal in general, mostly between individual language families and Chinese. There are lexical borrowings showing the opposite directionality, comprising most of the accepted loans. This suggests that the interaction among the populations might not be as intense as one anticipated from Starostin's chapter. Overall, this research sheds light on the prehistoric cultural interaction between the Chinese population and its neighbours. By investigating a larger number of potential loans, we hope to illustrate a better picture of the prehistoric contact in the region.
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再论助词 “来着”

陈丹丹 - CHEN Dandan
中国社会科学院语言研究所 - Chinese Academy of Social Sciences
chendd@cass.org.cn

“来着”作为北方汉语（主要使用于北京及河北部分地区、东北地区）中一个比较重要的助词，引起了广泛的研究兴趣，很多学者对此进行过探讨。但历来争议也颇大，无论其性质还是来源，都尚未达成统一的认识。

本文把 “来着” 分为 “来着 1” 和 “来着 2”。“来着 1” 是时体助词，最早见于清初文献，是清代满汉接触的产物，主要对应满语的 bihe 及相关构式，其核心的语法意义为 “追述已然”。 “来着 2” 是语气助词，最早见于清末民初的文献，表示 “想不起来或者提醒”。本文的这种二分法与之前学者区分的 “来着 1” 和 “来着 2” 不同，本文 “来着 2” 的范围比他们窄，仅指表示 “想不起来或提醒” 的情况，并认为不存在表示委婉语气的 “来着 2”。

根据太田辰夫（1950）， “来着” 作为一个词，最早出现于《满汉成语对待》（初刻本为康熙四十一年（1702））。祖生利、高云晖（2022）详细考察了清代各种文献中 “来着”的用法，认为其 “主要对应满语的 bihe 及相关构式”，作为清代中期以后逐渐定型化了的旗人汉语里的一个显著的满语干扰特征， “来着” 经由同旗人汉语的接触影响，进入到北京官话里面，沿用至今，成为一个永久性的接触所导致的变化”。我们赞同该观点，并认为用时体助词称这一时期的 “来着”（即本文的 “来着 1”）十分恰当。为进一步了解 “来着 1” 与满语的对应关系，本文选择了五部满汉合璧文献，分别为《满汉成语对待》《清文启蒙》《清文指要》《续编兼汉清文指要》《庸言知止》，穷尽性地考察 “来着 1” 的使用情况和对应的满语表达。

“来着 2” 来源于 “来着 1” 的进一步语法化与主观化，并与 “来着 1” 在 “与其他体标记共现” 、 “用于否定句” 、 “与表示将来的时间词共现” 这三个方面有非常不同的句法表现，这主要是因为 “来着 1” 是时体助词， “来着 2” 是语气助词，语气助词把整个句子作为一个命题，对该命题进行发问，所以基本不受任何句法限制，使用范围更广。而时体助词 “来着 1” 则受到较多的句法限制。如果不区分两种用法的 “来着”，很容易把 “来着 2” 的一些句法表现也看作是 “来着 1” 的用法，或者看成 “来着 1” 到现代汉语的新发展。所以区分 “来着 1” 与 “来着 2” 很有必要，二者产生时间不同，用法有异，不能混为一谈。

1 这五部文献均使用北京大学出版社的 “清代满汉合璧文献萃编” 丛书版本（简称 “萃编”）。其中《满汉成语对待》，初刻本为康熙四十一年（1702）， “萃编” 以北京大学图书馆藏本为底本。《清文启蒙》，“萃编” 以北京大学图书馆藏本为底本，有雍正八年（1730）序文。《清文指要》《续编兼汉清文指要》，二者 “萃编” 均以北京大学图书馆藏本为底本。《庸言知止》成书于嘉庆七年（1802）， “萃编” 以北京大学图书馆藏本为底本，参校中央民族大学图书馆所藏 光绪十七年（1891）抄本。
**Sinicisation as a typological de-Altaicisation of Koreanic and Japonic**

Chingduang YURAYONG  
University of Helsinki & Mahidol University  
chingduang.yurayong@helsinki.fi

Linguistic process of Sinicisation is an areal phenomenon visible in a contact zone extending from Northeastern China through the Korean Peninsula to the Japanese Archipelago. The contact occurred from late prehistory onwards with major watersheds marked by the introduction of Chinese writing systems and vocabularies as part of a cultural spread from China to the Korean and Japonic speaking areas (e.g. Frellesvig 2010; Eom 2015; Huang & Kang 2022). In terms of language structure, Sinicisation was one of the factors behind a typological de-Altaicisation of Koreanic and Japonic, deviating from the Altaic typology (Yurayong & Szeto 2020). At the same time, the remnants of Sinicisation also indirectly illustrate a typological profile of the Chinese variety which reinforced the typological restructuring of Koreanic and Japonic.

Adapting principles of the Wave Theory (Schmidt 1872) to Güldemann’s (2008) model of linguistic area, the present study delineates the spatially variegated degree of Sinicisation as it extends into the Korean Peninsula and the Japanese Archipelago from first millennia BCE to CE. The study examines whether the degree of contact-induced outcomes decreases relative to geographical distance from the assumed areal hotbed around the Liaodong Peninsula. The working hypothesis is that the degree of Sinicisation observed in Koreanic as belonging to the core circle is higher and gradually decreases towards the periphery where Sinicisation was transmitted secondarily through Koreanic to Japonic. This hypothesis is reflected in a larger proportion of loanwords and borrowing of morphosyntactic patterns observed in Koreanic.

Empirically, the present study discusses several typological features and tendencies in Koreanic and Japonic, which are subject to reinforcement by the Sinitic typology and can provide external evidence for the typological profile of Chinese in the first millennia BCE to CE. The investigation concerns: i) phonological distinction such as between the liquids /l/ and /l/; ii) lexical distinction between related body parts such as ‘hand’ and ‘arm’; iii) semantic and functional range of nominal and verbal numeral classifiers; iv) construction types of predicative possession; and v) finiteness and negation in clause combining strategies.
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Complex sentence in Tangwang

Redouane DJAMOURI - 罗端
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redouane.djamouri@ehess.fr

The Tangwang language, spoken in the Hezhou area within the Gansu province, is often cited as being a model of a highly altaicized variety of Chinese. It shows a dominant SOV order and displays only head-final adpositions and conjunctions. Here we will focus on complex sentences in Tangwang, specifically on ‘adverbial clauses’ and ‘complement clauses’, excluding ‘relative clauses’ and ‘coordinated clauses.’ We will see how the Tangwang language employs various complementary or competing strategies to indicate subordination. Subordinate clauses, in most of the cases, precede the main clause, but can also appear between the matrix subject and the main predicate. Fundamentally, it is necessary to distinguish between two major types of subordination in Tangwang. The first one, exemplified in (i), consists of the use of an ‘adverbial clause’ with a participial value (non-finite, stative) and a dependent syntactic status marked by the use of the suffix 着 -tʂə on its verb. Such a clause, which directly modifies the verb of the main clause, is obligatorily inserted to the right of the subject, which cannot be anaphorically referred to in the main clause.

(i) 电视哈 着 (那 i/j) 茶哈 喝寨
kæi tɕɛi SG-xa kʰɛ-tʂə nə tʂʰa-xa xʷy-tɕɛ
Kæi TV-ACC see-tʂə 3SG tea-ACC drink-IMPF
Kæi drinks tea while watching at the television.

The second type, exemplified in (ii), consists of the use in topic position of an 'adverbial clause' headed by the complementizer 是 ʂɿ. Unlike the adverbial clause with 着-tʂə, the 是 ʂɿ clause can optionally take conjunctions (such as 底会 -tei ʂɿ ‘when’ or 底话 -teix ʂɿ ‘if’) to specify its semantic value (temporal, conditional, concessive, etc.); moreover, its subject can be referred to by an anaphoric pronoun, or even replaced by a non-coreferential subject, in the main clause.

(ii) 电视哈 看 (底会/底话) 是 (那 i/j) 茶哈 喝寨
kæi tɕɛi SG-xa kʰɛ tei ʂɿ/tei ʂɿ ʂɿ nə tʂʰa-xa xʷy-tɕɛ
Kæi TV-ACC see when/if COMPLZ 3SG tea-ACC drink-IMPF
(When/if) Kæi watch at the television, he drinks tea.

In an attempt to provide elements supporting these two analyses, we will examine the connection between the use of ʂɿ and topicalization, and try to identify the compatibilities of the verbs present in both structures with different aspect markers in order to better analyze the syntactic dependence between adverbial clauses and the main clause.
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Languages contacts as shown in Qing period Western sources
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Frequent contacts between European countries and China during the Qing period kindled interest in the languages spoken in the Qing empire and led to the publication of numerous Western books on Chinese varieties but also on the Manchu language. The authors often adopt a contrastive approach, comparing Manchu and Chinese in order to explain grammar points and facilitate language learning. The language contacts between Manchu and Chinese and their reciprocal influences are thus reflected and analyzed in these sources. For instance, in the first Manchu grammar written by a European (Pelliot 1922:25–26), the *Elementa linguae tartaricae* by the Jesuit missionary Ferdinand Verbiest (1623–1688), we read of Chinese words that are “Tartarized” and “adapted to the Tartar inflexion” (“tartarizatum”, “inflexioni & terminationi Tartaricae accommodatum”, Verbiest 1682: 27, §100; Söderblom Saarela, forthcoming). The Orientalist L.-M. Langlès wrote of Chinese words “made foreign” (“dépaysés”) by adapting them to Manchu morphology (Langlès 1807: 194). Otherwise, Möllendorf underlines the Manchu influence on 19th century Chinese, writing that “By comparing the Chinese of these dialogues the interesting fact will be noticed that certain peculiarities of Pekingese are Manchuisms foreign to ordinary ‘Mandarin’” (Möllendorf 1884; see also Takekoshi 2015: 71)

Morrison goes a step further, affirming that “a Tartar-Chinese dialect is now gaining ground, and if the dynasty continues long, will finally prevail.” (1815, I: x), thus witnessing the influence of Manchu on Northern Mandarin and the growing importance of Northern Mandarin as “preferred form of Standard Chinese” (Coblin 2003: 196).

However, points of view diverge on the importance and impact of these language contacts. Hence, Harlez (1884) claims that the Manchu grammar borrowed a lot from the Chinese grammar while, according to Meadows, the Chinese influence on Manchu was not significant (Meadows 1849: 8). This communication investigates a corpus of Qing period Western works on Manchu, witnessing language contacts in the Chinese empire, and analyzes how these contacts are reflected or commented in Western sources.
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The non-convergence between Sinitic and non-Sinitic phonologies in Northeast Asia
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It is well-known that language contact can lead not only to convergence but also to divergence (Kühl and Braunmüller 2014; Evans 2019). Based on Phonotaction 1.0, a phonotactic database of Eurasia, we show that Jin and Mandarin, two Sinitic varieties spoken in North and Northeastern China, show unexpectedly little phonological similarity to other non-Sinitic lects spoken in Northeast Asia, such as Mongolic, Tungusic, and Koreanic, despite their geographical vicinity and historical contact. Phonologically, northern Sinitic bears many features absent in its geographical neighbors, such as tones, labial fricatives, syllabic fricatives, or rhoticization (erhua), while lacking features easily found in those languages, such as uvular consonants, obstruent codas, consonant clusters, or vowel harmony.

This is in stark contrast to Sinitic lects spoken in other regions, which show a strong level of similarity with the neighboring non-Sinitic lects. In the Qinghai-Gansu linguistic area, where Sinitic, Bodic, Turkic, and Mongolic are in contact, phonological convergence is observable between Sinitic and non-Sinitic (Janhunen 2006), including influence from Sinitic to Mongolic (Slater 2003; Dwyer 2008) as well as from Bodic to Sinitic (Sandman 2016). The same applies to Mainland South East Asia, where the Far Southern Sinitic displays uncontroversial similarity with the Hmong-Mien, Tai-Kadai, Tibeto-Burman, and Austroasiatic lects of the area (de Sousa 2015; Szeto and Yurayong 2021).

Based on Phonotacticon 1.0, we are able to calculate the phonological distance between each pair of lects. The distances show that Jin and Mandarin are phonologically closer to the lects of the Mainland Southeast Asia (including southern Sinitic) than to the surrounding Tungusic, Mongolic, and Koreanic lects. This low level of phonological similarity between Sinitic and non-Sinitic in Northeast Asia suggests that the historical contact between the demographically dominant Sinitic and the less-spoken non-Sinitic may have led to divergence rather than convergence, at least in the phonological domain.
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现代青海方言与元代汉儿言语是否存在来源关系？
—以“呵”、“有”为线索的考察—

川澄 哲也 - Tetsuya KAWASUMI
日本九州大学 - Kyushu University, Japan
tetsuya.kawasumi@gmail.com

刘勋宁先生在 1991 年的《青海西宁话表示假设的语气词 [xɔ] 与近代白话的 “呵”》一文中提出，同样 是用在从句末尾，表示假设的青海西宁方言 [xɔ] (以下写作“嗬”) 和元代汉儿言语的“呵”有来源关系。这一“同源说”后来为许多研究者所接受，现在已经成为一种“常识”。

本研究认为该说法有待商榷。据我们的调查，西宁方言的“嗬”兼有表假设(例 1)和表时间(例 2)的功能：
（1）下雨嗬，比赛停止嗬。如果下雨就停止比赛。
（2）我来嗬，你没有。我来的时候，你没在。

汉儿言语“呵”的主要功能则是表假设(例 3)和表停顿语气(例 4)：
（3）这般取人呵，国家后头得人材去也。（《通制条格》卷 5）
（4）俺买呵，买一两个自穿的不是。（《古本老乞大》）

可见，二者功能并不完全一致。其中最关键的差异是“呵”不表时间这一点。由此可以推测，如果我们设想“嗬”来源于“呵”，就难以解释“嗬”的时间用法究竟从何而来。跨语言的研究证明，表时间的成分可以演变为表假设的成分，反之则不可能。因此，“(表假设的‘呵’ >)表假设的‘嗬’ >表时间的‘嗬’”这样的演变链不符合语言的一般发展规律。根据这一点我们推断，表假设的“嗬”应是由表时间的“嗬”语法化而来的，与汉儿言语里表假设的“呵”并无来源关系。

2021 年，贾晞儒先生在他的《心镜—蒙古语青海方言—》中提到，青海汉语里有用在句子末尾的“有”(例 5)，同时，他还提出这一成分可能是汉儿言语句末助词“有”(例 6)的遗存。他阿爸哈说了有，没说的不是。他跟爸爸说了，不是没说。（贾 2021：149）

6）这般呵，自家的大名分也不落后了有。（《孝经直解》）

除此以外，我们未见到论及青海方言“有”的研究，因此其功能尚不清楚，目前很难从语言学的视角进行研讨。因此，本研究权且从历史的角度对“同源说”陈述个人的见解。纵观汉儿言语的代表性文献可以得知，句末助词“有”在元初兴起并有所发展，之后随着元朝的衰亡而完全消失。根据这一趋势我们推测，古今两种“有”字之间存在断绝的情况，不可能有来源关系。

现代青海方言与元代汉儿言语都是汉语同蒙古语系语言接触的产物，具有不少共 同点，然而，认为它们之间存在来源关系是不符合史实的观点。
Altai elements in Tangwang Chinese: an overview of the third person pronoun nə 呢

Julie LEFORT - 朱莉
CRLAO-CNRS-EHESS, Paris
julie.lefort@cnrs.fr

Tangwang is a dialect spoken in the south Gansu which features non-Sinitic traits that researchers believe to have been induced by contacts with Altaic languages. Although it has been mainly in direct contact with Dongxiang Mongolian since at least the 14th century, several phenomena tend to demonstrate that the Mongolic and Turkic influence on Tangwang is more complex and that several strata can be identified. Among those, the third person pronoun nə 呢 seems to have developed from demonstrative pronoun nə 呢 ‘that’, which derives from the Chinese demonstrative na/nei 那, which itself is originally of Altaic origin (Lu 1985; Hou 2012, Deng 2002). The use of distal pronominal forms for third person widespread among the North-western dialects, especially in the Jin dialects spoken along the Yellow River in Shaanxi and Shanxi provinces (Xing 2006; Hou 2012), could be the evidence of inheritance from those dialects in Tangwang. This point is further supported by the fact that Tangwang is the only dialect that has developed such form among the other hybrid dialects of the Gansu-Qinghai Area. For this paper, I propose to describe the forms and distribution of Tangwang third person pronouns (nə 呢) and other pronouns used in reference to the third person (ə̃wə 人家, ni-twə 你家 and ə ta 他). I will show how they cognate in other hybrid languages of the Gansu-Qinghai area, their possible origin and relationship with Altaic languages. I will show how they cognate in other hybrid languages of the Gansu-Qinghai area, their possible origin and relationship with Altaic languages. I will show that, demonstrative nə 呢 is most probably of Mongolic-Turkic origin (u兀> una 兀那> na 那 > nə 呢) and inherited by the earlier varieties of Chinese dialects. The formally identical third person pronoun (nə 呢) could be a secondary development due to direct contacts with Dongxiang Mongolian. My hypothesis is that the distal pronoun nə 呢 is a borrowing which form part of a substrate while the third person pronoun nə 呢 is a calque from recent contact.
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Relative clauses in four editions of Lao Qida
— The role of language contact in Chinese language evolution

Buqian LI
INaLCO-CNRS-EHESS, CRLAO, Paris
buhchian.li@gmail.com

This study attempts to explore whether language contact with Mongolian has had an impact on the development and evolution of relative clauses (RC) in Mandarin Chinese, by comparing RCs in four editions of Lao Qida, a textbook of colloquial Chinese published for Korean to learn Chinese.

The data on which this study is based are collected via the parallel edition of Takekoshi (2020) where four versions of each sentence are listed together to illustrate the variation between different time period. The four editions are: (A) Jiùběn Láoqídà 舊本老乞大 (around the middle of the 14th century), the language used in this edition is considered by Zu (2002) as an example of Han’er yanyu, a variation of Chinese highly influenced by Mongolian; (B) Fányì Láoqídà 翻譯老乞大 (1507-1517); (C) Láoqídà Xīnshì 老乞大新釋 (1761); (D) Chónghǎn Láoqídà 重刊老乞大 (1795).

We extracted all sentences containing RCs from the corpus (491 in total), and compared their syntact-morphological properties in the four versions. Our preliminary study shows that there are two types of RCs attested in the four editions: head-final RC and headless RC, and the proportion of their occurrence is roughly equal. In oldest version, surprisingly, the only RC marker attested is de 的, while in the documents of roughly the same time period, the frequency of usage of the marker dǐ 底 and de 的 is rather balanced (Cao 2014); furthermore, we found that demonstratives can never appear between RC and its head noun.

Several studies pointed out that complex nominal modifiers are more frequently attested in Chinese in documents of Yuan period, due to the contact with Mongolian (see Zu 2002, Liu 2008). According to Wang (2015), most of the influence from Mongolian has been eliminated in the versions published under Qing dynasty (C and D). If there are indeed influences from Mongolian passed onto Yuan Chinese, which are eliminated afterwards, one would expect to observe a unidirectional change from longer to shorter nominal modifiers, or to scattered small clauses. However, in our corpus, both directions of changes have been attested for both head final RCs and headless RCs (as shown in 1 and 2), which means the claim doesn’t hold, at least not in the case of Lao Qida. This distinction in regard of RCs maybe due to its colloquial register.

(1) 咱們往前行的十里來田地裏，有箇店子…… (A: 8/3b1–2)
   (compare: 咱們往前走，十多里路，有一箇店……) (C: 8/3b9-10)
   ZANMEI WANG QIAN XING DE SHI LI LAI TIANDI LI YOU GE DIANZI
   we.INCL towards ahead walk DE ten li about shop inside have CLF shop
   ‘There is a shop (...) located in the field within about ten li as we move forward.’

(2) 略稱了三斤麵，每斤七錢半…… (A: 17/7a3-7)
   (compare: 你稱了來的三斤麵，每斤十箇錢……) (C: 17/7b10-8a3)
   NEN CHENG-LE SAN JIN MIAN MEI JIN QI QIAN BAN
   you measure-PFV three catty flour each catty seven qian half
   ‘You had (lit. weighed) three jin of flour, at 7.5 qian per jin...’
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甘肃方言的三种“阿”字头

李蓝 - LI Lan
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甘肃方言中，“阿”可以用于亲属称谓，也可以构成疑问词。经过比较和分析，本文把甘肃方言的“阿”字头分成三种。第一种是用在直系亲属称谓中的“阿 1”。这个“阿”用在直系亲属称谓中有“尊长”义。这种用法与甘肃境内相邻接的少数民族语言如藏语、撒拉语、保安语、东乡语等相一致，其形成可能与语言接触相关。第二种是用来指称丈夫父母的“阿 2”。这个“阿”有指别义，其作用是在明确直系亲属关系的同时也标明“非生身”。这种用法在地理分布与“阿 1”基本不重合，还见于陕西关中及山西晋南。这是甘肃、陕西、山西毗邻地区共享的一个区域语言特征。第三种是用在疑问词中的“阿 3”。这个“阿”的作用是构成疑问词。在地理分布上，“阿 3”也见于青海，不见于陕西和山西。这是甘青方言共享的一个语言特征。

关键词 阿字头 亲属称谓 尊长义 “阿” 指别义 “阿” 疑问义 “阿” 。
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The Sanches-Greenberg-Slobin Generalization revisited:
evidence from Gan-Qing Mandarin
再论量词和复数标记不共现原则
——从甘青汉语说起

李旭平 - LI Xuping
浙江大学 - Zhejiang University
Email: xupingli@zju.edu.cn

本文主要研究甘青汉语（以临夏话为主）中复数标记“们”和数量短语的共现现象，重新诠释这些语言里“们”的语义性质和使用限制。根据 Sanches-Greenberg-Slobin 原则，量词和复数标记在世界语言往往呈现互补分布（Greenberg 1972, Sanches and Slobin 1973）。甘青汉语的表现似是违反了 SGS 原则，问题应该源自“们”。不同于普通话，甘青汉语的“们”有三个突出特点：1）“们”几乎能附缀所有名词；2）“N-们”具有三分歧义：仅表复数、仅表单数、兼表单复数；3）“N-们”既可以是有定也可以是无定。就其语义而言，本文提出，甘青汉语的“们”是一个“包括性复数（inclusive plural）”标记，“N-们”所指谓的集合包括原子个体和复数个体，不同的语用策略能够阻断其中的单数或复数解读（Krifka 1989; Sauerland 2003）。
On the origin of the particle lāizhe 来着 in Northern Chinese: a borrowing from Manchu?

Lin Xiao
École normale supérieure de Paris
lin.xiao@ens.psl.eu

In Yuan Dynasty hàń'èr yányǔ 汉儿言语, which is Altaicized Chinese, this particle is not attested in the usual documents that fall under this language, namely the Yuándài báihuà bèi jí lù 元代白话碑集录; the Yuán kān zájù sān shí zhòng 元刊杂剧三十种; the various editions of the Lào Qídà 老乞大 and the Piáo Tōngshì 朴通事. We do find the particle zhe 着 as an imperative marker, or the disyllabic modal particle yězhē 也者 (著) used at the end of a sentence to indicate affirmation but never lāizhe 来着.

Nor is there any trace of it in Ming dynasty, including those in a spoken register such as the Huang Ming zhàoling 《皇明诏令》 (cf. Jiang 1988).

Nevertheless, it has been suggested that the lāizhe 来着 marker may be related to the final verbal compounds yóulái 有来 or zhàoyōu lái 著有来, which are well represented in the Yuan vernacular (Zu 2011). This hypothesis will be discussed first, and we will see that it remains very fragile and unargued. It is not until the Qing dynasty that the lāizhe 来着 marker makes its first undeniable appearance, especially in documents heavily influenced by the Manchu language. As a tense and aspect marker, lāizhe 来着 is used at the end of sentences to indicate that the action or event took place in the past:

前几天我去的时候，他也托我问您好来着
qián jī tiān wǒ qù deshíhòu, tā yě tuō wǒ wèn nín hào lāizhe before a few days I go when he also entrust me to ask you well LAIZHE When I went there a few days ago, he also entrusted me to ask if you are well. (Guānhuà zhǐnán)

This Chinese marker lāizhe 来着 is a borrowing from Manchu. Chen Qianrui (2022) made a comparative analysis of four Chinese texts with their Manchu language equivalents. The particle lāizhe 来着, present in all four Manchu documents, always expresses a past tense (past progressive, imperfect, perfect). We will confine ourselves to confirming that the contemporary Pekingese lāizhe 来着 has indeed evolved from the same Manchu marker from which it originated, by studying documents of spoken Pekingese from the works of Western missionaries in the 18and 19centuries.
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Grammatical features of delimitative aspect constructions in Sinitic languages
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Li and Thompson (1989: 232) use the term delimitative aspect (DELM) for Mandarin Chinese, expressing the meaning of “doing an action a little bit, or for a short period”, which is structurally represented as verb reduplication. Furthermore, Liu Danqing (1996: 31) argued that the verb phrase \( \text{VERB-(ONE)-VCL-} \) can indicate the delimitative aspect in the non-Mandarin dialects as in (1), whose function is equal to the reduplicated verb form \( \text{VERB-(ONE)-VERB} \) in Standard Mandarin.

(1) Meixian dialect 梅县方言 (Hakka, Sinitic)

[talk one VCL]DELM

‘Talk a little.’ (Xie Yongchang, 1994: 165)

In this study, we examine the different types of delimitative aspect constructions and their areal distributions based on a survey of 645 Sinitic languages. There are four main types (seven sub-types) of delimitative constructions identified in Sinitic languages. Type I-a [\( \text{VERB-(ONE)-VERB} \)] is the most common in Sinitic languages; Type I-b [\( \text{VERB-VERB-ER \_\_} \)] is only utilized in some Jin and the Zhongyuan Mandarin dialects of northwestern China; Type II-a [\( \text{VERB-(ONE)-XIA 下 ‘while’} \)] is mainly found in Xiang, Gan and Hakka; Type II-b [\( \text{VERB-GEI 给 -XIA 下 ‘while’} \)] is mainly adopted by the Jin, Zhongyuan and Lan-Yin dialects; In addition, Type III [\( \text{VERB-(VERB)-ZHE 者 ‘a while’} \)] is only found in Southern Min, Type IV-a [\( \text{GE 去-VERB-GE 去-VERB} \)] and Type IV-b [\( \text{GE 去-VERB-ONE-XIA 下 ‘while’} \)] are mainly employed in the Jin dialects of Shanxi. Based on linguistic areas hypotheses proposed by Hashimoto (1985), Norman (1988), Chappell (2015) and Xing Xiangdong (2020), considering types and distributions for delimitative constructions in Sinitic languages, we classify the Sinitic languages in China into four linguistic areas, which are Northeastern (Type I-a), Central (Type II-a), Southwestern, Southeastern and Far Southern (Type I-a & Type II-a) and Northwestern (Type II-a & II-b). In contradistinction to earlier works on typology of Sinitic languages with a North-South division, a major line of separation for the delimitative constructions lies between western and eastern areas of China.

**Keywords:** delimitative aspect; geo-typology; Sinitic languages
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甘青河湟语言区域的共享特征
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甘青河湟语言区域

甘青河湟语言区域是西北语言接触最集中的区域。大约有十五种语言，属于汉藏语系和阿尔泰语系。区域内共有的语言环境使得汉藏语系的汉语、藏语和阿尔泰语系诸语言互动频繁，互相影响，结构趋同，产生了一系列“语言区域”。共享特征：除了声调减少和量词减少外，既有体词性的数范畴和系统的格范畴，也有谓词性的时体、副动词以及态范畴等。我们总结概括如下：

1. 声调减少
2. 量词减少
3. 复数标记“们[mu]”
甘青河湟方言中的“们”是一种内部具有一致性的区域性特征。

4. 定冠词和不定冠词
甘青河湟方言除了指示代词“这个/个”有冠词用法，“个”表示说话双方都知道具体所指的某个事物。例如：

5. 系统的格标记

6. 语序类型
甘肃青海一带的汉语方言出现了“你饭哈吃，水哈喝”（你吃饭喝水）“我你啊看来了”（我看你来了）的OV语序；也可以说“我老师是”，还可以说“我是老师是”SVOV的混合句型。

7. “领有”义动词表示存在、处所义
甘青河湟方言“领有”义动词可以表存在、处所等义，还表示判断。具有区域类型特征。例如：

尔萨家锯子有哩。（存在）
我的阿娜舍里有哩。（处所）
阿娜法图曼哈说了有，没说的[wei]不是。

1 我们调查的主要对象是该地区方言。所用语言资料，有些引自《中国少数民族语言简志》，引用有关文献资料时，引文用字按照原文；田野调查材料按照《中国少数民族语言简志丛书》的标音习惯（所引的语料均标明来源，未标明出处的为作者调查所得）。我们称作“河湟区域1”，主要是我们的调查集中在湟水流域和甘青之间的黄河两岸的民族地区。包括：1）甘肃临夏回族自治州的临夏市，2）甘肃甘南藏族自治州的临潭县，3）甘肃东乡族自治县，4）甘肃积石山保安族东乡族撒拉族自治县，5）青海化隆回族自治县（卡力岗人的语言），6）青海海北藏族自治州的祁连县（托藏语），7）青海门源回族自治县和大通回族土族自治县；8）西宁市的城东区。

2 “个”是现代汉语中使用频率很高的一个词，据北京语言大学编写的《现代汉语频率词典》统计，它在使用度最高的前八千个词中居于第九位。

3 从语言系属来看，这一区域有如下语言：
（1）带有语言接触特征的河湟汉语方言即接触语言，如临夏话、西宁话、积石山方言等。
（2）接触程度较高、带有混合性质的唐汪话、甘沟话和玉树话等，也包括少数民族转用的汉语方言，如保安汉语、东乡汉语等。
（3）汉藏语系藏缅语族的安多藏语和康方言。安多藏语无声调，分布在夏河县、碌曲县、玛曲县和天祝县等地；康方言有声调的，分布在卓尼县、迭部县、舟曲县的大部分地区。
（4）阿尔泰语系蒙古语族的东乡语、保安语、土族语、东部裕固语以及阿尔泰语系突厥语族的撒拉语和西部裕固语，这六种语言没有文字。
8. 副词和状语的语序
副词“再”不是用在动词前做状语，而是用于句首，修饰整个小句。例如：
再阿姨个的话要听。 （现在不再父亲的。）
“还”“格外”“确实”等副词也没有紧跟着修饰的对象，位置相对比较自由。
9. 从句标记 其中“是”用于前一分句的末尾，表示假设、条件关系、转折关系或顺承关系等。
10. 引语标记
你叫啥名字说着，我“索索”说fo着tšo说šu着tšε。 （你叫啥名字？
我叫索索。） （张安生：西宁回民话2007）
引语句的顺序为与普通话相反，均为“言说内容+引语标记+言说词”，使用虚化了的言说动词“说”（“是”说的语音弱化形式）作为引语标记。
11. 祈使标记
甘青河湟方言有祈使标记“给”。 例如：
坐给了坐给，要去ʨʰi。 （叫你留下你就留下，不要回来。）
你钢笔啦写给！ （叫你用钢笔写！）
茶倒给。
12. “把”字句
1）主语不出现的“把”字句。 例如：把那想了个美。（他想得美！）
2）谓语动词不出现的“把”字句：我把你个瞎怂！ （我把这个坏蛋！）
13. V1着V2结构
我刚抱着娃娃着出门俩。（我刚要抱着孩子出门呢。）
14. 句尾的“着”
肉们买去着一挂冻着说着。（买肉去时，发现肉全都冻住了。）
人家们稀不富着呢，金砖铺路着呢。（人家特别富有，路是用金砖铺的。）
综上所述，我们将河湟方言的区域特征大体概括为十四条，这些特征是我们深入
调查并进行过讨论的。事实远比着十四条多，有些是我们观察到还没有深入研究的特
征，比有“远指代词与第三人称代词相同”“疑问句中的特指问和选择问”“比较句”
等问题，相信随着调查的不断深入，调查范围的不断扩大，还会发掘更多的共享特征。

① 据兰州大学中文系临夏方言调查研究组和甘肃省临夏州文联编《临夏方言》（1996：206-207）， “是”还可以
表示假设关系、条件关系、转折关系或顺承关系等。
On some phonetic and lexical characteristics of the dialects of the Shùnyì 顺义 and Miyún 密云 districts belonging today to the Beijing direct-controlled municipality

Alain PEYRAUBE
Centre de recherches linguistiques sur l’Asie orientale, Paris
alain.peyraube@gmail.com

Using oral documents collected in the districts of Shùnyì 顺义 and Miyún 密云 in the early 1970s, some fundamental differences, both phonetically and lexically, with today’s Standard Mandarin will be studied.

These will be compared with data recently collected in the same districts in Jingjiāo fāngyán 《京郊方言》 (2015), as well as in Old Pekingese.

1. Some examples of phonetic differences with Standard Mandarin:

   他们 tāmen > tānmen (顺义)
   允 yǔn > rūn (顺义) 小子 xiǎo > xiě (密云)
   逮 dài > děi (顺义) 庄 zhuāng > zhāng (密云)
   倒 dāo > tāo (顺义) 藕粉 ōufēn > ngōufēn (密云)
   弄 nòng > nèng (顺义) 绿 lǜ > luī (密云)
   骑 qí > qú (顺义, 密云) 发热 rè > ruò (密云)
   碍 ài > nài (顺义, 密云) 做饭 zuò > zòu (密云)
   俊 jùn > zùn (顺义) 我 wǒ > wān (密云)

2. Some examples of lexical differences with Standard Mandarin:

   前半晌儿 > 上午 (顺义) 兀突 wūtu ‘neither cold nor hot water’ (also attested to in Yuan operas)
   天擦黑儿 > 黄昏 (顺义) 巴拉饼子 (巴拉 borrowed from Tibetan)
   儿吗 > 公马 (顺义) 乌拉 wūla ‘able to’ (source: Turkish)
   叫驴 公驴 > (顺义) 楞 lèng ‘wait’ (密云)
   跑栏子 > 公猪 (顺义) 祕袄儿 guàchār ‘short-sleeved shirt’
   马猴子 > 狼 (顺义) 一出儿 yīchūr ‘one-way ticket’ (密云)
   取灯儿 > 火柴 (顺义)

Nominalization in Wutun

Erika SANDMAN
University of Helsinki
erika.sandman@helsinki.fi

In my paper I will discuss nominalization in Wutun. Wutun is a mixed language spoken by ca. 4000 people in three villages in Tongren County, Huangnan Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Qinghai Province, P.R. China. While Wutun basic vocabulary and grammatical morphemes are mainly based on the local variety of Northwest Mandarin, its morphosyntax is heavily influenced by the local lingua franca Amdo Tibetan, and to lesser extent, the Mongolic Bonan language (Chen 1986, Sandman 2016). Nominalization is a process of deriving nominal expressions from verbs, adjectives or clauses (Yap, Grunow-Härsta and Wrona 2011: 3). Nominalization in Wutun is expressed by the multipurpose marker -de (cognate to Standard Mandarin de 的), which functions on both the lexical and clausal levels (see Sandman in press). Lexical nominalization takes the verb as its domain to derive nouns or adjectives, while clausal nominalization takes the entire clause as its domain and allows the clause to be treated as a noun phrase. Wutun clausal nominalizations can be divided into relative clauses, nominal complement clauses and adverbial subordinate clauses. While relative clauses in Wutun show clear resemblance to the relative clauses in varieties of Mandarin Chinese, nominal complement clauses and adverbial subordinate clauses replicate Amdo Tibetan syntactic structure.

For example, causal subordination in Amdo Tibetan is expressed by attaching the nominalizer -no and the instrumental case marker -gi to the verb. Wutun causal subordination construction is isomorphic with the Amdo Tibetan construction, with the Wutun nominalizer -de resembling the Amdo Tibetan nominalizer -no and the Wutun comitative-instrumental case marker -liangge (based on the Mandarin Chinese numeral liǎng 两, ‘two’ and the generic classifier ge 个), as in 1):

1) dak jhan-lio-de-liangge ren yidaze haipa-gu-lio  tiger see-PFV-NMLZ-INS person all (be)afraid-COMPL-PFV ze-lii EXEC-SEN.INF

‘Because of seeing a tiger, all the people were frightened.’ (Sandman & Simon 2016: 108)

In addition, the multi-purpose morpheme -de in Wutun has functions that go beyond nominalization, including pronominal function, pre-modification and stand-alone usage, which plays an important role in expressing the opinions and attitudes of the speakers. All these uses are consistent with the functions of the multi-purpose morpheme de 的 in Mandarin Chinese and they represent the Chinese component of the Wutun grammar.
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从冀鲁官话保定方言的名词复数词缀谈北方方言的外来成分
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从“阿拉篇”看清代北京话的动词时态系统

竹越 孝 - Takashi TAKEKOSHI
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takekosi@gmail.com

在中国近代之前，系统地描述外语语法的唯一资料为清代的满蒙文教材。由于其统治制度的要求，清朝必须不断培养大量的翻译官员，因此自17世纪至19世纪，各种满语教材陆续出版。现存的有关满语及蒙古语语法的教材至少有10种，如：一、沈启亮《清书指南》卷三《翻清虚字讲约》，康熙21年（1682）；二、桑额《满汉合书》卷三十二《字尾类》，康熙39年（1700）；三、载谷《清文备考》卷一《虚字讲约》，康熙61年（1722）；四、舞格《满汉字清文启蒙》卷三《清文助语虚字》，雍正8年（1730）；五、博赫《清语易言》，乾隆31年（1766）；六、富俊《三合便览》卷一《清文指要》，乾隆45年（1770）；七、赛尚阿《蒙文晰义》卷三《蒙文法程》，道光28年（1848）；八、嵩洛峰《清文接字》，同治5年（1866）；九、徐沃田《字法举一歌》，光绪11年（1885）；十、万福《清文虚字指南编》，光绪20年（1894）。以上文献基本上使用汉语来说明满文或蒙古语的各种格尾、动词词尾以及派生词尾等，不仅作为满语及蒙古语的历史资料具有很高的价值，对于汉语史的研究亦有参考价值。

有些满语语书包含有反映满语传统教育方法的教材，称为“阿拉篇”，此篇将满语ala-（“告诉”）这一词干为基础，附加各种词尾、副词等而形成一种排列用例的“词形变化表”，有的教材用汉语来解释其语义。如《清语易言》一书中可以看到满语ala-的200多种词形变化形式及汉译，其开头部分如下：

alambi “告诉”
al “叫告诉”
tubade alana “那里去告诉”
ubade alanju “这里来告诉”
te alanambi “现今告诉去”
ze alanjimbi “如今告诉来”

我们据此可知，当时的满、汉双语者怎样理解满语动词的各种时态，怎样用汉语来系统地表达动词的时态概念。本文将全面分析清代“阿拉篇”所描写的满语动词的各种词形变化形式及其汉译，以此考察当时北京话的动词时态系统。
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Influence from Chinese through Language Contact: the Case of Shinekhen Buryat
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In this presentation, we will be discussing the current situation of the language contact between Shinekhen Buryat—a Mongolic language—and Chinese. The following topics will be covered: 1) The original morphosyntactic structure of Shinekhen Buryat appears to be undergoing changes due to the language contact with Chinese; 2) Although such linguistic changes have been previously classified as borrowing, they should now be classified as code-switching, and 3) The phenomenon of mixing. Chinese elements with the language structure is not part of the normative awareness of Buryat speakers, as we have not found any instances of it during elicitation.

Shinekhen Buryat is a Mongolic language spoken in and around the Shinekhen River basin in the northern part of Inner Mongolia. Buryat speakers are descendants of Buryat refugees from Russia. The main difference between Buryat speakers in Russia and those in China is the influence of the language contact between Chinese and Shinekhen Buryat.

One of the most significant influences of Chinese on Shinekhen Buryat is the use of noun-verb homomorphic stems, which are only found in the Chinese lexicon. In Buryat, noun and verb stems are morphologically distinct. Whenever a noun is used as a verb or vice versa, a derivational suffix is required. This is also true for loanwords. For instance, Chinese loanwords adopted into Buryat prior to the migration always require a derivational suffix when they function as a verbal stem (e.g. the denominal suffix -nA: N. shang (Chi. 赏) > V. shang-na-, N. jing (Chi. 蒸) > V. jing-ne-). However, Chinese words adopted after the migration can function as both noun and verb stems in Buryat (e.g. N/V. d'endii- (Chi. 点滴) ‘hospital drip’, ‘to be on a hospital drip’, N/V. z'eehun- (Chi. 结婚) ‘a marriage’, ‘to marry’).

Yamakoshi (2022) regarded this phenomenon as a borrowing because of the loss of Chinese tones in the process. However, based on the distinction between code-switching and borrowing suggested by Muysken (1995) and Poplack & Sankoff (1984) and the following two points, we propose that it is more appropriate to classify these hybrid stems as code-switching rather than as borrowing: 1) verb stems without any derivational suffixes are used frequently, especially in children’s speech, and their use decreases as children grow older, and 2) their use in speech is noticeable to an outsider, such as the author. The fact that this phenomenon was only observed in natural conversation and not during elicitation also supports the conclusion that these words have not been established as borrowed.

References
Abstract: We try to study the languages and populations in the Gansu-Qinghai area with the interdisciplinary method. The paper argues that some paternal lineage does not match the languages such as Dongxiang and Bao’an, their forefather languages have been completely replaced. Some paternal DNA and languages generally correspond, this is the case of Salars, whose ancestral language is basically kept. Some other situations are more complex, say Western Yugurs and Eastern Yugurs, the languages of several clans have been replaced. These problems can be explained by ELITE DOMINANCE model on one hand and by CULTURE DOMINANCE model on the other.
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兰州方言的副动词标记“着”——接触引发的语法化
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徐丹，贝罗贝（2018）提出中国甘肃青海一带区域内的语言除了安多藏语和撒拉语，都有连接句子的连接词“着/者”等，即这一语言区域内的句子结构都常用“着”连接两个动词词组。部分“V 着 V”与标准汉语表面结构相同，但意义不完全相同。

兰州方言中也存在一类“着”，能附着于句中的一个或几个短语、小句之后，并且与之共同构成一个修饰性成分，作为一个整体修饰句中后一个谓词性成分，形成“[[XP+着]+VP]”这一构式，表达前后两个事件间诸如时序、方式、因果、让步、条件、转折等复杂的语义关系。该结构所展现的句法结构和蕴含的语义关系，与我国西北地区诸阿尔泰语言中的副动词（converb）具有高度的同构特征。已有研究表明，包括兰州话、临夏话等西北方言中这类句法现象的出现与周边少数民族语言的副动词结构有关（赵绿原 2015，敏春芳 2020，杨永龙 2022）。

本文对兰州方言副动词标记“着”的句法语义特征提供了进一步的思考。副动词结构的存在使得兰州方言在句法上排斥动词的连用，或排斥谓词性成分的无标记连用，因而连动结构、述补结构、并列小句等句法结构很不发达。兰州方言的副动词标记“着”是汉语立足自身演化发展的基础上，经历了深度的语言接触后进一步语法化的产物。
青海甘沟话格标记“哈”标记主语功能补议
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杨永龙（2015）对青海甘沟话多功能格标记“哈”的功能、分布、使用限定等进行了细致、精到的描写，研究显示“哈”的功能以标记宾格、与格为主，但两类情况下可以标记主语，一类是领有句或类领有句的主语，即领有者（见例（1）），一类句子动词为表主观意愿的“有心”“没心”的主语——这一类的范围根据我们的调查可以放宽至其他表行为主体心理活动、感知状态的动词或形容词（见例（2））：

(1) a. 你哈楼房没呗（你没有楼房）。 b. 我啊钱多着哩啊（我钱多着哪）。
(2) a. 我哈苹果有心吃（我愿意吃苹果）。 b. 我哈害怕着（我很害怕）。

本文详细调查了甘沟话中“哈”标记主语的用例，在此基础上讨论了“哈”这一特殊分布的成因。文章否定了甘沟话“哈”出现在主语后是受藏语之类拥有作-通格系统语言影响的可能，亦不认为甘沟话的“哈”有标记话题的功能。“哈”之所以标记领有者，是因为甘沟话中与格、宾格同标，而与之有接触关系的土族语中与格、位格同标，兼之在两种语言/方言中存在-领有结构同构，故“哈”类推出现在领有者（亦是一种“所在地”）后。“哈”之所以标记表心理活动句的主语，是因为在甘沟话中，大部分心理活动被识别为他者导致而非自身发出的，这类主语被识别为“被使者”（causee），故使用“哈”标记为与格。