A Chinese translation of this article was published as part of Chapter 1 of 《罗杰瑞卷》（《中西学术名篇精读 7》），柯蔚南、韩哲夫、梅祖麟、秋谷裕幸、沈瑞清读解。上海：中西书局，2026. It followed a Chinese translation of Jerry Norman's "A Model for Chinese Dialect Evolution".

A Readers' Guide to Jerry Norman's "A Model for Chinese Dialect Evolution"

W. South Coblin
University of Iowa

I. Introduction

Jerry Norman's article, "A Model for Chinese Dialect Evolution", is the final scholarly contribution completed by him during his lifetime. It appeared in print two years after his death. Significantly, it deals with what was his primary interest and concern during his academic career, i.e., the origin and history of modern spoken forms of Chinese. Like all his publications, the paper is carefully organized and clearly written. Why, then, should it warrant further guidance in order to be comprehended and appreciated? The answer is that there lies beneath its strikingly simple and lucid prose a substratum of scholarly and intellectual evolution that, when revealed to readers of the paper, may enhance their appreciation of its primary content.

To begin, the purpose of Norman's article is actually three-fold. Its primary goal is of course to construct an historical framework through which the development of modern spoken forms of Chinese can be recognized, traced, and elucidated. But there is also a second purpose, a natural outgrowth of the first, which is to lay to rest once and for all the older developmental model that was propounded by Bernhard Karlgren nearly a century ago and that continues to inform the work of some sinologists even today. The third intent is to supplant the uncritical use of the *Qièyùn* 切韻 System (QYS) as a quasi-historical framework for outlining the evolution of individual dialects. We shall now consider these points in detail, beginning with the problem of the Karlgrenian model.

II. The Karlgrenian Model

Karlgren's outline for the history of Chinese is so well known that Norman gives it fairly short shrift in the paper. Here we can summarize it as follows. In pre-Hn 漢 times there was a standard form of Chinese, used during the Shāng 商 and Zhōu 周 periods and whose pronunciation is reflected in the rime schemes of the *Shījīng* 詩經 Odes and to a certain extent in rimed verse found in certain later Zhōu texts. This language evolved more or less directly into a standard koine of the Táng capital, Cháng'ān 長安. During this process, one ancient form of Sinitic, the common ancestor of the multifarious varieties of colloquial Mǐn 閩, diverged from the just mentioned major Sinitic language stream and went its own way. All remaining mainstream dialects are directly descended from the Cháng'ān-based koine. But, returning to the Zhōu period, Karlgren believed that there were at this time in China also a number of non-standard speech types which he called "vulgar dialects" and which he averred were still in use by "the lowest strata of the population". Remnants of these, he supposed, survive primarily as occasional substrate elements in the modern dialects, identifiable as irregular colloquial pronunciations of certain syllables, i.e., irregular in that they are not systematically predictable on the basis

of fǎnqiè 反切 formulae cited in the *Qièyùn* (QY) lineage of rime dictionaries. Karlgren was quite familiar with these "irregular" forms, and the footnotes to his classic *Études sur la phonologie chinoise* (1915-26) are studded with examples of them. But he considered them to be culs-de-sac in the general history of Chinese.

Karlgren's model is avowedly based on the historical development of Greek (1915-26: 693). The modern Greek dialects are known to have evolved from the original Greek Koinḗ (ἡ κοινὴ διάλεκτος) of somewhat over 2300 years ago, with the exception of Tsakonian, which descends from a pre-Koinḗ dialect and would for Karlgren have been an analogue of Mǐn in Chinese. During the 1980's Norman expended a great deal of time and effort studying the history of Greek, poring over, among many other materials, major works such as L. R. Palmer's *The Greek Language* (1980) and Robert Browning's *Medieval and Modern Greek* (1983); and as a result of these studies he became convinced that Karlgren's Greek analogy was faulty on both chronological and linguistic grounds as a model for the development of Chinese dialects. But though he discussed this matter with me often in both conversation and correspondence, to my knowledge he only alluded to it once in print, in our joint article, "A New Approach to Chinese Linguistics" (Norman and Coblin 1995: 581).

Since it was first introduced, Karlgren's model has undergone many modifications and revisions; and there is probably no one today who accepts it as holy writ in its original form. But in Norman's view it continues to exert an overweening influence on the field of Chinese historical and comparative dialectology. To wit, the majority of dialectologists continue to embrace to one extent or another the idea that the phonologies of modern Chinese dialects descend directly from an actual linguistic system inherent in the structural framework of the QYS. Even those who do not overtly make such a claim nonetheless reveal their tacit reliance on it both in their general approach to dialect description and in their actual analysis of their data. As regards their general approach, they almost universally resort to direct comparison of single dialects with the QYS, *as if* these modern speech forms derived directly and individually from a single early language type (i.e., the putative "QY language"), rather than from proto-dialects that have engendered genetically related later *groups* of dialects. And, secondly, in classifying the sound classes of modern dialects, these individuals regularly state that the particular sounds of the said modern dialects "descend" from certain QYS classes, were "produced" by certain QYS classes, "evolved out of" certain QYS classes, etc., all of which turns of phrase implicitly affirm a belief in the type of development inherent in the Karlgrenian model. It was this state of affairs that so troubled Norman that he felt it necessary to construct a new, more historically realistic model for Chinese dialect development. For only in this way, he felt, could the field be liberated from the deleterious influences of the older model.

The above points notwithstanding, it is essential to understand fully and clearly Norman's basic attitudes towards the nature of the QY and the future role he envisaged for it in the field of historical dialectology. For he certainly did not propose to "throw it out" or "burn it", as some have histrionically alleged. In the present article he specifically says, "I am not advocating the abandonment of the *Qièyùn* as a basic datum of Chinese

historical linguistics; what I propose, rather, is a reinterpretation of its role." He then tells us that he intends to offer his new model for the historical evolution of spoken forms of Chinese and in so doing to "sketch a possible alternative approach [to the traditional Karlgrenian one] which reinterprets the *Qièyùn*'s function in such an evolution and... provides a neater and more economical overall picture."

III. The New Model

This at last leads us to the new model itself, which is the primary topic of Norman's paper. The two fundamental components of this model are reconstructed systems which Norman calls "Common Dialectal Chinese" (CDC) and "Early Chinese" (EC). Let us now examine each of these from the separate standpoints of content and developmental history.

IIIa. Common Dialectal Chinese

In the 1970's, after Norman assumed his academic position in Chinese linguistics at the University of Washington, he would every year or so construct his own experimental QYS transcriptions (or "reconstructions" in the parlance of that time). These were for use in his historical phonology classes, and he regularly sent me copies of them to examine and discuss with him. (This was all done by surface post, of course. We had no email in those days.) Some of these systems were brilliantly conceived and were so good that I once considered using one of them as a QYS transcription in my own work. But as the '80's wore on, Norman began to lose interest in such undertakings, for he increasingly felt that, since the QYS did not represent a real language, it was pointless to expend time and effort trying to posit "more accurate" phonological forms for it. Any transcription that was internally consistent would serve the purpose of identifying the system's constituent categories, and he felt that F. K. Li's modification of Karlgren's old Ancient Chinese system was entirely serviceable in this regard.[1]

From time to time during the 1980's Norman expressed in correspondence his belief that modern dialects had hitherto played a far less important role in the field of Chinese historical phonology than they should have. But it is in his letters from 1992-1993 that an even more notable development emerged. To wit, he spoke more often of strict application of the comparative method to dialect data and expressed what he felt was a need to reconsider and revise his earlier Proto-Mǐn reconstructed system. His thinking in this regard was not limited to Mǐn but extended to all modern dialects. In a letter dated November 9, 1993 he said in part, "K[arlgren] and P[ulleyblank]'s work is not truly comparative. Their theories are top-to-bottom; we need to become relentlessly comparative in our approach and adopt a bottom-to-top approach...I have no doubt that

[1] In fact, he actually felt that the Chinese practice of using formulaic abbreviations of traditional rime table terminology to refer to QYS sound classes was far superior to any Western-style transcriptions, because of its abstractness and phonetic neutrality. But this approach unfortunately does not lend itself to use in Western language works.

this kind of study will be very revealing and productive. It causes you to plant your feet solidly on the ground...We will have to accept a much messier view of language in China. The K[arlgren-]P[ulleyblank] approach is grossly simplificatory, and one pays a heavy price for this sort of simplification."

And so it was that during the 1990's Norman began to put the ideas expressed here into practice. His new work on the Mǐn dialects, resulting in the system he called "Common Mǐn", will be discussed further below. But at the same time he carried out comparative reconstructive work on the mainstream non-Mǐn dialects, by synoptic analysis of the data included in the *Hànyǔ fāngyīn zìhuì* 漢語方音字彙 (Peking University 1989 edition). This reconstruction was done as Norman himself prescribed, i.e., from the bottom up, using the classical comparative method. Much of it was, I believe, done "in his head", for he had a remarkable knack for digesting and manipulating dialect data in this way. But in more complex cases he resorted to pen and paper, so that now and again I would receive from him comparative tables he had compiled. However, it was not until the end result appeared that I understood the true nature and scope of what he had been doing with this material. He had in fact been reconstructing what he called Common Dialectal Chinese. In publishing this system, he wrote as follows (Norman 2006: 232):

> "There are basically two approaches to working out the categories of Common Dialectal Chinese (CDC). One could work backwards from modern dialects using the comparative method (Bloomfield 1933, Fox 1995). A quicker and more efficient approach will be to start with the categories of the *Qièyùn* and systematically eliminate those features not reflected in the modern dialects under consideration..."

And in the present paper he reiterates as follows:

> "To a large degree, the categories of CDC can be obtained by eliminating from the [QYS] inventory all the distinctions that are not reflected in the modern mainstream dialects; it is of course necessary also to verify the results obtained in this way by [recourse to] actual dialect data..."

In other words, in outlining his results, he chose a format that eschewed the painstaking and admittedly tedious approach of describing how each phonological unit in the proto-system was reconstructed comparatively. Instead, he presented his findings in terms of a reduction of QYS categories. Why did he do this? In small part I suspect it was to save space, for he was writing a paper, not a book. But in greater part it was almost certainly because Norman viscerally loathed tedium. He simply did not want to go through all the pirouettes and chassés of the methodological minuet involved in presenting a full comparative reconstruction in the traditional mode. And the result of this has been that he is now sometimes accused of producing Common Dialectal Chinese by simply taking a sculptor's chisel to the proverbial QYS woodblock, rather than using the comparative method per se. But let there be no confusion. Common Dialectal Chinese is in origin a true comparative reconstruction. It is because of its presentation format that it appears otherwise.

IIIb. Early Chinese

From Common Dialectal Chinese, we now proceed to the second component of the new model, Early Chinese, which Norman also calls a "reconstruction". But whatever it is, it most certainly is not a comparative reconstruction in the sense that a Bloomfield or a Fox would understand that term, or in the way that Common Dialectal Chinese is. What is it then? First of all, we should note what Norman himself tells us it is not:

> "...my goal is not to produce another OC reconstruction based solely on documentary data. What I want to do is uncover an early stage of Chinese that can serve as an anchor for Chinese linguistic evolution, particularly that of Chinese dialects."

He then says,

> "The goal here has been to exclude any element that cannot be shown to have implications for the subsequent development of the language."

What he envisages, then, is a highly truncated Pre-CDC system whose primary function is to aid in understanding the development of the modern dialects. As regards the syllable initials of Early Chinese, he remarks,

> "...in reality, the idea that we can produce a well-founded reconstruction of pre-Hàn initials may only be wishful thinking. To be sure, some productive ideas about early initials have been put forth, but the sort of detailed reconstruction envisioned by Karlgren is probably not possible."

And again,

> "Since EC, unlike conventional OC, is concerned mainly with an upper stage for the application to Chinese dialectal development, I do not feel compelled to follow many of the radical and speculative proposals put forward in the past. My tendency is to adopt a minimalist approach, including in the initial system only those elements which are in some way reflected in later developments;..."

From this we see that the initial system of Early Chinese will be simple, its only obligatory function being that of accounting for all later mainstream dialect developments. For the finals of EC, he says,

> "In a certain sense, EC is a reframing of the QY categories in light of earlier rime evidence. Thus, to my mind, the earliest stage of Chinese about which we have access is closer to the QY categories than traditional Archaic or Old Chinese."

IIIc. The *Qièyùn* System

The above reference to the QYS brings us face to face with the question of Norman's stance on the position of this system in his proposed model. He has already told us that he does not advocate abandonment of the system. What, then, does he envisage as its role in the new model? His answer is that it "occupies a position between a more archaic variety of Chinese, which I will call Early Chinese (EC), and a variety of Chinese ancestral to the modern mainstream dialects." Thus,

> "Rather than viewing the *Qièyùn* categories as in some cases ancestral to modern popular forms of speech, such modern forms are seen to come from an old form of popular (spoken) Chinese which differed in important respects from the character readings found in traditional sources. This old vernacular form of language was characterized above all by its comparative simplicity."

And, as just noted above he feels that this old vernacular, i.e., Early Chinese, can be brought to light through "a reframing of the QY categories in light of earlier rime evidence" and, as the oldest realistically recoverable stage of spoken Chinese, is "closer to the QY categories than traditional Archaic or Old Chinese." Then, having established this foundation, he sketches the methodology by which he will arrive at this early stage..

IIId. The Reconstruction of Early Chinese

As early as January 1971 (which is when I first met him), Norman had been impressed by the views of S. E. Yakhontov (1960) on the vowel system of Old Chinese. As expressed to me, his reason for this was not because he was actively interested in the reconstruction of Old Chinese (which it quickly became obvious to me that he was not), but because Yakhontov's scheme had the potential to better explain the evolution of modern dialects than did any other early Chinese vowel system that had been proposed at that time. In the end, he chose to make active use of refinements proposed by N. C. Bodman (1980) and his student, W. H. Baxter (1992) in working out the vowel system of Early Chinese. But he did not slavishly adopt the Bodman/Baxter vocalic configuration. Instead he introduced a number of modifications of his own, always emphasizing that his ultimate goal was to account for dialect development rather than to try and explain such arcana as the *Shījīng* rime categories or the sinographic xiéshēng 諧聲 series.

For the EC initials, he worked backward from CDC to the QYS and then combined these schemes with a number of the now generally accepted findings of the gǔyīnxué 古音學 philologists of the Qīng 清 period. As regards more recent theories concerning Old Chinese initials, he adopted nothing that was not absolutely necessary for the understanding of the phonology of the modern mainstream dialects. As a case in point, he notes his agreement in principle with others regarding the evidence that modern dialectal initial l- ultimately derives from an earlier *r-; but he does not adopt this *r- in EC, because none of the dialects with which he is working reflect such an initial. Viewed another way, if *r- is the ultimate origin of later l-, then this *r- > l- change must already have occurred by the hypothetical stage envisaged for EC.

As we have noted above, CDC is a proto-system reconstructed using the classical comparative method, even though its formal presentation has been as a reduction of QYS categories. However, EC is a horse of an entirely different color, for it is indeed a system arrived at in ways that Bloomfield or Fox would find unrecognizable. Put succinctly, it is a backward projection of CDC, to some extent filtered through the latticework of the QYS, and then tied to a specific set of desiderata derived from the gǔyīnxué principles of the Qīng philologists and the Yakhontov/Bodman/Baxter system of OC vocalism. Then, and most importantly, it is governed by the stipulation that it must ultimately also account for modern Chinese dialect evolution. It is in a sense neither fish nor fowl, for it is not a comparative reconstruction; and it is expressly not any form of OC. It is, in other words, something that has hitherto not been seen in Chinese historical phonology; and this has come about not by accident but by the avowed intent of its author. It is a new tool devised to facilitate what its author viewed as a new enterprise.

IIIe. Common Mǐn

A final component in the model is Common Mǐn, which is Norman's new reconstruction for the proto-language that gave rise to the modern Mǐn dialects. The new system was essentially complete by the late '90's, but a full presentation of it has never appeared in print. I believe the reason for Norman's hesitancy in publishing the system was two-fold. First of all, in correspondence he said on several occasions that if he had the job to do over again he would reconstruct not a single Common Mǐn system but two systems, i.e., Western Mǐn and Eastern Mǐn. And, secondly, during the last two or three years of his life he came increasingly to suspect that the Mǐn family was the result of a process of convergence between two or more different early dialect types, rather than a single dialect branch which had diverged discretely and intact from the general stream of Sinitic. These doubts were never expressed in print, so far as I know, but he discussed them from time to in email correspondence and was clearly troubled by them in significant ways.[2] Nonetheless, there is a veiled allusion to them in the conclusion to the present article, where Norman gives a broad summation of the new model as follows:

> "I have outlined here a model for tracing the phonological development of modern Chinese dialects. CDC was probably one of several daughter languages of Early Chinese. The relationship between EC and Common Mǐn is not so clear. Common Mǐn may have been a sister dialect to to EC, but it is premature to say anything with certainty."

IV. "Some Examples" — Ongoing Revisions of Early Chinese

The final phrases of the above summation in fact say far more about Norman's thinking than many readers might infer from them. And in fact they may deflect those readers' attention from a striking feature of the paper as a whole. I speak here of Section

[2] See Coblin (2018a; 2018b).

5 “Some Early Chinese Examples”. Regarding this part of the paper, Norman says by way of introduction,

> “Below a set of EC examples is presented. These forms are arrived at by applying the principles in Norman (1994). The finals, for the most part, are close to those proposed by William Baxter (1992), but with some differences noted here and there.”

Now, at the time of his death Norman had been working on, and had essentially completed, an entire syllabary of CDC and EC forms, together with a full set of notes for a lengthy introduction to this material.[3] But the examples here in question contain many completely new forms that presumably were intended ultimately to replace those found in the just mentioned large compendium. The reason for this is that the entire corpus of cognate sets cited in Section 5 involves comparisons between CDC and Common Mĭn, with QYS forms added for reference. The result is new EC forms that differ from those found in the large syllabary and also in certain of Norman’s latter day publications that cite EC forms. In other words, they are in a sense the rudiments of a new “Mĭnized EC”, which, if Norman had lived to continue his work on the system, might have significantly modified EC as we see it today, both in the syllabary and in other sources. But to what extent, we shall never know.

Some of the changes in question are in the initial system and involve the addition of parenthesized elements, such as pre-initial (*d) and (*h) before nasals and laterals. Others concern vowels. For example, at one point Norman says,

> “The sorting out of *a and *o vocalism before *n is a complex task employing early rimes and graphic structure; hence there is frequently room for disagreement about particular words.... I am tempted to say that all the words in the QY rime yuán 元 had *o vocalism in EC, but further study is needed.”

Hidden beneath these apparently straightforward observations is a sub-plot that many readers may fail to recognize. For the fact is that Norman during the entire second half of his career believed that dentilabialization in Chinese dialects was induced entirely and exclusively by the presence of rounded vowels after labial initials. And, conversely, where such vowels did not occur, dentilabialization invariably failed. But there were obstacles to this hypothesis, and the particular distribution of the EC finals *-on and *-an after labials was a case in point. There were also others, of course; and Norman’s struggles with these conundrums, as revealed in his letters and conversations, continued right down into final months of this life. And so, like Einstein’s legendary search for a Unified Field Theory, the solution in the end eluded him.[4]

---

[3] This work is now in press and will almost certainly have appeared by the time the present remarks see print (Simmons and Coblin [In Press]).

[4] Norman accepted my hypothesis that dentilabialization in the early Northwest dialects resulted from the presence of a following *u in those languages (Coblin 1991), but he felt this case was merely a special sub-development arising out of his more general theory, which he hoped would account for developments in *all* dentilabializing Sinitic varieties.

A somewhat similar case is that of the so-called wénbù 文部 "wén rime group" of the Archaic or Old Chinese reconstructive tradition. This category comprises both rounded and unrounded vowel QYS finals. But in the popular stratum of Mǐn rounded vowels are the rule. Norman posits EC *-un across the board here and remarks (p. 20),

> "All of the words [cited in his examples on p. 20] are *kāikǒu* words in the *QY*; that the Mǐn forms all have rounded vowels suggests that the conventional interpretation which sees a need for two contrasting vowels in the *wén* rime group may be incorrect. Perhaps what we see in the *QY* syllabary is a case of ancient dialect mixture, whereby words in original **un* began to merge with words in **in*. The Mǐn forms harken back to a language in which the merger did not take place."

Norman's formulation offers an interesting solution to the problem with which he is dealing and also throws light on the popular lexical strata of other southern dialect groups, such as Hakka and its sister dialect group, Shē 畲. But problems have arisen since his death which he could not have anticipated. For example, compare the following examples:

qín 芹 QYS gjən "Chinese celery" CDC *gin2/EC *gun
Common Shē *k'yn2 / *kin2 / *k'in2 Common Neo-Hakka *k'iun2/ *k'in2
Common Hakka-Shē *k'yn2 / *k'in2

qún 裙 QYS gjuən "skirt (n.)" CDC *giun2/EC *gun
Common Shē *k'un2 Common Neo-Hakka *k'iun2
Common Hakka-Shē *k'iun2
(Forms in final -in in these two sets are later literary borrowings from dialect types which reflect QYS-type unrounded finals. The rounded vowel finals are the popular strata archaic forms of the words in question.)

Here we note that Norman reconstructs identical forms in EC *gun for these two cognate sets. But the Shē finals in the two sets, though both rounded, have different vowels, leading us to posit different Common Hakka-Shē rounded finals. And, furthermore, the difference between Common Hakka-Shē *-yn and *-iun here corresponds exactly to that between QYS -jən and *-juən. Our tentative conclusion is,

---

And he also believed that dentilabialization must have first occurred in eastern China rather than the Northwest, even though the earliest known evidence for it comes from there.

then, that Norman was on the right track in reconstructing rounded finals in words of both the qín 芹 “celery” and qún 裙 “skirt” type; but the ultimate configuration in the early rounding dialects he envisaged must have been more complex than he had anticipated. He would undoubtedly have been fascinated by this riddle, but how he would have dealt with it we shall sadly never know.

To sum up, then, Norman’s model for Chinese dialect evolution can be characterized as follows: At the earliest period with which he is concerned there was ancestral to the mainstream modern dialects an entity he called Early Chinese. And ancestral to the Mǐn family there was another early form of Chinese, called Common Mǐn. Early Chinese and Common Mǐn may have been sister dialects, or perhaps have been related to one another in more complex ways than that; but nothing definite can yet be said on this score. Early Chinese evolved into Common Dialectal Chinese. The *Qièyùn* System is a summa of Six Dynasties riming practice, as preserved in lexicographical sources that were compiled over time in the interval between Early Chinese and Common Dialectal Chinese. It did not incorporate Common Mǐn phonological material, which at the time of is compilation was presumably viewed as lying beyond the pale of standard poetic usage. Common Dialectal Chinese gave rise to later proto-dialects, which in turn engendered the individual mainstream modern dialects.

It now remains for us to address a final matter involving Common Dialectal Chinese and Early Chinese, with which Norman does not specifically deal in his paper. To wit, how might his model, and in particular his CDC/EC pair of systems, be utilized by comparativists who are actually applying the comparative method to modern Chinese dialect data? The answer to this question, especially as it concerns southern Chinese dialects, is that the two systems aid us in highlighting different lexical strata in these dialects. Let us now turn again to Hakka and Shē to illustrate this. Consider the following cognate sets:

fǔ 斧 QYS pju: “axe” CDC *fu3/EC *pax
CS *pu3 CNH *pu3/ *p’u3/ *fu3
CHS *pu3

Here the Common Shē form *pu3 for “axe” agrees perfectly with Common Neo-Hakka *pu3, and the initials of both correspond directly to EC *p-. Thus, Common Hakka-Shē *pu3 can be reconstructed without difficulty and then identified as an early layer word. CNH *fu3, on the other hand, agrees in its initial with the Common Dialectal Chinese form, which identifies it as a later loan form in Hakka. It is totally absent from Shē. An additional noteworthy point in the set is that the CHS form *pu3 ends in final *-u, while

the corresponding EC form has final *-a. This indicates that, though the CHS word belongs to a pre-CDC layer, it postdates the EC stage. Thus, in several respects Norman's model aids us in seriating the lexical strata represented in this set. However, it does not enable us to establish an absolute chronology for these strata. In actual fact, some chronologization *is* possible based textual sources dealing with the histories of the Hakka and Shē peoples; but this sort of analysis lies beyond the purview of Norman's model. The model provides us only with relative chronology.

fěn 粉 QYS pjuən: "powder, flour" CDC *fun3/EC *punx
CS *pun3 CNH *fun3
CHS ---

In this set the Common Shē form agrees with EC, while the Common Neo-Hakka one hews to CDC. No Common Hakka-Shē form is reconstructable comparatively, but we can with some confidence hypothesize that Shē preserves an older autochthonous word for "powder, flour", while in Hakka the older form has been supplanted by a later one. Norman's model aids us in doing this.

fèng 鳳 QYS bjung- "phoenix" CDC *vung6/EC *bumh
CS *huŋ6 CNH *fuŋ6
CHS *fuŋ6

Here both Shē and Hakka have forms that agree with CDC rather than with EC. In Hakka this word for "phoenix" is widely used in the same literary or learned contexts where it occurs in other mainstream dialects as well as in wider Chinese written sources. In Shē it is part of the vernacular name for a married, or soon to be married, woman's coiffure and also in reference to a type of uniquely Shē bridal trousseau. Both dialect types have clearly received it from a post-EC donor. (Note that CDC *v- regularly corresponds to later CHS *f-.)

zhī 知 QYS tje "know" CDC *ci1/EC *tre
CNH *ti1/Literary: *tši1 CS *te1/ *tʃi1
CHS *te1/ *tši1

In this set, both Shē and Hakka have two forms. The dental stop forms agree with EC in having initial *t-, while the affricate readings correspond to the CDC *c- form. Thus, CHS can be reconstructed with both an early layer form *te1 and a late layer one in *tši1.

zhōng 中 QYS tjung "center" CDC *ciung1/EC *trung
CS *tuŋ1 / *tiuŋ1/Literary: *tʃiuŋ1 CNH *tuŋ1/Literary: *tšiuŋ1
CHS *tuŋ1 / Literary: *tšiuŋ1

This set is analogous to the preceding one, with the exception that Common Shē has two forms that correspond to EC *trung. Norman's model tells us that both of these predate CDC, but it does not allow us to clarify their relationship to each other. In order to do this, we must go beyond the model. The comparative method does enable us to determine that only *tuŋ1 can be projected back to the CHS stage, and further comparative study of Hakka-Shē data confirms that *tuŋ1 is the expected Shē correlate of CNH *tuŋ1. But then we must go beyond the model proper, where we then note that the form *tiuŋ1 is very likely a Southern Mǐn loanword in Shē. (Cf. Xiàmén (reading form) [tiɔŋ1], Taiwanese Mǐn (general form) [tiɔŋ1] "center".) Norman's model has pointed us in the right direction here, but we have then had to go further on our own to completely elucidate the matter.

chóng 蟲 QYS ḍjung "bug, insect" CDC *jiung2/EC *drung
CS *tʃ'iuŋ2 CNH *tš'iuŋ2
CHS *tš'iuŋ2
In this set the initials of both the Shē and Hakka forms agree with the CDC affricate initial. No form derivable from the EC stage, which has a stop initial *d-, has survived in either Common Shē or Common Neo-Hakka. The word is therefore a late layer importation into Common Hakka-Shē.

In closing, we note that Norman's model for Chinese dialect evolution is novel and for the most part lies outside the bounds of the traditional field of Chinese historical phonology. It is a dialect-oriented, data-based construct rather than a text-based one. And its purpose is to serve as a tool for the study of spoken forms of Chinese rather than written Chinese of successive eras. Once, in an offhand private conversation, Norman suggested to me that it might be interesting to teach Classical Chinese using a glossary that gave Early Chinese forms for every character, in addition to Modern Standard Chinese readings. To me this seemed to be a fundamentally incongruous reverie, a methodological oxymoron, as it were. For Early Chinese is by definition a backward projection of Common Dialectal Chinese, which is in turn based for the most part on the syllable corpus found in the *Hànyǔ fāngyīn zìhuì*. But Classical Chinese texts are studded with characters representing syllables that do not occur in the *Fāngyīn zìhuì*. This is because the linguistic competence of modern speakers of mainstream dialects or of Modern Standard Chinese does not include them. They could all be looked up in lexical sources or resurrected (dare we go a step further and say, "concocted") on the basis of commentarial notes and fǎnqiè formulae, but such forms would be purely bookish readings, rather than belonging to anyone's spoken competence. In the end then, EC and CDC are first and foremost valuable tools and guides for the study of comparative and historical dialectology. Even in cases where newly studied dialects exhibit phonological configurations that cannot be captured by either EC or CDC, these systems will serve as a navigational template or a form of shorthand for quick reference to the problem. For example, we can say that EC *gun in the "celery"/"skirt" pair cannot account for the

difference between the Common Hakka-Shē finals *-iun and *-yn after gutturals, and readers will know immediately where the problem lies and perhaps even discover how to solve it. In this sense CDC and EC will be similar to Bloomfield's Proto-Algonquian sketch or Edward Sapir's early Proto-Athabaskan reconstructions. Both of these systems have been superseded through advances achieved with the passage of time, but they have nonetheless served as *points d'appui* for defining and confronting new problems that have continually arisen as these fields progressed. This, I believe, will ultimately also be the lasting contribution of Norman's model for Chinese dialect evolution.

References[5]

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. New York: Hold and Company.

Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Coblin, W. South. 2018a. "Jerry Norman: Reflections on the Development and Current Status of Sinological Linguistics", *Yǔyán yánjiù jíkān* 語言研究集刊 [Bulletin of Linguistic Studies], vol. 21 (2018). Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe. (Special number in honor of Jerry Norman.) pp. 56-78.

-----. 2018b. "Convergence as a Factor in the Formation of a Controversial Common Mǐn Phonological Configuration", *Yǔyán yánjiù jíkān* 語言研究集刊 [Bulletin of Linguistic Studies], vol. 21 (2018). Shanghai: Shanghai cishu chubanshe. (Special number in honor of Jerry Norman.) pp. 79-122.

Fox, Anthony. 1995. *Linguistic Reconstruction: an Introduction to Theory and Method*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Karlgren, Bernhard. 1915-1926. *Études sur la phonologie chinoise*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Palmer, Leonard R. 1980. *The Greek Language*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press.

Simmons, Richard VanNess, and W. South Coblin (eds.). In Press. *Jerry Norman's Early Chinese and Common Dialectal Chinese — Collected Essays and Representative Syllabaries*.

[5] References in this guide that are already given in Norman's original article are not repeated here.