

Review of *Baheng-yu Yanjiu* (巴哼语研究) [Research on the Pahng language] by Mao Zongwu (毛宗武) and Li Yunbing (李云兵). 1997. Shanghai Far East Publishers. 344pp.

Pahng is a Hmong-Mien language spoken in Southern Guangxi China and Northern Vietnam. It has long been recognized that Pahng is of great potential importance in Hmong-Mien comparative studies as well as in general linguistic theory, but this potential has remained unrealized due to inadequate documentation. Although scattered pieces of data on the Pahng language have been available to the general linguistic community at least since Chang Kun's fieldwork in the 1940s (Chang 1947, etc.)—to say nothing of Bonifacy's (1905) word list of Na-e—it is only very recently that descriptive work on Pahng has moved beyond spartan word lists and vague pronouncements. During the nineteen-nineties, several scholars produced important work advancing the cause of Pahng linguistic studies: Edmondson's (1992) work on the phonetics of Pahng and the comparison of Pahng dialects, Wang Fushi and Mao Zongwu's (1995) reconstruction of Proto-Hmong-Mien (which employed extensive data from two Pahng dialects), Mao Zongwu's brief sketch of Pahng (Mao 1996), and Niederer's (1997) article on comparative Pahng. Despite this work, almost no information was available regarding the details of Pahng syntax, morphology, or phonology (outside of bare phonological inventories and phonotactics). While controversies continued regarding the genetic position of Pahng within Hmong-Mien (Miao-Yao), no text, lexicon, or usable grammatical description of Pahng was forthcoming.

This state of affairs has fundamentally changed with the publication of Mao Zongwu and Li Yunbing's new book on Pahng. *Bahng-yu Yanjiu* (巴哼语研究, *Research on the Pahng Language*), part of the series *Zhongguo Xin Faxian Yuyan Yanjiu Congshu* (中国新发现语言研究丛书, *Research on Newly Discovered Languages*) edited by Sun Hongkai 孙宏开, touches on most aspects of Pahng grammar and provides in-depth information on several facets of this fascinating language. The descriptions are based upon three language varieties: Wenjie Pahng, Gundong Pahng, and Haoxingshan Hmnai (which our authors consider to be a dialect of Pahng).

The first chapter presents phonological inventories of each of the Pahng language varieties included in the volume. These are concise, but nevertheless include examples of each phonemic contrast posited as well as some explanatory notes which often provide interesting phonetic information. The section on Hmnai also gives examples of tone sandhi, illustrating an interesting pattern where native words show anticipatory tone sandhi, but modern loan-words from Chinese show perseveratory tone sandhi patterns (13-14). Unfortunately, there is little or no discussion of tone sandhi in Pahng proper, so that it is not quite clear whether the sample dialects even feature tone sandhi, and if they do, what tone sandhi is like in these languages.

The second chapter discusses the structure of the Pahng lexicon, includes a section on morphology as well as a discussion of Chinese loanwords in Pahng. Like many Hmongic languages (and indeed, many languages of Southeast Asia), Pahng has a system of iambic noun prefixes. Mao and Li give an excellent overview of the Pahng nominal prefix system, providing copious examples and discussing

the semantic parameters that govern the appearance of individual prefixes. This data should prove useful in determining to what extent such a system of prefixes can be reconstructed for Proto-Hmongic, since Pahng stands genetically apart from the core-Hmongic languages (a fact that will be discussed farther below).

The third chapter is mostly devoted to syntactic issues, including grammatical categories, structure of basic phrases, and sentence structure. This section is lamentably brief, but is a welcome contribution given the paucity of literature on Pahng syntax. Fortunately, though, there is also a fairly long Pahng text at the end of the book (almost twenty pages of interlinearized text [pp. 315-335] with an idiomatic translation [pp. 335-340]) which can further aid a researcher's investigations of Pahng syntax. While the fifty pages of Chapter 3 (33-83) may seem like little space in which to address such a massive subject area as syntax, but compared to the void that was Pahng syntactic studies prior to the publication of this book, the contribution is significant. While the section is quite short, it increases our knowledge of Pahng grammar many times over. The discussion, while terse, covers most things a syntactic sketch could be expected to cover and brings to light a number of interesting phenomena, particularly in behavior of Pahng pronouns.

The strongest parts of the book are the fourth and fifth chapters, which discuss the genetic relationships between dialects of Pahng and the genetic place of Pahng within the Hmong-Mien family respectively. In Chapter 4, the authors provide solid support for their classification of the speech varieties employed in the book. All that is missing is a discussion of the other Pahng varieties documented by

Chinese, Vietnamese, and Western scholars (for example, Bonifacy 1904, Chang 1947, Nguyen 1972, Edmondson 1992) and their place within this classificatory scheme. The discussion of the wider genetic affiliation of Pahng is rigorously supported and insightful. While the authors are cautious and tentative on many points, they display no more caution than is demanded by the controversy that has previously surrounded this subject.

Pahng was once classified by Chinese scholars as part of the Bunu group, which was treated as part of Mienic (Yao) by Mao, Meng, and Zheng (1982) in their sketch of Mienic languages. This classification was based upon cultural factors, the Bunu as a people sharing certain cultural affinities with the Mien. Politically, Bunu are treated as part of the Yao nationality, along with the Mienic-speaking people-groups. But linguistically, Bunu is clearly closer to Hmongic than to Mienic, and Strecker (1987a, 1987b), among others, proposed that Bunu be classified as part of Western Hmongic. Since Pahng is clearly not part of this group (at least according to linguistic criteria), he placed it in a separate top level group under Hmongic (in company Hmnai, Jiongnai, and Yunuo) and later proposed, in response to a suggestion by Benedict (1986), that Na-e/Pahng too constituted an independent branch of Hmong-Mien¹. Wang Fushi, while acknowledging that Bunu and Pahng were closer to Hmongic than to Mienic, wished for various reasons to keep Bunu separate from the rest of Hmongic

1. Actually, Strecker (1987b) suggested that Pahng (including Na-e), Hmnai, Yunuo, and She (Ho Nte) should all be elevated to the status of separate branches without providing a clear reason for doing so other than Mao, Meng, and Zheng's (1982:117) vague pronouncement that these languages "have almost reached the status of separate *yu*."

and believed that Pahng constituted part of this branch (Strecker 1987c). However, about a decade later, Mao and Wang (1995:1-16) introduced a new classification system that separated Pahng from Bunu and placed both of them as top-level nodes in the Hmongic (Miao) side of the Hmong-Mien Stammbaum.

Mao and Li further develop this classification. They propose (in Chapter 5) that the Hmongic (Miao) language family has four branches: Miao, Bunu, Baheng-Yunuo, and Jiongnai-She. This classificatory system has much to recommend it, independent of the arguments presented in Mao and Li (1997):

- The classification groups together in Hmongic all and only those languages that share a recognized set of phonological innovations: the merger of syllables ending in *-k into the C tone (*qusheng*) and the subsequent loss of all final obstruents (see Ratliff 1998).
- The languages classified under Hmongic also share a common set of lexical items not shared by the Mienic languages (i.e. the other languages in the Hmong-Mien family), e.g. for 'pig': Western Hmongic (Mong Leng) npua³³, Eastern Hmongic (Yanghao) pa⁴⁴, Northern Hmongic (Jiwei) mpa⁵³, Bunu (Qibailong) npai⁴⁵, Pahng (Wenjie), Yunuo (Liutian) mpe³³, Jiongnai (Changtong) mpei³⁵, She (Tuozhu) pui³¹.
- The special relationship between She and Jiongnai noted by Wang and Mao (1995:18) is now reflected in the classification.

The classificatory scheme now provides a principled position for Yunuo and Hmnai, which can be verified as more data on these little-known languages becomes available. Benedict criticized Strecker for having arbitrarily elevated Yunuo, Hmnai, and Yunuo to top-level groupings without having provided any reason for doing so (Strecker 1987c).

What Mao and Li add to these already existing arguments is an impressive body of rigorous comparative evidence bearing on the place of Pahng in this scheme. They demonstrate, through the use of detailed phonological and morphosyntactic comparisons, that Pahng is no more closely related to Bunu than to Western Hmongic, but is considerably closer to both of these language groups than to Mien. Furthermore, the authors demonstrate persuasively that there is no special relationship between Pahng and She or Jiongnai, but do claim to find a close relationship between Pahng and Yunuo. In general, the classificatory system proposed by the authors is well supported by their comparative data.

This is not to say, however, that there is no room for improvement in the classificatory scheme. While I am in general agreement with the outline of Mao and Li's system, there are a few points regarding this scheme which should be addressed in the future. For example, Martha Ratliff (2002) has recently pointed out that Pahng and Northern Hmongic preserve some PHmM (Proto-Hmong-Mien) phonological features unattested elsewhere in Hmongic, namely vocalic distinctions correlated with the presence or absence of PHmM *final obstruents. Ratliff argues, based upon this evidence, that Pahng-Hmnai should be seen as the first language group to break off from the Proto-Hmongic stock (thus making Pahng-Yunuo the most distant outlier within Hmongic)². The same argument would

2. These distinctions are also preserved in Hmnai, as it was possible to verify from Mao and Li's extensive wordlist. It would be interesting to know if this distinction is also present in Yunuo, though the current data doesn't seem sufficient to make this determination.

suggest that Northern Hmongic actually separated from core-Hmongic earlier than She-Jiongnai and Bunu. In fact, Mao and Li's classification of Bunu as an independent branch of Hmongic, coequal with Miao, She-Jiongnai, and Pahng-Yunuo, is perhaps the biggest problem with the classification they offer. Numerous scholars have placed Bunu close to Western Hmongic, or even within it (see Strecker 1987a,b,c). And while lexicostatistical studies of Hmong-Mien, as well as Huang's (1999) recent phonostatistical study, have generally not supported the position that Bunu is closer to Western Hmongic than is Eastern Hmongic, such studies have placed Bunu closer to these two groups than to any of the other Hmong-Mien language groups. These findings accord with my own impression of the relationship between these languages—that Bunu is father from Western Hmongic than Eastern Hmongic but is closer to these two divisions than any of the other Hmongic groups. But whatever subgrouping of Hmongic ultimately becomes the consensus view among scholars working in the area, Mao and Li have made significant progress in placing Hmongic subgrouping on solid empirical ground.

And it would seem a shame to complete the review without noting the beautifully collected and organized wordlist included as an appendix to the book. Like the wordlists in the *Jianzhi* series, this list is organized by semantic field. Unlike those wordlists, it is very extensive, with upwards of 1500 entries (pp. 248-314). Data is given for all three dialects used as standards of comparison in the book, and lacunae appear to be relatively few in number. Given the groundwork laid by our authors, it will be a shame if future years do not see significant progress in comparative studies of Pahng.

In general, the quality of this book is very high, and its material is of significant value. While it is neither a grammar on the one hand, nor a comparative handbook on the other, it succeeds in being something in-between and has much to offer to any scholar interested in the synchrony and diachrony of Hmongic languages, and Southeast Asian languages generally.

David Mortensen

UC Berkeley

REFERENCES

- BENEDICT, Paul K. 1986. "Miao-Yao enigma: the Na-e language." *LTBA* 9.1:89-90.
- BONIFACY, Auguste Louis. 1905. "Etude sur les langues parlée par les populations de la haute Rivière Claire". *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient* 5:306-327.
- CHANG Kun 张昆. 1947. "苗瑶语声调问题" [Problems in Miao-Yao tones]. *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica* 16:93-110.
- CHEN Qiguang 陈其光 . 1996. 巴哼语 [The Ba-heng language]. *Minzu Yuwen* 1996.2:66-76.
- EDMONDSON, Jerold A. 1992. "Pa-hng development and diversity." M. Ratliff and E. Schiller (eds.), *Papers from the First Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society* 1991. Program for Southeast Asian Studies, Arizona State University, Tempe, 159-86.
- HUANG Xing 黄行 . 1999. 苗瑶语方言亲疏关系的计量分析 [Quantitative analysis of the relative distance of relationship between Miao-Yao dialects]. *Minzu Yuwen* 1999.3:56-64.

- MAO Zongwu 毛总武, MENG Chaoji 蒙朝吉, and ZHENG Zongze 郑总泽. 1982. 瑶族语简志 [Outline of the Language of the Yao Nationality]. Beijing: Minzu Chubanshe.
- NGUYEN Minh Duc. 1972. "Tieng noi va van de chu viet pa hung (pa then)" [Language and literature of the Pahng]. In *Tim hieu ngon ngu cac dan toc thieu so o Viet Nam* [Approaches to the Minority Languages of Vietnam]. Ha Noi: Vien ngon ngu hoc. pp. 200-228.
- NIEDERER, Barbara. 1997. "Notes comparatives sur le pa-hng." *Cahiers de linguistique Asie Orientale* 26.1:71-132.
- RATLIFF, Martha. 1998. "Ho Ne (She) is Hmongic: One final argument." *LTBA* 21.2:97-109.
- . 2002. "Reconstruction arts: vowel feature condensation in Hmongic." Paper presented at the 35th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics. November 7-10. Arizona State University.
- STRECKER, David. 1987a. "The Hmong-Mien languages." *LTBA* 10.2:1-11.
- . 1987b. "Some comments on Benedict's 'Miao-Yao enigma: the Na-e language.'" *LTBA* 10.2:22-42.
- . 1987c. "Some comments on Benedict's 'Miao-Yao enigma': addendum." *LTBA* 10.2:43-53.
- WANG Fushi 王辅世 and MAO Zongwu 毛总武. 1995. 苗瑶语古音构拟 [Reconstruction of Proto-Miao-Yao phonology]. Beijing: Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe [Chinese Social Sciences Press].