

# Sound and Symbol in Chinese

by

BERNHARD KARLGREN

*Revised edition*



HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS

© Hong Kong University Press 1962  
2nd impression 1971  
3rd impression 1990

ISBN 962-209-257-8

The original English edition appeared in 1923 in the  
*The World's Manuals. Language and Literature Series*,  
General Editor, C.T. Onions. This revised edition is  
brought out with the permission of  
The Clarendon Press. Oxford.

Printed in Hong Kong by Elite Printing Company Limited.

## SIX CHAPTERS

1. Introduction	. . . . .	1
2. The Ancient Language	. . . . .	6
3. Word Formation	. . . . .	16
4. The Script	. . . . .	32
5. Syntax	. . . . .	54
6. Rhetoric	. . . . .	83
Bibliographical Notes	. . . . .	95

## NOTES ON THE PRONUNCIATION OF CHINESE

The vowels *a, e, i, o, u, ü* are pronounced as in German.  
*ê* is the 'neutral vowel' of English *about*, German *Knabe*.  
*i* as in *sî*: let the tongue remain in the position of *s* when pronouncing the following *i*.

The symbol ' , as in *k'u*, marks a strong aspiration, *k-h-u*.

*k'* and *ts'* are both pronounced as *ch* before *i* and *ü*.

*h* and *s* represent the German 'ich-laut' before *i* and *ü*.

*h* before all other vowels the German 'ach-laut'.

*j* is the sonant sibilant of French *jamais*, English *pleasure*.

## CHAPTER I

THE scholar who examines the structure and evolution of human speech finds material of the highest value in every one of the several thousand languages of the world. The phonetic laws and inflexions of a South Sea language or a Negro language may be just as instructive, in the comparative study of linguistics, as the corresponding phenomena in Latin or German. The non-specialist public, on the contrary, attaches a widely varying value to the different languages. On the one hand, a language is considered of more practical importance the larger extension it has, i.e. the greater the number of people who speak it; on the other, a language is appreciated in proportion as it possesses a rich and valuable literature and thus plays a great part in civilization. It is remarkable that the Europeans have until recent times paid but scant attention to a language which in both these respects must be said to occupy a very prominent place among the languages of the world, namely, Chinese. Spoken by a larger number of people than any other language, it is at the same time a language having a venerable and extensive literature, a language which has played in eastern Asia a part comparable to that of Latin and Greek in Europe.

An exact figure of the number of people who speak Chinese as their mother tongue cannot be given. We can only state, in the way of approximation, that Chinese is spoken over an area in eastern and central Asia that is larger than Europe, and by a population of something between 600 and 700 millions. There are, moreover, considerable Chinese colonies in other parts of the world, for instance in

Malaya. And to this it must be added that for many centuries it served as literary language in Japan, Korea and Annam.

Not only does Chinese exceed in extent the most widely spoken European languages, such as English, German, French, Russian, Spanish, but it may make good its claim to a position equal with theirs as a civilizing influence. While it is only during the last few hundred years that the Western languages have become the media of an advanced culture, China can produce a literature three thousand years old, a literature which, some centuries before Christ, had reached full maturity, and comprised works of philosophy and of historical research as well as works of a purely literary or æsthetic character.

In putting the age of Chinese literature at three thousand years we are giving an approximate figure only. And here we are brought face to face with the first great problem that has to be considered in the study of the linguistic conditions of China. How far back can we trace the Chinese language? What can be ascertained about its origin and early history? In endeavouring to find an answer to these questions scholars have tried two different methods.

The first of these methods was adopted by certain European scholars in the nineteenth century, who, following the trend of current opinion, supposed that a civilization in most cases is not produced spontaneously, and that it is seldom autochthonous, but is the cumulative result of migrations. They attempted to relate Chinese with certain languages of western Asia, and postulated a migration in the third millennium B.C. through central Asia to the northern China of to-day.

None of these attempts to connect Chinese with West-Asiatic languages was successful. Concerning the affinities of Chinese one fact only has been established, that it forms, together with Siamese and some other languages in Farther India, one branch, the Thai-Chinese branch, of a great

family of languages, the Sinitic family, the other branch of which is the Tibeto-Burman group. But the affinity of even these languages with Chinese is somewhat remote, and hitherto it has been impossible to undertake a serious scientific investigation of the question whether the Indo-Chinese family of languages has any connexion with other families, such as the Altaic (which comprises the Turkish languages and possibly Korean), the Semitic (Hebrew, Arabic, &c.), the Finno-Ugrian (Finnish, Lappish, Hungarian), or the Indo-European family (which embraces Sanskrit, Greek, the Latin languages, the Slavonic, and the Teutonic languages, etc.). Thus the attempts to solve by theories of migration the question of the earliest history of the Chinese language have so far entirely failed.

When we state that we can follow Chinese *literature* back some 3,000 years, this does not mean that we cannot follow the *language* further backwards. In fact it is possible to take a long step further into antiquity.

Like most nations with an ancient civilization, the Chinese have had a rich store of legends concerning the primeval eras of the nation, and they considered the tales (preserved in texts from the latter part of the first millennium B.C.) about a golden age under three great sovereigns Yao, Shun and Yü in the third millennium, followed by two long dynasties of 'kings' in a great Chinese realm, called the Hia and the Yin (or Shang) dynasties, as truly historical, the latter ending, in the orthodox chronology, with 1123 B.C. The subsequent ruling house, the Chou dynasty, is well known through a rich store of historical data. Until the end of the 19th century the pre-Chou dynasties were no more than legendary names, but during the sixty years of this century one of the last capitals of the Yin (Shang) house has been thoroughly explored and its archæological treasures preserved. Among them are a vast hoard of inscribed pieces—small and large—of tortoise shell and bone, which turn out to have been used

in prognostication: the kings consulted the Spirits of their dead ancestors on all important matters, and the inscriptions are brief formulas of questions put to the Spirits and sometimes the answers received. Though these 'texts' have no literary interest, they are of paramount historical importance: they give us a complete list of the sovereigns of the Yin (Shang) dynasty, and—more interesting to us here—they furnish the earliest picture available of the Chinese language and the peculiar script (to be described further below), which in all essentials already existed during the era of the Yin. The orthodox dating of the dynasty has always been 1766–1122 B.C., but this has nowadays proved to be wrong; we should say circa 1500–1028 B.C.

From the Chou dynasty (1027–256 B.C.) we have a large store of texts, on the one hand a great many inscriptions on sacrificial bronze vessels, some of them quite extensive, preserved to our days, on the other hand a rich literature of poetical, historical, philosophical and ritual contents, but the latter are known only through successive stages of transmission from teachers to pupils; there are no manuscripts of them preserved prior to some centuries A.D.

This complete annihilation is not due only to revolutions and disturbances in more recent times. The stock of manuscripts was definitively reduced in a particular year of the country's history (213 B.C.), so that old manuscripts from that very date became a rarity. The blow was dealt by one of China's greatest rulers, the emperor Ts'in Shī-huang-ti. Chief of one of the many almost independent fiefs which fought for the hegemony of China in the third century B.C., he succeeded in crushing one rival after another, united the whole country in his strong hand, and put an end for ever to feudalism in China. From the conservative literary class, however, he met with a stubborn resistance, and in their opposition the scholars always brought forward the ancient Chinese method of government as embodied in the classical



books of the past. A man of radical measures, the emperor soon found a remedy for this recalcitrancy. He issued an edict ordering a general *burning of books*, which was resolutely carried out. Few were the specimens of the earlier literature that scholars succeeded in hiding, and the stock of old manuscripts was nearly wiped out of existence.

With only a limited number of relics bearing inscriptions and no ancient manuscripts the historian might seem to be seriously handicapped. The position, however, is by no means so hopeless as it appears. The fact is that the book-burning had not the annihilating effect expected by the despot. Only a few years later he lay in his grave, his dynasty was overturned, and the house which now came into power, the Han dynasty (206 B.C.—A.D. 220), distinguished itself by eager efforts to repair the damage. The little that had escaped the fire was searched out, edited, and annotated, and the scholars, who knew the classical books by heart—a thing quite common down to our day—wrote them down from memory. The old literature acquired a glory of martyrdom which made it extraordinarily popular. Moreover, a rational and thorough philological science grew up in connexion with the work of editing and commenting, with the result that the intellectual life of China received a great impulse from the burning of the books.

It is now evident that, in order to discuss the age of China's civilization and literature, we have to go to the literature preserved by the scholars of the Han epoch. It consists chiefly of the Confucian classics. Confucius—the words K'ung fu-tsi, 'the master K'ung', were latinized in this form by the early Jesuit missionaries—was a statesman and philosopher who flourished about 500 B.C. Appearing in an age of political and social dissolution resulting from the unfettered sway of feudalism, he became the most predominant spirit in the cultural history of China. He

collected, sifted, and preserved for posterity the works which embodied the Chinese ethos, works which through his labours have come to be the bible of the Chinese, the *liber librorum* of Chinadom. They include *Shi King*, the Canon of Odes, a collection of Chinese poetry and the *Shu King*, the Canon of Documents, historical records consisting to a large extent of solemn speeches and moral maxims of ancient emperors, both products of the first centuries of the Chou era; *I King*, the Canon of Changes, a book of symbolism and mysticism, used for necromancy and regarded as a deposit of the profoundest speculations of philosophy; *Li Ki*, the Memorial of Rites, the standard of decorum in every department of life; and *Ch'un Ts'iu*, Spring and Autumn, an extract, revised by Confucius, from the annals of his native state Lu from 722 to 484 B.C. These and other works made up a body of classical literature which has moulded Chinese thought throughout the ages, has become the theme of, and has coloured most of, the literature of later times, and to this day may be said to be the best exponent of the Chinese mind.

## CHAPTER II

IF, in order to find our way in the vast domain of the Chinese language, we start with an investigation of the ancient language preserved in the inscriptions and the classical books, we at once realize a fact that must strike everybody who studies Chinese civilization, that in China things are very often diametrically opposite to all that we are accustomed to in the West. The scholar who examines, for instance, the oldest monuments of Scandinavian language, the runic stones, proceeds first of all to determine the sounds, the phonetic values, of the separate runes; when he has done this, he spells out the words of the inscriptions,

and then only is he able, on the basis of phonetic correspondence (based upon certain laws), to identify these words with mediæval Scandinavian words. It is only in this way, through the old pronunciation, that he arrives at the sense of the words.

In Chinese the procedure is exactly the reverse. There are old characters identifiable with those still used in China. In the course of many centuries their *form* has been considerably changed, it is true, but the *idea* represented is the same. Every one of these stands for a whole word. There is, e.g., the character ☉, identical with the modern 日, having the sense of 'sun'; ☾ is the same as the 月 of to-day and means 'moon'. Both are simple pictures of the objects they denote. Through the characters we arrive directly at the *sense* of the word; but, as they do not constitute a phonetic but an ideographic script, they give no hint whatever of the *sounds* that formed the words in ancient Chinese. The knowledge that now, in modern Mandarin, the two words are pronounced, the first *jī*, the second *yüe*, is of little avail, for in the lapse of many centuries the pronunciation of the words has changed past recognition. The consequence is that one is able to read off the meaning of the ancient classics, but not their ancient pronunciation. The Chinese of to-day read aloud their ancient literature, giving the words the pronunciation of to-day—a Peking man will read *jī*, *yüe* while a Canton man reads *yat*, *üt*—without giving a thought to the old pronunciation, for the most part even without realizing that there ever was any considerable difference in this respect between ancient and modern times.

In the study of other languages the primary task consists in fixing the phonetic value of the ancient characters; once this is done, the pronunciation can be determined. In Chinese, on the contrary, we have to deal exclusively with characters which are symbols for whole words—symbols the old pronunciation of which is unknown, and which cannot

therefore be transcribed as they were read at the time. Consequently in the study of ancient Chinese the study of the script occupies a prominent place. We shall return later to the interesting subject of the constitution of the Chinese script and its history.

The nature of the ideographic writing enables the student to unravel the original signification of the ancient letters. But for the philologist it has the serious disadvantage that it gives no clear indication of the living conditions of the ancient language. Are we then entirely unable to reconstitute this language as it was spoken centuries ago?

The problem which the philologist has to face here is not without parallel. Western philological science has succeeded in reconstructing, on the basis of a series of cognate languages, the original from which they have all been developed. One of the greatest triumphs of philology is the reconstruction in its essential features of the primæval Indo-European language from which such different languages as Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, German, and Russian have all taken their rise, and the discovery of the way in which the ramification took place. Since there now exists in China a large number of dialects as divergent as, for example, the North-German and South-German dialects, the philologist's task is here very similar, and it is therefore by no means impossible to draw conclusions from a comparative study of the dialects concerning the Chinese of ancient times.

The evidence of the dialects themselves can be corroborated by evidence of another kind. When the Buddhist religion was propagated in China in the early centuries of our era, a number of Indian missionaries came to China. The Indians were of old highly skilled philologists, and they taught the Chinese to study their language grammatically. Thus it came about that Chinese scholars began to arrange the phonetic stock of their language: in their dictionaries they brought together words beginning with the same sound

and words that rhymed, and they drew up synoptic tables of specimen words, in which groups were formed of phonetically related words (one group containing, e.g., words in *t*-, *t'*-, *d'*-, *n*-, another group words in *p*-, *p'*-, *b'*-, *m*-, &c.). These linguistic works of the old Chinese scholars are of very great value to the modern scholar.

Furthermore, during the last two centuries B.C. and throughout the first thousand years of the Christian era, the Chinese had more or less close relations with various peoples in Central and Western Asia, and our researches are greatly helped by the records of these foreigners concerning China and the Chinese literature with which they came in contact. These aliens transcribed alphabetically to the best of their ability the Chinese words that they heard, and, on the other hand, the Chinese rendered the foreign names—names of peoples, persons, gods, and countries—in their own written characters. These transcriptions give an approximate idea of the old pronunciation of many Chinese characters. Thus, for instance, the name of Buddha was rendered by a character now read *fo* in Mandarin. By comparative dialect study we arrive at the conclusion that this word in ancient Chinese was pronounced *b'juét* (in certain ancient dialects, *b'juéd*), which agrees well enough with the original *Buddha*.

If Chinese intercourse with peoples of alien civilization affords valuable clues to the philologists, the information obtained through the channel of peoples civilized by the Chinese is still more rich and precious. During the latter part of the first millennium of our era there was a general introduction of Chinese culture into Korea and Japan, countries which had until then possessed only a primitive civilization. Somewhat later the same thing took place in Annam. With this borrowing of Chinese culture there went a transference on an enormous scale of Chinese words and phrases, and this stock of Chinese loan-words in Korean, Japanese, and

Annamese provides invaluable philological data. These loan-words have of course developed on the foreign soil according to the phonetic laws of the alien languages, but these laws can be ascertained, and in many instances a conservative spelling reveals the line of evolution. We have, for instance, reason to believe (from dialect comparison and from ancient Chinese sources) that Mandarin *kie*, Cantonese *kīp*, &c., 'to rob', was anciently *kjāp*, and this is borne out by Sino-Japanese. There the form is *kiō*, but it is spelled in an archaizing fashion *kefu*, and this *kefu* was pronounced, as we can prove, *kepu* (-*u* being a parasitic vowel) at the time of its introduction fifteen hundred years ago. The Japanese evolution was *kepu* > *kefu* > *ke(w)u* > *keu* > *kiō*, and we have in the original Japanese form strong corroboration of our reconstruction of the word.

By such methods linguistic science has been able to form an accurate picture of the Chinese language of the sixth century A.D. And, by the aid of data furnished on the one hand by the rimes of the earliest Chinese poetry (*Shi king*), on the other hand by certain phenomena in the Chinese script to be described below, it has been possible to reconstruct, in a fairly detailed way, the phonetic garb, the pronunciation, of the Chinese words around 800 B.C.

We have now to come to close quarters with the language and to discover the characteristics which give it its peculiar constitution. Our attention immediately fixes upon certain peculiarities common to all the stages of the language with which we are acquainted. These have been summed up under two heads. On the one hand, Chinese is *monosyllabic*, on the other hand, it is *isolating*, i.e. it treats the words as if they were isolated unities, without modifying them according to their function in the sentence. So the German scholar F. N. Finck, in his little book *Die Haupttypen des Sprachbaus* (Leipzig, 1910), in which he gives a concise description of the character of eight languages belonging to different

linguistic families, characterizes Chinese thus: 'There are two peculiarities the coexistence of which gives the structure of this language a very curious character. On the one hand, the Chinese words consist, not absolutely always but in the majority of cases, of a single syllable; on the other hand, the relation of these monosyllabic words to the whole sentence is not expressed by any marks in the words themselves, but in the first place by a fixed word-order, and secondly—and in a less important degree—by the addition of words the original concrete sense of which is so far faded that they can be used for formal purposes somewhat like our so-called auxiliaries'.

Let us start by examining this last feature. It is a well-known fact that the Indo-European languages express variations in the meaning of one and the same word by means of various inflexional affixes. If we compare the forms *puella*, *puellae*, *puellam*, *puellā*, *puellas*, *puellarum*, *puellis*, we find that they all possess an element *puell-*, bearing a sense common to them all, but that they differ in having affixes of various forms. Such an affix has, taken by itself, no meaning whatever, but in combination it becomes significant because it indicates the category to which the *puell-* in question belongs. Thus in the form *puellarum* there are no less than three determinations of category: firstly, the *-a* indicates the category 'feminine gender' (in opposition to *-o* in *puerorum*); secondly, the *-rum* indicates the category 'plural number'; and thirdly, this same affix *-arum* conveys the idea of ownership, thus marking the 'possessive case'. In the same way the German form *betest* expresses the categories 'singular number', 'second person', and 'present tense'.

While the Indo-European languages and many other tongues, to a large extent and with great lucidity as a result, make use of such inflexional affixes, Chinese on the whole does without these devices, and thus employs words without modification in the most diverse functions and connexions.

The word *jên* means equally 'man', 'man's', 'men', 'men's', and 'the man', 'the man's', 'the men', 'the men's'; the sentence *yu jên tsai mên wai*, lit. 'have man gate outside', may mean 'there is (il y a) a man outside the gate', but it may equally well mean 'there are people outside the gate'. The phrase *jên sin*, 'man heart', corresponds to 'the heart of the man', but also to 'the heart of man' or 'the hearts of (the) men'. There is no sign in the phrase to indicate number (man or men), case (man or man's), the definite or indefinite form (man, a man, or the man). In the same way *lai* is equivalent to the infinitive 'to come' as well as to various forms of that verb, which, in German for example, are inflected: *komme, kommst, kommt, kommen, kommet*. In the sentence *t'a niang tso t'ien ta t'a*, 'he mother yesterday thrash he', i.e. 'his mother thrashed him yesterday', we can see that Chinese has no equivalent of our *-ed* (past tense ending) in the verb any more than it distinguishes the possessive category of 'his' from the objective category of 'him'.

Now, with regard to the other characteristic, monosyllabism, the statement that Chinese words, if not without exception, yet for the most part, consist of one single syllable, must not be misunderstood. In Chinese, as in other languages, we must of course distinguish between compound words (*composita*) and simple words (*simplicia*). By compounds we mean words consisting of two or more parts each of which can appear by itself (unchanged or with some slight modification) as an independent word. Chinese is very rich in compound words, and these of course may consist of two or more syllables, e.g. *kin-piao*, 'gold-watch', *hi-t'ie-shī* (pull-iron-stone), 'magnet'. But every simple word consists as a rule—there are some exceptions, but of slight importance—of a single syllable. So while English, for example, uses simple words of one, two, or more syllables, e.g. *go, club, kitchen, window, anchor, writer, flogging, leanness, unbearable*, Chinese does all its work with monosyllabic materials.



Among the English words just cited there are some—*go*, *club*, *kitchen*, *window*, *anchor*—which cannot be analysed into smaller constituent parts. (This statement must be taken from the point of view of modern English: etymologically they can be further analysed, e.g. *kitchen* < Old English *cycene* < Latin *coquina*; *window* < Scandinavian *vind-auga* ‘wind-eye’.) These may be called stem-words. The rest can be dissected into various parts, as: *writ-er*, *flog(g)-ing*, *lean-ness*, *un-bear-able*, but they are none the less simple words, not compounds, because parts like *-er*, *-ing*, *-ness*, *un-*, *-able* cannot be used as independent words. Words of this type are derivatives formed by means of the affixes just mentioned, and by cutting them off we may usually arrive at the stem-words (*write*, *flog*, *lean*, *bear*) from which they are derived.

In comparison with the English language, therefore, the monosyllabism of Chinese involves two things. Firstly, all Chinese simple words are stem-words, i.e. Chinese refuses to form new words by means of derivative affixes. Thus, while in English from the verb *shoot* we have a verbal noun *shooting*, the two notions implied are rendered alike by *shē*; similarly, *transgress* and *transgression* are both *kuo*. Now this in fact is logically much the same phenomenon as the ‘isolating’ system of Chinese, i.e. its aversion for inflexional affixes (*puellarum*, &c.); for inflexional and derivative affixes from a semasiological point of view serve analogous purposes. The inflexional affixes indicate, as we have seen, various categories (case, number, person, tense). And the derivative affixes have similar functions: *-er*, for instance, indicates the category ‘nouns denoting agent’ (*nomina agentis*), *writer*, *swindler*, *brewer*, *baker*; *-ness* marks the category ‘nouns denoting quality’, *leanness*, *ugliness*, *sharpness*, *swiftness*, &c. That all Chinese simple words are stem-words is due to the same tendency which we have considered above when speaking of the isolating nature of the language: Chinese in general does not express categories by means of affixes.

In the second place, Chinese has not, as other languages have, stem-words of more than one syllable. It is true that we in English, after cutting off the various affixes of derivatives, often arrive at monosyllabic stem-words (*flog(g)-ing lean-ness* &c.), but quite as often the stems are disyllabic or polysyllabic. The old Indo-European mother language possessed disyllabic as well as monosyllabic stem-words, and the Finno-Ugrian languages have as a rule disyllabic stem-words. Compared with these two great families of languages Chinese stands in sharp contrast with its system of one-syllable stem-words.

The definition of Chinese as on the one hand isolating, and on the other hand monosyllabic, is based mainly on a comparison with other languages; but, at the same time, its definition as monosyllabic necessitates the consideration of Chinese by itself. There is in this a slight inconsistency in regard to the point of departure, but we shall find, if we keep apart the relative and the absolute description, that the various characteristics of the relative description may be reduced to a single absolute quality. Thus, from the relative point of view, seen against the background of our European languages, Chinese has three *negative* characteristics.

1. It has not, as certain other languages, disyllabic or polysyllabic stem-words (*kitchen, anchor*).

2. It has no simple words formed with derivative affixes (*writ-er, lean-ness*).

3. It has no words varied by inflexional affixes (*puell-arum*).

These three negative characterizations, the first and second of which, taken together, imply that Chinese has no simple words of more than one syllable, and the second and third of which, taken together, imply that Chinese does not employ affixes to indicate grammatical categories, are in

reality equivalent to the following single positive characterization:

From the absolute point of view, considered by itself, Chinese has this special character, that, when we analyse its sentences into the simple words of which they consist (either as independent words or as members of compounds), these words are found to be fixed monosyllables.

Like a set of building-blocks of the same size and pattern, Chinese words are assembled into the structure called a sentence.

This *uniformity*, though it is the most important characteristic of the phases of the language with which we are most familiar, has not always existed. Traces remain of disyllabic stem-words, certain peculiarities in the 'tone' (see chapter III) are vestiges of derivative affixes, and the prose of the latter part of the Chou dynasty (1027-256 B.C.) has been shown to possess case-inflexion in personal pronouns. Just as English has nowadays no inflexional distinction in nouns between nominative 'the man' and accusative 'the man', but still preserves a trace of an older stage in the pronouns *I, me, thou, thee*, in the same way Chinese had formerly nominative *ngo* 'I', accusative *nga* 'me', nominative *ńio* 'thou', accusative *ńia* 'thee'. Moreover, the unchangingness of the syllable-word, absolute in modern Chinese, was very often broken through in Archaic Chinese (the centuries B.C.), for the word stem could be phonetically varied to express different grammatical functions, e.g. *d'ák* 'to measure' (verb): *d'ág* 'a measure' (noun), just as in English *sing* (verb): *song* (noun)—a common mode of derivation in various languages. In short, the old theory which classified Chinese as a 'primitive' language, not yet raised to the inflexional and derivative status, is the opposite of the truth. Chinese, in fact has followed exactly the same line of evolution as the Indo-European languages in the gradual loss of synthetic terminations and phonetic stem variations, with all the stronger

This little classic on the Chinese spoken and written language has remained standard reading both for the student and the general reader. It gives a lucid account of the development and distinguishing features of Chinese writing and speech and this edition has been revised by the author.

Professor Bernhard Karlgren was Professor of Sinology at Gothenburg University from 1918 to 1938. He was Director of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities from 1939 to 1959 and as editor of its Bulletin he published a series of sinological papers. Among his many outstanding works are *Etudes sur la phonologie chinoise*, *Grammata serica recensa*, *Glosses on the Book of Odes*, *Glosses on the Book of Documents*, *Legends and Cults in ancient China*, *Yin and Chou in Chinese Bronzes*, and *Glosses on the Tso Chuan and the Li Chi*.

ISBN 962-209-257-8



HONG KONG UNIVERSITY PRESS