NOTES SECTION

Categories of grammatical Sino-Vietnamese vocabulary

Mark J. ALVES
Montgomery College, USA

Abstract

A noticeable portion of grammatical vocabulary in Vietnamese is Chinese in origin. While many of these words were borrowed from Chinese already grammaticalized, others were grammaticalized only after being borrowed into Vietnamese. In other cases, words originally grammaticalized in Chinese have developed new grammatical functions in Vietnamese. This study presents Sino-Vietnamese grammatical vocabulary in several grammatical categories and discusses the grammatical clines involved.

0. Introduction

This paper enumerates grammatical vocabulary in Vietnamese that is of Chinese origins, considering questions such as the certainty of the etymological origins, the kinds of grammaticalization types that have or have not occurred, and whether the vocabulary was borrowed grammaticalized or became grammaticalized after borrowing.[1] The first section of this article briefly introduces general historical linguistic categories of borrowing and issues of the timing of grammaticalization of Chinese loanwords in Vietnamese, while subsequent sections look at several grammatical categories of vocabulary and relevant details and examples.

1. Sino-Vietnamese and degree of grammaticality

Most generally (and safely), Sino-Vietnamese vocabulary can be classified into two types based on their means of entry into the language. There is, first of all, 'literary Sino-Vietnamese,' which was borrowed en masse through the spread of literacy in Chinese during the Tang and ensuing Song Dynasties, the era of Middle Chinese, the phonological categories of which Sino-Vietnamese has maintained well. Such words can be readily identified in Sino-Vietnamese dictionaries with their corresponding Chinese characters.

---

[1]See also Alves 2006 (downloadable at www.geocities.com/malves98) for additional discussion on the process of changes of these words.

Next, there is a class of what I will call 'colloquial Sino-Vietnamese',[2] which can be considered phonological doublets for existing literary Sino-Vietnamese. This latter type consists of vocabulary that may have been borrowed through spoken contact with Chinese or other languages that borrowed Chinese, such as Tai or Mon-Khmer languages, or such vocabulary may be borrowed literary forms that have been nativized in pronunciation, but in general, such vocabulary is generally seen by the Vietnamese as part of native, colloquial Vietnamese, not Chinese. This is seen in discussion of the distinction between the two types of pre-romanized writing scripts, *Hán tự*, words recognized as Chinese in origin, and *Chữ Nôm*, words considered non-Chinese in origin. Some of the vocabulary may have origins in the Tang or Post-Tang dynasty era (either borrowed or nativized, meaning slight phonological changes occurred), while certain words were likely borrowed in previous dynasties, even as early as the Han dynasty. More precise studies differentiating the timing of phonological developments could shed light on the approximate dates of borrowing of colloquial Sino-Vietnamese, a subject which is not in the scope of this brief paper.

As for stages of grammaticality, the vocabulary considered consists of three types: (1) words which entered Vietnamese as grammatical vocabulary and which did not change,[3] (2) words which entered Vietnamese grammaticalized (i.e., having developed specialized semantico-syntactic functions) but which developed different and/or additional grammatical features, and (3) words which entered Vietnamese ungrammaticalized but have come to have specialized grammatical functions. Words in the first category are literary Sino-Vietnamese. Words in the second two categories are considered uncontroversially to be Sino-Vietnamese in origin when the semantic overlap is significant and the phonetic shape is either exactly the same as the likely literary source form or can be shown to belong to a class of colloquial Sino-Vietnamese based on regular phonological correspondences (largely following work by Tryon (1979) on phonological patterns of nativized Sino-Vietnamese). Words which have significant semantic and/or phonological

---

[2]While the existence of the category of literary Sino-Vietnamese is non-controversial, the proposed colloquial vocabulary mentioned here has been referred to with different terms in various studies. Many Vietnamese simply consider these Nôm readings as opposed to Chinese characters, without explicit reference to their etymological origins. Benedict (1947) used the terms 'literary' and 'vulgar' forms to distinguish the two categories, essentially the same distinction made here, but with the choice of the term 'colloquial'. Haudricourt (1954) and Pulleyblank (1981) called it 'pre-Sino-Vietnamese'. Mei (1970) and Alves (2001) discussed 'Old Sino-Vietnamese'. Wang Li (1948), Tryon (1979), and numerous Vietnamese linguists (Nguyễn Văn Tu (1968), Đào Duy Anh (1979), Nguyễn Tài Cẩn (1979), and Nguyễn Thiện Giáp (1985)) generally recognize a distinction between some kind of 'pre-Tang Sino-Vietnamese' and 'nativized Sino-Vietnamese', essentially a subset of literary Sino-Vietnamese that has been changed somewhat phonetically. Đào Duy Anh (Ibid.) in particular takes Wang Li's work and adds, excludes or reclassifies certain Sino-Vietnamese words.

[3]It should be noted that semantic and syntactic similarity does not preclude the possibility that the changes occurred after borrowing, but then, the matter becomes whether certain Sino-Vietnamese words developed new functions in Vietnamese independently or under continued contact with Chinese, a question not dealt with in this paper.

differences that cannot be accounted for with regular phonological changes have been excluded from the study.[4]

2. Grammatical categories

The semantico-syntactic areas in which Sino-Vietnamese vocabulary can be seen include (1) comparative and intensifying words, (2) clause-connecting words, (3) quantity words, measure words, and classifiers, (4) preverbal elements, (5) pronouns and referential terms, and (6) time and location words. Within each section, the vocabulary is identified, and each word's status in the above-mentioned categories is considered. Also, where relevant, grammatical clines are indicated and discussed.[5]

Throughout the text, for Chinese loanwords which are colloquial in nature and which are considered native Vietnamese *Chữ Nôm* words, the literary Sino-Vietnamese (SV) forms are indicated in parentheses immediately following the first mention of such words. All other words are literary Sino-Vietnamese readings which can be readily identified in Sino-Vietnamese dictionaries. For Chinese characters, Mandarin (Md.) readings are provided for general reference, not to indicate what the pronunciation was of Chinese at the time of borrowing into Vietnamese.

2.1 Comparative and intensifying words

The system of comparison and intensification in Vietnamese contains several words of Chinese origin. However, most of them were not originally grammatical forms in Chinese but instead became grammatical after entering Vietnamese.

---

[4]Some tentative words can be excluded from the category of Sino-Vietnamese based primarily on three reasons. Some have problems in expected phonological changes from earlier stages of Chinese, words such as *đừng* 'don't' (SV *đình* 'stop', Ch. 停 (Md. *tíng*)), *khi* 'when' (SV *kì* 'period of time', Ch. 欺 (Md. *qī*)), and *ở* 'be at' (SV *vu* 'be at', Ch. 于 (Md. *yú*)). Some either come from other etymological sources or generally have competing etymological sources and cannot be safely included due to incomplete evidence, words such as *trong* 'inside' (SV *trung* 'center', Ch. 中 (Md. *zhōng*, cf. Pacoh *kalhúng* and Khmer *knung* 'inside')), *đánh* 'to hit/manipulate' (SV *đả* 'to hit', Ch. 打 (Md. *dǎ*, but cf. the Taiwanese reading *dã⁷* with a nasalized vowel), and *mọi* 'every' (*SV mỗi* 'each', Ch. 每 (Md. *měi*, cf. Pacoh *mooi* and Khmer *mui* 'one'). Finally, some are most likely grammaticalized native Vietnamese vocabulary with no need for an external source for borrowing as an explanation, including the words *đề* 'in order to' (SV *đế* 'the bottom', Ch. 底 (Md. *dǐ*)), which most likely is a development from the homophonous word meaning 'to put', and *đã* 'already' (SV *dĩ* 'already', Ch. 已 (Md. *yǐ*)), which is likely derived from the homophonous word meaning 'satisfied', a feasible path of grammaticalization. Nevertheless, future data could help to clarify one way or the other, and some may still be shown to be Chinese in origin.

[5]The formal notation and general categories of grammaticalization clines follow that which is used in Heine and Kuteva 2002. The starting and end points of the clines are in capital letters, and direction of change is indicated with a greater-than sign (e.g., TRUE > INTENSIFIER).

The two words with somewhat similar functions in Chinese are the colloquial Sino-Vietnamese *thật* 'very/truly' (cf. literary SV[6] *thiệt, thực*, Ch. 實 (Md. *shí*)) and *như* (Ch. 如 (Md. *rú*)) meaning 'as/similar to'. The origin of the former word is complicated by its doublet counterparts, but it is nevertheless most likely a nativized form. The second word, *như*, which indicates similarity, has a more literary flavor in Chinese and somewhat restricted usage. Though similar to Chinese in having an equative function, in Vietnamese, *như* has also developed the function of indicating examples, meaning 'such as', similar to English 'like', which also has this function.

Two other words are of slightly less certain status since they have developed grammatical functions entirely lacking in Chinese, though they are completely homophonous and overlap in semantic domains. First of all, Sino-Vietnamese *quá* (Ch. 過 (Md. *guò*)), originally having the meaning 'to pass', has developed an intensifying function, meaning 'extremely', and is generally used after stative verbs, but sometimes before. Still, such a development is a common grammaticalization path as noted in Heine and Kuteva (hereafter referred to as H&K), roughly matching the grammatical cline EXCEED > ELATIVE (2002:126-127), seen in various languages. Next, Sino-Vietnamese *nhất* (Ch. 一 (Md. *yī*)), originally meaning 'one', indicates the superlative in Vietnamese. While H&K have not posited such a cline, noting that 'one' is the source of many grammatical forms in languages (Ibid.:323), we can here suggest a cline of ONE > SUPERLATIVE (cf. Sino-Japanese *ichiban*).

Finally, there are two words with both phonetic and semantic distance from their literary counterparts, but they are nevertheless included here based on typological tendencies of grammaticalization and observable phonetic correspondences. First, *bằng* (cf. SV *bình* 'level', Ch. 平 (Md. *píng*)), which means 'equal to', is possibly a nativized form. The complication is the Sino-Vietnamese word *bình* (Ch. 憑 (Md. *píng*)), meaning 'based on', which could also be the source of the form and which has also been borrowed into other Southeast Asian languages, such as Thai and Khmer (Pou and Jenner (1973:9)). In either case, the semantic and distributional overlap could show either to be the source form. Second, the word *giống* 'same' (cf. SV *chủng*, Ch. 種 (Md. *zhǒng*)) is possibly an older colloquial borrowing. If so, we can posit a cline of TYPE > SAME.

2.2 Clause connecting words

Of the several Sino-Vietnamese clause-connecting words, most are literary Sino-Vietnamese, though not all have the original meaning. One other word is of less certain Chinese origins.

---

[6]Some abbreviations used in this article are as follows: 'SV' for literary Sino-Vietnamese, 'Ch.' for Chinese, and 'Mand.' for Mandarin. Literary Sino-Vietnamese counterparts are listed after colloquial Sino-Vietnamese words. The literary Sino-Vietnamese pronunciation is shown in parentheses only when a colloquial form exists.

Words borrowed grammaticalized and preserving original meanings include *nhưng* 'but' (Ch. 仍 (Md. *réng*)), which maintains the older, literary meaning, *tuy* 'although' (Ch. 雖 (Md. *ruí*)), and *tuy nhiên* 'however' (Ch. 雖然 (Md. *suī rán*)). Sino-Vietnamese *thậm chí* 'even' (Ch. 甚至 (Md. *shén zhì*)) is similar in meaning to the original Chinese form. The Vietnamese word *sở dĩ* (Ch. 所以 (Md. *suǒ yǐ*)) means 'the reason why...', which is slightly different from but clearly related to the Chinese meaning 'therefore'. Finally, *vì* 'because' (cf. SV *vi* and *vị*, Ch. 為(Md. *wéi* and *wēi*)) appears to be a genuine colloquial Sino-Vietnamese form, being close enough phonetically and semantically to the literary word. The locational word *tại* (Ch. 在 (Md. *zài*)) has grammaticalized since entering Vietnamese, developing the meaning 'because', in accordance with H&K's cline LOCATIVE > CAUSE (Ibid.:200).

The other word of somewhat less certain etymological status is *thì* (cf. SV *thời*, Ch. 時 'time' (Md. *shí*)). This word is sometimes translated as 'then', as in 'if...then...' constructions in English, but it has a more general function in Vietnamese as a connector between topics and comments in such constructions. If this word was borrowed and then grammaticalized, the semantic shift went from a general time location (i.e., 'when X, then Y') with two clauses to a situation in which a wide range of clauses, phrases, and words with clauses topic functions could precede *thì*, with predicational comments following in theme-rheme constructions. However, since data has not revealed use of *thì* in an interclausal position as marker of an adverbial clause (i.e., that it means 'when/at the time of'), which would allow for reanalysis of it as a more general interclausal connector, and other words to accomplish this exist which have not developed this function (e.g., *khi* and *lúc* 'when'), its status as Chinese in origin is somewhat more tentative.

2.3 Quantity words, measure words, and classifiers

This section is separated into three parts, first dealing with numerals and other quantity words, secondly, with various directly countable measure words, and thirdly, classifiers. To compare meanings of these words, especially the measure words and classifiers, several works were referred to, including Nguyễn Đình Hoà 1957 and 1966, Wang and Wu 1989, and Từ Điển Tiếng Việt 1996.

A brief note on the grammaticalization of measure words and classifiers is required. For the most part, these two classes of grammatical words are historically derived from non-count common nouns, which do take following nouns. In Vietnamese, they have come to serve as links between numerals and common nouns, the latter of which are basically noun complements. Classifiers are even more grammaticalized as they have developed various semantic cooccurrence restrictions. The semantico-syntactic changes are shown diagrammatically in rough semantico-syntactic properties as follows.

COMMON NOUNS → *MEASURE WORDS* → *CLASSIFIERS*
non-count   countable   countable
no complements   complements   complements
(not applicable)   no semantic restrictions   semantic restrictions

---

2.3.1 Quantity words

While Vietnamese has maintained its overall native numeral system (unlike many neighboring Tai languages which use numeral systems largely originating in Chinese), Chinese numbers have highly specialized functions in Vietnamese, for example, being used for grade levels in school. Other commonly used Sino-Vietnamese quantity terms include *các* 'the various' (Ch. 各 (Md. *gè*)), *mỗi* 'each' (Ch. 每 (Md. *měi*)), *muôn* 'ten thousand' (SV *vạn*, Ch. (Md. *wàn*)), and *tá* 'a dozen' (Ch. 打 (Md. *dǎ*)). Only one of these, *muôn*, is in the class of colloquial Sino-Vietnamese and of somewhat less etymological certainty. Two forms, *mỗi* and *tá*, are completely homophonous and roughly the same in meaning as in Chinese. Finally, the form *các*, while different from the Chinese meaning 'all', fits the grammaticalization cline noted in H&K, ALL > PLURAL (Ibid.:36), and can be safely considered a Chinese grammatical loanword.

2.3.2 Measure words

Words in this category can be immediately preceded by numbers but have few semantic restrictions on nouns following them, as opposed to classifiers which take only special semantic classes of nouns after them. The words in this category tend to be semantically transparent (i.e., easily translated), but their grammatical status is significant as they are distinguished from the numerous non-count common nouns in Vietnamese and are in position in the future to develop semantico-syntactic features that place them in the even more grammaticalized category of classifiers.

The words that fall in the category of literary Sino-Vietnamese and that have essentially the same meaning as in Chinese include *bao* 'a package of' (Ch. 包 (Md. *bāo*)), *cân* 'a unit of weight' (Ch. 斤 (Md. *jīn*)), *chương* 'a chapter (of a book)' (Ch. 章 (Md. *zhāng*)), *hàng* 'a row of' (Ch. 行 (Md. *xíng/háng*)), *khẩu* 'a mouthful of' (Ch. 口 (Md. *kǔ*)), *loài* 'a type of' (SV *loại*, Ch. 類 (Md. *lèi*)), *mẫu* 'a hectare' (Ch. 畝 (Md. *mǒu*)), *phần* 'a part, section' (Ch. 分 (Md. *fēn*)), and *phong* 'a letter, envelope' (Ch. 封 (Md. *fēng*)). Several others are also unquestionably Chinese in origin but have somewhat different meanings from their modern Chinese counterparts. These include *bộ* 'a set' (Ch. 部 (Md. *bù*), a classifier for artistic creations or machinery), *đấu* 'a peck (of corn)' (Ch. 斗 (Md. *dòu*), '10 liters of'), *đội* 'a company (of soldiers)' (Ch. 隊, 'a group of' (Md. *dùi*)), *kì* 'a session' (Ch. 期 (Md. *qī*), 'a phase of), *phân* 'a unit of length (1/10th of a tac)' (Ch. 分 (Md. *fēn*), '1/3 of a centimeter') (also in Khmer, Pou and Jenner, Ibid.:16), and *số* 'a number of' (Ch. 數 (Md. *shù*), 'number').

The remainder of these measure words are either homophonous with literary Sino-Vietnamese forms but have somewhat different meanings or belong to the colloquial Sino-Vietnamese layer and have existing literary Sino-Vietnamese counterparts. Those in the first category include just the two words *đồng* 'a coin' (Ch. 銅 (Md. *tóng*), 'bronze') and *thiên* 'a chapter (of a novel)' (Ch. 篇 (Md. *biān*), 'report/composition'), both of which apparently developed measure word functions after being borrowed. The other words are all colloquial Sino-Vietnamese, but in fact, most have maintained their original Chinese meaning. These include *chén* 'a cupful (of tea)' (SV *trản*, Ch. 盞 (Md. *chén*), 'small cup' and a measure word for a lamp), *hộp* 'a boxful of' (SV *hợp*, Ch. 合 (Md. *hé*)), *lần* 'a turn (as in a game)' (SV luân, Ch. 輪 (Md. *lún*)), *tầng* 'a level/floor' (SV *tăng*, Ch. 層 (Md. *zēng*)), *thìa* 'a spoonful of' (SV *chủy*, Ch. 匙 (Md. *chí*)), *vườn* 'a garden of' (SV *viên*, Ch. 園 (Md. *yuán*)), and *vuông* 'a square of' (SV *phương*, Ch. 方 (Md. *fāng*)). The last word considered here is *lạng/lượng* 'a tael' (Ch. 量 (Md. *liàng*), 'quantity' but not a measure word), which is of less certain status, but it has phonetic consistency and some semantic overlap.

2.3.3 Classifiers

In addition to providing countability to the nouns that follow them, various special co-occurrence restrictions obtain between classifiers and those nouns. In addition to their status as countable nouns, a less marked and more grammatical feature of nouns in Vietnamese, classifiers tend to have fewer transparent semantic features than do general measure words.

The first group of words considered consists of literary Sino-Vietnamese forms, most of which have changed little or not at all from the original Chinese meaning. The first group are those with essentially the same meaning as in Chinese, including *đạo*, a unit for laws, orders, and decrees (Ch. 道 (Md. *dào*)), *đoạn*, a unit for sections, paragraphs, and passages (Ch. 段 (Md. *duàn*)), *gian*, a unit for rooms (Ch. 間 (Md. *jiān*)), *môn*, a unit for a subject/field of study (Ch. 門 (Md. *mén*)), *phát*, a unit for a shot of a firearm (Ch. 發 (Md. *fā*)), and *vị*, a unit for people of high status (Ch. 位 (Md. *wèi*)). Words that have slight semantic differences include *bản*, a unit for scripts, reports, and compositions (Ch. 本 (Md. *běn*), a unit for books), *đỉnh*, a unit for mountains (Ch. 頂 (Md. *dǐng*), a unit for things with a pointed top (e.g., tents or caps)), and *viên*, a unit for officials (Ch. 員 (Md. *yuán*), a unit used in the past for military officers). The third group consists of words that are not classifiers or measure words in Chinese but which have become grammaticalized in Vietnamese. These include *vụ*, a unit for disasters (Ch. 务 (Md. *wù*), 'affair') and *bức*, a unit for upright flat things (Ch. 壁 (Md. *bì*), 'wall').

Another large group of classifiers consists of words either semantically or phonologically somewhat different from their literary counterparts. The first group discussed contains mostly colloquial Sino-Vietnamese and, despite slightly different semantics, are unit nouns as well in Chinese. These words consist of *bàn*, a unit for flat surfaces (e.g., table, hand, or foot) (Ch. 盤 (Md. *pán*), 'a plate of' or 'a coil of'), *chiếc*, either a unit for

vehicles (cars, boats, or planes) or 'a pair (of chopsticks)' (SV *chích*, Ch. 隻 (Md. *zhī*), a unit for animals), *cuốn*, a unit for books (SV *quyển*, Ch. 卷 (Md. *juǎn*), a unit used for coils or rolls of various things), *đôi*, 'a couple (of shoes, chopsticks, husband/wife)' (SV *đối*, Ch. 對 (Md. *dùi*), also 'a pair' but lacking specific semantic requirements of following nouns), *tòa*, a unit for buildings (SV *toạ*, Ch. 座 (Md. *zùo*), a unit for large objects 'mountains', 'cities', 'parks', etc.), and *viên*, a unit for small, round things (pills, tablets, bullets, etc.) (SV *hoàn*, Ch. 丸 (Md. *wán*), a unit for pills). Two other words are both literary Sino-Vietnamese forms that have become grammaticalized in Vietnamese, including *bài*, a unit for lessons, songs, or speeches (Ch. 牌 (Md. *pái*), 'a plate (generally with words on it') and *quả*, a unit for fruit (Ch. 果 (Md. *guǒ*), 'fruit').

The last category is more tentative due to their phonological oddities. First of all, *hãng* is a unit for businesses (SV *hàng*, Ch. 行 (Md. *xíng/háng*), 'a business'). The Chinese form is not a classifier, and the tone does not pattern with other colloquial loanwords. Still, this particular Chinese word has been borrowed in Southeast Asia into Cambodian, Thai, and Laotian (Pou and Jenner, Ibid.:85), and it is thus still rather likely to be a colloquial Sino-Vietnamese form.

Finally, it is here posited that *cái*, a generic unit for various objects could either be a standard Chinese form (SV *cái*, Ch. 丐 (Md. *gài*), not used in modern Chinese) or a colloquial Sino-Vietnamese form (SV *cá*, Ch. 個 (Md. *gè*), also a universal classifier). Linking this with the homophonous form in native Vietnamese meaning 'mother' or 'female' is not only semantically difficult to support but also problematic on historical phonetic grounds. The highly conservative Vietic language Rục has two phonetic forms (ki^3 for 'female' but ke^4 for the classifier (Nguyễn Văn Lợi (1993)), indicating two distinct etymological sources. The phonetic addition of final /-i/ is slightly problematic, but still, numerous Old Sino-Vietnamese forms have developed off-glides (e.g., *mùi* 'taste', SV *vị*, Ch. 味 (Md. *wèi*)), and overall, the semantics of the form is consistent with that seen in some Yue dialects (e.g., Toisanese) in Southern China.

2.4 *Preverbal elements*

The words in this category have a variety of modal and auxiliary verb-like functions. Only one is of definite, verifiable origins as Chinese, while the rest show varying lesser degrees of certainty.

Two words of high grammatical significance in Vietnamese are the passive-like markers, *bị* (Ch. 被 (Md. *bèi*)) and *được* (SV *đắc*, Ch. 得 (Md. *dé*)). The Chinese origin of *bị* is unquestionable (i.e., it can be readily identified in Sino-Vietnamese dictionaries is both phonologically and semantically the same), while the etymological source of *được* is somewhat less certain. Still, finding another source of *được* that takes into account both phonological reasoning and the significant semantic similarity is harder, and so it is best to consider it a colloquial Sino-Vietnamese etymology. While *bị* was borrowed with its original Chinese semantico-syntactic properties in passive-

like constructions, *được* appears to have developed in Vietnamese somewhat separately (see Matisoff 1991 for general discussion on grammaticalization and *được*).

Two other words with widely different functions each require some justification for their inclusion. First, the progressive marker *đang* (cf. SV *đương*, Ch. 當 (Md. *dāng*), 'at a certain time') may be a colloquial form, though the vowel is somewhat unexpected (though consider Proto-Vietic *a* with modern Vietnamese *ươ* (Nguyễn, Tài Cẩn, 1995:301-303)). If so, it matches the cline IN (SPATIAL) > CONTINUOUS listed in H&K (Ibid.: 178-179). Finally, Nguyễn Phú Phong (1996) has posited that the word *không* 'no/not' is derived from the homophonous literary Sino-Vietnamese form meaning 'void' (Ch. 空 (Md. *kòng*)). This is quite possible considering the cline NEGATION, EXIST > NEGATION (Ibid.:217-218), in which the original semantics of non-existence initially allowed negation of nouns and later verbs and predicates in general.

2.5 Pronouns and referential terms

Genuine Vietnamese pronouns (e.g., *tao* 'I' and *mày* 'you') are used with severe restrictions in Vietnamese society, and instead, for the most part, kinship terms of Chinese origin, both literary and colloquial Sino-Vietnamese, are used with pronominal reference. While it is not uncommon among languages to have kinship terms develop grammaticalized discourse and sentence-external functions (i.e., not functioning as subject or object of a sentence), they have been grammaticalized to an extreme in Vietnamese. These common nouns have evolved to fit into a pronominal system that indicates degree of age, gender, degree of familiarity, and various complicated discourse-related functions. In addition, these words, which were originally non-count, common noun, can be directly preceded by numerals. Indeed, many function as classifiers (Nguyễn Đình Hoà (1957)). Notably, the Sino-Vietnamese terms tend to refer to those older than the speaker, whereas a handful of the terms to refer to those younger or commanding less respect are of Mon-Khmer origin (e.g., *em* 'younger sibling', *con* 'child', and *cháu* 'grandchild').

In virtually every instance, the original meanings of the words, which provide the basic semantic properties of gender and age, have remained in the grammaticalized forms. The system is complex and cannot be given direct translations into English. Instead, the words are here described based on their gender and general age in relation to a speaker. The forms of uncontroversial status as Sino-Vietnamese include *bà*, a female of a speaker's grandmother's age (Ch. 婆 (Md. *pó*)), *cô*, generally a female of equal age, equal to 'miss' in meaning (Ch. 姑 (Md. *gū*)), *dì*, a female of a speaker's mother's younger sister's age (SV *di*, Ch. 姨 (Md. *yí*)), and *ông*, a male of a speaker's grandfather's age (Ch. 翁 (Md. *wēng*)). Next are those words with some phonetic changes, indicating their status as colloquial borrowings. These include *bác*, a male of a speaker's father's older brother's age (SV *bá*, Ch. 伯 (Md. *bó*)), *thím*, a female of a speaker's father's younger brother's wife's age (SV *thẩm*, Ch. 嬸 (Md. *shěn*)), *chị*, a female of a speaker's older sister's age

(SV *tỉ*, Ch. 姐 (Md. *jiě*)), *chú*, a male of a speaker's father's younger brother's age (SV *thúc*, Ch. 叔 (Md. *shū*)), and *cậu*, a male of a speaker's mother's younger brother's age (SV *cửu*, Ch. 舅 (Md. *jiù*)). The word *bạn* 'friend' (Ch. 伴 (Md. *bàn*) 'companion') can also be used with such pronominal function without gender restrictions but with less formality.

The glosses used here simplify the functions of these words, and in fact, they have developed further in ways that demonstrate additional semantic bleaching and complications in usage that typically accompany and/or lead to further grammaticalization. For example, *cô* is used to address women of various ages with more formality, while *chị* tends to be used with women somewhat older than a speaker but with a more congenial feeling. *Bác*, in particular, can be used with either men or women to indicate more respect. These semantic shifts further demonstrate a connection between pragmatic needs and semantico-syntactic shifts of these words.

The next few pronouns mentioned each have peculiarities that make them less certain as Chinese loans. First, *y* 'he/she' (Ch. 伊 (Md. *yī*)) is used strictly in Vietnamese in formal, literary contexts. Next, *ta* (which used alone means 'we'), when used as the second elements in compounds with referential pronouns, provides 3rd person reference (e.g. *cô ta*, miss-3rd pers., 'she'). This parallels the semantics of the literary Sino-Vietnamese *tha* (Ch. 他 (Md. *tā*)), referring to 3rd person, although the phonetic discrepancy cannot be accounted for, nor can the usage in a compound rather than a stand-alone form, as in Chinese (and the fact that the word is not common in neighboring parts of Southern Chinese). Finally, the Sino-Vietnamese *chúng* (Ch. 眾 (Md. *zhòng*)) indicates 3rd person plural in compounds (e.g., *chúng nó*). In addition to being related to a literary Sino-Vietnamese form, this change fits H&K's posited cline PEOPLE > PLURAL (Ibid.:230-231).

2.6 Time and location words

Words in this category include adverbs and prepositions, but all function to indicate location or direction in space and time. Some of the words are considered unquestionably to be Chinese in origin, either being identifiable literary Sino-Vietnamese or belonging to a regular pattern of phonological changes seen in colloquial Sino-Vietnamese.

The time adverbs *thường* 'often' (Ch.常 (Md. *cháng*)) and *hiện tại* 'at the present' (Ch. 現在 (Md. *xiàn zài*)) are roughly the same in meaning as in Chinese and are thus uncontroversial in origin. The locational *tại* (Ch. 在 (Md. *zài*)) is similarly uncontroversial, though it has developed the meaning 'because' in Vietnamese (see §2.2), a meaning beyond its Chinese counterpart, which can mean 'depend on'. The preposition *cách* 'from' (Ch. 隔 (Md. *gé*)) is used in a way similar to that of Chinese.

Interestingly, two words in this category both have colloquial and literary counterparts in use in Vietnamese. The colloquial Sino-Vietnamese form *ngoài* 'outside' is related to literary Sino-Vietnamese *ngoại* (Ch. 外 (Md. *wài*)), and similarly, colloquial *từ* 'from' is related to literary *tự* (Ch. 自 (Md. *zì*)). The correspondence between the huyền tone in colloquial forms and the

nặng tone in literary forms is seen in several other Sino-Vietnamese doublets, such as colloquial Sino-Vietnamese *dùng* 'to use' versus the literary *dụng* (Ch. 用 (Md. *yòng*)). Consider as well the measure word *loài* 'a type of' in §2.3.1 and the classifier for buildings *tòa* in §2.3.2, both of which have literary counterparts with the nặng tone.

The other words are of less certain origin as they are phonologically different from their supposed literary counterparts, but most appear to have generally the same meanings and/or grammatical functions and are thus considered good prospects. These include *qua* 'past' (SV *quá*, Ch. 過 (Md. *guò*) 'to pass'), *bên* 'side' (SV *biên*, Ch. 邊 (Md. *biān*)), *gần* 'close to' (SV *cận*, Ch. 近 (Md. *jìn*)), and *từng* 'ever' (SV *tằng*, Ch. 曾 (Md. *zēng*)). The form *qua* has shifted from the concrete meaning as a verb 'to pass' to an adverbial direction, matching H&K's cline GO > ALLATIVE (Ibid.: 160-161).

2.7 Miscellaneous

The remaining words do not fit the previously discussed general grammatical categories but nonetheless have grammatical functions. The first group is literary Sino-Vietnamese words that have essentially the same meanings as in Chinese, while the latter few are of less certain origins. Those words which are clearly of Sino-Vietnamese origins include *chỉ* 'only' (Ch. 只), *chính* 'just / precisely' (Ch. 正 (Md. *zhèng*)), *do* 'by/through' (Ch. 由 (Md. *yóu*)), and *thành* '(transform) into' (Ch. 成 (Md. *chéng*)).

The remaining forms should be considered but excluded if further data cannot fully support them or, indeed, goes against their inclusion. First, *bằng* 'made of' (Ch. 平 (Md. *píng*)) appears to be a development from 'equal to', discussed in §2.1. Next, *càng* 'all the more' could be related to literary Sino-Vietnamese *cánh* (Ch. 更 (Md. *píng*), 'even more'), though the phonetic support is admittedly weaker. Another possibility is *cùng* 'together', which may be related to literary Sino-Vietnamese *cộng* (Ch. 共 (Md. *gòng*), 'total'). The form *lại* (SV *lai*, 來 (Md. *lái*), 'come'), which represents the basic verb 'to come', appears to have developed a few other meanings. First, it is most likely the source of the postverbal adverb meaning 'to come back' and 'again', matching H&K's posited cline RETURN > ITERATIVE (Ibid.:259-260). These general meanings may in turn be the source of the preverbal meaning that indicates an unexpected situation from the previous context. Finally, *mà* is a sentence-final emphatic particle, similar in function to Chinese 嘛 (Md. *ma*), an emphatic particle suggesting that what is stated is obvious. However, it is not impossible that this is coincidence considering (a) the typologically unmarked phonetic material of the word and (b) the fact that languages throughout the region have numerous sentence-final particles expressing varying degrees of assertion.

3. Conclusion

Clearly, Sino-Vietnamese vocabulary has a special status in Vietnamese, and apparently its grammar as well. However, the end result has largely been one of accommodation rather than influence; Chinese vocabulary

has come to fit Vietnamese syntactic structure more than to influence or change it. However, as most of the colloquial Sino-Vietnamese words are not considered to be Chinese in origin, their development as grammatical vocabulary suggests that their social status aided in maintaining or developing such grammatical functions, even words not grammatical in nature in Chinese.

In the data, a noticeable phonological pattern was observed between colloquial Sino-Vietnamese with the huyền tone and literary forms with the nặng tone. Were such words taken from literary readings and changed, or were these words brought in through contact with Chinese speakers through trade, making these the result of second language acquisition perception of those tones? Understanding the nature of such borrowings could be helpful in understanding the nature of human relations among various groups in and around Vietnam, including speakers of Chinese as well as neighboring Southeast Asian languages. In fact, numerous Chinese words of trade (*bao* 'package'), cuisine (*bánh* 'pastry' (SV *bính*, Ch. 餅 (Md. *bǐng*)) and *phấn* 'powdery substance'), finance (*đồng* 'copper' and *công ty* 'company'), and various other culturally specific categories (e.g., *bài* 'playing cards' and *ngan* 'goose' (SV *nhan*, Ch. 鵝 (Md. *é*))) have entered Southeast Asian languages (see Pou and Jenner 1973), such as Thai and Khmer, most of which, unlike Vietnamese, do not have a literary tradition connected with Chinese. Perhaps a comparative study of colloquial Sino-Vietnamese with those other languages could reveal other historical details of timing of phonological and grammatical changes and even the direction of borrowing.

REFERENCES

Alves, Mark. J. 2001. "What's so Chinese about Vietnamese?" In Graham Thurgood, ed., 221-241. Papers from the Ninth Annual Meeting of the Southeast Asian Linguistics Society.

Alves, Mark J. 2006. "Sino-Vietnamese grammatical vocabulary and triggers for grammaticalization." The 6th Pan-Asiatic International Symposium on Linguistics, 315-332. Hanoi: Nhà xuất bản Khoa học Xã hội (Social Sciences Publishing House).

Benedict, Paul K. 1947. "An analysis of Annamese kinship terms." *SJA* 3:371-390.

Đào, Duy Anh. 1979. *Chữ Nôm: Nguồn Gốc, Cấu Tạo, Diễn Biến (Chu Nom: origins, formation, and transformations)*. Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.

Hashimoto, Mantaro J. 1978. "Current developments in Sino-Vietnamese studies." *JCL* 6:1-26.

Heine, Bernd and Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Maspéro, Henri. 1912. "Études sur la phonétique historique de la langue annamite: les initiales." *BEFEO* 12:1-127.

Matisoff, James A. 1991. "Areal and universal dimensions of grammatization in Lahu." In Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine, eds., *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, 1:383-453. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Mei, Tsu-Lin. 1970. "Tones and prosody in middle Chinese and the origin of the rising tone." *HJAS* 30:86-110.

Nguyễn, Đình Hoà. 1957. "Classifiers in Vietnamese." *Word* 13(1):124-152.

Nguyễn, Đình Hòa. 1966. *Vietnamese-English Dictionary.* Rutland, Vermont: Charles E. Tuttle Co.

Nguyễn, Phú Phong. 1996. "Negation in Vietnamese and in some of the Viet-Muong languages." *Pan-Asiatic Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Languages and Linguistics,* January 8-10, 1996, vol. II:563-568. Thailand: Mahidol University at Salaya, Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development.

Nguyễn, Tài Cẩn. 1979. *Nguồn Gốc và Quá Trình Hình Thành Cách Đọc Tiếng Hán Việt (The Origins and Process of Development of Sino-Vietnamese Readings).* Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.

Nguyễn, Tài Cẩn. 1995. *Giáo trình lịch sử ngữ âm tiếng Việt (Textbook of Vietnamese historical phonology).* Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Giáo Dục.

Nguyễn, Thiện Giáp. 1985. *Từ vựng học tiếng Việt (Vietnamese lexical studies).* Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Đại Học và Trung Học Chuyên Nghiệp.

Nguyễn, Văn Lợi. 1993. *Tiếng Rục (The Ruc Language).* Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.

Nguyễn, Văn Tu. 1968. *Từ vựng học tiếng Việt hiện đại (Modern Vietnamese lexical studies).* Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Giáo Dục.

Nhà Xuất Bản Đại Học và Giáo Dục Chuyên Nghiệp (The University and Career Education Press). 1990. *Từ Điển Hán-Việt (A Chinese-Vietnamese Dictionary).* Hà Nội.

Pou, Saveros and Philip N. Jenner. 1973. "Some Chinese loanwords in Khmer." *JOS* 6(1):1-90.

Pulleyblank, Edwin G. 1981. "Some notes on Chinese historical phonology." *BEFEO* 277-288.

de Rhodes, Alexandre. 1991 (originally 1651). *Từ Điển Annam-Lusitan-Latinh (Thường Gọi là Từ Điển Việt-Bồ-La).* Ho Chi Minh City: Nhà Xuất Bản Khoa Học Xã Hội.

Tryon, Ray. 1979. "Sources of middle Chinese phonology: a prolegomenon to the study of Vietnamized Chinese." M.A. thesis, Southern Illinois University

Trung Tâm Từ Điển Học. 1996. *Từ Điển Tiếng Việt. Hà Nội: Nhà Xuất Bản Đà Nẵng.*

Wang, Dajin and Wu Zhifang (eds.). 1989. *Dictionary of Chinese Classifiers with English Equivalents.* Union City, CA: Heian International, Inc.

Wang, Li. 1948. "Hanyueyu yanjiu (Research on Sino-Vietnamese)." *Lingnan Xuebao* 9(1):1-96. Reprinted 1958 in the Hanyushi Lunwenji, 290-406. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.

Department of Reading, ESL,
Foreign Languages and Philosophy
Montgomery College, Rockville
Rockville, MD 20850
USA
<mark.alves@montgomerycollege.edu>

BOOK REVIEWS

Yasuyuki SAKAMOTO. *The Cambodian-Japanese Dictionary.* **Tokyo: Institute of the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa (ILCAA), Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, 2001. 3:175 pp.**

Reviewed by NARASET Pisipanporn
Mahidol University, Thailand

The dictionary, published in 2001, is arranged according to the Khmer alphabetical system and divided into 3 volumes: Volume 1 (from ក to ង), Volume II (from ច to ព) and Volume III (ភ from to ឡ). The dictionary, Volumes I-III, totals 3,175 pages and may be considered the most comprehensive Cambodian dictionary ever published.

The introductory section, pages i-x, gives the background of the dictionary in 6 topics and several sub-topics. This section provides very useful information, especially on the Khmer linguistics and also provides a list of books (in English, Japanese, Khmer, French and Thai) used in the compilation of this dictionary.

Lexical items, arranged according to Khmer alphabetical system, are given first with the main head lexical item, provided with the IPA transcription, and followed by the lexical items which occur in the different showing to show the usage of such lexical item. The explanation is given in Japanese. The lexical items are repeated in different sections and contents for convenience adding to the number of pages and resulting in a 3 volume set which is easy to search for Khmer lexical items.

The phonetic transcription, given in IPA for each head lexical item, is helpful for users who study Khmer to pronounce the Khmer word correctly.

Lexical items cover all aspects of the Khmer people's way of life, such as social, economic, political, ecological aspects. The lexical items for 'nut', written as <ស្ពា> in Khmer (see Volume III, pages 615-617), is a good example. The lexical item is given its usage in different contexts. It not only helps the users easily check the Khmer lexical items, but also helps understand the lexical item in relation to Cambodian social, economic, political, ecological aspects. They are typed using beautifully designed Khmer fonts; and are easy to read and to check for the Khmer spelling.

However, the situation in Cambodia is changing so fast that many invented lexical items have been introduced, especially since the 1990s when UNITED NATIONS TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY IN CAMBODIA UNITED (UNTAC) (February 1992 - September 1993) came to operate in Cambodia. Thus, the dictionary may not have been able to include all the new innovations. Some lexical items may not be found in the dictionary, such as: ឈូសឈរាយ 'the cleared land' is not found. Minor mistakes due to printing errors for Thai words do occur, such as:

จฬาลงกรณ์มหาวิทยาลัย (page x)

The dictionary can be considered the most up-to-date Khmer dictionary. It is one of the most reliable sources for Khmer spelling, and one of the best dictionaries for Khmer language study. It is helpful for both Khmer and Japanese studies. The dictionary is very helpful to Japanese students learning Khmer, and is also helpful for Khmer students learning Japanese as well.

✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳✳

CONFERENCE REPORTS

The 3ʳᵈ International Conference of Austroasiatic Linguistics (ICAAL3), 26-28 November 2007, Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Pune, India

Reported by Paul SIDWELL
Australian National University, Australia

The Third International Conference of Austroasiatic Linguistics (ICAAL3) was held at Deccan College Post-Graduate & Research Institute, Pune (India), from November 26th-28th 2007.

The meeting marks the welcome revival of a movement that began promisingly with two conferences held in the mid-1970s yet subsequently stalled for three decades (ICAAL1 at the University of Hawaii, and ICAAL2 at the Central Institute of Indian Languages at Mysore). Since then a new generation of scholars has come to the study of Austroasiatic languages (especially in the context of the contemporary focus on documenting endangered languages), some original ICAALers are still with us, and an important body of descriptive and comparative-historical studies have accruded. Furthermore, it is a century since the foundational studies of Wilhelm Schmidt, making it both an appropriate and auspicious time to relaunch the ICAAL.

The meeting in Pune was organized jointly by the Department of Linguistics of Deccan College, the Linguistics Society of India, and the Central Institute of Indian Languages (Mysore). The Local Organizing Committee deserves congratulations for their efforts making the meeting a practical reality. They were lead by the principal organizer Prof. Keralapura Shreenivasaiah Nagaraja, who was assisted by Prof. S.R. Sharma, Dr. Sonal Kulkarni-Joshi and Dr. Shailendra Mohan. The conference proceedings will be published by the Deccan College, and are expected to appear around mid 2008.

Some 32 papers were read over three days in a single stream. Most presentations were in English, although several were read in Hindi on the afternoon of the third day. Topics covered included: comparative-historical, etymology, descriptive, socio-linguistics, language planning and computational linguistics.

Reflecting the number of Indian based attendees, a majority of papers dealt with issues of Munda, Khasi and Nicobar languages. The latter are of very special interest since research access to the Nicobar islands has been more or less impossible for decades, leaving comparativists and topologists to contend with dated and incomplete sources. In this context it is worth mentioning the presentations by Winston Cruz, who was invited by the Andaman and Nicobar authorities to do field studies over several years. In addition to reading a paper Cruz showed the meeting a 40 minute documentary film about cultural life and political structures on the Nicobars.

Another notable contribution to Nicobar related discussions was the paper read by George van Driem on behalf of Roger Blench (who did not attend). Blench suggests that the overwhelming majority of recorded Shompen words lack Austroasiatic etymology, and thus the language may be considered an isolate. In a facinating exchange from the floor, Diffloth asserted that about half the Shompen lexicon is Austroasiatic but concealed by sound changes, while R. Elangaiyan (who has direct fieldwork experience of Shompen) asserted the independence of Shompen, arguing that the relevant informants had offered many non-Shompen forms for various reasons, distorting Diffloth's analysis of the published sources. Clearly there is much interesting work to be done on Nicobar languages, and this is exactly the sort of effort and robust discussion that the ICAAL should be stimulating.

The strong presence of Khasi speaking students and researchers from North Eastern Hills University (Shillong) certainly made their mark. Especially memorable among their presentations was the jointly read paper of Eddie War and Marchtime Kharryngki describing an extensive survey of Khasi dialects project recently cut short by the passing of the chief investigator. There followed a lengthy discussion from the floor about how many distinct dialects could be claimed for Khasi, with assertions varying wildly between just a handful and as many as 400. This particular discussion also highlighted an interesting more general feature of the conference - among the attendees were Sanskritists who lacked specific knowledge of Austroasiatic but were very assertive when participating in floor discussions. They seemed determined to make general linguistic points and Indo-Aryan typological comparisons at every opportunity, repeatedly and thoroughly reminding us all of the cultural and institutional priority of Indo-Aryan in the Indian academic context.

While a majority of delegates were Indian based academics and students, there were also international attendees from Cambodia, Japan, Thailand, Australia, The Netherlands and Great Britain. It was especially good to see the Japanese presence, evidence of a strong non-Eurocentric academic interest in Austroasiatic languages. This included Toshiki Osada speaking about expressives in Mundari, and a three co-author paper reporting on a corpus based investigation of Santali.

More than a dozen papers on Munda languages were read, some by researchers who are also native speakers, including the inaugural address to the meeting by Ram Dayal Munda (former VC of Ranchi University) discussing

the state of Munda languages. Characteristic of the Munda related presentations was a focus on language planning and a strong emphasis on the political and economic aspirations of various Munda communities. This was a refreshing change compared to Mainland Southeast Asia, where normal cultural considerations demand that we avoid offending the dominant ethnos, and dare not suggest that cruel oppression of minorities continues. By contrast the Indian academic environment appears to handle openly politicized discussion without suffering debilitating loss of face.

There was also several talks of a specifically programmatic nature. K. S. Nagaraja presented a broad review of Austroasiatic languages and linguistics, including comparison of various language classifications offered by different authors. This writter (Sidwell) presented an historiography of Mon-Khmer comparative linguistics studies, and Doug Cooper, a computer scientist, discussed mechanisms for data sharing.

The plenary talk, "Considerations on the Homeland of AA", was delivered by Gerard Diffloth on the morning of the first day. Introduced as arguably the first paper to ever discuss the question of localizing the proto-Austroasiatic homeland, Diffloth suggested that the proto-lexicon has characteristics suggesting a tropical location, perhaps around the Bay of Bengal. In particular words 'peacock' and two specific species of deer and lizard were discussed, in addition to mentioning that no names for cold climate or high-altitude species of plants are apparently reconstructable.

Credit for reviving the ICAAL belongs to the International Committee (Gerard Diffloth, Udaya Narayan Singh, George van Driem, Nick Enfield, Keralapura Shreenivasaiah Nagaraja, Nicole Kruspe, Therapan Luangthongkum) who coordinated several closed preparatory meetings in the lead up to the ICAAL3. These meetings were clearly important, since it has been so long since a dedicated Austroasiatic linguistics conference was held, and the relatively few scholars in the field have not formed a strongly coherent group (arguably to the detriment of the field). With the success of the Pune meeting it is clear that the judgment of the International Committee, especially Gerard Diffloth and George van Driem who initiated the revival, was correct. The strength of support shown at Pune for continuing the meetings was very gratifying, and by consensus agreement was reached to hold the ICAAL4 meeting in 2009 in Thailand. The meeting will be jointly hosted by the Centre for Research in Computational Linguistics and the Department of Linguistics, Mahidol University at Salaya.

Speaking as one of the organisers of the next meeting, every effort will be made to make sure that it will be more than just a SEAsian linguistics meeting to which the ICAAL brand is appended. A real problem is the fact that the branches of the Austroasiatic family (and thus various scholars themselves) are divided between South and Southeast Asia, a far-from-trivial fact that outsiders can find difficult to appreciate. In this context it is important to note, as did Gerard Diffloth in his opening remarks, that the ICAAL3 meeting shares

important continuities with the ICAAL2 - being held in India and being co-sponsored by the CIIL Mysore. But if the ICAAL is to survive and achieve something more meaningful than what is done by existing conferences and journals, the continuities must be developed. The conference must purposefully bring the South and Southeast Asian linguists together, to encourage the exchange of ideas and data, and facilitate the personal contacts that are more important then ever in this age when email and internet have cheapened (in every sense) communications.

Received: 17 December 2007   Department of Linguistics
                                          Research School of Pacific & Asian Studies
                                          Australian National University, 0200, ACT,
                                                                          AUSTRALIA
                                                        <paulsidwell@yahoo.com>

****

The 2ⁿᵈ SSEASR Conference, 24-27 May 2007, ILCRD, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom, Thailand

Reported by Amarjiva LOCHAN
Delhi University, India

The 2ⁿᵈ International conference of the SSEASR (South and Southeast Asian Association for the study of Culture and Religion) was hosted by the ILCRD, Mahidol University May 24-27, 2007 at the Salaya Campus. This conference was part of the international academic body of the IAHR under the CIPSH, UNESCO. The SSEASR Conference organized every other year was one of the largest academic exercises undertaken by us at Mahidol University. This was co-hosted by **Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Mahamakut Buddhist University** and **Mahachulalongkornrajavidyalaya University.** The Conference was organized to mark the 225ᵗʰ Anniversary of the Foundation of the Chakri Dynasty and Ratanakosin Bangkok City, Diamond Jubilee of the Accession to the Throne of His Majesty Bhumibol Adulyadej, King of Thailand and the completion of the 60ᵗʰ Anniversary of the UNESCO. Since this was the 2550ᵗʰ Anniversary of Buddhism, we particularly invited scholars and papers dealing with Buddhism.

We were honoured as **Her Royal Highness Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn** of Thailand graciously accepted our humble request to preside over the 2ⁿᵈ SSEASR Conference and came for the inauguration. In her inaugural speech, Her Royal Highness emphasized on the needs of the dialogue between various cultures and civilizations in general, and South and Southeast Asia in particular. Tracing the cultural ties between the two since time immemorial, she lauded the SSEASR's efforts to create an academic bridge between the regions, and complimented the Institute of Language and Culture for Rural Development, Mahidol University for organizing this event.

There was a keynote address by **Prof. Anthony Reid**, Director, Asia Research Institute, **National University of Singapore**. Professor Anthony Reid's remarkable speech highlighted the dynamics and the dialectics of the process of syncretism in the Asian context through the several centuries wherewithal the warp and woof of adoption and adaptation have woven an abiding pattern of a fabric called **religious pluralism**. While emphasizing the lines of **co-existence** and "**mutual acceptability**", Prof. Reid found it reachable as cutting across different social, cultural, linguistic and religious specialties, this region ushers in the mosaic what we call a "**composite culture.**"

Afterward, we were blessed by HRH inaugurating the Special Exhibition on Ethnicity of the region. After the coffee break hour there was a special symposium on **Kingship and Religion** organized to celebrate the Diamond Jubilee anniversary of **His Majesty the King Bhumibol Adulyadej's auspicious Accession to the Throne**. It was presided over by **Assist. Prof. Dr. Prapod Assavavirulhakarn**, Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok. Five speakers from different countries (India, Bhutan, Nepal, Thailand and Germany) spoke on the institution of kingship. As His Majesty is well known for equal treatment of his subjects of various faiths and religions, the presenters highlighted the sense of togetherness and syncretism in their individual talks.

A feature of the SSEASR Conference at Mahidol was the daily plenary session which featured world figures and well-known academic authorities on various subjects around the main theme of the Conference, "**Syncretism in South and Southeast Asia: Adoption and Adaptation**". It included **Prof. Yoneo Ishii (Japan)** a world reknowned authority on the subject, who spoke on **Syncretic nature of Thai Buddhism. Bhikkhuni Dhammananda (Thailand)** gave a very thought provoking lecture on **Women's Role in preserving Religion and Culture**. It drew a lot of attention from participants. **Prof Rosalind Hackett (USA)** gave a unique but highly relevant talk on **Proselytization Revisited: Rights Talk, Free Markets, and Culture Wars** and **Prof. Richard Gombrich (Oxford, UK)** enthralled the audience with a lecture on **Syncretism or accretion? Theravada in practice.**

The entire conference and its engaging papers were subdivided into various sections run simultaneously in six conference halls. They offered convenience and choice to the listeners on a common theme. The titles of some of the panels enjoyed and attended by scholars and Thais are as follows:

Syncretic Systems in South and Southeast Asia
Women and Religion
Religion and Music
Religion: Violence and Dialogue
Tradition vis-à-vis Globalisation
Sanskrit and its Heritage in Southeast Asia
Communication, Media and Religion