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It seems to be generally accepted that the populations inhabiting south China in the Shang and early Zhou periods and before were not closely related to those of north China, and that they spoke languages which were not related to Chinese. What sorts of languages might these have been? K. C. Chang (1987) argues that the original home of the Austronesian languages was here. His argument is based on archaeological affiliations between the Chinese mainland and Taiwan in prehistoric times; William Meacham (1988: 95–99) questions the archaeological evidence, but in any case the assertion that the prehistoric peoples of Taiwan were the direct linguistic ancestors of the Austronesian-speaking peoples of modern Taiwan is not really testable.¹ Pulleyblank (1983) notes that there is no hard evidence for Austronesian languages on the Chinese mainland in prehistoric times, but that the written sources contain a few glosses which suggest that Austroasiatic languages were spoken here. In this article I shall discuss another written source which may afford some help in this question.

Of the many non-Chinese peoples who inhabited south China in the Shang and Zhou periods we have significant written sources only for the ancient states of Wu 吳 and Yue 越, which covered the region of southern Jiangsu, northern Zhejiang, and eastern Anhui. Their capitals are believed to have been near Suzhou and Kuaiji, respectively. A distinctive archaeological culture in this area is sometimes referred to as the Wu Culture (Ji Zhongqing 1982; Li Boqian 1982; cf. Zhong Min 1982: 50); a definite connection between this culture and the state of Wu seems to have been established in 1986 with the excavation of what is believed to be the tomb of King Yu-mo 鬼冒 of Wu (trad. r. 530–527 B.C.).²

The earliest mention of either of these states is in the Chunqiu 春秋. Both are mentioned often in the Guo yu 國語 and the Zuo zhuan 左傳,³ and there are also several early bronze inscriptions which contain relevant narratives (see e.g. Yu Xingwu 1979). The Shi ji 史記 devotes several chapters to Wu and Yue,⁴ and from the Eastern Han period we have two books, the Wu Yue chunqiu 吳越春秋 and the Yue jue shu 越絕書, which appear to be severely edited collections of folklore from the region.⁵

Taibo of Wu 吳太伯, and Taibo’s younger brother Zhongyong 仲雍, were sons of the Great King of Zhou 周文王 [the grandfather of King Wen of Zhou 周文王] and the older brothers of Jili the King 王季.

Jili was wise, and had a sage son, Chang 昌. The great King wished to enthrone Jili, followed by Chang. At this time the two men, Taibo and Zhongyong, fled to the Jing barbarians 靜; they tattooed their bodies and cut their hair [in the fashion of the barbarians], showing that they were unsuitable [for the throne], in order to give place to Jili. Jili was in the event enthroned; he became Ji the King 季 of Zhou, and Chang became King Wen 文王.

After fleeing to the Jing barbarians Taibo called himself Gou-Wu 句吳. The barbarians found him to be just; over a thousand families came to him and enthroned him as Taibo of Wu 吳太伯.

When Taibo died he had no sons, and his younger brother Zhongyong was enthroned; this was Zhong of Wu 吳仲雍.

When Zhongyong died, his son Jiijian 季簡 was enthroned.
When Jiijian died, his son Shuda 歇達 was enthroned.
When Shuda died, his son Zhouzhang 周章 was enthroned.

At this time [trad. 1122 B.C.] King Wu of Zhou 周武王 defeated Yin 殷; he sought out the descendants of Taibo and Zhongyong, and found Zhouzhang. Since Zhouzhang already ruled Wu, he was enfeoffed with this state. Zhouzhang’s younger brother Yuzhong 玉仲 was enfeoffed at the ancient ruin of Xia 夏墟, north of Zhou; thus it was that Zhong of Yu 玉仲 ranked among the lords.

When Zhouzhang died, his son Xionsui 熊遂 was enthroned.
When Xionsui died, his son Kexiang 柯相 was enthroned.
When Kexiang died, his son Qiangjiuyi 張姬夷 was enthroned.
When Qiangjiuyi died, his son Yuqiaoyiwu 餘搖疑吾 was enthroned.
When Yuqiaoyiwu died, his son Kelu 犭盧 was enthroned.
When Kelu died, his son Zhouyao 周鄂 was enthroned.
When Zhouyao died, his son Quyu 闕羽 was enthroned.
When Quyu died, his son Yiwu 瓕吴 was enthroned.
When Yiwu died, his son Qinchu 瓕處 was enthroned.
When Qinchu died, his son Zhuan 詰 was enthroned.
When Zhuan died, his son Pogao 頑高 was enthroned.
When Pogao died, his son Goubei 句卑 was enthroned.

At this time [655 B.C.] Duke Xian of Jin 頃獻公 destroyed the Duke of Yu 玉公 north of Zhou by pretending that Jin was attacking Guo 郭.

When Goubei died, his son Quyi 句齊 was enthroned.
When Quyi died, his son Shoumeng 助夢 was enthroned.

At the time that Shoumeng was enthroned, Wu began to increase in power, and to use the title ‘king’.

From the time that Taibo created Wu 吳 there were five generations until King Wu 武王 defeated Yin. He enfeoffed his [Taibo’s] descendants as two hereditary houses: one was at Yu 瓕 of the Central States 中國, and one was at Wu 吳 of the Yi barbarians 雍. After twelve generations Jin destroyed Yu of the Central States. Two generations after the destruction of Yu of the Central States, Wu of the Yi barbarians rose to prominence. From Taibo to Shoumeng were altogether nineteen generations.
The text

The text with which we are concerned here is the genealogy given in the Shi ji for the early rulers of Wu, which is translated in the box on the facing page. This passage is one of about thirty genealogies given in the Shi ji for the “hereditary houses” of various states of ancient China. Each genealogy begins with an ancestor with some relation to the hereditary house of Zhou and includes a later enfeoffment by Zhou, usually around the time of the Zhou conquest of Shang.

It seems to be a plausible hypothesis that the original source for all these genealogies was a document prepared at the Zhou court (perhaps in the sixth or fifth century B.C.?) with the purpose of legitimizing Zhou rule and giving each of the local de facto rulers a place in the family of the Empire. Names taken from local traditions (which may or may not have been organized as genealogies) were placed in a genealogical framework in such a way as to relate the current rulers to the Zhou house. A study of these genealogies, and a hypothetical reconstruction of the original document which was the Shi ji’s source, would undoubtedly contribute to an understanding of Zhou politics and court attempts at an ideological unification of an enormous and essentially ungovernable empire. Here we must concentrate on the genealogy of Wu.

The first ruler of Wu, Taibo, is mentioned by Confucius as a paragon who three times renounced the throne (Lun yu, book 8, SBCK 4: 11a; tr. Waley 1938: 132). He does not mention a connection with Wu, and the three renunciations cannot be explained on the basis of other pre-Han sources, though the commentator Zheng Xuan (A.D. 127–200) makes a valiant effort. It seems unlikely that Confucius drew here on the same tradition as the Shi ji; it may be that Taibo originally was a hero in northern tradition, and only later, in the hypothetical Zhou document suggested here, was used ad hoc as a bridge between the genealogies of Zhou and Wu.

The intrusive treatment in the genealogy of the minor northern state of Yu is apparently an explanation of the characters Wu and Yu. The most obvious explanation for the oddly redundant phrases “Yu of the Central States” and “Wu of the Yi barbarians” is that Yu and Wu were written with the same character in the original source – though not necessarily with either of these two characters. That there might have been some sort of connection between the northern state of Yu and the southern state of Wu is not inconceivable, but there seems to be good reason to believe that the statement of this relationship is probably a fiction created to explain
an orthographical coincidence. There is no reason to take it seriously.7

The name Gou-Wu

It is likely that the name which Taibo is said to have adopted, Gou-Wu 叔吳, is a transcription of a non-Chinese name, and that the use in the ancient historical texts of the single character Wu 吳 as the name of the state represents an assimilation of the name to normal Chinese usage, in which nearly all states had single-character names. A variety of other transcriptions of the same name can be found in ancient texts and bronze inscriptions. The following list, which undoubtedly is incomplete, gives the reconstructed Archaic reconstructions of those which I have noticed.

ku ngo 叔吳 (GSR 108a, 59a).8
ku ngo 叔艑 (GSR 108a, 58q)9
kung ngo 工吳 工吾 (GSR 1172e, 59a, 58f).10
kung ngo 工艑 工齧 (GSR 1172a, 79d, 79m).11
kung ngo (or kông ngo) 攻吳 攻吾 (GSR 1172e, 59a, 58f).12
kung ngo (or kông ngo) 攻艑 攻齧 (GSR 1172e, 58q)13
kūng ngo 江吾 (GSR 1172v, 79d)14

These versions of the name are all phonetically very similar, and obviously go back to a name pronounced something like *kuijo.

It is interesting that the state of Yue is referred to in many ancient texts15 as Gan-Yue 干越, which is Archaic kâŋ-giwât (GSR 139a, 303e). Meng Wentong (1983: 17–19) cites several early sources which indicate that the language of Yue was similar to that of Wu, and it may be that this expression is a transcription of some word cognate to *kuijo in another Wu–Yue dialect.

Two other names which could be variants of Gou-Wu and Gan-Yue may also be mentioned in passing. The Hou Han shu (1965, 24: 839–840; cf. Qiu Zhonglun 1982) mentions an ethnic group in south China called Luo-Yue 蠻越, which is Archaic glâk giwât (GSR 766s, 303e). The Guo yu (SBCK 16: 4a; cf. 1978: 511) mentions an ethnic group called Kui-Yue 麓越, which is Archaic g’iwer (or g’iwed) giwât, (GSR 1237s, 303e; Karlgren 1954: 298, 302).
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Table 1 Reconstructed Archaic Chinese pronunciations of the names of the first twenty rulers of Wu. Nos. 1, 2, and 6 may not be in the Wu language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name in Archaic Chinese</th>
<th>Name in Wu</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>t’a’d pâk</td>
<td>太伯</td>
<td>GSR 317d, 782f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d’iông · jung</td>
<td>仲雍</td>
<td>GSR 1007f, 1184h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>kiweâ kân</td>
<td>桑闕</td>
<td>GSR 538a, 191d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>sjök d’ât or sjök t’ât</td>
<td>叔達</td>
<td>GSR 1031b, 271b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ūg şiang</td>
<td>謝章</td>
<td>GSR 1083a, 723a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>ngiwo d’iông</td>
<td>嘉仲</td>
<td>GSR 59h, 1007f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>giüm dañwâd</td>
<td>熊遂</td>
<td>GSR 674a, 526d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>kâ siâng</td>
<td>柯相</td>
<td>GSR 1d, 731a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>g’iông kio̍g dijer or kjîng kio̍g dijer</td>
<td>餘唷夷</td>
<td>GSR 710e, 992n, 551a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>dio</td>
<td>g’io̍g</td>
<td>ngieq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>kâ lo</td>
<td>柯廌</td>
<td>GSR 1d, 69d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>hio̍g dijer or hio̍g d’iông</td>
<td>威廌</td>
<td>GSR 1083a, 1144n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>k’iôwâ giwo</td>
<td>屈羽</td>
<td>GSR 496k, 98a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>dijer ngo or dijer ngaio</td>
<td>夷昊</td>
<td>GSR 551a, 58f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>g’iâm t’êjo</td>
<td>齊侯</td>
<td>GSR 651j, 85a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>tiwan</td>
<td>轉</td>
<td>GSR 231e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>p’inâ kog</td>
<td>前高</td>
<td>GSR 25p, 1129a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>ku piêg or kiu piêg</td>
<td>句卑</td>
<td>GSR 108a, 874a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>k’iab dz’iër or k’iab tsjär</td>
<td>去齊</td>
<td>GSR 642a, 593a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>d’o̍g mûng or d’o̍g mung</td>
<td>罡蒙</td>
<td>GSR 1090g, 902a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names of the rulers

The persons named in the genealogy are likely to have been heroes in the folklore of the people of Wu. From the bare genealogy given here there is no hope of reconstructing this mythology; we cannot even assume that the persons named were originally ascribed any genealogical relationship. It seems reasonable to expect, however, that the names as given here were transcribed on one occasion, and represent a transcription from one Wu idiolect to one Archaic Chinese idiolect. If this is indeed the case, these names should constitute a homogeneous sample of the language of Wu. We see them through a transcription, darkly; but they seem to give us a chance to say something about the phonology of the Wu language.
The Archaic Chinese pronunciations of the names, reconstructed after Karlgren (1954; 1957), are listed in Table 1. Table 2 lists all of the initials and finals of Karlgren’s reconstruction and shows how the initials of the Wu names are distributed over these.

In considering these tables a problem to be borne in mind is that the method used by Bernhard Karlgren in the reconstruction of Archaic Chinese, and the comparative material which was available when he was working, do not permit a complete reconstruction of Archaic Chinese phonology. In particular it is to be expected that many initial consonant clusters show up in the reconstruction as single consonants, and that there may have been more final consonants than are indicated here.

With such a small sample of the Wu language, and considering the presumable difficulties of a Chinese scribe transcribing non-Chinese sounds, we should expect to have difficulty finding usable phonological regularities. It is something of a surprise, therefore, to find that a very clear pattern emerges.

The first two names in Table 1 are probably not true Wu names. Neither person is, in the story, originally from Wu. Taibo 太伯 means “great earl” (or “lord”, “ruler”, etc.), and the prefix tai 太 is common in the names of founders of hereditary houses. The zhong in Zhongyang 仲雍 means “second brother”, and this fits with his story. No. 6 is also suspect: Yuzhong 壽仲 could mean “the second brother, [who went to] Yu”, which again would fit the story. The passage about Yuzhong seems to be a rather strained attempt to give a relationship between Wu and Yu; most likely there was no such relationship, and Yuzhong was a figure in Yu’s traditions rather than Wu’s. When we finally notice in Table 2 that these three names fit rather poorly in the emerging pattern, it seems reasonable to remove them from the sample. We then have a list of 17 Wu names which are likely to derive from a single source.

In this sample we find the following initial consonants:

\[
\begin{align*}
&k, \ k' \quad g, \ g' \\
&t \quad d \\
&t' \quad g \quad d \\
\end{align*}
\]

There are no initial vowels. The final consonants found are:

\[
\begin{align*}
&-g, \ -ng \\
&-t, \ -d \quad -n \quad -r
\end{align*}
\]

The only final vowel is -o, which occurs more often than any other final.
Table 2 Statistics of initials and finals in the reconstructed Archaic Chinese names of the first twenty rulers of Wu.

Initial in first character:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voiceless</th>
<th>Voiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gutturals</td>
<td>k-4</td>
<td>g-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laryngals</td>
<td>k'-2</td>
<td>g'-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentals</td>
<td>s-0</td>
<td>n-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supradentals</td>
<td>s-0</td>
<td>n-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatals</td>
<td>t-1</td>
<td>t-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labials</td>
<td>t'-0</td>
<td>t'-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Final in last character:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Voiceless</th>
<th>Voiced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gutturals</td>
<td>-k 1*</td>
<td>-g 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentals</td>
<td>-t 1</td>
<td>-d 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labials</td>
<td>-p 0</td>
<td>-m 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vowels: -o 5 -a 0 -u 0 -a 0

* There is reason to doubt that nos. 1, 2, and 6 in Table 1 are true Wu names. Eliminating these would give ng- 0, t'-0, d'-0, -k 0, -ng 3.

The initials and finals of the Wu names thus fall into a very simple and symmetric pattern. What happens inside the names appears to be rather more complex. This could be due to sandhi phenomena (in Archaic Chinese, or the Wu language, or both), or to the general difficulties of transcription.

The hypothetical name *kugo, discussed above, fits nicely into the pattern seen here. It would be easy to cull from various sources a much larger sample of Wu and Yue personal names and place names; but this procedure could not be expected to give a sample which is as homogeneous as the one discussed here.

It is fairly certain that the Wu language was not related to Archaic Chinese, and it seems possible to make a case for a relationship
between this phonological system and that of proto-Austronesian as reconstructed by O. C. Dahl (1981: 152). I shall refrain from trying to make this case here, however, for in matters of phonology I am on thin ice. I will be interested to hear from you, Søren, what you think of all this. I wonder too whether some of the names in Table 1 may be found in the traditions of some modern non-Han people of south China or Southeast Asia.

Notes
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2 Renmin ribao 人民日报 (People’s daily), 1986.5.25: 3, quoting Wen hui bao 文汇报.
3 A thorough review of the written sources is given by Liang Baiquan (1980).
5 On these see especially Eichhorn 1969; Schüssler 1966; 1969.
6 Ch’i Ssu-ho (1940) also argues that the Wu genealogy in the Shi ji is fiction, but he suggests that it was written at the court of Wu rather than that of Zhou. This would make no difference for the use to which the text is put here.
7 The Han shu (1962, 28b: 1667) states that the place where Zhouzhang’s younger brother (here called Zhōngh 蜀中 rather than Zhòng 仲) was enfeoffed was first called Northern Wu 北吳, but later renamed Yu 庐. See also Ruan Yuan’s 阮元 discussion of this question, quoted by Chou Fakao (1975, 12: 6079), and Shang Zhou 1979: 159.
8 Shi ji 1962, 31: 1445, 1475; Huainan zi 淮南子, SBCK 10: 66; note also 鋐吾, Shan hai jing 山海經, SBCK 3: 38b; Yuan Ke 1980: 82.
The Language of the Ancient Chinese State of Wu


The expressions Gan-Yue 干越 and Yu-Yue 干越 (Arch. kän-giwäät, giwö giwät, GSR 139a, 97a, 303e) occur in the pre-Han texts Zhuang zi庄子, Xun zi荀子, and Mo zi墨子; in the Han texts Huainan zi淮南子, Shi ji史記, Yan tie lun鑄鐵論, Xin xu新序, and Han shu漢書; and in the somewhat later Wu du fu吴都賦. Since the two expressions are meaningless and graphically very similar they have given scribes and commentators great difficulties, and often the one is replaced by the other in different editions or in quotations. The two are clearly equivalent, regardless of which may be original.

The Chunqiu 春秋 refers to Yue three times as Yu-Yue 干越 (Arch. jo giwät, GSR 61e, 303e). In modern Chinese the characters 干 and 于 have the same pronunciation and meaning, but they were quite distinct in Archaic Chinese, and a confusion between them in a text so old, and so revered by later scholars, is quite unlikely. It seems likely that Yu-Yue干越 in the Chunqiu and Gan-Yue干越 in the other texts quoted here were transcriptions of two cognate non-Chinese words (possibly the same word). Presumably the use of 于 in this context in the Chunqiu led some scholars to substitute yu于 for gan干 in the expression Gan-Yue. In the last two millennia there has hardly been an educated man in China who was not familiar with the Chunqiu, and a substitution of gan干 for yu于 in this context is much less likely to have occurred. (For a different interpretation see Ma Liqian 1987.)

- Mo zi (SBCK 4: 7a) has simply Yue, but the same passage as quoted by the commentator Li Shan 李善 (A.D. ca. 630–689) in Wen xuan文選 (1977, 12: 10a, Jiang fu江賦) has Gan-Yue.  
- Huainan zi, SBCK 1: 7a; textual variants listed in Liu Wendian 1923, 1: 10b–11a; cf. Kraft 1957: 221.  
- According to Meng Wentong (1983: 45) the expression Gan-Yue occurs in the Xin xu of Liu Xiang 劉向 (77–6 B.C.), in one of the five chapters entitled Za shi雜事.  
- Chunqiu, Dinggong定公 5th & 14th years, Aigong哀公, 13th year; SBCK 27: 10a, 28: 12a, 29: 23a; Yang Bojun 1981: 1549, 1593, 1675; Couvreur 1914, 3: 519, 584, 685; Legge 1872: 759, 787, 831.
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