BASIC COLOUR TERMS FOR BLACK AND WHITE IN CHINESE: WITH DISCUSSIONS ON MODELS OF LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

Jingyi Gao
University of Tartu and Tallinn University

Abstract. The basic colour terms for black and white are studied in four archaic and two contemporary linguistic norms of the Chinese language. It is presented that studied Chinese linguistic norms use a common term for white and three different terms for black. It is suggested that the different basic colour terms for black might originate from different source languages. The study supports a panchronic language development instead of a diachronic one, and includes introductions to histories of the Chinese linguistic norms.

Keywords: basic colour term, model of language development, linguistic norm, philology, etymology, Chinese.

1. Introduction

The task of the present article is to study basic colour terms for black and white in panchronic Chinese, more precisely in archaic and contemporary linguistic norms of the Chinese language.

A linguistic norm is "the historically determined aggregate of linguistic means in common use in a given language; also, the rules governing the choice and use of such means – rules that have become generally accepted by a specific linguistic community during a specific historical period" (Itskovich 1968). A linguistic norm is comparable to a standard language in synchronic studies. In this article, most studied linguistic norms are literary norms of written languages. They can be simply understood as Chinese languages or dialects. I avoid judging whether they are languages or dialects.

It is conventionally known that the Chinese language has multiple terms for black. At present, the most common one is [6506]

黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$[1]. But in ancient texts, ^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$ is normally seen. In dialectal texts and some coined terms, ^{70CF}烏$^{(wū/ô)}$ is often seen. The relationships of these terms have not been studied in detail. Theoretically, there are three possibilities:

(a) They are actually terms for slightly different tones of black, such as dark black, light black etc. This is a synchronic view favoured by Chinese semantics.

(b) They are actually terms for black in different historical stages of the Chinese language. This is a diachronic view welcomed by "Comparative-Historical Linguistics". Its theatrical base goes back to the Tree Model of language development (Schleicher 1863).

(c) They are actually terms for black in different source languages of the Chinese language. This is a panchronic view contributed by the present study. Its theatrical base goes back to the Wave Model of language development (Schmidt 1872).

Unlike the complexity of black, the circumstance of white is simple. The Chinese language has a common term for white: ^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$. This is confirmed in the present study.

In general, the present study produces qualified linguistic results that meet the requirements of further research by both Western linguistics and Sino-linguistics (classical Chinese linguistics).

The present study focuses on black and white, because they are the most elementary colour terms according to the evolutionary theory of basic colour terms set by Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7). However, the present study does not attempt to discuss the general application of the evolutionary theory of basic colour terms.

---

1 In this article, I have elevated most Chinese data to an advanced academic level to make the data clearer to universal readers. A relevant Chinese term is regularly represented by its DOM number (Unicode sequence number of a primary glyph of a Chinese etymon, for specific references), primary glyph (for Chinese references), primary reading in Pinyin and primary reading in Sino-Vietnamese (for general references). Sino-Vietnamese is an incumbent Latin orthography that is clearer to non-Chinese readers. Moreover, it fits some southern tongues of the Chinese language.

2. Review of previous studies

Previously, the same theme has been partially dealt with by many scholars.

The American anthropologist Brent Berlin and the American linguist Paul Kay (1969: 84, 92) studied Mandarin and Cantonese in their initial studies on basic colour terms.

This study investigated basic colour terms in Mandarin and Cantonese using lexicological and experimental methods. The criteria of a basic colour term set by Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7) were: "(i) It **is monolexemic**; that is, its meaning is not predictable from the meaning of it parts. [...] (ii) **Its signification is not included in that of any color term**. [...] (iii) Its application **must not be restricted to a narrow class of objects**. [...] (iv) It **must be psychologically salient** for informants. [...]"

According to the results of their study, basic colour terms for black and white should be:

1) *hei* [academically, ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] for **black**, and *pai* [^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$] for **white**, in Mandarin.

2) *hɒk* [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] for **black**, and *pāk* [^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$] for **white**, in Cantonese.

Fourteen years later, another American scholar, who specialised in Chinese language and linguistics, William H. Baxter (1983), released an English article of a study on Chinese basic colour terms: "A look at the history of Chinese color terminology".

This study investigated basic colour terms in "Old Chinese"[2] using philological methods. The studied materials were «*Shi* [詩]» (0N: Throne Zhou [宗周]) and «*Shuowenjiezi* [說文解字]» (121). The applied criteria of a basic colour term were cited from the criteria of Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white should be:

---

2 "Old Chinese" is a term of "Comparative-Historical Linguistics". In fact, it is not a single lect but a blend of the Throne Zhou lect and some other old lects.

1) [7384]玄(xuán/huyền) for "**dark-cool, black/green/blue**" [**black**], and [767D]白(bái/bạch) for **white**, in "the earlier period[(1500~771BC)3] [of 'Old Chinese'], probably ending with the end of the Western Zhou dynasty or somewhat earlier" [the Throne Zhou literary norm[(1046~771BCE)]][4].

2) [6506]黑(hēi/hắc) for **black**, and [767D]白(bái/bạch) for **white**, in "the later period[(770BC~220AD)] [of 'Old Chinese'], perhaps ending with the Han dynasty" [the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm[(221BCE~589CE)]].

Nineteen years after the evolutionary theory of basic colour terms set by Berlin and Kay, a Chinese scholar, who specialised in foreign languages and linguistics, Yáo XiǎoPíng [姚小平] (1988), released the first Chinese review on the evolutionary theory of basic colour terms, including a study on Chinese basic colour terms.

This study investigated basic colour terms in Chinese using philological methods. The studied materials were "tens of conventional and classical literatures", without details. The applied criteria of a basic colour term were translated from the criteria of Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white should be:

1) [5E7D]幽(yōu/u) for **black**, and [767D]白(bái/bạch) for **white**, in "the Fine Shang [殷商] period" [the Fine Shang literary norm[(1300~1046BCE)]].

2) [7384]玄(xuán/huyền) and [6506]黑(hēi/hắc) for **black**, and [767D]白(bái/bạch) for **white**, in "the Zhou-Qin [周秦] period". [This period does not form a single lect. At least, lects of feudal warring states are different.]

3) [6506]黑(hēi/hắc) for **black**, and [767D]白(bái/bạch) for **white**, in all later periods [literary norms].

---

3 Quoted dates are of previous studies.
4 Terms in double quotation marks are from previous studies. These terms are indefinite and variable. If they correspond, my definite and stable terms are given in square brackets. My nomenclature is based on synchronic names of regimes. Detailed introductions of the linguistic norms are given in Section 3.

Eight years later, a Chinese scholar in England, who specialised in Chinese language and archaeology, Wāng Tāo [汪濤] (1996), released an English article of a study on Chinese colour terms, "Colour terms in Shang oracle bone inscriptions", including an approach to choosing the basic colour terms.

This study investigated colour terms in the oldest Chinese language using philological methods. The studied materials were the Shang oracle bone inscriptions. The criteria of a basic colour term were not clarified.

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white in "Late Shang Chinese" [the Fine Shang literary norm[(1300~1046BCE)]] should be: [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] for **black**, and [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**.

Three years later, another Chinese scholar, who specialised in Chinese language and Sino-semasiology, Xú ZhāoHuá [徐朝華] (1999), released a Chinese monograph of a study on "Old Chinese [上古漢語]" colour terms, including an approach to choosing the basic colour terms.

This study used semasiological and corpus-linguistic statistical methods. The studied materials were three conventional and eleven classical literatures: «*Shi* [詩]» (0N: Throne Zhou), «*Shu* [書]» (0N, Throne Zhou), «*Yi* [易]» (0N: Throne Zhou), «*Zuoshichunqiu* [左氏春秋]» (0N: ca. 451 BCE, Feudal Lu [魯]), «*Lunyu* [論語]» (0N: after 479 BCE, Feudal Lu), «*Mengzi* [孟子]» (0N: after 289 BCE, Feudal Lu), «*Mozi* [墨子]» (0N: ca. 400 BCE, lower class), «*Xunzi* [荀子]» (0N: ca. 238 BCE, Feudal Zhao [趙]), «*Zhuangzi* [莊子]» (0N: ca. 286 BCE, Feudal Song [宋]), «*Hanfeizi* [韓非子]» (0N: ca. 233BCE, Feudal Qin [秦]), «*Chuci* [楚辭]» (0N: ca. 278 BCE, Feudal Chu [楚]), «*Liji* [禮記]» (0N: after 479 BCE, Feudal Lu), «*Taishigongshu* [太史公書]» (0N: by Sīmǎ Qiāng [司馬遷][(?~86BCE)] of the Han [漢] Empire) and «*Lunheng* [論衡]» (0N: by Wáng Chōng [王充][(27~97)] of the Han Empire). The applied criteria of basic colour terms relied on statistics.

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white in "Old Chinese" should be: [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] and [7384]玄[(xuán/huyền)] for **black**, and [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**.

For the two basic colour terms for black, it was determined that the first term ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$ occurred 220 times (49.0%), and the second term ^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$ occurred 131 times (29.2%).

Nine years later, another Chinese scholar, who specialised in Chinese language and lexicology, Xiè HǎiJiāng [解海江] (2008), released two Chinese articles of a study on Chinese basic colour terms.

This study investigated basic colour terms in panchronic Chinese ("Old Chinese", modern Chinese and Chinese dialects) using philological methods and corpus-linguistic statistical methods. The studied materials for "Old Chinese" were not specified. The results for "Old Chinese" relied on previous studies. The studied materials for modern Chinese were modern literary works by over 600 writers. The studied materials for Chinese dialects were parts of a dictionary series (2002). The applied criteria of basic colour terms were translated from the criteria of Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white in both "Old Chinese" and modern Chinese should be: ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$ for **black**, and ^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$ for **white**.

This study observed 32 dialects [of 14 tongues of the Chinese language] in the dictionary series of Chinese dialects (2002). The relevant findings were: In many dialects [of the Min tongue], for the colour category **black**, the term ^{70CF}烏$^{(wū/ô)}$ is used instead of the term ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$. In some dialects [of the surrounding areas], both terms are used.

Three years later, another Chinese scholar, who specialised in English language and linguistics, Wú JiànShè [吳建設] (2011), released an English article of a study on Chinese basic colour terms: "The evolution of basic color terms in Chinese".

This study investigated basic colour terms in Chinese using philological and corpus-linguistic statistical methods. The studied materials were contemporary dictionaries of Chinese oracle bone inscriptions and bronze inscriptions, the oldest conventional and classical texts [its corpus is similar to the previous study of Xú (1999)] and the 25 historiographies of China

(0N: dated from 93 BCE to 1929 CE). The applied criteria of basic colour terms were cited from the theory of Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).

According to the results of this study, the basic colour terms for black and white should be:

1) [5E7D]幽[(yōu/ɾu)] for **black**, and [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**, in "the Late Shang Dynasty[(1500~1121BC)]" [the Fine Shang literary norm[(1300~1046BCE)]].

2) [7384]玄[(xuán/huyền)] for **black**, and [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**, in "the Western Zhou Dynasty[(1121~771BC)]" [the Throne Zhou literary norm[(1046~771BCE)]].

3) [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] for **black**, and [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**, in all later periods [literary norms].

G<small>ENERAL COMMENT</small>:

The most serious defect of the previous studies is that most of them have not clearly distinguished relevant lects. Under the influence of "Comparative-Historical Linguistics" with the Tree Model, it has been wrongly believed that Chinese is a single language with a linear diachronic development, and that different lects have been blended.

There is a clear signal of such blends: multiple basic colour terms for the same colour can be found when different lects are blended. For example, there are often two terms for black. It is especially confusing that the Chinese lects are different but related, and therefore most colours are etymologically identical, and thus graphically identical in Chinese glyphs. This confusion prevents people from recognising the lects.

This resembles a case in which English and German are blended; there are just two terms for black, E.[Etymon]#1[(black/Blachfeld)] and E.#2[(swart/schwarz)]. Also, most other basic colour terms are etymologically identical in English and German: E.#3[(white/weiss)] for **white**, E.#4[(red/rot)] for **red**, E.#5[(yellow/gelb)] for **yellow**, E.#6[(green/grün)] for **green**, E.#7[(blue/blau)] for **blue**, E.#8[(brown/braun)] for **brown**, E.#9[(grey/grau)] for **grey**, and E.#10[(orange/orange)] for **orange**.

3. Materials and methods

3.1 Materials

A total of six linguistic norms of the Chinese language are studied. The five national norms are most representative of the Chinese language. The Min regional norm is chosen because the remarkable regional difference in the basic colour terms for black exists there, according to the previous study of Xiè (2008).

(1) Fine Shang literary norm[(1300BCE~1046BCE)]

The Fine Shang [殷商] literary norm refers to the linguistic norm of the Fine Shang Empire [also transliterated as "Yin-Shang", and commonly called "the Late Shang Dynasty"[5]]. "Fine [[6BB7]殷[(yīn/ân)]]" is an attribute and and the exonym of the empire. "Shang [[5546]商[(shāng/thương)]]" is an ethnonym with a concrete etymology that means "know from outside [从外知內也] (121: #1449)".

The Fine Shang Empire is the first, both historically and archaeologically, attested regime in China. It existed from ca. 1300 BCE to 1046 BCE, based in eastern central China (around present-day Anyang).

The Fine Shang Empire left its written language on oracle bones, which are commonly called oracle bone inscriptions. The oracle bone inscriptions were first discovered and deciphered by contemporary scholars in the 20th century.

In the present study, a *ci*-book (polymorphemic dictionary with concrete etymological correlations) of the oracle bone inscriptions (Yáo 1989) has been accessed. It is a source of mate-

---

5 People who really understand both European and Chinese histories would not call the Chinese imperial regimes "dynasties". A dynasty is a sequence of rulers considered members of the same family. A regime can be ruled by different dynasties. A dynasty can rule different regimes. Rulers of a Chinese imperial regime did not always belong to the same family. The Chinese "dynasties" may have been different regimes with different nations and religions. However, most Chinese regimes struggled to gain unique Chinese sovereignty.

rials. The etymological correlations have been generally agreed to and followed. The interpretations have been considered but not followed.

(2) Throne Zhou literary norm[(1046BCE~771BCE[~256BCE])]

The Throne Zhou [宗周] literary norm refers to the linguistic norm of the Throne Zhou Empire [also commonly called "the Western Zhou Dynasty"]. "Throne [5B97宗[(zōng/tông)]]" is an attribute. "Zhou [5468周[(zhōu/châu)]]" is an ethnonym with a concrete etymology that means "meticulous [密也] (121: #876)".

The Zhou State was originally a feudal state granted by the Shang Empire. It was based in western central China (around present-day Xi'an). In 1046 BCE, allied forces of feudal states led by Zhou defeated the imperial troops of Shang. Zhou gained the imperial throne and sovereignty. The Throne Zhou Empire lasted about 275 years. It fell in 771 BCE, when the emperor and the crown prince were killed in rebellions. In 770 BCE, another Zhou price, supported by two feudal states, Jin [晉] and Zheng [鄭], restored the throne, but in another town in eastern central China (around present-day Luoyang). The restored throne was acknowledged by the feudal states but lost actual control of the country to the feudal states. There was no single linguistic norm in the country for about 550 years, until the unification accomplished by the Qin [秦] Empire. The later regime should be called the Cheng Zhou [成周] Empire [also commonly called "the Eastern Zhou Dynasty"]. The later period is commonly known as the era of feudal and warring states [春秋戰國].

The Throne Zhou Empire left its written language on bronze artefacts, which are commonly called Chinese bronze inscriptions. In addition to the bronze artefacts, books made of bamboo and wooden slips began to be produced in the Cheng Zhou Empire. The first books, entitled with single morphemes, are generally acknowledged as the oldest conventional books of the Throne Zhou Empire, and they were reissued in the Cheng Zhou Empire. Later books with longer titles are known as the classical literature of the feudal states.

In the present study, a concrete etymological correlation of the bronze inscriptions (Róng 1925 [1985]) has been accessed.

It is a source of materials. The etymological correlations have been generally agreed to and followed. The interpretations have been considered but not followed. The conventional texts «*Shi* [詩, 'poems']» and «*Yi* [易, 'logic']» which originated from the norm, have been accessed and used as the primary references for literary attestations.

The conventional text «*Shu* [書, 'writings']» has not been studied, because it is clear that many editions of this text were faked by people in later regimes and, it is difficult to select the original layers. Editions of this text were faked because it contains political histories and ideological issues.

(3) Qin-Han-Jin literary norm[(221BCE~589CE)]

The Qin-Han-Jin [秦漢晉] literary norm refers to the linguistic norm within the Chinese sovereignty from the unification of the Qin [秦] Empire until the fall of the Chen [陳] Empire.

The foundation of this linguistic norm goes back to the language of the Qin State. "Qin [[79E6]秦[(qín/tàn)]]" is an ethnonym with a concrete etymology that means "a sort of grain [禾名]" (121: #4429).

The Qin State was originally a feudal state granted by the Cheng Zhou Empire in 770 BCE. It was based in north-west China (around present-day Baoji). In 256 BCE, the Cheng Zhou Empire fell when the emperor surrendered to a military expedition of the Qin Kingdom and then died of depression. No new emperor was named. The Qin Kingdom also defeated the other major kingdoms, and finally gained sole control of the sovereignty in 221 BCE.

After the unification, the King of Qin declared himself the emperor of Qin. There were major linguistic changes. For example, the primary Chinese term for emperor was changed from 天子 'the son of heaven' to 皇帝 'king-deity'. The linguistic norms of the other feudal states were banned.

The Qin Empire fell in 207 BCE in rebellions led by revived feudal powers. Most of the books of Qin were burnt in revenge, and therefore details of the linguistic norm of the Qin Empire were lost. A classical book, «*Erya* [爾雅]» was likely a standard dictionary of the Qin Empire. Glosses used in this dic-

tionary form a lexicon that is similar to the standard lexicon of the Han Empire. Some studies on archaeological Qin books (e.g. Wèi 2003: 3–32) have also corroborated this coherence.

After a new war among the feudal powers, the Han [漢] feudal state gained sole control of the sovereignty in 202 BCE and declared the Han Empire. The Han regime was based in the same principal territory of Qin. Most likely, the linguistic norm remained identical.

The Han Empire lasted over 400 years. It was the most important regime in Chinese history. The term "Han" is still a valid endonym for the Han-Chinese nation. It was originally a hydronym [漾也] (121: #6971).

Books made of paper began to be produced in the Han Empire. Numerous books of this linguistic norm have survived to the present day. Among the books, the first *zì*-book (mono-morphemic dictionary with concrete etymological correlations), «*Shuowenjiezi* [說文解字]» (121), is the most important linguistic text. Its author was an imperial officer.

In 220 CE, the prime minister of Han achieved a peaceful take-over, gained the throne and renamed the country the Wei [魏] Empire. In the same way, in 266, the prime minister of Wei gained the throne and renamed the regime the Jin [晉] Empire. In 316, non-Han-Chinese troops captured the capital of the Jin Empire. In 317, the Jin Empire, with a huge population, evacu-ated to southern China.

The Jin Empire held Chinese sovereignty for about 155 years. In this era, Buddhism became the primary belief in Chi-na. This may be the reason why Buddhist neighbouring coun-tries acquired the term "Jin" as an exonym for China. It is now the widest used exonym for China. It is etymologically identi-cal to the Sanskrit "*Cīna*", the Persian "*Čin*", the Greek "*Kίνα*", the Latin "*Sinae*", the French "*Chine*", the English/German/ Spanish "*China*", etc. Because of this term, we can say that this linguistic norm is the real and original "Chinese". [Western lit-eratures often mistake the etymological source of this exonym for the ethnonym of Qin [秦]. In fact, the ancient Etymologically Read Form of Qin [秦] should be *dzien* (Guō 1986: 237), *zin

(ZhèngZhāng 2003: 445) or *ziem (mine). In China, the ethno-nym Qin [秦] was also used to denote the Roman Empire.]

In 420, a general of Jin achieved a peaceful take-over, gained the throne and renamed the country the Song [宋] Em-pire. In the same way, a general of Song gained the throne and renamed the regime the Qi [齊] Empire in 478; a general of Qi gained the throne and renamed the regime the Liang [梁] Em-pire in 502; a general of Liang gained the throne and renamed the regime the Chen [陳] Empire in 557.

Up to that point, Chinese sovereignty had shifted without linguistic changes, because there were only changes in the rul-ing houses; the ruling population remained the same.

In 589, the Chen Empire was defeated and annexed by the Sui [隋] Empire from northern China. This marked the end of the Qin-Han-Jin norm.

In the present study, the standard dictionaries (121, 543) of this literary norm have been accessed and analysed. In the case of uncertain denotations, some **common texts** of this liter-ary norm have been accessed and analysed.

Common texts must be non-linguistic and non-historio-graphical. Linguistic texts may consist of different lects. For ex-ample, the first dialectal dictionary, «...*fangyan* [輶軒使者絕代語釋別國方言]» (18), is a dictionary from dialectal tongues to a national tongue. Historiographical texts may consist of a large number of citations from different linguistic norms. In Chinese historiographies, there is no need to translate written data from different linguistic norms, as long as they are written in Chinese glyphs. For example, they are even valid for Japanese names and coined terms.

(4) Sui-Tang-Song literary norm(589~1276[1279])

The Sui-Tang-Song [隋唐宋] literary norm refers to the linguistic norm within the Chinese sovereignty from the unifi-cation of the Sui [隋] Empire until the fall of the Greater Song [宋] Empire. It is called "Middle Chinese" after the diachronic view with the Tree Model.

The foundation of this literary norm goes back to the lan-guage of the Second Wei [魏] Empire. "Wei [9B4F魏(wèi/nguy)]" is an

ethnonym from a lexeme [5DCD]巍(wēi/nguy) that means "high [高也]" (121: #5816).

The Second Wei Empire was originally the Dai [代] Kingdom (based in Inner Mongolia, under non-Han-Chinese rule) nominally granted by the Jin Empire. After the evacuation of the Jin Empire in 317, several local empires and *de facto* independent kingdoms came into existence in northern China. Many of them were ruled by non-Han-Chinese populations. In 398, the Dai Kingdom moved its capital to Pingcheng [平城] (present-day Datong), a Chinese town, and changed its name to the Wei Kingdom, which is more prestigious in Chinese. In 399, the [Second] Wei Empire [commonly called "the Northern Wei Dynasty"] was declared. In 439, it gained sole control in northern China. In 440, the emperor officially converted to Taoism. In 444, the emperor ordered a ban on Buddhism. In 493, the empire moved its capital to Luoyang [洛陽], the former capital of the Jin Empire, changed its national language to Chinese and banned its own language.

The new linguistic norm of the Second Wei Empire may have been based on a Chinese dialect in Pingcheng, where the ruling population first acquired the Chinese language.

In 557, the prime minister of Wei achieved a peaceful take-over, gained the throne and renamed the regime the [Second] Zhou [周] Empire. In 581, a general of Zhou gained the throne and renamed the regime the Sui Empire.

Because there was no change of the ruling population, the linguistic norm remained identical.

In 589, the Sui Empire defeated and annexed the Chen Empire in southern China, thus gaining *de jure* Chinese sovereignty. Its linguistic norm became the national norm.

Printing technology was developed in the Sui Empire. As a result, a large number of their texts have survived to the present day. Among the texts, standard dictionaries are numerous. A common outline and similar contents of standard dictionaries were used until the fall of the Greater Song Empire. This indicates that the same linguistic norm was maintained.

In 1276, the capital of the Greater Song Empire was seized by the Mongolian-ruled Great Yuan [大元] Empire. In 1279, the

last Song emperor died in the last battle against Yuan troops. The fall of the Greater Song Empire marked the end of the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm.

In the present study, the standard dictionaries (1008, 1043) of this literary norm have been accessed and analysed. In the case of uncertain denotations, some common texts of this literary norm have been accessed and analysed.

(5) Modern linguistic norm[(1923~)] (Yan regional tongue)

The modern linguistic norm refers to the linguistic norm of modern China. It is applied to both written and spoken forms. It is called "Modern Chinese" after the diachronic view with the Tree Model. It is commonly called "Standard Chinese" or "Mandarin". It is almost identical to the Beijing dialect of the Yan regional tongue of the Chinese language.

The foundation of this linguistic norm goes back to the language of the Yan [燕] State. "Yan [[71D5]燕[(yān/yên)]]" is an ethnonym with a concrete etymology that means "swallow [玄鳥]" (121: #7646).

The Yan State was originally a feudal state granted by the Throne Zhou Empire before 1000 BCE. It was based in northeast China (the area between present-day Beijing and Shenyang). It was the northernmost Chinese settlement. It became a kingdom in 323 BCE. The Yan Kingdom was defeated and annexed by the Qin Kingdom in 222 BCE.

In 202 BCE, the Yan Kingdom was again granted by the Han Empire. In 196 BCE, the kingdom was dissolved after the king was defeated in his conflicts with the emperor.

In 238 CE, a local lord was remotely granted as the King of Yan by the local Wu Empire in southern China, but in the same year the kingdom was conquered and dissolved by the Wei Empire.

In 337, a non-Han-Chinese dynasty named Murong [慕容], which had already controlled the region, declared the Yan Kingdom again. In 341, it was officially granted by the Jin Empire. In 352, it was upgraded to a local empire. In 370, it was defeated and annexed by another local empire ruled by another non-Han-Chinese nation. In 384, the local Yan Empire was restored by the same Murong dynasty. In 409, the throne of Yan was gained by

another dynasty named Feng [馮]. In 429, the local Yan Empire was defeated and annexed by the Second Wei Empire.

In 911, a local lord declared the Great Yan [大燕] Empire in the same region. In 912, it was defeated and annexed by the Second Liang Empire. This ended the last restoration of the Yan State.

The Yan tongue might have been the linguistic norm in all the local regimes, though linguistic evidence has not been studied.

The Yan tongue could have become the present-day national norm because the influential Great Qing [大清] Empire acquired it.

The Great Qing Empire was founded by Manchu and Han-Chinese people in the newly captured Chinese town of Mukden (Shenyang) in 1636. In 1644, the Great Qing Empire seized Beijing and established its new capital there. In 1662, the Great Qing Empire gained sole control of Chinese sovereignty when the last Ming emperor was captured and killed. The influential Great Qing Empire lasted 277 years.

The Yan tongue was the spoken language of Qing mandarin officials but not the literary norm. The literary norm of the Great Qing Empire was problematic: its phonetic foundation was the Beijing dialect of the Yan tongue of the Chinese language, but its lexical foundation was a mixture of all existing Chinese texts. The literary norm was not equal to any spoken language. Actually, such a manufactured literary norm had already been established by the Great Ming [大明] Empire[1368~1644[1662]], because it tried to restore the Chinese culture once damaged by the Mongolian-ruled Great Yuan [大元] Empire[1271~1368[1402]].

In 1912, the Republic of China was founded in Nanjing, but soon moved its capital to Beijing, after the abdication of the last Qing emperor. There were struggles over the establishment of a new national linguistic norm. Finally, in 1923, the modern linguistic norm was established with a lexical foundation of the common language in northern China ["Mandarin"] and a phonetic foundation of the Beijing dialect of the Yan tongue of the Chinese language [新國音]. It is almost identical to the spoken language in Beijing.

In 1928, the Republic of China moved its capital back to Nanjing without changing the linguistic norm. After the major campaigns of the Chinese Civil War, in 1949 the People's Republic of China was founded in Beijing.

The modern norm is now maintained in parallel in mainland China and in Taiwan. It is commonly called "the modern Han-Chinese tongue [現代漢語]" and "the common tongue [普通話]" in mainland China, but the "national tongue [國語]" in Taiwan.

In the present study, the standard dictionaries (1994 [1997], 1998) of this linguistic norm have been accessed and analysed. Contemporary attestations are provided.

(6) Min linguistic norm (Min regional tongue)

The Min [閩] linguistic norm refers to the linguistic norm of the Min tongue of the Chinese language in south-east China. It is applied to both written and spoken forms. It is commonly called "Min Chinese". "Min [⁹⁵ᴬ⁹閩^(mĭn/mân), *bân* in Minnan]" is an ethnonym with a concrete etymology that means "a sort of snake in south-east Yue-China [東南越蛇種]" (121: #8887).

In the area of the Min people, there was a non-Han-Chinese ruled Min-Yue [閩越] Kingdom, nominally granted by the Han Empire in 202 BCE. In 110 BCE, the King of Min-Yue declared himself the Emperor of Yue, claiming separate sovereignty. His regime was soon conquered by the imperial troops of Han. After that, Han-Chinese settlers in the area and the local Min-Yue people formed the Min people.

In 909 CE, a Min local officer was granted as the King of Min by the Second Liang Empire. The Min Kingdom existed until 945 CE. It left the first official texts in the Min tongue.

The present Min linguistic norm is conventionally set to its most developed dialect, the Xiamen (Amoy) dialect. There is an academic dictionary called "the dictionary of the Xiamen dialect [厦門方言詞典]" (1993). In Taiwan, the Min linguistic norm is officially set. It has a standard dictionary called "the dictionary of usual words of the Min tongue in Taiwan [臺灣閩南語常用詞辭典]" (1998 [2011]). The same language variety was called "the Taiwanese tongue [臺灣語]" when Taiwan was occupied by Japan from 1895 to 1945.

In the present study, the standard dictionaries (1993, 1998 [2011]) of this linguistic norm have been accessed and analysed. Contemporary attestations are provided.

3.2 Methods

Classical philological methods are used in collecting and analysing linguistic data. Dates and layers of texts are carefully handled. Notes and addenda in reissued texts are excluded.

Only basic colour terms are presented. Generally, non-basic colour terms are not presented unless there is a need to contradict opposite suggestions by previous studies.

My **criteria of a basic colour term** are listed below: [They are comparable but not identical to the criteria of Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).]

(i) It is **prevalently used as a certain colour**, not an item with a certain colour. Especially in ancient Chinese texts, there are monomorphemic terms for items with certain colours, e.g. [9A6A]驪[(lí/--)] 'dark black horse', [9A29]騩[(guī/--)] 'light black horse', [9A02]騂[(xīng/--)] 'red horse', [7DC7]緇[(zī/--)] 'black fabrics', and [7E39]縹[(piǎo/phiếu)] 'light grue fabrics'. These are not colour terms.

(ii) It is of **one zì** [6]; thus it is monomorphemic, further than monolexemic. [The criteria set by Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7) state: "It is monolexemic."] Especially in modern Chinese texts, there are polylexemic colour terms, e.g. 深黑 'dark black', 淺黑 'light black', and 橘色 'colour of orange'. These are not basic colour terms.

(iii) It is **not a secondary synonym** of another colour term. In practice, it is much more attested than its synonym. It is understood by native speakers without literary education. Secondary synonyms may often enter a language via literary education. For example, an illiterate Mandarin speaker only knows

---

6   A zì [字] is a linguistic unit in Sino-linguistics. It is roughly equal to an etymon and a morpheme. Chao (1946) released the first article on this parallelism.

the primary term [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)], but not the secondary term [7384]玄 [(xuán/huyền)] for black. The latter exists only in old literature.

(iv) It is **not a hyponym** of another colour term. [The criteria set by Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7) state: "Its significa-tion is not included in that of any color term."] Especially in ancient Chinese texts, there are many such hyponyms, e.g. [8D6E]䝓[(xiá/--)] 'very red' is a hyponym of [8D64]赤[(chì/xích)] 'red', and [9EC7]黇[(tiān/--)] 'whitened yellow' is a hyponym of [9EC3]黃[(huáng/hoàng)] 'yellow'. These are not basic colour terms.

(v) Its application is **not restricted to a narrow class of objects** having the colour. [This is identical to a criterion set by Berlin and Kay (1969: 6–7).] Especially in Chinese literature, some colour terms are restricted to coined terms, e.g. [7384]玄[(xuán/huyền)] for black in 玄武 '[holy] black tortoise', and [70CF]烏[(wū/ô)] for black in 烏龜 '[ordinary] black tortoise', and 烏雲 'black clouds'. These are not basic colour terms.

4. Results and discussion

(1) Fine Shang literary norm[(1300BCE~1046BCE)]

GRAPHIC ATTESTATIONS:

I have researched the relevant texts of the Fine Shang lit-erary norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #6506 [黑] is at-tested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

[7]★[6506]黑[(hắc/hēi)] for **black**, attested as ⚘ [(Period 1~3)].

☆[767D]白[(bạch/bái)] for **white**, attested as ⊖ [(Period 1~5)].

LITERARY ATTESTATIONS:

For a colour term, I present all its relative [non-independ-ent] occurrences that have been summarised in the reference (Yáo 1979, henceforth Y). My interpretations are not always identical to the reference.

---

7 In order to provide clearer formats in this section, a black star is used to lead a paragraph on a colour term for black; a white star is used to lead a paragraph on a colour term for white.

★The colour term for black [⁶⁵⁰⁶黑^(hēi/hắc)] is attested 13 times, and applied on four occasions: (1) 黑牛 *'black cattle' [x4], (2) 黑羊 *'black sheep' [x3], (3) 黑犬 *'black dog' [x2], and (4) 黑 *'black–human' [x4] [referring to a black (brown) Australoid or a black (dark) Mongoloid. Both existed.]. The original texts are listed in Appendix 1.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a black colour (e.g. humans, cattle, sheep and dogs); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆The colour term for white [^{767D}白^(bái/bạch)] is attested 94 times, and applied on 26 occasions: (1) 白人 *'white human' [x3] [referring to a white Caucasoid or a white (light) Mongoloid. Both existed.]; (2) 白羌 *'white Germa⁸' [x2]; (3) 白馬 *'white horse' [x5]; (4) 白羊 *'white sheep' [x4]; (5) 白犬 *'white dog' [x3]; (6) 白狐 *'white fox' [x3]; (7) 白鹿 *'white deer' [x2]; (8) 白木 *'white tree\wood' [x1]; (9) 白穧 *'white sheaf' [x3]; (10) 白彔 *'white carve–wood' [x1]; (11) 白糸 ? *'white fabrics' [x4]; (12) 白⊕ *'white ?' [x3]; (13) 白⊕ *'white ?' [x1]; (14) 白盛 *'white container' [x1]; (15) 白降⊡ *'white ?' [x2]; (16) 白林 *'white forest' [x1]; (17) 白刜 *'white knife' [x1]; (18) 白牛 *'white cattle' [x16]; (19) 白牝 *'white cow⁹' [x1]; (20) 白牡 *'white bull' [x3]; (21) 白豕 *'white pig' [x13]; (22) 白豖 *'white boar' [x8]; (23) 白毚 *'white wild–boar' [x5]; (24) 白豚 *'white young–pig' [x5]; (25) 白兕? *'white animal?' [x1]; and (26) 白龟 *'white turtle' [x2]. The original texts are listed in Appendix 2.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hypo-

---

8   ^{7FBC}羌^(qiāng/khương) "Germa" is an important ethnonym in Ancient China, a major enemy of Fine Shang, but an origin of Throne Zhou. It has been glossed as "people who domesticate sheep" (121: #2345). According to previous etymological studies (Gāo 2008), the ethnonym is connected to Germanic, and the language is compared to Germanic languages.

9   As in Germanic, different etyma were used for cattle with distinctions regarding gender and age. The modern linguistic norm of Chinese uses just one etymon for Tribe Bovini.

nym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white colour (e.g. humans, horses, sheep, dogs, foxes and pigs); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

GENERAL ANNULMENT regarding a notion ["^{5E7D}幽$^{(yōu/ʈu)}$ for black"] in the previous studies Yáo (1988) and Wu (2011). Additionally, Wang (1996) interpreted "^{5E7D}幽$^{(yōu/ʈu)}$ for dark red".

The term ^{5E7D}幽$^{(yōu/ʈu)}$ is attested with nine relative occurrences, but on just one occasion: as an attribution of 牛 'cattle'. Its limited usage brings its denotation and property into doubt. In addition, there is another term for black in the Fine Shang norm. Consequently, it cannot be a colour term. It could mean 'peaceful' as in modern Chinese.

SUMMARY: In the Fine Shang literary norm, the basic colour term for black is ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$; the basic colour term for white is ^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$. [This confirms the previous study of Wang (1996).]

LIMITATION: Archaeological texts that originated from the linguistic norm have not been directly accessed and analysed, but have been studied through contemporary collections and studies. Previous scholars have only identified etyma of colour terms in historical and contemporary lects. Theoretically, the Fine Shang norm could have other colour terms that were not inherited by the later lects. However, it is less possible that there could be some other basic terms for black and white than the current terms.

(2) Throne Zhou literary norm$^{(1046BCE\sim771BCE)}$

GRAPHIC ATTESTATIONS:

I have researched the relevant texts of the Throne Zhou literary norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #7384 [玄] is attested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

★^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$ for **black**, attested as 𝟠 (1925: #05934).

☆^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$ for **white**, attested as ⊖ (1925: #05278~ 82).

Literary attestations:

For a colour term, I present all its occurrences in the studied conventional texts. The interpretations are my own.

★The colour term for black [7384玄(xuán/huyền)] is attested nine times, and applied on seven occasions: (1) 'black[-yellow] horse' [x1]; (2) 'black–fabrics' [x1] [as a noun]; (3) 'black dress' [x2]; (4) 'black grass' [x1]; (5) 'black bird' [x2]; (6) 'The King Black' [x1]; and (7) 'black-yellow blood' [x1]:

(1.1)《詩•周南•卷耳》陟彼高岡　我馬玄黃
(2.1)《詩•豳風•七月》載玄載黃　我朱孔陽　為公子裳
(3.1)《詩•小雅•采菽》又何予之　玄袞及黼
(3.2)《詩•大雅•韓奕》玄袞赤舄　鉤膺鏤錫
(4.1)《詩•小雅•何草不黃》何草不玄　何人不矜
(5.1)《詩•商頌•玄鳥》
(5.2)《詩•商頌•玄鳥》天命玄鳥　降而生商
(6.1)《詩•商頌•長發》玄王桓撥　受小國是達
(7.1)《易•坤•上六》龍戰于野　其血玄黃

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a black colour (e.g. horses, dresses, grass and birds); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆The colour term for white [767D白(bái/bạch)] is attested 29 times, and applied on 16 occasions: (1) 'white reeds' [x4]; (2) 'white stone' [x3]; (3) 'white top' [x1]; (4) 'white dew' [x3]; (5) 'white flower' [x3]; (6) 'white flag' [x1]; (7) 'white 2-years-old–horse' [x5]; (8) 'white skirt' [x1]; (9) 'white cloud' [x1]; (10) 'white hoof' [x1]; (11) 'white bird' [x1]; (12) 'white felicitous–stone' [x1]; (13) 'whiten' [as a verb] [x1]; (14) 'white father–livestock' [x1]; (15) 'white horse' [x1]; and (16) 'white forge–ahead' [x1]:

(1.1)《詩•召南•野有死麕》野有死麕　白茅包之
(1.2)《詩•召南•野有死麕》白茅純束　有女如玉
(1.3)《詩•小雅•白華》白華菅兮　白茅束兮
(1.4)《易•賁•初六》藉用白茅　无咎
(2.1)《詩•唐風•揚之水》揚之水　白石鑿鑿
(2.2)《詩•唐風•揚之水》揚之水　白石皓皓

(2.3)《詩・唐風・揚之水》揚之水　白石粼粼
(3.1)《詩・秦風・車鄰》有車鄰鄰　有馬白顛
(4.1)《詩・秦風・蒹葭》蒹葭蒼蒼　白露為霜
(4.2)《詩・秦風・蒹葭》蒹葭淒淒　白露未晞
(4.3)《詩・秦風・蒹葭》蒹葭采采　白露未已
(5.1)《詩・小雅・白華之什》
(5.2)《詩・小雅・白華》
(5.3)《詩・小雅・白華》白華菅兮　白茅束兮
(6.1)《詩・小雅・六月》織文鳥章　白旆央央
(7.1)《詩・小雅・白駒》
(7.2)《詩・小雅・白駒》皎皎白駒　食我場苗
(7.3)《詩・小雅・白駒》皎皎白駒　食我場藿
(7.4)《詩・小雅・白駒》皎皎白駒　賁然來思
(7.5)《詩・小雅・白駒》皎皎白駒　在彼空谷
(8.1)《詩・小雅・裳裳者華》裳裳者華　或黃或白
(9.1)《詩・小雅・白華》英英白雲　露彼菅茅
(10.1)《詩・小雅・漸漸之石》有豕白蹢　烝涉波矣
(11.1)《詩・大雅・靈臺》麀鹿濯濯　白鳥翯翯
(12.1)《詩・大雅・抑》白圭之玷　尚可磨也
(13.1)《詩・周頌・有客》有客有客　亦白其馬
(14.1)《詩・魯頌・閟宮》白牡騂剛　犧尊將將
(15.1)《易・賁・六四》賁如皤如　白馬翰如　匪寇婚媾
(16.1)《易・賁・上九》白賁　无咎

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white colour (e.g. clouds, dew, horses, dresses and birds); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

GENERAL ANNULMENT regarding a notion ["^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hǎc)}$ for black"] in the previous studies of Yáo (1988), Xú (1999) and Xiè (2008).

The term ^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hǎc)}$ is actually not a basic colour term for black. [This somewhat agrees with the previous studies of Baxter (1983) and Wu (2011).] The term is attested only two times:

(1)《詩・邶風・北風》莫赤匪狐　莫黑匪烏 'crow [is not] black'

(2)《詩・小雅・大田》來方禋祀　以其騂黑 'a black red–horse'

It is applied to a few items with a black colour (e.g. crows and certain horses); therefore, its application is restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. It could be a secondary synonym of another term for the colour left by the previously dominant Fine Shang norm. [It was a basic colour term for black in the Fine Shang norm.] In conclusion, it is not a basic colour term for black.

SUMMARY: In the Throne Zhou literary norm, the basic colour term for black is ^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$; the basic colour term for white is ^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$. [This confirms the previous studies of Baxter (1983) and Wu (2011).]

LIMITATION: Conventional texts of this literary norm have been reprinted and reissued several times through the ages. Ancient publishers could not ensure that the reprints remained identical. In addition, there could have been artificial adjustments that partly changed the linguistic norm. These form a general limitation in philological studies. If this limitation is maximised, the whole historical philology becomes suspicious. However, I support historical philology.

(3) Qin-Han-Jin literary norm$^{(221BCE~589CE)}$

LEXICOGRAPHIC ATTESTATIONS:

I have researched the relevant standard dictionaries of the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #6506 [黑] is attested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

★^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$ for **black**, glossed as 火所熏之色也 'colour of soot' (121: #6506).

☆^{767D}白$^{(bái/bạch)}$ for **white**, glossed as 西方色也 'colour of the West' (121: #4905).

LITERARY ATTESTATIONS:

For a colour term, I present three examples of its literary uses in common texts of the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm.

★Three examples of literary uses of the colour term for black [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] are:

(1)《春秋繁露‧求雨》(0N: by Dǒng ZhòngShū [董仲舒]
[179~104BCE] of the Han Empire) 衣黑衣 'wear a black dress'.

(2)《論衡‧無形》(0N: by Wáng Chōng [王充][27~97] of the
Han Empire) 人少則髮黑 老則髮白 'hair [is] black'.

(3)《世說新語‧言語》(0N: by Liú YìQìng [劉義慶][403~444]
of the Song Empire) 卿瞳子白黑分明 'eyeball [is] black'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a
secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hypo-
nym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having
a black colour (e.g. dresses, hair seeds); therefore, its application
is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In
conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆Three examples of literary uses of the colour term for
white [767D白(bái/bạch)] are:

(1)《春秋繁露‧求雨》(0N: by Dǒng ZhòngShū [董仲舒]
[179~104BCE] of the Han Empire) 衣白衣 'wear a white dress'.

(2)《論衡‧無形》(0N: by Wáng Chōng [王充][27~97] of the
Han Empire) 人少則髮黑 老則髮白 'hair [is] white'.

(3)《世說新語‧言語》(0N: by Liú YìQìng [劉義慶][403~444]
of the Song Empire) 卿瞳子白黑分明 'eyeball [is] white'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a sec-
ondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of
another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white
colour (e.g. dresses, hair and flowers); therefore, its application is
not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In
conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

SUMMARY: In the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm, the basic col-
our term for black is 6506黑(hēi/hắc); the basic colour term for white
is 767D白(bái/bạch). [This confirms the previous studies of Yáo (1988)
and Wu (2011).]

LIMITATION: The limitation given for the Throne Zhou
literary norm also applies here. Additionally, the results rely
on original lexicographic works. Common texts of this literary
norm have not been extensively researched since the original
lexicographic works are trusted. Lexicographical scepticists
may question it. This forms a general limitation in philo-
logical studies. If this limitation is maximised, all historical

philology becomes suspicious. However, I support historical philology.

(4) Sui-Tang-Song literary norm[(589~1279)]

Lexicographic attestations:

I have researched the relevant standard dictionaries of the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #6506 [黑] is attested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

★ [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] for **black**, glossed as 北方色 'colour of the North' (1008: #24342).

☆[767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**, glossed as 西方色 'colour of the West' (1008: #23244).

Literary attestations:

For a colour term, I present three examples of its literary uses in common texts of the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm.

★Three examples of literary uses of the colour term for black [[6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)]] are:

(1)《秋浦歌‧十七首之七》(0N: by Lǐ Bái [李白][(701~762)] of the Tang Empire) 空吟白石爛 淚滿黑貂裘 'black marten'.

(2)《賣炭翁》(0N: by Bái JūYì [白居易][(772~846)] of the Tang Empire) 滿面塵灰煙火色 兩鬢蒼蒼十指黑 'ten fingers [are] black'.

(3)《水調歌頭‧相公倦臺鼎》(0N: by Xīn QìJí [辛棄疾][(1140~1207)] of the Song Empire) 占古語 方人也 正黑頭 'black top (hair)'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a black colour (e.g. martens, fingers and tops); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆Three examples of literary uses of the colour term for white [[767D]白[(bái/bạch)]] are:

(1)《暖酒》(0N: by Lǐ Bái [李白][(701~762)] of the Tang Empire) 撥卻白雲見青天 掇頭裡許便乘仙 'white clouds'.

(2)《夢仙》(0N: by Bái JūYì [白居易][(772~846)] of the Tang Empire) 坐乘一白鶴 前引雙紅旌 'white crane (a bird)'.

(3)《水調歌頭・日月如磨蟻》(0N: by Xīn QìJí [辛棄疾] [1140~1207] of the Song Empire) 黃雞白酒 君去村社一番秋 'white alcohol'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white colour (e.g. clouds, cranes and alcohol); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

In summary, in the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm, the basic colour term for black is [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)]; the basic colour term for white is [767D]白[(bái/bạch)]. [This confirms the previous studies of Yáo (1988) and Wu (2011).]

Limitation: Same as the limitation given for the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm.

(5) Modern linguistic norm[(1923~)] (Yan regional tongue)

Lᴇxɪᴄᴏɢʀᴀᴘʜɪᴄ ᴀᴛᴛᴇꜱᴛᴀᴛɪᴏɴꜱ:

I have researched the relevant standard dictionaries of the modern linguistic norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #6506 [黑] is attested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

★[6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] for **black**, glossed as 像墨和煤那樣的顏色 'colour of ink and coal' (1998).

☆[767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for **white**, glossed as 雪花或乳汁那樣的顏色 'colour of snow and milk' (1998).

Cᴏɴᴛᴇᴍᴘᴏʀᴀʀʏ ᴀᴛᴛᴇꜱᴛᴀᴛɪᴏɴꜱ:

For a colour term, I present three examples of its contemporary uses.

★Three examples of contemporary uses of the colour term for black [[6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)]] are:

(1) 黑羊 'black sheep'.

(2) 黑麥 'black rye'.

(3) 黑車 'black car [any wheeled vehicle]'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a

black colour (e.g. sheep, rye and cars); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆Three examples of contemporary uses of the colour term for white [767D白(bái/bạch)] are:

(1) 白羊 'white sheep'.

(2) 白米 'white rice'.

(3) 白車 'white car [any wheeled vehicle]'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white colour (e.g. sheep, rice and cars); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

SUMMARY: In the modern linguistic norm, the basic colour term for black is 6506黑(hēi/hắc); the basic colour term for white is 767D白(bái/bạch). [This confirms the previous studies of Yáo (1988), Xiè (2008) and Wu (2011).]

(6) Min linguistic norm (Min regional tongue)

LEXICOGRAPHIC ATTESTATIONS:

I have researched the relevant standard dictionaries of the Min linguistic norm. A term after the Chinese etymon #70CF [烏] is attested and understood as a colour term for black; a term after the Chinese etymon #767D [白] is attested and understood as a colour term for white.

★70CF烏(wū/ô) for **black**, glossed as 黑[色] 'black colour' (1993: 62).

☆767D白(bái/bạch) for **white**, glossed as 白色 'white colour' (1993: 370).

CONTEMPORARY ATTESTATIONS:

For a colour term, I present three examples of its contemporary uses.

★Three examples of contemporary uses of the colour term for black [70CF烏(wū/ô)] are:

(1) 烏羊 'black sheep'.

(2) 烏米 'black rice'.

(3) 烏車 'black car [any wheeled vehicle]'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a black colour (e.g. sheep, rice and cars); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for black.

☆Three examples of contemporary uses of the colour term for white [767D白(bái/bạch)] are:

(1) 白羊 'white sheep'.
(2) 白米 'white rice'.
(3) 白車 'white car [any wheeled vehicle]'.

It is a one-zì (monomorphemic) colour term. It is not a secondary synonym of another colour term. It is not a hyponym of another colour term. It is applied to many items having a white colour (e.g. sheep, rice and cars); therefore, its application is not restricted to a narrow class of objects having the colour. In conclusion, it is a basic colour term for white.

SUMMARY: In the Min linguistic norm, the basic colour term for black is 70CF烏(wū/ô); the basic colour term for white is 767D白(bái/bạch). [This confirms the previous study of Xiè (2008)].

(7) General remarks

The linguistic norms of the Chinese language are written in Chinese glyphs. Once they are academically written in Chinese glyphs, a Sino-linguistic procedure of etymological correlations is simultaneously done. Etymologically identical data are identically written. This advanced writing method has elevated the ordinary philological level of all Sino-literate Chinese [also Japanese, Korean and Vietnamese] people from lexemes to etyma (= zì [5B57字(zì/tự)]). For example, all Sino-literate Min speakers are able to tell other Chinese people that the etymon 6506黑(hēi/hắc) exists in their own language, but that it is not primarily used for the black colour. Nevertheless, on the same issue, literate English speakers without specialised knowledge of etymology are unable to tell other Germanic people that the etymon E.#2(swart/schwarz) exists in their own language, but that it is not primarily used for the black colour.

In summary, in Western texts, linguistic data with the same alphabets can be lexically identical; in Chinese texts, lin-

guistic data with the same Chinese glyphs are not necessarily lexically identical but should be etymologically identical (excluding applications of the Semantically Read Forms [訓讀/訓読み_(kunyomi)]).

　　To make the results more understandable in the Western way, I decode the Chinese etyma to the Etymologically Read Forms [音讀/音読み_(onyomi)] in Table 3.

Table 3. Etymologically Read Forms [ERF] of the etyma.

variety↓ etymon→	6506 黑(hēi/hǎc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)	7384 玄(xuán/huyền)	70CF 烏(wū/ô)
Standard Chinese	hēi	bái	xuán	wū
Beijing Yan	[xeɪ˥]^(A1)	[paɪ˥]^(A2)	[ɕˠan˥]^(A2)	[ʔu:˥]^(A1)
Min Chinese	hik	pik	hiân	oo
Xiamen Min	[hiɔ̌k˦]^(D1)	[piɔ̌k˥]^(D2)	[hian˥]^(A2)	[ʔɔ:˥]^(A1)

Note: ERF of the standard Chinese are given in Pinyin. ERF of the Min Chinese are given according to alphabetic lemmas in the standard dictionary in Taiwan. IPA data are mine.

　　However, the archaic linguistic norms cannot be easily decoded to ERF that make sense in the Western way, because their ERF data were omitted or given in Chinese texts of Sino-phonology. I will not pursue this issue further, because it is not required in the present non-phonological study.

5. Overview

Basic colour terms for black and white in studied linguistic norms of the Chinese language are summarised in Table 4.

Table 4. Basic colour terms for black and white in Chinese.

variety↓ colour→	black	white
Fine Shang	6506 黑(hēi/hắc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)
Throne Zhou	7384 玄(xuán/huyền)	767D 白(bái/bạch)
Qin-Han-Jin	6506 黑(hēi/hắc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)
Sui-Tang-Song	6506 黑(hēi/hắc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)
Modern	6506 黑(hēi/hắc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)
Min	70CF 烏(wū/ô)	767D 白(bái/bạch)

All the studied colour terms belong to four etyma. Semantic assignations of the etyma in the studied norms are demonstrated in Table 5.

Table 5. Semantic assignations of the etyma.

variety↓ etymon→	6506 黑(hēi/hắc)	767D 白(bái/bạch)	7384 玄(xuán/huyền)	70CF 烏(wū/ô)
Fine Shang	**black**	**white**	--	--
Throne Zhou	**black$_2$**	**white**	**black$_1$**	crow
Qin-Han-Jin	**black$_1$**	**white**	**black with red**	crow
Sui-Tang-Song	**black$_1$**	**white**	**black$_2$**	peaceful
Modern	**black$_1$**	**white**	abstruse	**black$_2$**
Min	**black$_2$**	**white**	abstruse	**black$_1$**

Note: Bold glosses are colours. Other glosses are abstract or concrete notions. "--" means not attested. "$_1$" means primary. "$_2$" means secondary.

The basic colour term for white is etymologically identical in all the studied linguistic norms [767D白(bái/bạch)]. Its ancient ERF is *beăk* (Guō 1986: 127), *braag* (ZhèngZhāng 2003: 268) or *bàga-L* (mine). Its further abstract etymological link has not been established in Tibeto-Burman languages, but it has been established in established in Germanic-Finnic-Baltic-Slavic languages (Gāo 2008: 87, 130) [cf. Danish *bleg* 'pale', Swedish *blek*

'pale', Icelandic *bleikur* 'pale', Old Norse *bleikr* 'pale', Old English *blāc* 'pale', English *black* 'black', Old Low German *blēk* 'pale', Dutch *bleek* 'pale', Old High German *bleh* 'pale', German *bleich* 'pale', Estonian *valge* 'white', Finnish *valkea* 'white', Cheremis *walɣ̂δ∂ˀl wolɣ̂δ∂ˀ* 'bright, clear', Latvian *bāls* 'pale'; *balts* 'white', Lithuanian *baltas* 'white', Old Church Slavic бѣлъ (*bělŭ*) 'white', Polish *biały* 'white', Russian белый (*bélyj*) 'white', Bulgarian бял (*bjal*) 'white', etc.].

The basic colour term for black is etymologically variable. There are three terms for black.

The first term for black [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] is first attested in texts of the Fine Shang Empire. The second term for black [^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$] is first attested in texts of the Throne Zhou Empire. The two regimes might have spoken different but related languages. They used different basic colour terms for black, but the same colour term for white. The Throne Zhou Empire defeated and replaced the Fine Shang Empire in 1046 BCE; therefore, the language of Throne Zhou became a new national linguistic norm. In this new linguistic norm, the second term for black [^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyền)}$] was primary; the first term for black [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] became secondary.

The Throne Zhou Empire fell in 771 BCE; therefore, the Throne Zhou linguistic norm declined. During the era of feudal and warring states [770~221BCE], there were several linguistic norms issued by different states. Finally, the Qin feudal state unified the warring states and banned all the other norms. The language of Qin became a new national linguistic norm. This language used the first term for black [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hắc)}$] in common with the language of Fine Shang.

From the Qin Empire through the empires of Han, Wei, Jin, Song, Qi and Liang to the Chen Empire, for over 800 years, sovereignty shifted without major linguistic changes. Even though the Jin Empire, with a huge population, evacuated to southern China in 317 CE, some linguistic changes were not greater than those between British and American English. Therefore, the same national literary norm was kept, called the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm in the present study.

The Sui Empire defeated and annexed the Chen Empire in 589 CE. This resulted in major linguistic changes. However, the linguistic changes did not involve the basic colour terms for black and white. These two basic colour terms remained the same, not because there was no diachronic change, but because there was no synchronic difference between the foundational dialects of the linguistic norms.

At present, most Chinese dialects, including the foundational dialect of the modern national linguistic norm, basically use the first term for black [^{6506}黑$^{(hēi/hǎc)}$]. Its ancient ERF is *$xək$ (Guō 1986: 131), *$hmluuug$ (ZhèngZhāng 2003: 351) or *mɦuaþe (mine). Its further abstract etymological link has been established in Tibeto-Burman languages (Starostin & Peiros 1996) [cf. Kachin $muʔ^2$ 'be dark', Lushai $mūk$ 'dull (in colour)', Limbu mak 'black', Yamphu $maik$ 'black', and Tibetan $mog/smag$ 'dark'; $smug$ 'cherry-brown, purple-brown'], and in Finnic languages (Gāo 2008: 163) [cf. Estonian $must$ 'black' and Finnish $musta$ 'black'].

The Ningbo dialect of the Wu tongue [Wu Chinese] uses the second term for black [^{7384}玄$^{(xuán/huyèn)}$]. [Pointed out by the previous study of Xiè (2008). The previous study did not consider it as a basic colour term in the dialect. Its status is not researched in the present study.] This may have been determined by the ancient dominant Throne Zhou language. Its ancient ERF is *$ɣiwen$ (Guō 1986: 225), *g^ween (ZhèngZhāng 2003: 508) or *ɦuɛnda-R (mine). Its further abstract etymological link has not been established in Tibeto-Burman languages, but it has been established in Germanic languages (Gāo 2008: 218) and Slavic[-Indic] languages (the present study) [cf. Gothic $swarts$ 'black', Danish $sort$ 'black', Swedish $svart$ 'black', Icelandic $svartur$ 'black', Old Norse $svartr$ 'black', Old English $sweart$ 'dark', English $swart$ 'swarthy', Old Low German $swart$ 'black', Dutch $zwart$ 'black', Old High German $swarz$ 'black', German $schwarz$ 'black', Old Church Slavic чрьнъ ($črĭnŭ$) 'black', Polish $czarny$ 'black', Russian чёрный ($čórnyj$) 'black', Bulgarian черен ($čéren$) 'black', and Sanskrit $kṛṣṇa$ 'black'].

Dialects of the Min tongue and the Min literary norm basically use the third term for black [^{70CF}烏$^{(wū/ô)}$]. [Pointed out

by the previous study of Xiè (2008). Confirmed in the present study.] This may have been determined by an uncertain archaic language. [A Yue(Viet) substratum is less possible, because the native Vietnamese term for black is *đen*.] This uncertain archaic language might have only used this term for black. Its ancient ERF is **a* (Guō 1986: 91), **qaa* (ZhèngZhāng 2003: 491) or **ɦuaɦua-R* (mine; onomatopoeia after a crow). Its further abstract etymological link cannot be established in Tibeto-Burman languages (in contrast to Starostin & Peiros 1996), nor in Italic languages (in contrast to Gāo 2008). The most possible etymological equivalents of this term are the Turkic-Mongolic-Japonic term for black [cf. Chuvash *xypa* (*xura*), Turkish *kara*, Turkmen *gara*, Kazakh *қара* (*qara*), Kyrgyz *кара* (*qara*), Uzbek *qora*, Uyghur اراق (*qara*), Old Turkic *qara*, Khakas *xapa* (*xara*), Mongolian *xap* (*xar*), and native Japanese くろい(*kuroi*)] and the Germanic term for rook (a bird) [cf. Danish *råge*, Swedish *råka*, Icelandic *hrókur*, Old Norse *hrókr*, Old English *hróc*, English rook, Dutch *roek*, Old High German *hruoh/hruohho*, and obsolete German *Ruch*].

The use of this term for black extends to some dialects of other tongues of the Chinese language in the surrounding area of the Min zone. Generally, the more remote the location, the less chance that this term for black is used. This phenomenon can be best explained by the Wave Model of language development.

In summary, the term [767D]白[(bái/bạch)] for white is of Sino-Germanic[-Finnic-Baltic-Slavic] origin; the term [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] for black is of Sino-Finnic[-Tibeto-Burman] origin; the term [7384]玄 [(xuán/huyền)] for black is of Sino-Germanic[-Slavic-Indic] origin; the term [70CF]烏[(wū/ô)] for black is of Sino-Altaic origin [[70CF]烏[(wū/ô)] for crow is of Sino-Germanic origin, and the whole etymon is ultimately onomatopoetic].

The overview of the colour terms conflicts with the synchronic view and the diachronic view but supports the panchronic view of language development.

The synchronic view may claim that the different terms for black are actually terms for slightly different tones of black. Its major weakness is that non-primary terms are more often attested as abstract or concrete notions (such as 'crow', 'peaceful'

and 'abstruse') rather than slightly different tones of black (to be fair, there is just one attestation: 'black with red'). The balance is unreasonable. Only the panchronic view solves this problem. The fact is that the Throne Zhou term for crow and the Min term for black are etymologically identical. This is comparable to the fact that the English term for Negroid "negro" and the Spanish term for black "*negro*" are etymologically identical.

The diachronic view may claim that there are different terms for black in different diachronic stages of the Chinese language. Its major weakness is that it requires a backward evolution after the Throne Zhou, while the more ancient Fine Shang term for black must come back. The backward evolution is unreasonable. Only the panchronic view solves this problem. Fine Shang and Throne Zhou used different but related languages. Their similar languages had a few differences in very elementary terms, including the term for black (but not the term for white). Throne Zhou ruled the country of Fine Shang for about 275 years, and therefore managed to impose the usage of their term for black instead of the Fine Shang term for black. After the fall of the Throne Zhou Empire, the term for black in the new standard language was etymologically identical to the Fine Shang term for black. This makes it seem that the Fine Shang term came back. This is comparable to a case in which there is a town that has been ruled by the Dutch, English and German languages in turn, and meanwhile the languages have adopted the Chinese writing system, which means that they are etymologically written. In the texts of this town, we see a common term for white (Etymon#3[(wit/white/weiss)]) but two terms for black (the Dutch-German Etymon#2[(zwart/schwarz)] and the English Etymon#1[(black)]). The English one appears in the middle. It has nothing to do with a backward evolution in the language of the town.

Moreover, the diachronic view does not fit the actual history of the Chinese language. The first dialectal lexicographic work in China (18) recorded greater dialectal differences in lexis. If people still defend the Tree Model, they must assume that languages developed enough in the Tree Model before the documentation [and then most branches had to fade or fuse to

get the present-day picture]. Is there any scientific theory that must avoid attested data?

Actually, it is more reasonable to suggest that the language development resembles a water system. There were more language varieties in the beginning. They are comparable to fountains and brooks. The fountains and brooks have flowed together to become a river. The rivers have flowed together to become a bigger river. This is my Water Model, following a panchronic view of language development.

The Tree Model was based on an assumed single root of languages according to the suggested single origin of species. In the 19th century, people did not expect that there could be so many unrelated languages outside Eurasia. Nowadays, we are understanding that human languages developed independently much later than the common origin of human. There were more unrelated languages in the past. Most languages became extinct sooner, as the small brooks. A few languages have survived longer as the big rivers.

6. Conclusions

In the Fine Shang literary norm, the basic colour term for black is [6506]黑[(hēi/hǎc)]; the basic colour term for white is [767D]白[(bái/bạch)]. [This confirms the previous study of Wang (1996).]

In the Throne Zhou literary norm, the basic colour term for black is [7384]玄[(xuán/huyền)]; the basic colour term for white is [767D]白[(bái/bạch)]. [This confirms the previous studies of Baxter (1983) and Wu (2011)].

In the Qin-Han-Jin literary norm, the Sui-Tang-Song literary norm and the modern linguistic norm of Chinese, the basic colour term for black is identically [6506]黑[(hēi/hǎc)]; the basic colour term for white is [767D]白[(bái/bạch)]. [This confirms the previous studies of Yáo (1988) and Wu (2011)].

In the Min linguistic norm, the basic colour term for black is [70CF]烏[(wū/ô)]; the basic colour term for white is [767D]白[(bái/bạch)]. [This confirms the previous study of Xiè (2008)].

The major new advances of the present study are:

1) It has contradicted interpreting the term [5E7D]幽[(yōu/ʮu)] as black. It has suggested interpreting it as peaceful.

2) It has solved that the various basic colour terms for black in Chinese are of different linguistic origins: [6506]黑[(hēi/hắc)] is Sino-Finnic[-Tibeto-Burman]; [7384]玄[(xuán/huyền)] is Sino-Germanic[-Slavic-Indic]; [70CF]烏[(wū/ô)] is Sino-Altaic.

3) It has supported the panchronic view of linguistic developments. It has suggested a Water Model of language development.

Acknowledgement

Address:
Gao Jingyi [高晶一]
University of Tartu
Ülikooli 18
51014 Tartu
Estonia
E-mail: jingyi.gao@ut.ee

Chinese References (Ordered by years of first releases)

0N[on-linguistic] Non-linguistic texts are instantly quoted with titles, situated regimes, estimated dates and data of authors (if certain). These texts are not listed in this section of references.

18([漢]天鳳五年)[依作者卒年] 揚雄[Yáng Xióng]:《輶軒使者絕代語釋別國方言[...*fangyan*]》, 長安[西安][Xi'an]: 未刊遺作<原本佚>; →[晉]太寧元年[323] [漢]揚雄† 撰 [晉]郭璞注《輶軒使者絕代語釋別國方言》<刊本佚>; →[宋]慶元六年[1200] [漢]揚雄†撰 [晉]郭璞†注 [宋]潯陽太守李孟傳刊《輶軒使者絕代語釋別國方言》, 潯陽[九江].

121([漢]建光元年) 許慎[Xǔ Shèn]:《說文解字[*Shuowenjiezi*]》, 雒阳[洛阳][Luoyang]<原本佚>;→[宋]雍熙三年[986] 漢太尉祭酒許慎†記 [宋]銀青光禄大夫守右散騎常侍上柱國東海縣開國子食邑五百戶[臣]徐鉉等奉敕校定《說文解字》, 東京[開封].

543([梁]大同九年) 顧野王[Gù YěWáng]:《玉篇[*Yupian*]》, 建康[南京][Nan-jing]<原本佚, 有殘卷>; →[唐]上元元年甲戌[674] 梁黃門侍郎兼太學博士顧野王†撰本 [唐]南國處士富春孫強增加字《大廣益會玉篇》, 佚地<刊本佚>; →[清]康熙四十有三年[1704] 南書房舊史秀水朱彝尊序《大廣益會玉篇》, 北京.

1008([宋]大中祥符元年) 陳彭年[Chén PéngNián]等[et al.]:《大宋重修廣韻[...*guangyun*]》, 東京[開封][Kaifeng]<原本佚>;→[巾箱本]: [1147±16](*南宋高宗紹興年間)《大宋重修廣韻》, 臨安[杭州].

1043([宋]慶曆三年) 丁度[Dīng Dù]等[et al.]:《集韻[*Jiyun*]》, 東京[開封][Kai-feng]:國子監<原本佚>;→[湖南本]: [1162~1189](*南宋孝宗時期) [宋]翰林學士兼侍讀學士朝請大夫尚書左司郎中知制誥判秘閣兼判太常禮院群牧使柱國濟陽郡開國侯食邑一千一百戶賜紫金魚袋臣丁度†等奉敕脩定《集韻》.

1925 容庚[Róng Gēng]:《金文編[*Jinwenbian*]》, 长洲[蘇州][Suzhou]: 章鈺署尚貽安堂; 1939 長沙: 商務印書館; 1958 北京: 科學出版社; 1985 容庚†(編著) 張振林&馬國權(摹補):《金文編》, 北京: 中華書局.

1986 郭錫良[Guō XīLiáng]:《漢語古音手冊[*Hanyu gu yin shouce*]》, 北京[Beijing]: 北京大学出版社.

1988 姚小平[Yáo XiǎoPíng]:〈基本颜色调理论述评: 兼论汉语基本颜色词的演变史(A survey of studies of basic colour terms with a note on the evolution of those in Chinese)〉–《外语教学与研究(Foreign language teaching and research)》1988[**27**].3 (19–29), 北京[Beijing].

1989 姚孝遂[Yáo XiàoSuì](主編):《殷墟甲骨刻辭類纂[*Yinxu jia gu ke ci leizhuan*]》, 北京[Beijing]: 中華書局.

1993 周長楫[Zhōu ChángJí]:《厦門方言詞典[*Xiamen fangyan cidian*]》, 南京[Nanjing]: 江蘇教育出版社.

1994[1997] 教育部國語推行委員會:《重編國語辭典修訂本[...*guoyu cidian*...]》, http://dict.revised.moe.edu.tw/

1998 中国社会科学院语言研究所[中國社會科學院語言研究所]&商务印书馆编辑部[商務印書館編輯部]:《新华字典[*Xihua zidian*](9^)》, 北京[Beijing]: 商务印书馆.

1998[2011] 教育部國語推行委員會:《臺灣閩南語常用詞辭典[*Taiwan min-nanyu changyong cidian*]》, http://twblg.dict.edu.tw/

1999 徐朝华[徐朝華][Xú ZhāoHuá]:《上古汉语颜色词简论[*Shang gu hanyu yanse ci jian lun*]》, 天津[Tianjin]: 南开大学出版社.

2002 李榮[Lǐ Róng](主編):《現代漢語方言大詞典[*Xiandai hanyu fangyan da cidian*]》, 南京[Nanjing]: 江蘇教育出版社.

2003 魏德胜[Wèi DéShèng]:《〈睡虎地秦墓竹简〉词汇研究[*Shuihudi qin mu zhujian cihui yanjiu*]》, 北京[Beijing]: 华夏出版社.

2003 郑张尚芳[鄭張尚芳][ZhèngZhāng ShàngFāng]:《上古音系[*Shang gu yinxi*]》, 上海[Shanghai]: 上海教育出版社.

2008 高晶一[Gāo JīngYī]:《汉语与北欧语言: 汉语与印欧语言及乌拉尔语言同源探究(Chinese language and languages of northern Europe)》, 北京[Beijing]: 中国社会科学出版社.

2008 解海江[Xiè HăiJiāng]: 〈汉语基本颜色词比较研究[Hanyu jiben yanse ci bijiao yanjiu]〉 –《鲁东大学学报(哲学社会科学版)[*Lu dong daxue xuebao (zhexue shehuikexue ban)*]》, 2008[25].1[1] (65–70), 煙臺[Yantai].

2008 解海江[Xiè HăiJiāng]: 〈汉语基本颜色词普方古比较研究(Basic color terms in Chinese: a contrastive study)〉 –《语言研究(Studies in language and linguistics)》, 2008[28].7[3] (91–96), 武漢[Wuhan].

Non-Chinese References

Baxter, William (1983) "A look at the history of Chinese color terminology". *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association* 18, 2, 1–25.

Berlin, Brent and Paul Kay (1969): *Basic color terms: their universality and evolution.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Chao, Yuen Ren (1946) "The logical structures of Chinese words". *Language* 22, 1, 4–13.

Itskovich, Viktor Aleksandrovich (1968) *Jazykovaja norma*. Moscow: Prosveščenie.

Schleicher, August (1863) *Die Darwinsche Theorie und die Sprachwissenschaft: offenes Sendschreiben an Herrn Dr. Ernst Haeckel*. Weimar: Herman Böhlau.

Schmidt, Johannes (1872) *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Weimar: Herman Böhlau.

Starostin, Sergei A. and Ilya I. Peiros (1996) *A comparative dictionary of five Sino-Tibetan languages*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

Wang, Tao (1996) "Colour terms in Shang oracle bone inscriptions". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 59, 1, 63–101.

Wu, Jianshe (2011) "The evolution of basic color terms in Chinese". *Journal of Chinese Linguistics* 39, 1, 76–122.

Kokkuvõte. Jingyi Gao: Põhivärvinimed musta ja valge jaoks hiina keeles: koos aruteluga keele arengu mudelite üle. Põhivärvinimed musta ja valge jaoks on uuritud neljas arhailises ja kahes tänapäevases hiina kirjakeele normis. Tulemustest nähtub, et käsitletud normid kasutasid ühist põhinime valge jaoks ning kolme erinevat põhinime musta jaoks. Töös pakutakse, et erinevad põhinimed musta jaoks võivad pärineda erinevatest keeltest või keelevariantidest. Uurimus toetab diakroonilise asemel pankroonilist keele arengu mudelit. Samuti sisaldab uurimus sissejuhatust hiina kirjakeele normide ajalukku.

Märksõnad: põhivärvinimi, keele arengu mudel, kirjakeele norm, filoloogia, etümoloogia, hiina keel

Appendix 1. Literary attestations of the term ⁶⁵⁰⁶黑⁽ʰēⁱ/ʰắᶜ⁾ for black in Fine Shang texts.

(4)	(3)	(2)	(1)
(Y:104)	(Y:104)	(Y:104)	(Y:104)

Appendix 2. Literary attestations of the term ⁷⁶⁷ᴰ白⁽ᵇᵃⁱ/ᵇᵃᶜʰ⁾ for white in Fine Shang texts.

Appendix 2. (continued)

(12)			(Y:384)
(13)			(Y:384)
(14)			(Y:384)
(15)			(Y:385)
(16)			(Y:385)
(17)			(Y:385)
(18)			(Y:382-3)
(19)			(Y:382)
(20)			(Y:382)

Appendix 2. (continued)