

## **6. An archaeolinguistic approach to Indianisation and Sinicisation of languages in Eastern Eurasia**

Chingduang Yurayong (University of Helsinki)

et alii (see after the abstract)

Linguistic processes of Indianisation and Sinicisation are two areal phenomena visible across respective contact zones in Eastern Eurasia. They occurred from late prehistory onwards with major watersheds marked by the introduction of writing systems and vocabularies, giving expression to cosmopolitan modes of rulership, religion and trade. Linguistic Indianisation and Sinicisation have consequent correlation in the material record, which over the same period reflects multiple trajectories of state formation and subsequent transnational history. Processes of linguistic and cultural spread have been extensively studied for the individual regions (e.g. Smith 1999; Byington 2013; Carter et al. 2021; Huang & Kang 2022), but fewer transregional comparisons have been conducted (e.g. Lieberman 2003, 2009; Manguin et al. 2011).

Adapting principles of the Wave Theory (Schmidt 1872) to Güldemann's (2008) model of linguistic area, our study delineates the spatially variegated degrees of Indianisation and Sinicisation as they extend into Southeast and Northeast Asia from first millennia BCE to CE. Combining evidence from linguistics, archaeology and history we examine whether the degrees of contact-induced outcomes decrease relative to geographical distance from their areal hotbeds as is the case for Western Lingnan Sprachbund (Szeto & Yurayong 2022). We predict geographic radially being complicated by maritime polities. Our study is further informed by Watkins' (2000: xxii) parallels between language as a cognitive nonmaterial culture, and artefacts as material culture. We hypothesize that certain categories, such as loanwords/Wanderwörter in language, and prestige items for trades in material culture, represent more superficial layers of their respective fields which travel further, while categories including typological profiles, toponyms and artefacts reflective of local subsistence patterns constitute deeper layers which travel less far. Such variegation will become complicated with the adoption of cosmopolitan signification systems by early states giving rise to multiple sub-areal hotbeds which together form larger core circles of contact. The data are visualised cartographically with ArcGIS programme by illustrating four categories of evidence: 1) ancient epigraphs in which historical discourse on contact events with the Indic and Sinitic civilisations were attested, 2) ancient Indic and Sinitic-styled architecture, 3) sites where traded goods as traces of the maritime silk road have been found, and 4) language communities reconstructed through historical records and their present-day distribution. The first three sets of data are interpreted as presence or absence of evidence, while the linguistic data can be further quantified by scores aggregated from degrees of Indic or Sinitic loanwords and typological convergence which each language datapoint shows. The anticipated results will show that toponyms, ancient epigraphs and architecture such as ancient commanderies can be used to draw boundaries of the areal hotbeds which falls under a direct contact with the source of influence, while shared typological tendencies lying in human cognition can extend further to the core circles with lower contact intensity. Meanwhile, loanwords/Wanderwörter and traded goods such as glass beads can spread beyond the core circles towards the peripheries where contact influence is not necessarily direct but transmitted through intermediators. For instance, traces of native Sinitic epigraphs and commanderies are located as far as to Liaodong Peninsula in the north and Northern Vietnam in the south, marking boundaries between the areal hotbeds and core circles in which the degree of linguistic Sinicisation observed in Koreanic and Vietic is high (Eom 2015; Alves 2022), while the degree of Sinicisation gradually decreases towards the peripheries as it was largely transmitted secondarily through Koreanic to Japonic (Yurayong & Szeto 2020) and through Vietic to Chamic (Thurgood 1999).

The current study puts Eastern Eurasia in the current trend of a cross-disciplinary approach to prehistoric contact and its outcomes by illustrating more quantifiable data illustration and analysis methods which can facilitate estimation of degrees of contact intensity in different times and spaces.

## References

- Alves, Mark. 2022. Lexical evidence of the Vietic household before and after language contact with Sinitic. In Trang Phan, John Phan & Mark Alves (eds.), *Vietnamese Linguistics: A State of the Field*, 15-58. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Byington, Mark E. (ed.). 2013. *The Han Commanderies in Early Korean History*. Cambridge, MA: Korea Institute, Harvard University.
- Carter, Alison Kyra, Laure Dussubieux, Miriam T. Stark, & H. Albert Gilg. 2021. Angkor Borei and Protohistoric Trade Networks: A View from the Glass and Stone Bead Assemblage. *Asian Perspectives* 60(1). 32-70.
- Eom, Ik-Sang. 2015. 2,200 years of language contact between Korean and Chinese. In William S-Y. Wang & Chaofen Sun (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Linguistics*, 226-235. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Güldemann, Tom. 2008. The Macro-Sudan belt: Towards identifying a linguistic area in northern Sub-Saharan Africa. In Bernd Heine & Derek Nurse (eds.), *A linguistic geography of Africa*, 151-185. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huang, Chin-Hao & David C. Kang. 2022. State Formation in Korea and Japan, 400–800 CE: Emulation and Learning, Not Bellicist Competition. *International Organization* 76(1). 1-31.
- Lieberman, Victor. 2003. *Strange parallels: Vol. 1 Integration on the Mainland: Southeast Asia in Global Context, c. 800–1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lieberman, Victor. 2009. *Strange Parallels: Vol. 2 Mainland Mirrors: Europe, Japan, China, South Asia, and the Islands: Southeast Asia in Global Context, C. 800-1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Manguin, Pierre-Yves, A. Mani & Geoff Wade (eds.). 2011. *Early Interactions between South and Southeast Asia: Reflections on Cross-Cultural Exchange*. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.
- Schmidt, Johannes. 1872. *Die Verwandtschaftsverhältnisse der indogermanischen Sprachen*. Weimar: H. Böhlau.
- Smith, Monica L. 1999. "Indianization" from the Indian point of view: Trade and cultural contacts with Southeast Asia in the early first millennium C.E.. *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 42(1). 1-26.
- Szeto, Pui Yiu & Chingduang Yurayong. 2022. Establishing a Sprachbund in the Western Lingnan region: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Folia Linguistica* 56(1). 25-55.
- Thurgood, Graham. 1999. *From ancient Cham to modern dialects: two thousand years of language contact and change*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i press.
- Watkins, Calvert. 2000. *The American Heritage Dictionary of Indo-European Roots*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Yurayong, Chingduang & Pui Yiu Szeto. 2020. Altaicization and De-Altaicization of Japonic and Koreanic. *International Journal of Eurasian Linguistics* 2(1). 108-148.

## Co-authors and responsibility areas

### *Historical linguistics*

1. Chingduang Yurayong (University of Helsinki) – [chingduang.yurayong@helsinki.fi](mailto:chingduang.yurayong@helsinki.fi) > Lexical Indianisation of Suvarṇabhūmi; Typological Sinicisation of Korea

2. Sami Honkasalo (University of Helsinki) – [sami.honkasalo@helsinki.fi](mailto:sami.honkasalo@helsinki.fi) > Typological Indianisation of Suvarṇabhūmi; Typological Sinicisation of Japan
3. Pui Yiu Szeto (Ca' Foscari University of Venice) – [puiyiu.szeto@unive.it](mailto:puiyiu.szeto@unive.it) > Typological and lexical Sinicisation of Lingnan
4. Charlotte Ye Xu (Nanjing University) – [charlottexuye@gmail.com](mailto:charlottexuye@gmail.com) > Lexical Sinicisation of Korea and Japan

#### *Historiography*

5. Andrew Logie (University of Helsinki) – [andrew.logie@helsinki.fi](mailto:andrew.logie@helsinki.fi) > Sinicisation of Korea, Japan and Vietnam
6. Utain Wongsathit (Silpakorn University) – [tainzgree@yahoo.com](mailto:tainzgree@yahoo.com) > Indianisation of Northeast India and Myanmar
7. Sombat Mangmeesuksiri (Silpakorn University) – [sombat69@hotmail.com](mailto:sombat69@hotmail.com) > Indianisation of Thailand and Laos
8. Kangvol Khatshima (Silpakorn University) – [kangvol@gmail.com](mailto:kangvol@gmail.com) > Indianisation of Cambodia and Southern Vietnam

#### *Archaeology*

1. Youngchan Oh (Ewha Womans University) – [ycoh@ewha.ac.kr](mailto:ycoh@ewha.ac.kr) > Sinicisation of Wiman Joseon (195-108 BC) and Triệu Đà of Nam Viet (203-111 BC)
2. Ohyoung Kwon (Seoul National University) – [koy1108@snu.ac.kr](mailto:koy1108@snu.ac.kr) > Sinicisation of Baekje (200-600 AD) and Champa Lâm Ấp (192-629 AD)
3. Junyoung Park (Seoul National University) – [zkdwlsk0111@snu.ac.kr](mailto:zkdwlsk0111@snu.ac.kr) > Trade of glass beads in India and Southeast Asia
4. Cheunsoo Park (Kyungpook National University) – [chspark@knu.ac.kr](mailto:chspark@knu.ac.kr) > Trade of glass artefacts and potteries in Central Asia and Northeast Asia