

An Emphatic Verb Phrase in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions*

K. Takashima

University of British Columbia

This paper examines the construction pattern in which what is normally taken as a verb or verb phrase is nominalized by the main verb *yu* 有/又 or *wang* 亡. It suggests a hypothesis that such a construction conveys a sense of "emphasis" or entails a function of "contrast." The hypothesis is tested against actual inscriptions, and its adoption would account for some out-of-the-ordinary situations in which certain sacrificial activities were carried out by certain classes of people and/or directed toward certain ancestors.

0. Introduction: A General Description of the Different Types of Nominalization in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions

Nominalization is a grammatical process by which a verb, verb phrase, or sentence is changed into a noun or noun phrase. A nominalized phrase thus plays the role of topic, subject, direct or indirect object of the verb, or object of a co-verb within a sentence. Notionally and semantically, the primary and intrinsic function of a noun or noun phrase is to refer to some animate or inanimate thing, matter, activity, process, state, or concept. However, in the case of a phrase which is obtained through nominalization

* The original title of this paper was "A Palaeographer's Note on Nominalization: An Emphatic Verb Phrase in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions" which was presented at the XXXI International Congress of Human Sciences in Asia and North Africa (Tokyo and Kyoto), 31 August - 7 September, 1983. The present paper is a revised version of the above done in March 1988, which was further improved June 1988 by a detailed critique from Professor David N. Keightley. I would like to dedicate this to the memory of Professor F. K. Li, my former teacher at the University of Washington in Seattle.

of the verb_2 in the pattern “ $\text{verb}_1 + \text{verb}_2$ ” (in which verb_2 is nominalized by being dependent on, or embedded in, verb_1), the primary referential function mentioned above becomes insignificant. This kind of nominalization plays the role of a predicate or verb phrase.

The concrete meanings of nominalized phrases cannot, of course, be exhaustively listed; they can mean any number or kind of things within a particular linguistic setting at any given time. There are, however, two categories of general meanings with which nominalization can be associated. In one of these, a phrase may be said in effect to convey such “performative” meanings as emphasis, contrast, characterization, or explanation. In the other category, a phrase may be interpreted as expressing a more specific, segmental, meaning such as a person, object, activity, time, location, condition, etc. It is only in the latter that the referential function is important. In the language of the oracle-bone inscriptions, the former category (“Category 1”)—which can be divided into two subtypes—is clearly marked, while the latter category (“Category 2”)—which can be divided into five subtypes—is not marked.

One of the two subtypes in Category 1 has the form of a verb or verb phrase preceded by the verb *yu* 又 or *wang* 亡. The other is comprised of a verb or verb phrase preceded by the “descriptive copula” *wei* 隹 or its negative counterpart *pu wei* 不佳 or *fei* 非; or alternately by the prescriptive or presumptive copula *hui* 𠄎/𠄎 and its most common negative counterpart *wu wei* 勿隹. Takashima (1990) contains a full study of the latter.

The five unmarked subtypes in Category 2 are determined by consideration of the meaning of a verb, verb phrase, or portion of a sentence, with reference to the particular syntactic positions in which it is found. Interpreted in terms of classical Chinese, they may be referred to as the “quasi-*che* 者” type, the “quasi-*so* 所” type, the “quasi-*chih* 之... (*yeh* 也)” type, the “quasi-*ch'i* 其” type, and finally the relative-clause type, in which the head noun modified by the preceding clause often refers to an unspecified subject or

object of the verb in the preceding clause. Apart from scattered remarks in previous papers, I have not yet made a systematic study of the last three types. For the quasi-*che* and the quasi-*so* types, however, the reader is referred to Takashima (1984b); here I will provide only two examples of each. First, for the quasi-*che* type:

𠩺來自西 (*Ping-pien* 94.1) which is to be interpreted as 有來自西者
“there shall be someone coming from the west”; and

亡其來自西 (*Ping-pien* 94.2) which is to be interpreted as 亡其來自西
者 “there might not be anyone coming from the west.” (Cf. also
Case [C] on p. 684.)

For examples of the quasi-*so* type, we have the following;

若僞 (*Ching-hua* 1) which is to be interpreted as 若所稱 “just as
prognosticated”; and

陟歲 (*Ts'ui-pien* 167) which is to be interpreted as 陟所𠩺 “offer up
that which has been *kuei*-cut.”

This paper discusses only one type of nominalization, the Category 1 construction in which a verb, verb phrase, or portion of a sentence is preceded by the verb *yu* 𠩺/又 or *wang* 亡.

The abbreviations of the titles of oracle-bone collections, both rubbings and drawings, follow those given in Keightley (1978: 229-231). Those not found in Keightley (*ibid*) are according to Shima (*S* 589).

The following symbols are used:

/ means “or.”

* means “unattested or reconstructed.”

> means “yields to.”

< means “is derived from.”

... means “missing” or “abbreviated.”

{ means “a pair of charges, *tui-chen* 對貞” or “to be considered together.” (NB: it does not mean “choose one or the other,” as it does in standard linguistic notation.)

() means various things such as “can be supplied,” “the bone/modern form equivalent,” “bibliographical information,” etc., in other words “parenthetically supplied information for fuller understanding.”

= means “is equivalent to.”

≈ means “is roughly equivalent to.”

We have also arbitrarily assigned the readings “Ch’iao” to 雀 and “Ch’üeh” to the name of the diviner 設.

1. The Verbs *Yu* 出/又 and *Wang* 亡 + Verb / Verb-Phrase Pattern: The Emphatic Hypothesis

The kind of nominalization we shall be studying in this section functions as a verb phrase or predicate. It has the pattern “Verb₁ (*yu* or *wang*) + Verb₂,” where Verb₂ invariably carries the essential information load. This is to be contrasted with the cases where the main idea of existence/possession is asserted, positively by the use of *yu* and negatively by the use of *wang*.

What has motivated the study of this pattern is that the Shang apparently could express a similar meaning with or without the use of the verb *yu/wang*. If this was the case, though, why did they use it at all? The following examples illustrate this question:

- (1) { (a) 丁巳卜貞王 室 日不雨。 Pu-tz’u 535
Ting-ssu day cracking, tested: When the king treats the sun as guest, it will not rain.
(b) 貞 帶 出 室。 Ping-pien 457(7)
Tested: Fu/*yu*/conduct a guesting ritual.
(c) 帶 亡 其 室。 Ibid (8)
Fu/*wang*/perhaps/conduct a guesting ritual.

Example (1) (a) uses a single verb *pin* 室, whereas (b) employs a verb phrase consisting of *yu* and *pin*. Example(c)uses *wang*, the negative counter-

part of *yu*, followed by the modal particle *ch'i* 其.¹ This shows that in (b) and (c) the main verbs are not *pin* but *yu* and *wang*, respectively. It also shows that *yu* cannot mean *yu* 侑 'to offer' because in that case the negative would have to be *wu* 勿. Here are another "pair" of examples:

- (1) { (d) 王其往逐麋獲。 *Ch'ien-pien* 3. 32. 5
 If the king goes chasing *chih*-deer, (he) will catch (them).
 (e) 戊午卜覈貞雀追亘虫獲。 *Ping-pien* 304 (7)
 Wu-wu day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: If Ch'iao chases Hsüan,
 (Ch'iao) will/*yu*/catch (him).

Although the Shang distinguished the chasing of game from that of humans by using the verbs *chu* 逐 and *chui* 追, respectively, they used the same verb *huo* 獲 for the successful outcome of both. Notice that in (e) the verb *yu* appears but in (d) it does not. Although (1) (d) and (1) (e) do not constitute a *tui-chen*, the former is expressed without *yu*, the latter with it. Why is this so?

The nominalization of the verb *pin* in (1)(b) and (1)(c), as well as that of the verb *huo* in (1)(e), is made possible by their being embedded in the "higher" verbs *yu* and *wang*. While this grammatical analysis is readily acceptable to specialists, the precise semantic interpretation of such a construction may be different depending on the analyst. The hypothesis I wish to offer in this paper is that such a construction came to entail "emphasis"

1 The modal particle *ch'i*, when combined with the verb *wang*, follows it, rather than precedes it--viz., *wang ch'i*. There are only two exceptions to this order in *Ping-pien*, namely, 47(8) [貞其亡來齒; but the rubbing is unclear] and 77(2) [王固曰吉佳其亡工言面其德]. Since the *wang ch'i* can be followed by a noun--e. g., *chih* 麋 'deer' [*Ping-pien* 286 (2); quoted in (4) (A) (d) and (e)]--the scope of *ch'i*'s modality extends backwards (as odd as this might seem) to the verb *wang*. That is, *wang ch'i* as a verb phrase is a tight unit both grammatically and semantically. I would like to discuss this phenomenon and related matters more fully on another occasion; for the present see also Note 26.

or “contrast,” a linguistic phenomenon which has a “performative” rather than a “referential” function. In other words, *yu/wang* gave prominence to the succeeding verb or verb phrase, and the divinatory charge and prognostication were uttered either positively or negatively with extra modal force, possibly resulting in a contrast between the nouns that are grammatically associated with the succeeding verb. In what follows, I will attempt to support this hypothesis, and explore some of its implications.

2. Dummy Word “occasion” / “chance”

We have already observed in (1)(b) and (1)(c) that the main verbs are *yu* and *wang*. When they are followed by another verb, we may regard the succeeding verb as being dependent on, or embedded in, them. This is one kind of nominalization, and I believe the semantic motivation for it should be explained in terms of the basic meanings of the verbs *yu* and *wang*, “have/there is” and “have not/there is not,” respectively.

In Takashima (1973: 50-53) I suggested that a dummy word such as “occasion” or “chance” be supplied after these verbs. Such a word is required in English to connect them to the succeeding verbs. While it is not essential in Chinese, it serves as a step toward accounting for the obvious difference in locution of such pairs of sentences as the following:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|---|------------------------|
| (2) | { | (a) 戊寅卜穀貞沚夏其來。 | <i>Ping-pien</i> 28(1) |
| | { | Wu-yin day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: Chih Chia might come. | |
| | { | (b) 貞夏不其來。 | Ibid (2) |
| | { | Tested: Chia might not come. | |
| | { | (c) 乎目于河出來。 | Ibid 503 (5) |
| | { | If (we) call upon Mu [to make a <i>ti</i> -binding sacrifice (禘) ²] | |

2 Although I have supplied the verb *ti* 禘 here on the basis of the total context of the inscriptions on *Ping-pien* 502 and its reverse, 503, it is possible that the missing verb is *wang* 往 ‘to go; to send’. In either case, Chow Kwok-ching’s

- { to the River God, (s)he will have an occasion to come.
(Tentative translation.)
(d) 貞亡其來。 Ibid (6)

Tested: There might not be an occasion for (Mu) to come.

Or: (Mu) might not have an occasion to come. (Tentative translation.)

The difference in locution here is that (a) and (b) do not use *yu/wang*, while (c) and (d) do, for the same verb *lai*.

Studies by Takashima (1980: 84-86; 95-96) and (more specifically) Chow Kwok-ching (1982: 136-141) have shown that in certain contexts the verbs *yu* and *wang* are best construed as active, transitive verbs stronger in meaning than "to have/not have." Chow (*op.cit.*: 136-137) suggests the meaning "get" for *yu*, and *mutatis mutandis* this is acceptable. Applied as it stands to examples (2)(c) and (2)(d), Chow's suggestion would produce the meaning "(Mu) shall *get* to come" and "(Mu) might not *get* to come," respectively. (Here I have used the word "might" to express the sense of "uncertainty" on the part of the Shang diviner indicated by the use of the modal particle *ch'i*.)

One possible deduction from the interpretation of "get to come" is a potential meaning, "can come." Since this is based on an English translation, it is perhaps perilous to assign that meaning to the Shang expression itself. However, to ensure that we are not prematurely discarding a correct answer, let us examine the evidence in the inscriptions.

First, the potential meaning does not seem to apply to all the cases in which the *yu/wang* + verb/verb-phrase pattern is observed.³ For example:

(續) study (1982: 100-116) indicates the need to supply a verb before *yü* 于, rather than to interpret *yü* as a full-fledged verb, which would presumably mean "to go."

3 In Section 4 we shall discuss cases where the verbs *yu* and *wang* are followed by another verb and yet cannot be regarded as forming the *yu / wang* + verb / verb-phrase pattern.

- (2) { (e) 甲申卜旁貞孚丁亡敗。 Ping-pien 61(5)
 Chia-shen day cracking, Pin tested: The soldiers⁴ of Yü will not
 get (<have an occasion to be) defeated. (Tentative translation.)
 (f) 貞孚丁其出敗。 Ibid (6)
 Tested: The soldiers of Yü might get (<have an occasion to
 be) defeated. (Tentative translation.)

It is clear from other inscriptions (*S* 170.4) that Yü 孚 is the name of a friend of the Shang. It would be strange, therefore, that the Shang should have divined whether Yü's soldiers might "be able to" be defeated or will not "be able to" be defeated. (The use of English "get" when followed by the past participle of a transitive verb has a passive meaning, but that is irrelevant to the semantic implication of *yu* and *wang* in question.) The strangeness of the potential interpretation for *yu* and *wang* is further intensified by the presence of action-controllable verbs such as *pin* 賓 'to treat as guest' in examples (1)(b) and (1)(c), since the execution of this verb under normal circumstances (which will be made clear later) depended on the will of the Shang. Second, in the inscriptions, the potential meaning is expressed by the word *k'o* 克 'be able, can; vanquish', which in the following example is found combined with the word *yu* itself:

- (2) (g) 夷小臣沓克又戕画……。 Chia-pien 1267
 It should be the *hsiao-ch'en*, Yung, who should be able to have
 a chance to give a damaging blow to...⁵

Although this is a Period III inscription which might require a different

4 For this meaning, see Ch'iu Hsi-kuei (1983: 23-24).

5 The modern transcription of this inscription is uncertain. For another interpretation of the order in which the inscription is to be read, see Shima Kunio (*S* 132.2). Cf. also the *k'ao-shih* by Ch'ü Wan-li 屈萬里 for *Chia-pien* 1267/p. 127. However, it seems certain that the string "*k'o yu tsai* 克又戕" is to be construed as a syntactic unit, and that is the crucial point here.

treatment from the Period I inscriptions of (2)(e) and (2)(f), it is unlikely that *yu* in (2)(g) had a potential meaning in addition to that of *k'o*.

Another possible deduction from the interpretation “get to come” or, literally, “get/obtain someone’s coming” or “have (a chance/opportunity) for someone to come,” is to construe the *yu* and its negative counterpart *wang* as conveying an emphatic sense. This is derived chiefly from evidence I have found in the inscriptions, supported by the possibility that nominalization of this type often conveys emphasis in classical Chinese as well.⁶

- 6 This possibility is yet to be fully explored. It is a common practice that, when *yu* or *wu* 無 precedes a verb/verb phrase, one supplies either *che* 者 or *so* 所 (which is basically referential in function) to understand the expression. This is appropriate in many cases, but there is another kind of example in which the emphatic hypothesis seems to give a better explanation for the use of *yu* and *wu*. A few examples are given below:

- (1) 志士仁人無求生以害仁，有殺身以成仁。

Lun-yü 論語 (HY Concordance 31/15/9)

The determined scholar and the man of virtue will never seek to stay alive at the expense of doing harm to [the principle of] humane life; (they) will even sacrifice their lives to establish it.

N. B. Ōta Tatsuo (1964: 73) quotes this passage and observes that in the above use of *yu* and *wu* it is not clear “what [求生以害仁 or 殺身以成仁] refers to—whether it refers to the existence or non-existence of the action or to that of the person.” It quite possibly refers to neither. That is, the use of *yu* and *wu* is to be explained more as an emphatic expression. In this regard, Ma Chien-chung (1898: 228)—whose opinion is dismissed by Ōta (ibid)—nonetheless captures the meaning here. Ma says that the use of *yu* here is to be interpreted as *wei yu* 惟有 ‘it is only...’.

- (2) 子曰苟有用我者，期月而已可也，三年有成。 *Lun-yü* (*op. cit.*: 25/13/10)

“The Master said, ‘If anyone were to employ me, in a year’s time I would have brought things to a satisfactory state, and after three years I should [really] have results to show for it’.” D. C. Lau’s (1979: 120) translation.

- (3) 故君子有不戰戰必勝也。 *Meng-tzu* (HY Concordance 14/2B/1)

Therefore, a gentleman would rather not fight; but if he does, he will surely win a victory.

- (4) 人之有道也，飽食煖衣逸居而無教則近於禽獸。聖人有憂之。

Meng-tzu (*op. cit.*: 20/3A/4)

In Takashima (1973: 53-57), I suggested such renditions as "in reality," "after all," or "certainly," but it is not necessary to insist on any particular form. For example, one may translate the relevant inscriptions cited so far as follows:

- (1) (b): "The *fu* should *really* (=in fact) conduct a guesting ritual."
- (1) (c): "The *fu* might not conduct a guesting ritual *after all*." Or: The *fu* might not, *in fact*, ...
- (1) (e): "If Ch'iao chases Hsüan, (Ch'iao) wil *surely* (=in fact) catch (him)."
- (2) (c): "(Mu) might *get* to come." Or: "(Mu) will *surely* (=in fact) come."
- (2) (d): "(Mu) might not *get* to come." Or: "(Mu) might not come *after all*." Or. "(Mu) might not, *in fact*, come."
- (2) (e): "Yü's soldiers shall *never* be defeated." Or: "Yü's soldiers shall not, *in fact*, be defeated."
- (2) (f): "Yü's soldiers might be defeated *after all*." Or: "Yü's soldiers might, *in fact*, be defeated."

With regards to example(2)(g), 禹小臣沘克又戕画..., it should be pointed out that *yu* is no longer the main verb, as it is in all other cases. Instead, it is embedded in the main verb *k'o* 克. The verb *tsai* is also embedded in *yu*, which as a unit is further embedded in *k'o*. Although the literal meaning of *k'o yu tsai* is "to be able to have (a chance) to give a damaging blow," the word *yu* is used like a particle or an adverb, adding emphasis to the embedded verb *tsai*. Interpreted thus, (2)(g) may be read as "It should be

(續) This is the way of the common people: once they have a full belly and warm clothes and have a comfortable dwelling, they degenerate to the level of animals if they are allowed to lead idle lives, without education and discipline. The sage king did worry about it. (Part of the translation is based on D. C. Lau [1970: 102].)

the *hsiao-ch'en*, Yung, who will *certainly* (or *in fact*) be able to give a damaging blow to..." The following inscriptions in which Yung (the same as in inscription (2)(g)) appears are used in the context of his military campaign against the Wei 衛, which supports our present understanding of (2)(g):

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| (2) | (h) 伐衛不雉眾。 | Yi-ts'un 5 |
| { | In attacking the Wei (and) the P'i, (we) shall deploy ⁷ the royal masses. | |
| (i) | 伐亡戔。 | Ibid |
| { | In attacking [the Wei and the P'i], (we) will not [be able to] give a damaging blow [to them] <i>after all</i> . Or: ... (we) will not, <i>in fact</i> , [be able to]... | |
| (j) | 夷畎又戔。 | Ibid |
| { | It should be Yung who will <i>surely</i> (= <i>in fact</i>) give a damaging blow to [the Wei and the P'i]. | |
| (k) | 夷畎又戔。 | Ibid |
| { | It should be X who will <i>surely</i> (= <i>in fact</i>) give a damaging blow to [the Wei and the P'i]. | |

Notice that in the above series of inscriptions there is a shift in focus from (2)(i) to (2)(j), from the possibility of not being able to give a damaging blow to that of being able, if Yung and/or X (畎) was to be involved.

In Period I inscriptions, the Wei also appears as an enemy to the Shang, and the way in which it occurs in the charge is without the use of *yu* or *wang*. Presumably, there is no emphasis intended in this case:

7 Cf. *CKWTCS*, pp. 1257-1263, where the opinions of Li Hsiao-ting, Ch'en Mengchia, and Yü Hsing-wu all seem to point towards the meaning of the word *chih* 雉, i. e., "to deploy." I have adopted it here.

- (2) { (1) 酉卜設貞我伐衛于臺。 *Yü-hsü* 37
 ...-*yu* day cracking Ch'üeh tested: We will [be able to] give a
 damaging blow to the Wei at Huo (?). Or: ...give a damaging
 blow to the Wei and (于) the Huo.
 (m) 設貞衛不我伐。 *Pu-tz'u* 690
 ... Ch'üeh tested: the Wei will not [be able to] give us a
 damaging blow.

3. Some Implications of the Emphatic Hypothesis

Before we give further examples which may support the emphatic hypothesis for the *yu/wang* + verb pattern, let us pause for a moment to explore some of the implications of this hypothesis.

While I have checked as many inscriptions as possible, I have noticed that there are in fact not many relevant examples. However, it should be remembered that too many examples would make the emphatic hypothesis meaningless. If the *yu/wang* + verb pattern is emphatic, it should be restricted to cases where special circumstances would have dictated its employment. I believe this is correct, as in the majority of the examples it is possible to discover these special circumstances.⁸

8 A multitude of such special circumstances can be conceived. David Keightley (private communication dated May 23, 1988) has suggested the following possibilities: (1) particular diviners and/or engravers; (2) media; (3) pits; and (4) periods. To comment briefly on these one by one:

(1) would be the case of an idiolect in which the pattern *yu/wang* + verb does not have any semantic motivation, but the *yu* or *wang* attachment to a verb is a matter of personal style. This is unlikely, as the (presumed) speaker is the diviner Ch'üeh in our example sentence (5)(a), while it is the king in (5)(n). The possibility of it having been some particular engravers who might have been using the pattern in question, regardless of what was actually spoken by the diviners or kings, seems improbable in view of the fact that (5)(e) is a Wu 午 Group inscription which was engraved by a hand different from that responsible for (1)(b) and (c),

Let us take (1)(b) 貞帝出寔 and (1)(c) 帝亡其寔 as our examples once again. This pair of *tui-chen* sentences has been translated as “The *fu* should *really* (=in fact) conduct a guesting ritual” and “The *fu* might not conduct a guesting ritual *after all*” (or “The *fu* might not, *in fact*, ...”), respectively.⁹ What is unique about (1)(b) and (1)(c) is that the subject of the verb *pin* 寔 / 寔 / 寔 / 寔 / 寔 / 寔 / 寔¹⁰ ‘treat as guest,

(續) specimens belonging to the Pin Group;

(2) “media,” may refer to the divining media, either turtle plastron or bovine scapula (bone). However, (1)(b) and (c) occur on a turtle plastron, while (5)(i) and (j) occur on a bone; and

(3) the question of the “pits” in which the inscriptions with the pattern in question may be associated, is closely related to the grouping of the diviners and the problem of their periodization (which itself is suggestion [4]). Our sentences (1)(b), (1)(c), (5)(e), (5)(k), and (5)(l) are from the famous pit “YH 127” dating to Period I, whereas (5)(b) and (5)(c), for example, are specimens that could not have been from the same pit, as they are datable to Period II and III-IV.

In short, the pattern *yu/wang*+verb seems common throughout a variety of non-linguistic variables.

9 The possibility that the *fu* in these sentences might be construed as the direct object of the verb *pin* for purposes of stress cannot be ruled out entirely. However, in these sentences, the main verbs are *yu* and *wang*, and there are no examples in which the noun preceding them is to be taken as the direct object. For more on this point, see section 5 under the heading “The Controllable Verb Yü 卬.”

10 On the epigraphic rigor with which the Shang inscribers maintained the graphic distinction between the graph 寔 with the foot element and the one without it, 寔, and hence the possible difference in meaning between them, see Keightley (1983: 25 and Note 17 on pp. 42-43), part of which reads as follows: “...it is almost invariably true that when the king (specified or implied) is *pin*-ing, the foot element is present; there are few exceptions to this rule.” This is true, but once one expands the corpus of graphs to include other forms, the distinction must be restated as follows: In *S* 275.3, 4, one finds that the graphs 寔 (at least eight cases*) and 寔 (one case) are used with the same apparent meaning as 寔. The epigraphic rigor as regards what is generally taken to be the word *pin* 寔 ‘guest; to treat as guest’ thus needs

conduct a guesting ritual' is the *fu*, a title, rank, or kinship term of some sort (Matsumaru 1970: 77-79; cf. also Chou Hung-hsiang 1970; Wang, Chang, Yang 1977; Yen Yi-p'ing 1981; Chang Cheng-lang 1986; Chang Ping-ch'üan 1986).¹¹ The subject of all the other inscriptions given in Shima's *Sōrui* (275. 1, 3, 4; 276, 4; 277. 1, 2, 3) is always the king (with the exception of two inscriptions to be discussed shortly). While this fact itself is easily recognized, it is noteworthy that the verb *pin* is nominalized by the verbs *yu* and *wang*. This was done, in my opinion, precisely because of the rather unusual situation in which the *fu*, rather than the king himself, was proposed as *pin*-ing. The characterization of the emphatic hypothesis given earlier--"yu/wang has the effect of giving prominence to the succeeding verb/verb phrase, and the charge and prognostication were uttered... with extra modal force"--can now be refined as follows: the pattern "yu/wang + (ch'i) + verb (here *pin*)" was used by the Shang diviners, because on the underlying level there was a tacit understanding among them to the effect that, "unusual though it may be, the diviner would propose the *fu* to be the agent of *pin*-ing" and, for the negative counterpart, "quite expectedly (<after all), the diviner would propose the *fu* to be not *pin*-ing."

(續) to be understood in such a way as to distinguish the graphs 𠩺, 𠩻, 𠩼, 𠩽, 𠩾, 𠩿 and 𠪀 on the one hand from 𠪁 on the other. The graphic significance of each element under the common roof is not yet clear.

* N. B. There are probably fourteen cases in all, but to be cautious, I have discounted the cases where 𠩺 is preceded by a negative, in view of the remark by Keightley (p. 43) "...because the negative charge, by its nature, involved no action by the king, the engraver may have thought it superfluous to provide the foot in that charge." (This seems rather dubious, however.)

- 11 On the basis of these studies and others such as Ch'en Meng-chia (1956), Shima Kunio (1958; *S*), and others to be found in the works cited here, one might be able to arrive at a better understanding of the nature and role of the *fu*. I have provided these references here for those who may be able to make use of them, given my own inability to synthesize the various opinions about the term *fu* at this time.

The emphasis conveyed by the verb phrases *yu/wang* + *pin* may, in this instance, be said to have shifted more to their subject than to the verb phrases themselves. As I shall attempt to demonstrate in more detail later, such a shift of emphasis is not unusual linguistically.

The two exceptions referred to above (in which the subject of the verb *pin* is the *fu*) are the kind of exceptions that give rise to the possibility that the verb *pin* may belong to a special class of verbs that have a built-in meaning of “can, be able to” given some particular conditions. We shall examine this possibility shortly, but let us first see how the two exceptions may be translated.

(3) (a) 貞帚好弗其寔嘏。

Yi-chu 523

Tested: Fu Hao (or Tzu) will not perhaps [be able to] treat X as guest.

N. B. An inscription similar to the above except that no object is expressed after the verb *pin* is found in *Shih-to* 1.296 (*S* 275.3).

(3) (b) 帚井……寔……

Hsü-ts'un 1.42(*S* 275.3)

Fu Ching will... [be able to] treat... as guest.

N. B. Shima notes cautiously that the inscription might read “... 寔 帚井,” rather than “帚井 寔 ...” Cf. also *S* 275.4, *Hsü-ts'un* 1.42, where he also shows the alternate reading.

We have mentioned previously (p. 660) that the verb *pin* is normally a controllable verb. We can tell that it is a self-controllable activity from the meaning which specialists assign to this verb, “treat... as guest, conduct a guesting ritual.” The negative used for such verbs is preponderantly the modal and controllable negative *wu* 勿 ‘do not, should not’ as in *Ping-pien* 36(3), 180(10), 385(3), 392(2), 393(4); *Chui-ho* 211; *T'ieh-yün* 270.2; and *Ch'ien-pien* 7.30.3. There are, however, four cases in Shima's *S* in which the negative is the non-modal and uncontrollable *fu* 弗 ‘will not, did not’ (i.e.,

[3] [b] above, *Shih-to* 1.296, *K'u-fang* 2178, and *Ch'ien-pien* 7.27.4).¹² When the subject is expressed (in two out of the four cases), it is Fu Hao (or Tzu) 婦好. If we can indeed take Fu Ching 婦井 in our example (3) (b) above as the subject of the verb *pin*, we would have a situation in which the subject is *fu*, rather than the king. This fact, taken together with such "success" verbs as *te* 得 'to obtain, get', *kung* 攻 'to attack', *luan* 亂 (?) 'to net; surround', *pi* 𠂔 (or *ch'in* 禽) 'to capture, seize', *ku* 古 'to manage, be in charge of, and *huo* 獲 'to capture' -- all of which are negated by *fu*--, suggests that the verb *pin* can also be regarded as a "success" verb under such conditions as when its subject is a *fu*. This is the reason why we have translated *pin* in (3) (a) and (3) (b) as "[to be able to] treat... as guest," implying a successful completion of the *pin*-ing activity by Fu Hao or Fu Ching, unusual though her participation would be.

Another implication to be drawn from the emphatic hypothesis is that, if it is correct, the divinatory charges and the prognostications are most likely declarative or imperative, not interrogative, sentences. Without going into details here,¹³ I should point out that the Shang diviners frequently used the emphatic *yu/wang* before what may be considered an uncontrollable or "success" verb (examples of which were given in the above paragraph). Other examples include such verbs as *pai* 敗 'be defeated', *tsai* 戕 'give a damaging blow, destroy; be destroyed (?)', *cheng* 正 'be proper, correct', *chi* 及 'reach, get to' (a success verb), *shou sheng* 受生 'receive life (become pregnant?)', *ch'ung* 寵 (?) 'get better, improve', *chih* 至 'arrive at' (a success verb), and perhaps others. Most of these verbs imply good things for the

12 Shima (*S* 275.4) cites *Kikō* 2.1.12 as an example in which the negative is *fu*, but the rubbing does not indicate that he is correct.

13 Cf. Keightley (1972; 1978: 29, Note 7), Serruys (1974: 21-24), Li Hsüeh-ch'in (1980: 39-42), Nivison (1982), and Ch'iu Hsi-kuei (1988). I am not yet totally persuaded by the conclusions of Li Hsüeh-ch'in and Ch'iu Hsi-kuei, who admit the existence of true interrogative sentences in the *ming-tz'u*. I hope to write a thorough critique on some other occasion. [I did just this in Takashima 1989.]

Shang, a point which I think can be demonstrated. A verb like *pai*, which implies an undesirable result if the subject is the Shang or its ally, would then be strongly negated by *wang* to show their preference. (See examples [2](e) and [2](f). Note also the use of Serruys' [1974: 25ff.] "undesirable" *ch'i* 其 theory in the positive alternative [2](f).) These verbs are emphasized, because the Shang wanted their good and desirable meanings to materialize and their bad and undesirable meanings to disappear. In this sense, the Shang oracular statements are not merely the records of impartial divination. They do not fit a dictionary definition of the word divination: "The action or practice of divining; the foretelling of future events or discovery of what is hidden or obscure by supernatural or magical means."¹⁴ They are the records of a spell, an incantation, a charm, in an effort to influence, rather than to foretell the future. If so, they do not require any linguistic response from the spirit of the divine turtle, *shen-kuei* 神龜, or from that of the ox bone; but they do require the spirit to influence the course of an action or event in the Shang world. I owe the above characterization of the nature of late Shang divination to the works of Keightley (1972; 1973; 1975; and 1984) part of whose insight into the matter is summed up in the following quotation (private communication dated May 23, 1988; to appear in a forthcoming issue of *Philosophy East and West*):

"I regard all these routine divinations about no misfortune for the coming week, night, or whole day, as ritual incantations with a strong magical element, designed to ward off possible trouble. These charges were not primarily inquiries into the unknown. They were not genuine attempts to discover if there would be disasters; they were attempts to make sure that there would be no disaster."

Notice here that the charges (and prognostications) are not questions but rather statements which would have been appropriate responses *if* they had

14 *The Oxford Universal Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1955), p. 543.

asked questions. What the diviners and kings sought was a response in "action" rather than in "speech." If such a condensed characterization of the nature of the charging statements proves to be correct, the emphatic hypothesis as regards *yu/wang* would coexist easily with the hypothesis that the *ming-tz'u* are declarative or imperative sentences, but it would clash with the traditional view that the charging statements are interrogative sentences.

4. The Pseudo-*yu/wang* + Verb Pattern

In choosing appropriate examples of the genuine *yu/wang* + verb/verb-phrase pattern, one must exclude the following three superficially similar cases:

(A) Those inscriptions in which a syntactic break can be detected between *yu/wang* and the succeeding verb, which results in something entirely different from the pattern studied in this paper.

(B) Inscriptions in which the subject of the main verb, *yu/wang*, is different from that of the following verb, although the latter subject is not expressed. This too differs from the pattern in question.

(C) Inscriptions in which the object of the main verb, *yu/wang*, is a noun phrase specifically referring to a person or situation (i. e., a quasi-*che* 者 type noun phrase).

Case (A) above concerns the problem of parsing, and it is sometimes possible to show that no embedding of the verb is involved between it and *yu/wang*. For example:

- | | | | |
|---------|---|---|-------------------------|
| (4) (A) | { | (a) 王其出，用入畢。 | <i>Ping-pien</i> 183(4) |
| | | If the king does the offering, (he) should use the catch that has been contributed. | |
| | { | (b) 王勿用。 | <i>Ibid</i> (5) |
| | | The king should not use (it). | |

The positive charge (4)(A)(a) is followed by the negative charge (4)(A)(b) which is not expressed with *wang*, but with *wu*. It is apparent from this that *yung ju pi* (or *ch'in*) 用入 畢 (or 禽) in (4)(A)(a) above is the main clause, in which *yung* is the main verb. What precedes it, *wang ch'i yu* 王其 畀, must then be construed as a conditional clause in which 畀 is interpreted as *yu* 侑 'to offer, present'. If this parsing is correct, the Shang diviner probably uttered the charge “王其侑用入畢” with a pause between *yu* and *yung*. I have thus supplied a comma in (4)(A)(a) above to show this interpretation. Thus, one must exclude (4)(A)(a) from the corpus of sample sentences (to be given further in section 5) used in testing the emphatic *yu* hypothesis.

Another kind of example that must be excluded from our corpus is represented by (4)(A)(c) below:

(4)(A)(c) 王固曰之畀，獲廌一豕一。

Ping-pien 287(2)

The king, having interpreted the omens, said, “There [i.e., to the east of the field] there will be [*chih*-deer]; (we) caught *chih*-deer and wild boar (numbering) one (each).”

It seems at first sight that the above “*yu huo* 畀獲” could form the pattern “*yu*+verb” in the same way as observed in (1)(e), *yu huo*, in section 1. However, on the obverse side of (4)(A)(c) is found two pairs of inscriptions, of which only one pair quoted below will be sufficient to demonstrate why one should not construe *yu huo* as a constituent in (4)(A)(c):

(4)(A) { (d) 野(?)于東畀廌。

Ping-pien 286(1)

To the east of the field(?) will be *chih*-deer.

(e) 貞野(?)亡其廌。

Ibid (2)

Tested: There might not be *chih*-deer (in) the field.

The deictic and demonstrative pronoun *chih* 之 in (4)(A)(c) could very well refer to what I have rather venturesomely rendered as *yeh* 野; and the verb

Case (B) involves a few rather stereotyped sentences in which the subject of the main verb *yu/wang* cannot be said to refer to the same subject as the following verb on the underlying level. For example:

- (4) (B) { (a) 庚申卜設貞我亡作禍。 Ping-pien 104(3)
Keng-shen day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: We have a misfortune caused (by God on High).
(b) 庚申卜設貞我亡作禍。 Ibid (4)
Keng-shen day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: We do not have a misfortune caused (by God on High).

It is probably safe to assume that the underlying subject of *tso* 作 'to make, cause' is Ti 帝 'God on High', as it appears in such sentences as 帝其/弗其降禍 (e.g., *Yi-ts'un* 36) "God on High might/might not send down misfortunes" or 帝其/弗作王 (禍) (e.g., *Yi-pien* 4861, 1707) "God on High might/will not cause misfortune (for) the king." These sentences support the

15 Ch'u 楚 is normally written as 𣎵, as in *Ts'ui-pien* 1547, a Period III bone. Chang Ping-ch'uan's transcription is suspect, since this is the only example he so transcribes in the entire *Ping-pien*, which consists almost entirely of Period I turtle shells and plastrons (or the Middle Period of the Diviner Pin Group 賓組中期).

16 The examples are legion. In *Ping-pien* alone, the *yün huo* 允獲 expressions in the verifications are as follows: 86 (4), 87 (5), 323 (5), (14), (16), and 546 (3); however, there are no *yu huo* in the verifications.

understanding of (4)(B)(a) and (4)(B)(b) as they have been translated. They also suggest that *wo* cannot be taken semantically as an agent of the verb *tso*.¹⁷ *Wo* is an “experiencer,” and the following inscriptions, in which the experiencer *tzu yi* 茲邑 ‘this settlement’ (which cannot be the agent) occurs, confirm the correctness of this analysis.

- (4) (B) { (c) 戊戌卜𠩺貞茲邑亡降禍。 *Ping-pien* 326(5)
 { *Wu-hsü* day cracking, Pin tested: This settlement shall not
 have misfortunes sent down (by God on High).
 { (d) 貞茲邑其𠩺降禍。 *Ibid* (6)
 Tested: This settlement might have misfortunes sent down
 (by God on High).

It is characteristic of these stereotyped sentences that the Shang did not have the option available to them of choosing whether or not to use *yu/wang*. Therefore, these sentences must be excluded from our corpus in examining the emphatic *yu/wang* hypothesis. Below are some more examples:

- (4) (B) { (e) 甲申卜爭貞王𠩺不若。 *Ping-pien* 510(1)
 { *Chia-shen* day cracking, Cheng tested: The king has (some-
 thing which God on High) disapproves of.
 { (f) 貞王亡不若。 *Ibid* (2)
 Tested: The king has no(thing which God on High) dis-
 approves of.
 { (g) 辛未卜𠩺貞王𠩺不正。 *Yi-pien* 7773
 Hsin-wei day cracking, Pin tested: The king has (something

17 There is not much chance that *wo* 我 here is the name of a tribe/diviner *Wo* (cf. Jao Tsung-yi 1959: 705–713) and that *Wo* is to be regarded as the agent of the verb phrase *tso huo* 作禍 ‘cause misfortune’. The inscriptions quoted in Jao (*ibid*) and Shima (*S* 352–356.1) indicate that *Wo* was friendly to the Shang. In fact, *Wo* may simply have been *wo*, i. e., the Shang themselves in this case.

- which is) not going properly.
- (h) 貞王亡不正。 Ibid
- Tested: the king has no(thing which is) not going properly.

There are other sentences of this type, with some grammatical variations,¹⁸ but the above examples show that there is indeed a referential function in noun phrases occurring after *yu/wang*; *tso huo* 作禍 in (4)(B)(a) and (b), *chiang huo* 降禍 in (4)(B)(c) and (d), *pu jo* 不若 in (4)(B)(e) and (f), and *pu cheng* 不正 in (4)(B)(g) and (h) all *refer* to some specific condition. Emphatic verb phrases consisting of *yu/wang* + verb, however, have no such referential function.

Case (C) also involves noun phrases which have a referential function pointing to someone, some thing, or a certain situation or condition. These noun phrases are what I have elsewhere (e.g., 1984a) referred to as the “quasi-*che*” type. Since they function as the direct object of the verb *yu/wang*, they cannot be included in the corpus of the emphatic verb phrases. For example:

- (4) (C) { (a) 貞其出來。 Ping-pien 296(1)
- Tested: There might be (someone) coming.
- (b) 貞亡其來。 Ibid (2)
- Tested: There might not be (anyone) coming.

I interpret *lai* 來 in the above sentences as having the classical Chinese meaning *lai che* 來者 ‘one who comes’ on the basis of the following inscriptions:

18 E. g., *Ping-pien* 66 (3), 517 (1)(2), and 518 (2) in which the word *tso* 左 ‘to be wrong, improper’ is preceded by *yu*, but the negation is achieved by *pu wei* 不佳, rather than *wang*. That is, we have *wei yu tso* 佳虫左 and *pu wei yu tso* 不佳虫左.

- | | | |
|---|---|-------------|
| { | (c) 八月。癸酉卜羔貞𠂔來自西。 | Ibid 94(1) |
| | The eighth month. Divining on the <i>kuei-yu</i> day, Kao tested: | |
| | There shall be (someone) coming from the west. | |
| { | (d) 亡其來自西。 | Ibid (2) |
| | ... There might not be (anyone) coming from the west. | |
| | | |
| { | (e) 見入九氏。 | Ibid 95(2) |
| | Chien contributed nine [turtles]; (he) brought [them] in | |
| | (personally). | |
| { | (f) 𠂔來自南氏龜。 | Ibid 621(6) |
| | There shall be (someone) coming from the south to bring | |
| | turtles. | |

Briefly, (c) and (d) above show that the diviner made a prediction of someone coming from the west to bring a tribute of turtles (in all probability), because on the reverse side of *Ping-pien* 94, i.e., (e), is a record of the name of a person or tribe, Chien, who contributed "nine" (turtles). (cf. [f] above.) In short, *yu/wang+lai* in (c), (d), and (f) above does not constitute an emphatic verb phrase.

5. *Yu/Wang*+Controllable Verbs: Some Further Examples

As mentioned in Section 3, it is easy to understand why the Shang diviners cast spells or made incantations in an emphatic mood when using uncontrollable success verbs with desirable meanings. "We will catch," "we will give a damaging blow," "we will attack successfully," "all shall go properly," "the illness shall improve," and so on, are expressions that tend to be emphasized. There are in fact many examples of this sort, often without any negative counterpart. We have already discussed several of these (i.e., [1] [e], [2] [e] [g] [i] [j] [k]), as well as their implications regarding the nature of Shang divination. It is also important to study what motivated the Shang diviner to use emphatic expressions when humanly

controllable activities were involved. First, we shall provide examples in which “controllable” verbs are preceded by *yu/wang*. We shall then discuss the ramifications of the emphatic hypothesis.

The Controllable Verb Yü 卺

- (5) (a) 癸未卜設貞子漁卺于癸。

Hsü-pien 3.48.3

Kuei-wei day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: Tzu Yü should really perform the exorcizing rite in (the presence of the spirit of) E.

A Tzu X--in this case, an important Shang aristocrat named Tzu Yü 子漁--usually occurs as the direct object (semantic patient) of the verb *yü* 卺 (cf. S 53.1, 2, 3). It is tempting to assume that a similar situation exists here as in the special case of the *fu* 帚 performing the *pin* 窰 ritual mentioned earlier in (1)(b).

By the same token, however, one could consider Tzu Yü here as being the direct object, rather than the subject. This is based on the possibility that Tzu Yü might have been stressed, and thus preposed, before the verb phrase *yu yü* 卺. In Note 9 we have pointed out that there are no other examples showing that the direct object is preposed before the verbs *yu/wang*; this is suggestive, but it cannot be considered a rule until we have checked all the examples. Are there any other reasons that we can suggest in favor of interpreting Tzu Yü in the pattern “Tzu Yü+*yu/wang*+*yü*” as subject? I believe there are some worth mentioning, even though none of them are absolutely certain in the absence of native speakers to verify the meaning.

First, we accept that Chinese is a SVO language, which will ordinarily mean that Tzu Yü occurring before *yu/wang* is the subject. Failure to accept this general principle will result in serious confusion.

Second, if we should assume for the moment that Tzu Yü is actually a preposed object, that would point towards an interpretation which made

yu/wang the main verb and *yü* its direct object, meaning “there shall or shall not be an exorcism.” Now, if the word *yü* is to be the direct object, a preposed Tzu Yü can only be the indirect object; and the meaning of the phrase would have to be “*To Tzu Yü there shall be an exorcism.” This is impossible for two reasons. First, in (5)(a) we already have the indirect object E 𠄎 introduced by the particle *yü*. Second, the exorcism rite was conducted by a *living* person (as Tzu Yü was here) who made an appeal to a deceased ancestor. Furthermore, it would be wrong to interpret *yu/wang* + *yü* as meaning “there shall or shall not be an exorcism,” because that meaning is normally expressed by the simple verb *yü* for the positive and with *wu* 勿 ‘do not, should not’, not *wang*, for the negative, as in *Chin-chang* 415 (勿 𠄎 子 𠄎 ...) or in *Chia-pien* 3078 (勿 𠄎 雀 于 母 庚). This shows that *yü* is a controllable verb, and that *wang yü* is not to be explained as a simple negation of *yü*. Similarly, *yu yü* is not to be explained as a simple affirmative version of *wu yü* but as a special case of the affirmative.

For these two reasons, it is grammatically more defensible to interpret any noun occurring before the main verb *yu/wang* as subject, no matter whether it is semantically a location (e.g., [4][A][c], [d], and [e]), an experiencer (e.g., [4][B][a] and [b]), or an agent (e.g., [1][b], [c], [5][a], etc.).

The following inscriptions in which the king, normally the object of the *yü* exorcism rite (cf. the 𠄎王 inscription at S 52.3, 4--see qualifications below), is proposed as its agent with the emphatic *yu*, lends credence to the view developed above:

- (5) (b) 丁巳卜王𠄎于祖丁十牛。 *Fu-shih*, Ti 80 (S 54.2)
 Ting-ssu day cracking: The king should really perform the
 exorcism rite in(the presence of the spirit of)Tsu Ting(with)¹⁹

19 For an excellent study concerning the use of sacrificial victims which accompanied what is referred to as the “Type A verb” *yü* 𠄎, see Chow (1982: 188-205).

ten oxen.

(c) 壬申貞王又卽于祖丁夷先。

Nan-pei, Fu 58

Jen-shen day, tested: The king should in fact perform the exorcism rite in (the persence of the spirit of) Tsu Ting; it should be (that he) does that first.

Consider (5)(b) and (5)(c) in conjunction with the following inscription, in which the reflexive pronoun *tzu* 自 'oneself' is used with *yü* 余, apparently referring to the king himself:

(5) (d) 庚戌卜余自卽。

Yi-pien 5405

Keng-hsü day cracking: I personally should conduct the exorcism rite.

Clearly related to the above inscription on the same plastron is the following:

(5) (e) 庚戌卜朕臣鳴(?) 卽于祖庚羊百, 用五十八女, 自今日。

Ibid

Keng-hsü day cracking: My *hsiao-chen*, Ming(?), should in fact exorcize in (the presence of the spirit of) Tsu Keng (with) sheep (numbering) one hundred and in fact use fifty-eight sacrificial women; (the offering) should indeed start from today.

All the inscriptions on this plastron (there are at least twelve) are concerned with the exorcism rite, and (5)(d) and (5)(e) may be interpreted as the king trying to decide who in fact should perform the rite.

There are, however, four other inscriptions in which the agent is the king and yet *yu* is not used.²⁰ According to what we have said so far, this

20 The statistics are based on Shima (*S* 53; 55.1, 3, 4; 56.1, 2). They are *Hsü-pien* 5.5.6 (*S* 53.3), *Jim-bun* 3020 (*S* 54.4, where Shima mistranscribes 𠄎己; it should be [𠄎] □, as Kaizuka [1960: 694] correctly transcribes), *T'ieh-yün* 67.2 (*S*

may seem to weaken the emphatic hypothesis. Upon closer examination, however, these four examples are not genuine exceptions, since there was no emphasis or contrast intended in them. Earlier, we mentioned that the king is the usual object of the *yü* exorcism rite. This is true statistically, judged from a comparison of the number of *yü wang* 𠩺王 inscriptions at S 52.3, 4 (seven or eight cases) and *wang yü* 王𠩺 inscriptions (four cases including negative expressions) referred to in Note 20. However, the difference here is nowhere near as extreme as that between the *wang pin* 王𠩺 inscriptions in S 276.3, 4; 277.1, 2; etc. (literally hundreds) and the *fu pin* 𠩺𠩺 inscriptions in S 275.3, 4 (only a few cases). We have thus argued that the performance of a *pin* entertainment ritual by a *fu* was so unusual that it led the Shang to use the emphatic or contrastive expression “*yu/wang+pin*” or a “success” verb such as *pin*. The same situation does not seem to apply to the *yü* exorcism rite. While a pertinent study of *yü* in terms of its philological and religious aspects has not yet been made, it could be said that it was a ritual performed by the king or some other important member of the Shang court, particularly a *tzu* 子.²¹ When the

(續) 55.1, where Shima mistranscribes, giving an incomplete handcopy; it should read 辛卯卜王𠩺祖乙𠩺羊𠩺掌), and *Hsü-pien* 1.28.8 (S 56.1). Shima also records *Yi-pien* 3380 (S 56.2) in which the king appears as the agent of *yü*, but I have discounted it because he omitted the word *ju* 入 after *wang ch'i* 王其. This expression “X [其] 入 𠩺” (e. g., *Ching-chin* 918 [S 55.3], *Jimbun* 1633) may have some special significance, and it requires further study.

- 21 See (5)(a). (5)(e) has a *ch'en*. The following examples show that there was “reciprocal” *yü*-ing between the king and Tzu Yung:

{ 戊午卜王勿𠩺子辟。 *Hsü-pien* 5.5.6

{ *Wu-wu* day cracking: The king should not exorcize Tzu Pi(?).

{ 丁丑卜𠩺貞子𠩺其𠩺王于丁妻二妣己𠩺羊三𠩺羌十。 *Yi-ts'un* 181

Ting-ch'ou day cracking, Pin tested: Tzu Yung might exorcize the king in (the presence of the spirits of) the Ting ancestors' [i. e., Tsu Ting 祖丁 and Chung Ting 中丁] consorts, the two Pi Chi, cutting sheep amounting to three and piercing the Ch'iang, ten (of them).

N. B. Shang Ch'eng-tso 商承祚 in his *k'ao-shih* of *Yi-ts'un* 181/p. 28a says that

emphatic *yu* is employed for *yü*, it is to emphasize or contrast the subject: (5)(d) and (5)(e) supply good contextual evidence for this. When the emphatic *yu* is not employed for *yü*, *ipso facto* no emphasis or contrast was intended by the Shang.

The Controllable Verb Kao 告

The following inscription, not found in Shima(*S*) but quoted as occurring on *Yi-chu* 733 by Wang Yung-shan et al. (1977: 8),²² is very important with regards to the implications of the emphatic hypothesis:

(5) (f) 帚好出告于多妣酹。

Yi-chu 733 (*sic*)

Fu Hao (Tzu) should really perform the announcement ritual (directed) toward the Many Ancestral Mothers (with) what has been *yu*-cut [酹 = 所酹].²³

(續) here the Ting ancestors refer to Tsu Yi 祖乙 and Tsu Ting 祖丁. If there is a special significance in performing the *yü* ritual directed toward the Ting ancestors, as I believe there is, then the next candidate who has “Pi Chi 妣己” as a consort is Chung Ting 中丁, not Tsu Yi.

22 I have been unable to make out the inscription on this bone piece. The authors clearly state in the footnote that the abbreviation *Chu* 珠 refers to *Yin-ch'i yi-chu* 殷契遺珠, but my Taiwan reprint (Yi-wen Yin-shu-kuan 藝文印書館, 1974) shows no recognizable inscriptions except the crack notation “二.”

23 It is standard to transcribe the bone graph 𩚑 as *chiu* 酒 ‘wine; to perform libation’. One problem with this interpretation is that the graph does not seem to stand for the word “wine,” so that its verbal interpretation “to ‘wine’” and hence “to perform libation” lacks a *raison d’être*. Moreover, the word for “wine” is expressed by the graph 𩚑, and the verb “to perform libation” is normally expressed by *kuan* 裸, 灌 (𩚑, 𩚑). Furthermore, syntactic considerations to be given below suggest that the bone graph stands for an action-controllable verb indicating a method of killing sacrificial victims such as humans, oxen, or sheep (frequently penned ones). The typical syntax of the word, to which we have assigned the reading *yu/*rəgwx* 酹, is as follows:

(*wu* 勿) + *yu* + (*yü* 于) + indirect object + direct object.

I believe the *kao* announcement ritual should be distinguished from other *kao* activities in the following way:

(1) the content of the announcement, if expressed at all, has to do typically with the king's illness of some kind (𠄎) or misfortune (*huo* 禍), or a natural phenomenon, including plagues of locusts (? 𧈧).

(2) it almost always specifies the addressee, which is an ancestral spirit considered higher in "ritual status" than the king himself.

(3) it is frequently accompanied by some "instrumental" or "comitative" sacrificial victim, i. e., the means with which the announcement was carried out.

(4) when it specifies the agent, it is frequently the king.

(續) For example, the relevant portion of *Ping-pien* 197(3) reads:

... 𠄎下乙十伐虫五 ...

... *yu*-cut sacrifice fifteen *fa*-human victims (to) Hsia Yi (=Tsu Yi)...

Chow Kwok-ching (1982: 341-346) has also studied the syntactic characteristics of this verb, suggesting that it is one of the Type B verbs which accompany and make complete the performance of a Type A ritual activity (i. e., *kao* 告 'to make (ritual) announcement', *yü* 𠄎 'to exorcise', and *ch'iu* 求 'to seek'). He has also established that *yu* is a Type B verb which was "performed ahead of and separate from" (p. 345) other Type B verbs like *liao* 𠄎 'to perform a holocaust', *yu* 虫 'to offer', *cho* 𠄎 'to cleave', etc.

Palaeographically, the grapheme 𠄎 in 𠄎 can be best interpreted as a drawing of "sun rays" (cf. 𠄎) having the semantic significance "bright, patterned, and beautiful," on the basis of such characters as *t'ung* 彤 'red, bright', *ts'ai* 彩 'colorful', *tiao* 彫 'carve (to make some patterned, bright, design or decoration)', *yen* 彦 'good-looking young man' and *chang* 彰 'beautiful pattern; manifest'. Because the pronunciation of these characters varies widely, it is safer to consider the grapheme 𠄎 an *yi-fu* 義符 and to read 𠄎 as *yu*/**rəgw*. It is possible that the word is etymologically related to *tiao*/**ɬjəgw* 彫 which is also used in the sense of "injure" (*shang yeh* 傷也) in the classics. I would therefore understand the word *yu* 𠄎 to have meant some way of cutting, the neat and beautiful execution of which must have been required as a preparatory sacrifice. (There is inscriptional evidence to show that the *yu*-sacrifice was conducted outdoor, and rain was not wanted.)

I have found only two possible exceptions to this last rule, of which one is (5)(f) above, a genuine exception in that the subject is Fu Hao, not the king. We shall comment on this shortly. The other is the *tui-chen* pair (5)(g) and (5)(h) below:

- (5) { (g) 丁未貞王其令望乘帶其告于祖乙一牛父丁一牛。 Chui-ho 334 (apud S 123.3)²⁴
(Translation to be provided shortly.)
(h) 貞王其令望乘帶其告于祖乙二牛。 Ibid
(Translation to be provided shortly.)

We might translate (5)(g) above as “*Ting-wei* day tested: If the king orders Wang Ch’eng [to do something], the *fu* might perform the announcement ritual (directed) toward Tsu Yi (with) one ox and toward Fu Ting (with) one ox.” But this translation is problemetical, particularly the portion “... orders Wang Ch’eng [to do something],” for we have no idea of what that “something” might refer to. The graph 帶 here should be interpreted as standing for the word *kuei* 歸 ‘to return’, as Ch’iu Hsi-kuei (1981: 312) has already done. The resulting meaning of (5)(g) would be quite natural: “... When the king orders Wang Ch’eng to return (to the capital or to his post), (the king) might perform the announcement ritual (directed) toward Tsu Yi (with) one ox...” Example (5)(h) should be interpreted in a similar way. Thus, (5)(g) and (5)(h) are not exceptions to the four rules given above concerning the verb *kao*.

As for our example (5)(f), the situation is exactly the same as in the case of the *pin* ritual discussed in Section 3. It is reasonable, therefore, to understand that in (5)(f) the Shang diviner used the emphatic expression

24 *Chui-ho* 334 does not correspond to what is given in Shima; there seems to be an error in the name of the collection or the number. Ch’iu Hsi-kuei (1981: 312) appears to have copied Shima’s error, but as he notes, the inscription is actually from *Ts’ui-pien* 506, which should be rejoined with *Nan-pei*, Ming 499.

yu kao because of the rather unusual situation in which he found himself proposing Fu Hao as the performer of the *kao* announcement ritual.

The Controllable Verb *Ts'ung* 從

Numerous inscriptions in *S* 20.3 ff. show that the subject of the verb *ts'ung* in the sense of "follow" is the king. Tzu Yü is the only exception to this rule, as shown in the following inscriptions:

- (5) { (i) 子漁出從。 Ch'ien-pien 5.44.3
 Tzu Yü should really follow (someone--understood).
 (j) 貞子漁亡其從。²⁵ Hou-pien 1.27.2
 Tzu Yü should not perhaps follow (someone--understood) after all.

It is clear that we are here faced with a situation very similar to that observed in the case of *fu* performing the *pin* ritual and the *fu* performing the *kao* ritual in special and unusual circumstances. The case of Tzu Yü performing the *yü* ritual is slightly different in that this ritual, by its nature, was not almost totally restricted to the king; it offered a much wider latitude for choice as to whether the king or a *tsu* (or a *ch'en* 臣 in one case, [5] [e]) was to perform it. We have argued that these peculiar circumstances led the Shang to employ the emphatic *yu/wang*+verb pattern in these cases, and would maintain that the same holds true for (5)(i) and (5)(j).

Modality of *Wu* 勿 and *Wang* 亡

25 Ikeda Suetoshi (1964: 128), commenting on the word-order of *wang ch'i ts'ung* 亡其從, judges this to be an inversion (*tōbun* 倒文) of **ch'i wang ts'ung* 其亡從. Inversion is generally understood as a process whereby an uncommon structure is derived from a common structure for some semantic purpose (e. g., for emphasis, contrast, suspension of information). Yet, as mentioned in Note 1, *ch'i wang* is an order which is not at all common. Therefore, if such an expression as **ch'i wang ts'ung* is ever found to exist, *this* would be the inversion, not *wang ch'i ts'ung*.

Now a corollary of the above argument is a characterization of the modal²⁶ difference between the negative *wu* and the negative verb *wang*. These negative words²⁷ are used with the verb *ts'ung* in the sense of "follow." (Cf. *S* 20.3 ff.). When we contrast *wu* and *wang*, the difference between them seems to lie in the degree of modal force with which the charges were uttered.

To begin with, let us examine the following pair:

- (5) { (k) 王從于河。 Ping-pien 443(5)
 If (the king/we) really are to follow [$>$ proceed along], (the king/we) should do so in (the region of) the Ho river.
 (1) 其從勿于河。 Ibid (6)
 If (the king/we) might follow [$>$ proceed along], (the king/we) should not (do so) in (the region of) the Ho river.

The use of the negative *wu* in the position it occurs in (5)(1) shows that the sentence is not a simple sentence. The best interpretation I can offer

26 For a theory proposing that the "mood" is associated with the initials of the negatives, see Takashima (1973; 1986). In these works, the negatives are divided into the **p*-type (*pu* 不 and *fu* 弗) and the **m*-type (*wu* 毋 and *wu* 勿); the former type is non-modal and the latter modal. *Wang* (**mjang*) 亡 in this scheme would belong to the **m*-type, though it is, strictly speaking, a negative verb rather than a negative particle.

27 There are a few cases in which the negative *fu* 弗 is used, which would weaken the "uncontrollable-verb negating *fu*" theory. There are, however, two possible explanations. One is that the verb *ts'ung* is to be regarded as a success verb under certain specifiable conditions (like the verb *pin* 寔, as discussed previously). Another is that *ts'ung* is negated by *fu* because it occurs in an embedded structure. That is, because *ts'ung* is basically an action-controllable verb, its negative should be a **m*-type modal one (*wu* 毋 or *wu* 勿), but the modality associated with the **m*-initial can be considered "neutralized," which leads to the employment of *fu* in these linguistically conditioned cases. For more on this neutralization of the modal negatives, see Takashima (1984b: 82-85).

is to construe the underlying full sentence to be *其從，勿從于河. Similarly, (5)(k) would be *𠄎從，從于河. If this is correct, one can further examine to see in what way 𠄎從 and 其從 are contrastive. Our discussion so far has shown that *yu*+verb is emphatic, while *ch'i*+verb is not; *ch'i*, being a particle expressing uncertainty, is semantically opposite to *yu*. Thus, *yu*+*ts'ung* in (5)(k) is an emphatic conditional clause which is contrasted with the weak clause *ch'i*+*ts'ung* in (5)(l).

On the other hand, it is clear that in the underlying string *𠄎從，從于河 --the emphatic conditional clause of *yu ts'ung* 'if (the king/we) really are to follow' --is not in semantic conflict with the main clause of *ts'ung yü ho* '(the king/we) should do so in the region of the Ho river'. Similarly, in the string *其從，勿從于河, the conditional clause 其從 'if (the king/we) might follow' is not in semantic conflict with 勿從于河 '(the king/we) should not do so in the region of the Ho river'. However, if we were to use *wang* in the place of *wu*, it would create a certain amount of semantic conflict. It would be illogical to combine a conditional clause meaning "if (the king/we) might follow" with a main one meaning "(the king/we) should not follow". In other words, if there had been any doubt in the mind of the diviner as to the wisdom of the act of "proceeding along [the Ho River]," he would not have negated it with *wang*, the negative verb stronger in mood --we would conclude--than the negative particle *wu*. The significance of the above is that it yields a rule predicting the non-occurrence of a subordinate clause with the modal particle *ch'i* followed by a main clause which has the emphatic negative verb *wang*; and as far as I can establish, this rule holds. However, the main significance of this rule is that it derives from the degree of modality we have assigned to *wu* and *wang*.

The Controllable Verb Yung 用

In addition to the use of the emphatic *yu* in example (5)(k), another good example would be (5)(m) below:

- (5) (m) 癸丑卜 𠄎 貞五百寇用。旬壬戌 𠄎 用寇一百。三月。 *Ching-chin* 1255
Kuei-ch'ou day cracking, Ch'üeh tested: The five hundred *k'ou*-s shall be employed; in a [ten-day] week, on the *jen-hsü* day, (we) did use the *k'ou* [but] numbering one hundred. Third month.

If it is correct to take the *yen-tz'u* as starting from the word *hsün*, the use of the emphatic *yu* may have been motivated by a “partial/specific confirmation or realization” of what was proposed. By this I mean that the verb *yung* is repeated in the *yen-tz'u* and embedded in the verb *yu*, but the number is at variance with what was proposed on the *kuei-ch'ou* day. By contrast, the word *yün* ‘indeed, really’ would have been used, if what was proposed in the *ming-tz'u* 命辭 and its outcome coincided. *Yün*, in other words, was like an echo repeating the validity of the entire preceding charging statement. This is a total confirmation. However, in (5)(m) above, this is not the case, because the number of the *k'ou* used was one hundred, rather than five hundred. It is only the verb *yung* and the patient *k'ou* in the *ming-tz'u* that were in fact carried out, hence the emphatic statement of *yu + yung*.²⁸ This is a partial and specific confirmation. Therefore, in terms of the degree of emphasis, *yün* seems to be stronger and more encompassing than the *yu + verb* phrases.

The Controllable Verb Wang 往

Example (5)(n) below is one of a type that Keightley (1978: 46, n. 90) calls a “display inscription,” which frequently offers a fuller context:

- (5) (n) 癸丑卜 爭貞旬亡禍。王 固 曰 𠄎 𠄎 𠄎 𠄎 。甲寅允 𠄎 來 𠄎 。左告曰
𠄎 往 𠄎 自 盜 十人 𠄎 二。 *T'ung-tsuan* 430

28 For the linguistic reason that we have here the quantifier 一百 in 𠄎 用寇一百 after *yu yung k'ou*, instead of *𠄎 用一百寇, see Takashima (1985).

Kuei-ch'ou day cracking, Cheng tested: There shall be no misfortunes in the [following ten-day] week. The king, having interpreted the omens, said, "There will be trouble; there will be..." On the *chia-yin* day, there was indeed the coming of invading peril.²⁹ The left (battalion) reported,³⁰ saying, "(They) did send the men-at-arms³¹ from the place of X, (the number) amounting to twelve."

On the grounds that the *yen-tz'u* always confirms the accuracy of the prognostication (*yao-tz'u* 繇辭) in the display inscriptions, I have included the sentence beginning with *tso kao yüeh* 左告曰 as part of the *yen-tz'u*. If this is correct, the emphatic expression *yu wang* 往 is used to augment the accuracy of the king's prognostication. Yet, like (5)(m) above, it provides a certain emphasis specifically for the phrase *yu lai chu*(?) 往來 訖 "there was indeed the coming of invading peril."

6. Summary

We have attempted to wring as much as possible out of the laconic inscriptional language through grammatical and semantic analyses. The hypothesis of this paper--that the pattern *yu/wang*+verb₂, wherein the verb₂ is nominalized by virtue of *yu/wang* which is verb₁, carries not a referential

29 For the reason why *yu lai chu* (?) 往來 訖 does not constitute an emphatic verb phrase, see section 4, examples (4)(C)(a)-(f).

30 This verb, *kao* 告, is different from the *kao* announcement ritual characterized under (5)(f). Notice that the content of *kao* is here expressed, and the "instrumental" or "comitative" sacrificial victim does not accompany the verb.

31 I have previously followed T'ang Lan's 唐蘭 (1939: 36/CKWTCS 1.218) suggestion that *ch'u* 芻 means "bucolics, rustics (*ch'u-jao chih ch'u* 芻蕘之芻)," but such a meaning does not fit here. It may have referred to some sort of fighting men belonging to such tribes as the Ch'iang 羌, Shen 允 (𡗗), X 𡗗 (𡗗), Yüan 𡗗 (𡗗), etc. They were also organized under the king (cf. when the word is preceded by *chen* 朕).

but an emphatic meaning--is based on the fundamental assumption that whenever the form differs there must be some underlying semantic motivation.

In Section 2 we began by recognizing that grammatically, *yu* or *wang* is the main verb of a sentence, with such standard meanings as "have/there is" or "have not/there is not"; but the information load rests more heavily on the nominalized verb. In the pattern *yu/wang*+verb₂, it is necessary to posit a "dummy" word such as "occasion" or "chance" to link the main nominalizing verb, *yu/wang*, and the nominalized verb. We have taken advantage of the semantic implications of *yu/wang* as far as evidence in the inscriptional language (and quite possibly in classical Chinese also--cf. Note 6) permits. Several representative examples were cited in support of the emphatic hypothesis.

In Section 3, we examined some of the implications the hypothesis may entail, as the emphatic hypothesis would not be meaningful without some idea of what motivated the Shang diviners to employ it. We have paid attention to the seemingly special situation wherein the *fu* 鬲 is proposed as the performer of the *pin* 賓 ritual, in contrast to the ordinary situation in which the king appears as its performer, and have argued that the emphatic hypothesis would account for this out-of-the-ordinary situation. The nature of Shang osteomancy was also discussed briefly, and it was pointed out that the emphatic hypothesis would fit in well if the divinatory charges, *ming-tz'u*, and the prognostications, *yao-tz'u*, were interpreted as declarative or imperative sentences rather than interrogative ones.

Section 4 was an analysis of some "pseudo *yu/wang*+verb/verb-phrases" which, in spite of surface appearances, must be given different interpretations.

In Section 5, several more examples supported the emphatic hypothesis. The excursion taken in Section 3 was further developed here. Since the implications such a hypothesis may carry are in a sense (i.e., to the palaeographers and historians) more important than the hypothesis itself, they

led us to a contextual analysis of some ritual practices in Shang times, involving the performers and addressees of the *pin* 𠩺, *yü* 卣, and *kao* 告 rituals. The occurrences of the *yu* + verb pattern in the verifying statements, *yen-tz'u*, were also analyzed, with the conclusion that the pattern was used for a "partial and specific confirmation" of a verb or verb phrase in the preceding statement. This was done by contrasting the use of the said pattern with the word *yün* 允, a "total confirmation" of the previous statement.

Abbreviations

- EC* *Early China* (The Annual Journal of the Society for the Study of Early China) (Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley).
- KWTYC* *Ku-wen-tzu yen-chiu* 古文字研究. (Published in Peking: Chung-hua Shu-chü 中華書局).
- CKWTCS* *Chia-ku wen-tzu chi-shih* 甲骨文字集釋. (Published in Taipei: Chung-yang Yen-chiu-yüan 中央研究院) (see also Li Hsiao-ting 1965 in Bibliography).
- KKHP* *K'ao-ku hsüeh-pao* 考古學報.
- LSYCK* *Li-shih yü-yen yen-chui-so chi-k'an* 歷史語言研究所集刊.
- MS* *Monumenta Serica*.
- S* *Inkyo bokuji sōrui* 殷墟卜辭綜類. (See Shima Kunio *S* in Bibliography).
- TP* *T'oung Pao* 通報.

Bibliography

Chang Cheng-lang.

1986. "A Brief Discussion of Fu Tzu," *Studies of Shang Archaeology* (ed. by K. C. Chang; New Haven: Yale University Press), pp. 103-119

K. Takashima

Chang Ping-ch'üan.

1986. "A Brief Description of the Fu Hao Oracle Bone Inscriptions," *Studies of Shang Archaeology* (ed. by K. C. Chang; New Haven: Yale University Press), pp. 121-140.

Ch'en Meng-chia 陳夢家.

1956. *Yin-hsü pu-tz'u tsung-shu* 殷虛卜辭綜述. Peking: K'e-hsüeh Ch'u-pan-she 科學出版社.

Ch'iu Hsi-kuei 裘錫圭.

1981. "Lun 'Li-tsu pu-tz'u' te shih-tai 論「羣組卜辭」的時代," *KWTYC*, 6, pp. 263-321.
1983. 'Shuo pu-tz'u te fen wu wang yü tso t'u-lung 說卜辭的焚巫尪與作土龍," *Chia-ku-wen yü Yin-Shang shih* 甲骨文與殷商史. Shanghai: Ku-chi Ch'u-pan-she 古籍出版社, pp. 21-35.
1988. 'Kuan-yü Yin-hsü pu-tz'u te ming-tz'u shih-fou wen-chü te k'ao-ch'a 關於殷墟卜辭的命辭是否問句的考察," *Chung-kuo yü-wen* 中國語文, 1(202), pp. 1-20.

Chou Hung-hsaing.

1970. "Fu-X Ladies of the Shang Dynasty," *MS*, 29, pp. 346-390.

Chow Kwok-ching 周國正

1976. "The Occurrence of yü (于) in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions" (typescript 44 pp., Vancouver).
1982. Aspects of Subordinative Composite Sentences in the Period I Oracle-Bone Inscriptions. Ph. D. dissertation. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.

Ikeda Suetoshi 池田未利

1964. *Inkyo shokei kôhen shakubun kô* 殷虛書契後編釋文稿. Hiroshima: Hiroshima Daigaku Bungakubu Chûgoku Tetsugaku Kenkyûshitsu 廣島大學文學部中國哲學研究室.

Jao Tsung-yi 饒宗頤

1959. *Yin-tai chen-pu jen-wu t'ung-k'ao* 殷代貞卜人物通考. Hong Kong:

Hong Kong University Press.

Kaizuka Shigeki 貝塚茂樹.

1960. *Kyōto daigaku jimbun kagaku kenkyūshozō kōkotsumoji, Hombunhen*
京都大學人文科學研究所藏甲骨文字・本文編. Kyoto: Kyōto Daigaku
Jimbun Kagaku Kenkyūsho.

Keightley, David N.

1972. "Shih cheng 釋貞: A New Hypothesis about the Nature of Shang Divination." Paper presented at the Asian Studies on the Pacific Coast Conference, Monterey, California, June 17, 1972.
1973. "Shang Divination and Shang Metaphysics (With an Excursion into the Neolithic)." Typescript. 100pp. (To appear in a forthcoming issue of *Philosophy East and West*.) Now published in the said journal, 38.4 (1988), pp. 367-397.
1975. "Legitimation in Shang China." Typescript 71 pp. Paper presented at the Conference on Legitimation of Chinese Imperial Regimes, Asilomar, California, June 15-24.
1978. *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
1983. "Royal Shamanism in the Shang: Archaic Vestige or Central Reality?" Paper for the workshop on Chinese divination and portent interpretation, Berkeley, June 20-July 1, 1983.
1984. "Late Shang Divination: The Magico-Religious Legacy," *Explorations in Early Chinese Cosmology*. (ed. by Henry Rosemont, Jr.; Chico: Scholars Press), pp. 11-34.

Lau, D. C.

1979. *Confucius: The Analects (Lun yü)*, a translation with an introduction by D. C. Lau. Middlesex: Penguin Books.
1980. *Mencius*, a translation with an introduction by D. C. Lau. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Li Fang-kuei 李方桂.

K. Takashima

1971. "Shang-ku-yin yen-chiu 上古音研究" / "Studies on Archaic Chinese Phonology," *Ch'ing-hua hsüeh-pao* 清華學報 / *The Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies*, New Series IX, Nos. 1 & 2 (combined), pp. 1-61.

Li Hsiao-ting 李孝定.

1965. *Chia-ku wen-tzu chi-shih* 甲骨文字集釋. 8 vols. Chung-yang yen-chiu-yüan li-shi yü-yen yen-chiu-so chuan-k'an chih wu-shih 中央研究院歷史語言研究所專刊之五十. Also abbreviated as *CKWTCS*. Nankang: Chung-yang Yen-chiu-yüan.

Li Hsüeh-ch'in 李學勤.

1980. "Kuan yü Tui-tsu pu-tz'u te yi-hsieh wen-t'i 關於自組卜辭的一些問題," *KWTYC*, No. 3, pp. 32-42.

1987. "Lun Pin-tsu chia-ku te chi-chung chi-shih k'e-tz'u 論賓組胛骨的幾種記事刻辭." Paper presented at the International Conference on Yin-Shang Civilization in China (中國殷商文化國際討論會), in An-yang, September 10-16.

Ma Chien-chung 馬建忠.

1898. *Ma-shih wen-t'ung chiao-chu* 馬氏文通校注 (ed. by Yang Shu-ta 楊樹達). Peking: Chung-hua Shu-tien 中華書店, 1961.

Matsumaru Michio 松丸道雄.

1970. "In Shū kokka no kōzō 殷周國家の構造," *Iwanami kōza: Sekai rekishi* 岩波講座・世界歴史, Vol. 4. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店.

Nivison, David S.

1977. "The Pronominal Use of the Verb *Yu* (GIÜG: 出, 有, 有) in Early Archaic Chinese," *EC* 3, pp. 1-17.

1982. "The 'Question' Question." Paper prepared for the International Conference on Shang Civilization, Honolulu, Hawaii, September 7-11.

Ōta Tatsuo 太田辰夫.

1964. *Koten chūgokugo bumpō* 古典中國語文法, Tokyo: Daian 大安.

Serruys, Paul L-M.

1974. "Studies in the Language of the Shang Oracle Inscriptions," *TP*, Vol. LX, 1-3, pp. 12-120.

Shima Kunio 島邦男.

1958. *Inkyo bokuji kenkyū* 殷墟卜辭研究. Hirosaki: Chūgokugaku Kenkyūkai 中國學研究會.

S: Inkyo bokuji sōrui 殷墟卜辭綜類, revised edition. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院. 1971.

Shirakawa Shizuka 白川靜.

1948. "Bokuji no honshitsu 卜辭の本質," *Ritsumeikan bungaku* 立命館文學, No. 62, pp. 19-41.

Takashima, Ken-ichi.

1973. Negatives in the King Wu Ting Bone Inscriptions. Ph. D. dissertation. Seattle: University of Washington.
1980. "The Early Archaic Chinese Word *Yu* in the Shang Oracle Bone Inscriptions: Word-Family, Etymology, Grammar, Semantics and Sacrifice," *Cahier de Linguistique, Asie Orientale*, No. 8, pp. 81-112.
- 1984a "Nominalization and Nominal Derivation with Particular Reference to the Language of Oracle-Bone Inscriptions," *Papers in East Asian Languages*, Vol. 2, pp. 25-74.
- 1984b "Wen Ting 問鼎," *KWTYC*, 9, pp. 75-95.
1985. "On the Quantitative Complement in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions," *Journal of Chinese Linguistics*, Vol. 13. No. 1, pp. 44-68.
1986. "Morphology of the Negatives in Oracle Bone Inscriptions," *Computational Analysis of Asian and African Languages*, No. 30 (1988), pp. 113-133.
1989. "Indai teiboku gengo no honshitu 殷代貞卜言語の本質," *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* (University of Tokyo), No. 110, pp. 1-166.
1990. "A Study of the Copulas in Shang Chinese," *The Memoirs of the*

K. Takashima

Institute of Oriental Culture (University of Tokyo), No. 112, pp. 1-92.

T'ang Lan 唐蘭.

1939. *T'ien-jang-ke chia-ku wen-ts'un k'ao-shih* 天壤閣甲骨文存考釋. Peiping 北平: Fu-jen Ta-hsüen yin-hang 輔仁大學印行.

Wang Yü-hsin 王宇信, Chang Yung-shan 張永山, and Yang Sheng-nan 楊升南

1977. "Shi-lun Yin-hsü wu-hao-mu te 'Fu Hao' 試論殷墟五號墓的 '婦好' ," *KKHP*, No. 2, pp. 1-22.

Yen Yi-p'ing 嚴一萍

1981. "Fu Hao lieh-chuan 婦好列傳," *Chung-kuo wen-tzu* 中國文字, Hsin 新, No. 3, pp. 1-104.

摘 要

本文主要的研究對象是一般被視為動詞或動詞句，在加上「有・又」或「亡」等主動詞後所形成的「名詞句」。若就上述的句型來看，可以做出一個假設，那就是這種類型的詞句具有「強調」和（或）「對比」的功能。以此假說和實際的甲骨文加以對照，討論其是否得當，我想或可較清楚地說明由某特定的人對特定的祖先所進行的祭祀狀況。