BULLETIN OF CHINESE LINGUISTICS

Vol. 13 No.1

CONTENTS

BCL FORUM 《中國語言學集刊》論壇

Beginning with the current Issue, the *Bulletin of Chinese Linguistics* (henceforth BCL) initiates a **Forum** for friendly discussion and debate of controversial but meaningful topics in the linguistic areas that BCL is involved with, namely the areas that the late Professor Li Fang-Kuei devoted his research to: historical and comparative study, inclusive of typology and dialectology, of all varieties of the Sinitic language, of Tibetan and other Tibeto-Burman languages, and of Tai languages.

《中國語言學集刊》（以下簡稱BCL）自本期開設**論壇**，以供同道在友好的氣氛中盡情表達意見，討論各項有爭議的重大學術問題。 討論的對象， 主要是李方桂先生致力的漢、 藏、 台語等相關語言，取徑則為歷史及比較研究方法，亦包括類型學與方言學。

Five volunteer editors for this **Forum**, named **Forum** Editors, have been selected from among the broad-minded Li Fang-Kuei Society Young Scholars who have a wide range of academic interests and enthusiasm for service, and who can instill new blood and excitement into BCL.

五位**論壇**編輯， 選自心胸開闊、 興趣廣泛、 有服務熱誠的李方桂學會青年學者， 為BCL注入新血及活力。

The breadth of interests and expertise of these five **Forum** Editors are, alphabetically:
其興趣及專業如下：

Deng, Lin 鄧琳—early Chinese texts and inscriptions (especially the oracle-bone inscriptions); historical phonology, morphology, and syntax; dialectology.
早期漢語出土文獻（尤其甲骨文）；歷史音韻學；上古漢語形態學與句法學；方言學。

Hill, Nathan—Classical Tibetan, Tibeto-Burman languages; Archaic Chinese phonology; reconstruction; verb morphology; Sino-Tibetan comparison.
古典藏語；藏緬語；漢語上古音；古音擬測；動詞形態；漢藏比較。

Jacques, Guillaume—historical linguistics; Rgyalrongic languages; Kiranti languages, Archaic Chinese, Sino-Tibetan; Tangut; Hmong-mien; phonology, morphosyntax; language contact; language phylogeny.
歷史語言學； 嘉絨語支； 基蘭提語支； 漢語上古音； 漢藏語系； 西夏文； 苗瑤語族； 音系學；形態句法；語言接觸；語言譜系。

List, Mattis—Computer-based and computer-assisted approaches to historical linguistics and Chinese historical phonology; computer-based and computer-assisted language comparison of Southeast Asian languages.
基於計算機和計算機輔助的歷史語言學和漢語歷史音韻學方法； 基於計算機和計算機輔助的東南亞語言之語言比較。

Wu, Rui-wen 吳瑞文—historical linguistics; reconstruction of proto-dialects and the relation between proto-dialects and Chinese historical phonology; Chinese historical grammar and comparative dialectal grammar.
歷史語言學；現代方言之祖語擬測及其與漢語音韻史的關係；現代漢語方言語法史與書面漢語語法史之比較研究。

The selection of topics for each **Forum**, solicitation of articles, and invitation of reviewers for each article are all undertaken by these **Forum** Editors.
議題由**論壇**編輯各自提出，各自徵稿，審稿人也由**論壇**編輯聯繫邀請。

To constitute a **Forum** for meaningful discussion and debate, each **Forum** consists of at least two papers. Depending on the number of papers selected, the **Forum** may constitute either part of a volume/issue of BCL, or stand as an independent volume/issue of BCL.
為促成建設性的討論，甚至辯論，**論壇**每期至少包含兩篇文章。根據入選文章篇幅、數量，**論壇**或為一卷/期之專欄，或獨立為一卷/期。

All **Forum** articles are in the form of full-length, academically sound papers that have gone through the regular BCL review process.
論壇文章需首尾完整，且符合學術論文的形式要求。審查則遵照BCL的一般原則與程序。

After the **Forum** is launched it is open to all interested scholars without restriction.
論壇推出後，歡迎學者撰文公開討論，無任何限制。

Zev Handel, Director *cum* Treasurer of the Li Fang-Kuei Society, serves as Consultant for this **Forum**.
論壇由李方桂學會董事兼司庫韓哲夫擔任顧問。

    BCL Editors-in-Chief
    《中國語言學集刊》主編

Notes on the First Forum: *Qi* in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions

We are excited in presenting our first Forum on *Qi in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions* to our readers. This Forum is under the guidance of the world renowned Oracle-Bone Inscriptions (OBI) scholar *cum* retired Board Director of the Li Fang-Kuei Society for Chinese Linguistics (LFKS), Ken-ichi Takashima, who secured the right of publication of two unpublished papers on *Qi* by the eminent OBI historian-sinologist *cum* Macarthur Fellow, the late Professor David N. Keightley (1932-2017), through his two sons. We are indebted to Steven Keightley and Richard Keightley for their generosity in affording us the permission for and honor of publishing these precious papers by their esteemed father in our *B*(*ulletin*) *of C*(*hinese*) *L*(*inguistics*).

These valuable papers are from the archive of Takashima, who was given a copy of the manuscripts by Professor Keightley. These manuscripts, meticulously scanned by Professor Jing Zhichun of the University of British Columbia, to whom we are much indebted, contained handwritten notes added by Takashima. Removing the handwritten notes in order to publish the unmodified original manuscripts posed a difficult problem, which was finally solved by Ryan Rui-wen Wu, a Research Fellow of the Academia Sinica *cum* LFKS Board Director and *BCL* Forum Editor, who spent three weeks cleaning up the manuscripts carefully and meticulously and to whom we owe our deep gratitude.

The original page numbers of the two Keightley papers provide crucial information for the reading of these two papers and are thus given in parentheses on each page.

Executive *Qi* in Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions
A New Hypothesis (*1994*)

David N. Keightley

> But I approach this matter with trepidation. It was my invest-
> igations into the modal qi problem that led me into oracle-bone
> studies twenty years ago, and I then quickly concluded that I had
> much more thinking to do about that problem. It is an
> extraordinarily difficult one.   ---David S. Nivison

If philology, as Peter A. Boodberg remarked, is "an unending conversation with the dead," then David Nivison, in the twenty-plus years that I have been privileged to share his conversations with the Shang kings and their diviners, has proved to be one of the most imaginative, engaging, sympathetic, and instructive of philologists. Little did I realize, when David drove up from Stanford to Berkeley on 1 July 1971 for a rudimentary, three-hour introduction to the oracle-bone inscriptions, that the world of the Shang, and my own understanding of it, was about to enter a golden age of conversation that has enlivened the study of China's first historical dynasty in numerous ways. The present essay--which explores the meaning of one frequently-used word in the Shang diviners' vocabulary--is a continuing part of that conversation.[1] I

---

1. I would like to express my gratitude to David Nivison, as well as to
   William H. Baxter, William G. Boltz, Derek Herforth, Father J.A. Lefeuvre,
   E.G. Pulleyblank, Edward L. Shaughnessy, and Ken-ichi Takashima, who have
   all participated in the conversation about qi and who commented on earlier
   versions of this paper (Keightley 1992, 1993a). None, of course, are
   responsible for my errors or my failure to take full account of their good
   advice. It is particularly fitting that qi should form the subject of this
   essay since, as Nivison indicates in the motto (1991:30) at the start of
   this essay, his initial interest in the oracle-bone inscriptions was indeed
   linked to the word; see, e.g., Nivison 1968, 1970. I should also note that

hope that it will at least serve to clarify some of the issues, which bear not only on relatively technical points of Shang usage but on the religious assumptions that underlay divinatory activity--and, presumably, many other kinds of activities[2]--at the dawn of Chinese history.

THE QI PROBLEM

In the reign of Wu Ding (ca. 1200-1181 B.C.), the 21st king of the Shang dynasty, the court diviners often presented their charges--which can be regarded as prayers, wishes, or statements of intent[3]--in the form of a pair (indicated below by my symbols ⌠ and ⌡) of complementary, positive and negative statements.[4] One member of the charge-pair frequently contained the

---

I do not, in this paper, address the issue of a pronominal Shang qi. The hypothesis that it or its roots may have been present in the Shang inscriptions is Nivison's own (see, e.g., Nivison 1992, 1992a, 1992b; cf. 1968; 1970) and he is the one who should develop it further. (Takashima [1970:25] had also claimed that "The pronominal and modal ch'i were really the same word" in the bone inscriptions, but he subsequently rejected that view [1973:272-73].) Djamouri (1987:400-03) discusses the pronominal hypothesis in some detail. He notes that the pronominal sense is attested in the Western Zhou bronze inscriptions, but in only a quarter of the occurrences of qi. His table (pp. 400-401; based on Cikoski 1978, Malmqvist 1981 (published version), and Guan Xiechu 1981) shows that the frequency of the two uses gradually shifted in favor of the pronominal which finally finished by supplanting the modal. Djamouri agrees with Lu Shuxiang (1979:7) and Cikoski (1978) that the pronominal and modal were entirely distinct semantically. Djamouri is also skeptical about Mei Tsu-lin's view (1981) (published version) that pronominal qi 其 and zhi 之 shared a common etymological origin.

2. For the view, based on Vernant 1974:10, that "where divination flourishes, its logic and assumptions are not likely to be at variance with those of the rest of life," see Keightley 1984:12, 28, n.7.

3. For the way in which Shang divination functioned see Keightley 1988, Takashima 1988-89 (and, more extensively, 1989), and Keightley 1991:143-96.

4. Keightley 1988:373-74. I define the ideal charge-pair (modern term, duizhen 對貞) as two charges, divined on the same day, by the same diviner, and about the same topic, varying only in the positive formulation of the one (as in [4A] and [18A] below) and the negative formulation of the other (as in [4B] and [18B]), and placed on the shell or bone in such a way that

Divinatory Conventions in Late Shang China

A Diachronic and Contextual Analysis of Oracle-Bone *Qi* 其 and Related Issues (1995)

David N. Keightley

Abstract

To use the Shang oracle-bone inscription as historical documents for the writing of Shang history, it is essential that we understand the conventions that produced them. Such understanding involves, to a significant degree, an understanding of how the Shang word *qi* functioned.

Part I-III of this study demonstrate, by focusing on the evolving usage of the Shi-, Li-, Chu-, and subsequent diviner groups, that *qi* was deictic rather than modal. Part IV applies that understanding to the contextual analysis of a large number of positive-negative charge-pairs (and some prognostications) of the Bin-diviner group, in order to defend the deictic interpretation of *qi* and to explore the conventions that governed its use in this special environment.

These conventions were: (1) The Bin-group diviners generally placed the charge about whose outcome they were most immediately concerned (usually a matter of hope, but sometimes of fear) on the right side of the shell. (2)Whichever charge of a charge-pair contained the *qi* was the retest that the diviner cracked second. (3) When one number of a charge-pair was abbreviated, it was the charge in the more complete form of the transcription unit that was divined first. (4) Favorable and non-contingent prognostications (together with verification) were adopted to, or incised on the same right or left side of the shell as, the desired charge. (5) When *qi* was present in both charges of a charge-pair, no diviner's name was likely to be recorded in the preface. Baldly stated, these conventions may seem of minor importance, but, considered in context, they permit coherent and consistent translations of the inscriptions, either in pairs or in groups of pairs.

A number of prominent cases in which the Bin-group diviners consistently did not observe one or more of these conventions is explored. These cases reveal

the degree to which the use of *qi*, in particular, was context-dependent. The rules of Shange divination were not, in fact, inflexible. Some scenario-specific considerations, not perhaps recoverable by modern scholars, appear to have influenced the placement of inscriptions and the use of *qi* on particular occasions. It is hoped, however, that the conventions, when either honored or breached, provide a clearer understanding than has yet been available of the divinatory procedures adopted by the various diviner groups.

The study ends with some reflections on the rationale that underlay these aspects of Shange divinatory practice.

List of Typos in Keightley's Two Article

Deng Lin

Keightley 1994

Page #	Location	Original	Corrections
4	Example [3A]	貞	[貞]
4	[3B]	貞:翌壬	[貞]:翌壬戌
12	[8]	(day 44)	(day 34)
13	Line above [10A]	not or	or not
14	[12A]	(day) 26,	(day 26),
16	Line 12	postive	positive
16	N. 28, Line 5	one day day	delete extra "day"
24	Line 18	kkng	king
25	Line 4	was was	delete extra "was"
26	[29A], [29B]	Crackmaking	Crack-making
26	[29A], [29B]	D	Da? Di?
28	Line 25	bring bring	delete extra "bring"
30	[35A]	壬寅兩	壬寅[兩]
30	[35A]	"Crack-	delete "
32	[37C]	kind	king
32	Line 22	auspicous	auspicious
32	Bottom line	note ???	note 41?
33	[38A]	auspciousness	auspiciousness
33	N.42	Keightley: 1978a	no ":"
34	N.44	considered	be considered
35	N.46		6C?
36	[41A], [41B]	*jiaxu*	*jiawu*
36	[41A]	day 11	day 31
39	N.56	Shaughnessy 1993: 00	Shaughnessy 1993: 62
41	Figure 1, Line 4	[4A]	[4B]
42	Line 6 from bottom	qulifed	qualified
44	Line 2	地二本	第二本
45	Line 17	Zukhan	Zuhan
46	Line 24	Zhongyuang	Zhongyang
46	Line 29	yangjiuyuan	yanjiuyuan