

# CONTENTS

## 目錄

---

### Articles 論文

- 1 Fuzzy Word Identification: A Case Study from the Oracle Bone Inscriptions  
(字詞的模糊辨識：以甲骨文「翌」字為例)  
Zev Handel (韓哲夫)
- 29 Incorrect Arrangement of the Bamboo Tablets in the *Shangshu*: A Falsifiable Hypothesis?  
(有待於驗證的假設——《尚書》中是否有錯簡?)  
Ken-ichi Takashima (高嶋謙一)
- 45 從「門」詞族論《詩·大雅·抑》「莫捫朕舌」之義  
(On *Shijing*'s "Do Not Hold My Tongue" (莫捫朕舌): An Etymological Explanation)  
楊秀芳 (Hsiu-Fang Yang)
- 59 先秦漢語的動賓關係和及物性  
(Verb-Object Relationships and Transitivity in Pre-Qin Chinese)  
蔣紹愚 (Shaoyu Jiang)
- 115 「V-過-來/去」的歷史發展  
(The Historical Development of "V-*guo-lai/qu*")  
魏培泉 (Pei-Chuan Wei)
- 149 並列連詞與遠指代詞的 h- 化問題  
(Debuccalization in a Coordinating Conjunction and a Distal Demonstrative Pronoun)  
孫景濤 (Jingtao Sun)
- 165 「咁」又如何？——再探早期粵語中的指示代詞  
(What about 咁？—Revisiting the Demonstrative in Early Cantonese)  
張洪年 (Hung-nin Samuel Cheung)

203 霍爾語格西話動詞對協  
(Verb Agreement in Gexi Horpa)  
孫天心、田阡子 (Jackson T.-S. Sun and Qianzi Tian)

225 Thao Loans from Bunun  
(邵語借自布農語的成分)  
Paul Jen-kuei Li (李壬癸)

243 編後語 (Afterword)

Appendices 附錄

245 Appendix I: Board of Directors and Officers of the Li Fang-Kuei  
Society for Chinese Linguistics  
附錄一：紀念李方桂先生中國語言學研究學會董事及執行委員  
名單

248 Appendix II: Four Awards of the Li Fang-Kuei Society for  
Chinese Linguistics  
附錄二：四種獎項及申請辦法

249 Appendix III: 2012 LFK Book Award  
附錄三：2012 年李方桂語言學論著獎

252 Appendix IV: 2013 LFK Field Award  
附錄四：2013 年李方桂田野調查獎

253 Appendix V: Winners of LFK Dissertation Award  
附錄五：李方桂學會博士論文獎歷屆得獎名單

254 Appendix VI: 2013 LFK Conference Travel Grant Award  
附錄六：2013 年李方桂研究生學術會議旅費資助獎金

255 Appendix VII: Letter from the Li Fang-Kuei Society for Chinese  
Linguistics

附錄七：紀念李方桂先生中國語言學研究學會的公開信

259 Appendix VIII: List of Donors to the Li Fang-Kuei Society for  
Chinese Linguistics Endowment Fund

附錄八：紀念李方桂先生中國語言學研究學會贊助人名單

260 Appendix IX: Style Sheet for BULLETIN OF CHINESE LINGUISTICS  
附錄九：《中國語言學集刊》稿約及撰稿格式

## **Fuzzy Word Identification: A Case Study from the Oracle Bone Inscriptions** \*

Zev Handel

*University of Washington*

In this paper, a new method of “fuzzy identification” is proposed for circumstances in which an exact match of an epigraphic written word with later attested forms is not possible (for example, because the word has been lost from the language). Based on our increasingly sophisticated understanding of early Chinese morphological patterns and word families, it is sometimes possible to achieve an approximate understanding of pronunciation and meaning in the absence of a precise identification.

As an illustration of this approach, I consider the oracle-bone graph 𠄎 as it appears in a famous eclipse inscription. This graph has been identified as 斲 *zhuó* and 𠄎 *dōu* (among others). I argue that any such identification is overly precise. A fuzzy identification, as a member of the word family based on root \**tok* with meaning ‘cut, chop’, is a more accurate reflection of the state of our knowledge and provides greater insight into the possible pronunciations and range of meaning and function of the word.

Keywords: oracle bone inscriptions, fuzzy identification, word families, eclipse

### **1. Introduction**

The identification of graphs and words is a central concern of philologists who interpret ancient Chinese manuscript and epigraphic texts, including the early

---

\* Earlier versions of this paper were presented in Berkeley on October 1, 2011 at a symposium in honor of David Keightley and in Boston on March 17, 2012 at the American Oriental Society meeting. I am grateful for suggestions received from participants at both venues, especially to Liu Xueshun for providing me with helpful advice and references to relevant scholarship. I owe special thanks to Ken Takashima for a careful reading of a draft of this article. His detailed feedback has saved me from a number of embarrassing errors and provided many valuable suggestions that have been incorporated into the final version. Because we disagree on some points, it is important for me to note that I am fully responsible for all viewpoints and errors herein. This article is dedicated to David Keightley, who first opened up the world of oracle bones to me when I was a student at Berkeley in the 1990s.

## **Incorrect Arrangement of the Bamboo Tablets in the *Shangshu*: A Falsifiable Hypothesis? \***

Ken-ichi Takashima

*The University of British Columbia*

The problem of *cuojian* 錯簡 “incorrect ordering of bamboo tablets” is not a new scholarly issue in the field of studies involving *jiandu* 簡牘 (writings on bamboo tablets). As early as Song times (960-1279), scholars began to notice that the received version of the *Shangshu* 尚書 was suspected to have had the problem of omitting or missing some characters in the bamboo tablets, referred to as *tuojian* 脫簡, in the Kanggao 康誥 chapter of the *Shangshu*. In Qing times (1644-1911) a counter-view was presented; namely, the Song *tuojian* hypothesis in the Kanggao chapter was not really correct, but it was how the text was arranged that led to some discontinuity in the beginning portion of the said chapter.

This paper provides two specific examples of what may have been the result of a *cuojian* in the Yaodian 堯典 chapter. It investigates such a possibility in terms of (A) context, (B) lexical features, (C) syntax and semantics, and (D) colometry or isocolometry.

Key words: *tuojian*, *cuojian*, Kanggao, Yaodian

---

\* This paper was made possible by a Fellowship (winter, 2012) at the International Consortium for Research in the Humanities, “Fate, Freedom and Prognostication. Strategies of Coping with the Future in East Asia and Europe” (supported by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research) at the University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. On November 27, 2012 I was fortunate to have been invited by the University of Bonn to present the first draft of this paper and received incisive comments from Professors Christian Schwermann and Ralph Kauz, a few graduate students, and some from the general public including Fr. Dr. Zbigniew Wesolowski, editor-in-chief, *Monumenta Serica*. I am grateful to them. A revised version of the first draft was discussed at the Jerry Norman Memorial Workshop held at the Department of Asian Languages and Literature, University of Washington (28-29 June, 2013). I would like to thank its participants for their questions and comments, and in particular Professor William Boltz for pointing out how the bamboo tablets were reproduced in the Tsinghua collection. The pdf version I relied on omits some crucial pages, so that my original calculations had to be redone afresh. Also, the question of counting the number of characters on a missing or broken tablet is rather complex as there are so many possibilities. I will later explain this.

# 從「門」詞族論《詩·大雅·抑》 「莫捫朕舌」之義

楊秀芳

臺灣大學

本文從「門」詞族的研究中，確認了「捫」既可表示「開門使得以通行」，又可表示「閉門使不得通行」。從這兩種相反的語義引申，產生了頗為不同的用法。例如「莫捫朕舌」的「捫」表示「以手掩口，有如閉門，阻擋舌頭說出言語」；「捫足」描寫遮掩不欲人知的動作；「捫淚」表示「拭去淚水」。前兩者來自「閉門」之義，後者來自「開門」之義。

本文的研究，說明了利用詞族觀點研究詞彙的重要性。「門」、「問」、「聞」、「悶」、「捫」的親屬關係一旦揭曉，不僅文獻所見的種種用法可以順著語義發展脈絡獲得合理的解釋，也更能增加我們對漢語詞彙史的認識。

關鍵詞：詞族、漢語詞彙史、語義反向引申、分別文

## 1. 前言

《詩·大雅·抑》曰「無易由言，無曰苟矣。莫捫朕舌，言不可逝矣。」毛《傳》曰「捫，持也。」（《毛詩正義》頁 1372）「持也」之義究竟如何，本文將根據「門」詞族的語義特點及「拊首捫持」之說，進一步深入探討。

以下第二節說明「門」詞族的音義特點，並及於其他以「門」為義符的字；第三節探討「莫捫朕舌」之義；第四節結語。

## 2. 「門」詞族的音義特點

《同源字典》（王力 1983:526-527）研究古漢語同族詞，在文部明母下有「門」

# 先秦漢語的動賓關係和及物性

蔣紹愚

北京大學 清華大學

本文選擇了先秦漢語中四種不同類型的 16 個及物動詞，對這 16 個及物動詞在先秦 10 部典籍中帶賓語的情況進行了調查和分析，指出這些及物動詞不帶賓語不是任意的，而是有一定條件限制的，大致有 8 種情況。這些情況大體都可以用 Hopper Paul J. & Sandra A. Thompson (1980) “Transitivity in grammar and discourse” 中提出的 10 項參數來說明。文章還考察了其中一些動詞在敦煌變文中帶賓語的情況。考察的結果表明：和先秦相比，這些及物動詞在敦煌變文中帶賓語的情況有較大變化。

關鍵詞：先秦漢語、及物動詞、賓語、及物性、敦煌變文

## 1. 引言

一般把動詞分為及物動詞和不及物動詞兩大類，這主要是根據動詞能否帶賓語來區分的。近來也有人主張三分，即在上述兩類之外再加上一類“作格動詞”或“非賓格動詞”。但深入考察一下，就會發現，實際上，所謂“及物動詞”只是能夠帶賓語，而不是在任何場合都帶賓語；而所謂“不及物動詞”卻常常帶使動賓語。

大概是因為有鑒於此，所以李佐豐（2004）把古代漢語的動詞分為四類：一、真自動詞。二、準自動詞。三、真他動詞。四、準他動詞。但這四類沒有明確的分類標準，而且“真他動詞”也不是必須帶賓語。宋亞雲（2005）對上古漢語動詞持三分的意見，又把“及物動詞”分為兩類：“黏賓動詞”（賓語不可以懸空的動詞）和“中性動詞”（賓語可以懸空的動詞）。“黏賓動詞”數量不多，有“猶”、“如”、“為”、“謂”、“曰”等。他舉了 10 個“中性動詞”和 12 個李佐豐所認定的“自動詞”，根據先秦的 10 部古籍對它們帶賓語和不帶賓語的情況一一作了調查，調查得相當細緻。但他的論文主要是研究作格動詞，所以對及物動詞和不及物動詞沒有展開談。

# 「V-過-來/去」的歷史發展\*

魏培泉

中央研究院

本文主要探討動趨式「V-過-來/去」以下的幾個議題：一，「V-過-來/去」句構的來源與發展；二，「過」由「經過」義演變為表示兩點間之橫向位移的途徑以及這種語義變化在「過-來/去」或「V-過-來/去」中的發展過程；三，「V-過-來/去」與「V-將-來/去」的異同與其間的消長過程。

關鍵詞：過、趨向詞、連動式、述補結構、近代漢語

## 1. 「V-過-來/去」句式的發展

### 1.1 現代漢語「V-過-來/去」的結構問題

漢語歷史語法學者多認為動趨式和動結式一樣，都是由連動式演變為述補結構的。「過」既然也是一種趨向詞，因此也無人懷疑動趨式「V-過」會有不同的演變。然而這樣的假定也未必是不證自明的。即使在現代漢語中，動趨式「V-過」的中心語究竟是V還是「過」也是有爭議的。過去動趨式一般都分析為述補結構，但戴浩一（Tai 2003:309-311）以「飛過」為例來證明「過」才是主要動詞，證據是「飛」可以省略而「過」不能省略。例如：

- (1) a. 約翰飛過英吉利海峽。
- b. 約翰過了英吉利海峽。
- c. \*約翰飛了英吉利海峽。

我們認為，指「過」為「V-過」的中心語，這種看法是很成問題的。其一，這種例子的「過」不能省略應是因為不能符合要表達的語義，只說「飛」不能傳

---

\* 本文為國科會專題研究計劃「『V 過』的歷史發展」(99-2410-H-001-086-MY2)之部分成果。

## 並列連詞與遠指代詞的 h- 化問題

孫景濤

香港科技大學

基於漢語歷史文獻以及現代方言材料，本文重點探討並列連詞與遠指代詞的 h- 化問題。主要有兩個發現。第一，北京及周邊方言中的連詞 xan<sup>51</sup>（“和”義）極有可能源自動詞“伴”。第二，謂詞性遠指代詞“行/杭”實為“那樣”合為一個音節後再發生 h- 化的結果。

關鍵詞：h- 化、連詞 xan<sup>51</sup>、遠指代詞“行/杭”、方言、漢語史

### 1. 引言

聲母變 h-（或者 x-）可以是條件音變，如四邑粵語透母字（t<sup>h</sup>-）讀 h-。變 h-（或者 x-）還可由語義虛泛驅動，基本不問原本聲母條件，本文稱之為 h- 化。如，在《兒女英雄傳》中，“煞上”（縛緊、勒緊）寫作“薩杭”，第二字“上”變“杭”，反映聲母 ʂ- 變讀為 x-。漢語方言中 h- 化現象很常見，筆者（孫景濤 即出）進行了較為全面的調查，得數十例，如：

#### (1) 漢語方言 h- 化例（括號中註明第二字聲母的 h- 化音變）

- a. 邈邈 la<sup>214</sup> xu<sup>55</sup> (t<sup>h</sup>- → x-) (山東煙台)
- b. 虻蜉 pje<sup>11</sup> xu<sup>0</sup> (f- → x-) (河北順平)
- c. 舞爪 wu<sup>33</sup> xwa<sup>31</sup> (tʂ- → x-) (河南洛陽)
- d. 後晌（晚上）xəu<sup>55</sup> xɔ̃<sup>0</sup> (ʂ- → x-) (山東昌邑)
- e. 螻蛄（記作“拉虎”，見許、宮田 1999:3267）(k- → x-) (河北井陘)
- f. 垂困（打盹兒）ts<sup>h</sup>uei<sup>35</sup> xuã<sup>213</sup> (k<sup>h</sup>- → x-) (湖南耒陽)
- g. 差使者（衙役）tɛ<sup>h</sup>ae<sup>11</sup> xi<sup>22</sup> teia<sup>21</sup> (s- → x-) (福建崇安)
- h. 回禮 he<sup>24</sup> he<sup>53</sup> (l- → h-) (福建廈門)
- i. 夜遊子 je<sup>21</sup> xəw<sup>2</sup> tsɿ<sup>5</sup> (j- → x-) (河北望都)



## 「咁」又如何？ ——再探早期粵語中的指示代詞\*

張洪年

加州大學柏克萊分校 香港中文大學

現代粵語中的指示代詞「咁」有兩種用法。例(1)的「咁」表示性質或狀態，相當於現代漢語的「這樣」；例(2)的「咁」則表示程度，相當於現代漢語的「這麼」。

(1) 佢好勤力咁學習。

(2) 佢咁勤力學習。

兩種用法的「咁」，在書寫上，有時候也可以區分，前者作「噉」，後者作「咁」。發音是 [kəm]，聲韻俱同，但聲調有別。表性質的「咁」是陰上調：[kəm35:]，表程度的「咁」是陰去調：[kəm33:]。

在早期的粵語口語材料中，兩種用法的「咁」都有許多例證。在書寫上，多作「咁」，偶爾也有作「噉」，但用法區分並不明顯。如 1883 年的 *Cantonese Made Easy* 同書二例：

(3) 你係咁講咩？ (頁 18)

(4) 人哋係噉講。 (頁 37)

至於發音，根據附有拼音的材料來看，韻母多作 om [ɔm]。聲調亦分陰去和陰上，但區別條件並不完全清晰。如下舉二用例，同出 1841 年的 *Chrestomathy*，用法相同，但聲調一作陰去，一作陰上。

(5) 夠爭一碼咁上下。 (頁 247) (陰去)

(6) 都係八份一咁上下。 (頁 345) (陰上)

本文試根據十九世紀到二十世紀的一些粵語材料，進行分析，研究「咁」的用法和演變過程，並提出「咁」和表量詞的「個」和代詞的「個」之間的可能關係。

關鍵詞：「咁」、「噉」、「個」、指代詞、早期粵語

---

\* 本文初稿曾在 2011 年香港科技大學人文學部主辦的 Workshop on Early Cantonese Grammar 會上報告，修訂稿在 2012 年香港中文大學中文系主辦「承繼與拓新：漢語語言文字學國際研討會」會上宣讀。前後承多位學者提供意見，在此謹表謝忱。

## 霍爾語格西話動詞對協\*

孫天心

中央研究院

田阡子

雲南師範大學

漢藏語系羌語支嘉戎語組多數語言、方言均採由言談語用條件決定之「分裂型」動詞對協體系。本語組霍爾語之動詞對協則存在明顯的方言分歧，部分地區採用存古與創新並存之混合對協機制，形式標記雖已趨簡，制約因素更為多元，現有文獻中之初步描寫語焉不詳，存在極多分析上之問題。

本文依據第一手語料重新探討甘孜州道孚縣格西霍爾語動詞對協。我們發現，格西話動詞對協形態與壤塘縣上寨霍爾語不同，包括添加後綴與重疊音節兩種手段，對協後綴還區別「普遍形式」與反映第一、二人稱單數及物主語之「特殊形式」。格西話對協系統仍屬由語用因素制約之典型分裂型，然而由於藏語接觸影響，由句法制約之「S/A 主語型」模式也已萌芽，為其整體語法系統由嘉戎語組「中心語標記」類型朝向藏語「附屬語標記」類型轉化之環節，轉化仍處於過渡階段，新生模式可以共時交替形式與舊有對協模式共存。在羌語支內部，嘉戎語、拉瑪戎語與壤塘縣霍爾方言之動詞對協採存古之分裂型，羌語和普米語動詞對協則採用創新之主語型，而格西霍爾語動詞對協兼容並蓄，恰恰處於羌語支動詞對協體系歷史發展之中間階段。

關鍵詞：動詞對協、形態句法類型、霍爾語、羌語支、漢藏語系

### 1. 引言

霍爾語（又稱爾龔語、道孚語）是四川西部藏族使用的一種語言，分佈於甘孜藏族自治州道孚、丹巴、爐霍、新龍等縣及阿壩藏族羌族自治州金川、壤塘二縣，使用人口約有六萬左右。各地霍爾語存在明顯方言差別。霍爾語屬於漢藏語系羌語支（孫宏開 1982，黃布凡 1991），親緣關係與相鄰之嘉戎語最近，有學者將其直接歸入嘉戎方言（瞿靄堂 1983）。我們認為，瞿文視為「嘉戎語西部方言」之霍爾語、拉瑪戎語與嘉戎語差別太大，內部又各有顯著方言歧異，應處理

\* 本文主要內容曾在新加坡南洋理工大學舉辦之第 45 屆國際漢藏語言暨語言學會議中報告，蒙多位在場學者參與討論。會後羅仁地教授惠賜詳細書面修改意見，僅此一併致謝。

## Thao Loans from Bunun\*

Paul Jen-kuei Li

*Academia Sinica*

Thao has extensive lexical and phonological, though not morphosyntactic, borrowing from Bunun. There are hundreds of Thao loanwords from Bunun. The consonants /b, d, l, ʔ, h/ have acquired phonemic status in Thao due to the great number of loans from Bunun. Linguistic evidence indicates that there are different periods of borrowing. Phonological and morphological adaptation of the forms is made for some lexical items. The problem of determining from which dialect(s) borrowing occurred is discussed in some detail, and so is the problem of some irregular forms. A list of Thao loanwords from Bunun is given in the appendix.

Keywords: Thao, Bunun, loan, adaptation, irregular forms

### 1. Introduction

Both Bunun and Thao are spoken in central Taiwan, Nantou to be specific. Bunun is a dominant Formosan language, with a population of 54,500, while Thao has a small population of 728. There is plenty of evidence that Bunun has exerted great linguistic influence on Thao lexically and phonologically, though not morpho- syntactically. Blust (1996) first made a systematic study of Thao loans from Bunun with many important observations. The focus of my study in this paper is somewhat different from his.

There are five dialects in Bunun: Takituduh, Takibakha, Takbanuaz, Takivatan, and Isbukun, all found in Nantou. The first two are called the northern dialects, the third and fourth are called the central dialects, and the last is called the southern dialect

---

\* I touched on this problem briefly in an earlier study (Li 1978). Since then, much more Bunun and Thao language data have become available, so I have decided to reexamine it. Professor F. K. Li (1956) published the very first paper on the Thao language of very high quality. His encouragement led me to my lifelong study of Formosan languages. I would like to thank Robert Blust, Shigeru Tsuchida, Elizabeth Zeitoun, Hui-chuan J. Huang, Motoyasu Nojima, and Shih-lang Jian (簡史郎) for their comments and Atul (全茂永), a native speaker of the Takibakha dialect of Bunun, for going through my Thao Dictionary to find out if there are similar forms in Bunun and for correcting some errors in my manuscript.