

丁邦新
余靄芹 編

語言變化與漢語方言

李方桂先生紀念論文集

中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處
美國華盛頓大學

丁邦新
編
余靄芹

語言變化與漢語方言

李方桂先生紀念論文集

李方桂先生紀念論文集

丁邦新敬贈

一九八一年六月四日

中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處
美國華盛頓大學

語言變化與漢語方言

李方桂先生紀念論文集

IN MEMORY OF PROFESSOR LI FANG-KUEI:

Essays of Linguistic Change and the Chinese Dialects

定價：新台幣 900 元 / US\$ 30

國外郵寄及手續費每本另加美金 10 元

Please add US\$ 10 handling charge for each volume.

不准翻印

主 編 者 丁 邦 新 · 余 靄 芹

出 版 者 中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處
University of Washington (Seattle, USA)

發 行 者 中央研究院語言學研究所籌備處
臺北市南港區研究院路二段128號

印 刷 者 惠文電腦排版印刷有限公司
臺北市青島西路11號7樓

代 售 處 文 鶴 出 版 有 限 公 司
臺北市和平東路一段9號6樓

南 天 書 局 有 限 公 司
臺北市羅斯福路三段283巷40弄40號

中 華 民 國 八 十 九 年 九 月 出 版

ISBN 957-671-725-6 (精裝)

GPN 509609890047



Professor Li Fang-Kuei

李方桂先生

(1902-87)

序

李方桂先生對語言學的貢獻是世界性的，多方面的，也是難以企及的。一九九八年八月，華盛頓大學亞洲語文系余靄芹教授特別召集了一個國際研討會來紀念這位大師，參加的人來自中國大陸、日本、加拿大、法國、美國、星加坡、香港、台灣、和澳洲。可以印證李先生影響之既深且遠。現在把那次研討會的部分論文編印成冊，在中央研究院的語言學研究所籌備處出版，我覺得特別有意義。這兩個單位和李先生都有深厚的關係，他在華大服務了十九年，從四十七歲到六十六歲，把一生精華的歲月都貢獻給華大了。中央研究院更是跟他有長達近六十年的淵源，他是中央研究院第一屆的院士，早年是歷史語言研究所的研究員，許多出名的著作都在歷史語言研究所發表。多年來語言組的發展和他的關注有密不可分的關係，和我同時的李壬癸先生、龔煌城先生都是李先生推薦到所服務的。現在語言所籌備處能有今天的規模，不能不說是先生一手栽培的結果。那麼由這兩個單位為他出版一本紀念論文集，可以說是最恰當的事。

論文集的內容除討論漢語的一般現象外，包括官話、湘語、贛語、粵語、閩語，貫串這些論文的是一個主題「語言變化」。李先生一生所做的研究是多方面的，但「語言變化」無疑是他最關心的主題之一。他對古漢語、古傣語、古藏語的研究都注意到個別語言本身的變化，以及從古到今的演變。高嶋謙一和余靄芹合作的文章討論甲骨文中因方言接觸而引起的變化，我覺得這是近來研究甲骨學的一項突破。結合甲骨學者和方言學者的眼光和思路，為甲骨學的研究開出一條新路，這是科際整合一個成功的例證。

前文提到原來的會議是余靄芹教授召集的，我只是在會後負起一部分連絡的任務，作為編者之一說起來有一點慚愧，但是想一想李方桂先生對語言學在中國發展的貢獻，對我個人的恩深義重，就讓我覺得作為這本書的一個編者既是榮譽也是責任。

丁邦新

Preface

When the young Li Fang-Kuei was walking in the campus of the University of Chicago after his final examinations, one of his professors, with whom he had studied comparative Indo-European historical linguistics, hurried toward him from across the street with a big smile and the remark that he had discovered him through his examination paper. Professor Li was a quiet student in class -- "like most Asians," he told us on one occasion when we pressed him to tell us the "story" of his student life. And a quiet and modest person he was. It was through his writings that his keen insight, great intellect, and profound knowledge could best be appreciated, although an encounter with him imprinted one with the impression of a typical traditional Chinese scholar, a true gentleman in every sense of the word.

As one of the most eminent founders of modern Chinese linguistics and a significant contributor to American Indian and Tai and Sino-Tibetan linguistics, his academic achievements have been eulogized again and again, and only the less often mentioned aspect of his achievement in non-Chinese linguistics is presented here in this volume by his student Ting Pang-Hsin. It was certainly a great fortune for the University of Washington to have had such a prominent scholar among her faculty for twenty years (1949-69). In recognition of his contribution to this and the wider academic community, an international symposium on "Linguistic Change and the Chinese Dialects from the perspectives of historical documentation and language contact" was held at the University of Washington in his memory, August 17-19, 1998, almost three decades after his retirement from this institution and eleven years after his departure from this world. Papers from this symposium were selected to constitute the present volume dedicated to his memory. All the authors of this volume, and indeed, all serious students of Chinese linguistics, have been influenced or touched by his works one way or another.

Blessed are those who have had a chance of studying with him. Among the contributors of this volume, Ting Pang-Hsin and South Coblin had the good fortune of having him as their mentor and supervisor, Ken-ichi Takashima, though not majoring in the main fields of Professor Li, had studied with him in such fields for years, and I also count myself lucky to have studied with him albeit for just one summer. Memories of Professor Li as a great scholar-teacher are given in two essays by his two most prominent students.

Blessed are those who have been his junior friends and have had the opportunity of discussion and debate with him. Although he might not agree with your ideas or approach, he showed respect for your viewpoints as long as they were well formulated. (Mei Tsu-Lin and Jerry Norman, do you agree?) His capacity for appreciation of different or even opposing opinions commanded respect from transformationalists and non-transformationalists alike. I recalled writing a term paper for him in the generative framework, which drew many words of comments but not a word of disapproval from him.

May his quiet modesty and generous spirit be with us and in our works always!

Anne O. Yue

Seattle, May 14, 1999

Acknowledgment

We would like to express our thanks to the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange and the Academia Sinica for their support in the publication of this volume. The essays in this volume were selected from papers contributed to the international symposium on “Linguistic Change and the Chinese Dialects from the perspectives of historical documentation and language contact” dedicated to the memory of Professor Li Fang-Kuei held at the University of Washington, August 17-19, 1998. To the sponsors of this symposium, the Chiang Ching-Kuo Foundation for International Scholarly Exchange, as well as the Department of Asian Languages and Literature, the China Studies Program and the College of Arts and Sciences of the University of Washington, we owe our gratitude.

We are indebted to Professor Ho Dah-An of the Academia Sinica for overseeing the publication of this volume, to Ms. Vicky Chen for taking care of the technical aspects involved in the publication, to Ms. Youngie Yoon for taking charge of budget matters, and to Mr. Paul Rempel for editing the English essays.

目 錄

Table of Contents

序	丁邦新	i
Preface	Anne O. Yue	iii
Acknowledgment		v
 一般及跨方言研究		
Evidence of Possible Dialect Mixture in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions		
Ken-ichi Takashima & Anne O. Yue (高嶋謙一、余靄芹)		1
 A Window on Re-lexification in Chinese		
Benjamin K. Tsou (鄒嘉彥)		53
 The Phonology of Proto-Central Jiang-Huai: An Exercise in Comparative Reconstruction		
W. South Coblin (柯蔚南)		73
 官話		
聲調調值系統在官話方言中演變的不同類型及其分布		
平山久雄 (Hisao Hirayama)		141
 論晉語的歸屬		
侯精一 (Jingyi Hou)		167
 The Jianghuai Area as a Core of Lexical Innovation and Diffusion: A Case of the Kinship Term “ye 爺”		
Ray Iwata (岩田禮)		179
 Syntactic Change in Southeastern Mandarin: How Does Geographical Distribution Reveal a History of Diffusion?		
Zhang Min (張敏)		197

贛、客語

Two Jiangxi Sound Changes in Spatial Perspective: The Case of th- > h- and tsh- > th-

Laurent Sagart (沙加爾) 243

閩語

閩南語複數人稱代詞形成合音的年代

梅祖麟 (Tsu-Lin Mei) 261

Voiced Initials in Shyrbei

Jerry Norman (羅杰瑞) 271

Denasalization, Vocalic Nasalization and Related Issues in Southern Min: A Dialectal and Comparative Perspective

Chinfa Lien (連金發) 281

閩南方言中性問句的類型及其變化

施其生 (Qisheng Shi) 299

粵語

早期粵語裡的借詞現象

張洪年 (Samuel H-N. Cheung) 319

湘語

“女書”與江永方言

黃雪貞 (Xuezhen Huang) 337

湖南古丈瓦鄉話的音韻初探

伍雲姬 (Yunji Wu) 349

附載

Fang-kuei Li: A Personal Memoir

W. South Coblin (柯蔚南) 367

李方桂先生的來信

丁邦新 (Pang-Hsin Ting) 377

「非漢語」語言學之父—李方桂先生

丁邦新 (Pang-Hsin Ting) 403



Evidence of Possible Dialect Mixture in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions*

Ken-ichi Takashima

University of British Columbia

Anne O. Yue

University of Washington

There are basically two opposing word order patterns in Shang oracle-bone inscriptions (OBI): V + Od (direct object) + Oi (indirect object) and V + Oi + Od, in which Oi is sometimes marked with the particle *yu* 于 'to'. We suggest that OBI verbs should best be classified into those with the [+request] or [-request] feature, the former specifying the Od + Oi order, and the latter specifying the Oi + Od order. Although the exceptions we found can generally be associated with specific diviners or diviner groups, there are genuine cases of exceptions which defy any better explanation than dialect mixture or external influence resulting in syntactic change in word order. Noticing that no diviner's name appears in many of these exceptions, we suggest that these genuine exceptions are possibly utterances made by speakers of a non-standard language. The linguistic scenario found in OBI compares well with what is reported of the same construction in modern Cantonese as spoken in Hong Kong. This construction shows that a new word order pattern, Oi + Od for verbs with the [+give] feature, is gradually making its way through this dialect which originally possessed a dichotomy in its word order; i.e., Oi + Od for verbs with a [-give] feature and Od + Oi for verbs with a [+give] feature. Such a portrait of the OBI language and modern Cantonese confirms the languages to have been in flux, just like any living language in any non-isolated location and at any stage in the history of Chinese.

1. Introduction

The oracle-bone inscriptions (abbreviated hereafter as OBI) are believed to have been made during the late Shang from the reign of the dynasty's 22nd king, Wu Ding

*We wish to record our thanks to Professors David N. Keightley and Alain Peyraube for their detailed comments and criticism based on which we have revised our paper originally presented to the Symposium.

武丁, until the 30th king, Di Xin 帝辛 (ca. 14th-11th c. B.C.). For a period of about 270 years, the Shang elites conducted divination on a daily basis with the use of turtle plastrons and bovine scapulas. The exact reason why they inscribed their divinations on these materials is not entirely clear, though some possible reasons for this have been explored (e.g., Shirakawa 1967:198-199). To date, well over 150,000 inscribed plastron and scapula fragments, in varying degrees of completeness, have been unearthed. About one half of them have been published, mostly in the form of rubbings. The largest corpus of OBI available to scholars is the *Jiaguwen heji* 甲骨文合集 published in Beijing by *Zhonghua Shuju* 中華書局 from 1978 to 1982. (Unless otherwise specified, the number assigned to each oracle-bone piece in the examples cited below corresponds to the number in this collection.) In this set of 13 folio volumes, there are a total of 41,956 pieces, with the number of characters on one piece ranging from a few to several hundred.

All of these pieces are ascribed to one of five historical periods and, although scholars still debate the dating of a few groups of inscriptions, these five periods correspond to the reigns of the Shang kings from Wu Ding (Period I) to Di Xin (Period V). The remaining seven kings (not eight because one king, Lin Xin 廩辛, though listed in the Shang royal genealogy of the *Shiji* 史記, does not seem to have come to the throne) are given the periodization from Period II to IV. These periods are associated with certain diviner groups from the earliest Diviner Shi 自 Group (early Period I) to the latest Huang 黃 Diviner Group (Period V). OBI represent the earliest source for the study of the Chinese language as used in the first historical dynasty to have emerged in China's central plains; i.e., in Xiaotun 小屯 near the present city of Anyang 安陽, Henan 河南 Province.

It is commonly understood among OBI specialists that the bulk of the inscriptions were composed of *mingci* 命辭, 'divination charges', which were presented orally to the spirits by the diviners. These charges frequently occur after such contemporary divinatory terms as *zhen* 貞, which we believe to mean "to test" in the sense of "to propose ... (to spirits) for rectification," *yue* 曰 'to say', or *bu* 卜 'to crack, to divine (using bone as the medium)'. The great majority of *zhouci* 繇辭 'prognosticating statements', which sometimes follow the *mingci* and are frequently introduced by the expression *zhan (bu) yue* 占(卜)曰, were uttered by the kings. The *mingci* and *zhouci* -- both of which are modern terms -- are occasionally followed by *yanci* 驗辭 'verification statements', another modern term, which relate what actually transpired in response to the divination rites. OBI inscriptions are not believed to have been written by the diviners; instead, this task was performed by scribes whose names were never recorded (Takashima 1988a).

The opening section of this study will offer a brief outline of Shen Pei's (1992) pioneering analysis of the double-object construction in OBI. It will review the approach that he took based on a binary categorization of verbs which relate to Shang sacrificial practices; namely, sacrificial verbs, henceforth [+sacr], and non-sacrificial verbs, henceforth [-sacr]. As will be made clear, we believe that this categorization is

problematic. It is not based on solid linguistic or sociological reasoning, and does not lead to an explanatory model of how the double-object construction may have functioned in the OBI language. This aspect of the present study, which deals with the grammar of OBI, should be considered along side the generally favorable review of Shen Pei's work published elsewhere, one that stresses the importance of interpreting OBI as accurately as possible (Takashima 1996a).

In regard to the [-sacr] verbs, Shen Pei brings three subcategories into consideration, and provides some steadfast rules of word order. However, his discussion of the [+sacr] counterpart quickly branches off into a perplexing array of variant verbal subcategories and corresponding sentence structures. This seems to result from Shen Pei's adherence to a principle of distinction, rather than one of economy. Consequently, in the final analysis he fails to arrive at a satisfactory theory of conditioning for the contrast in word order found in certain double-object constructions.

As will be detailed shortly, many of the problems associated with Shen Pei's analysis are related to the criteria he uses to investigate the double-object construction in OBI. For instance, verbs related to sacrifice do not seem to stand out from ordinary verbs in syntax. Moreover, a comparison of [+sacr]/[-sacr] features fails to reveal anything significant since variant word order can be found to an equal degree in both. It will be seen that Shen Pei's application of this criterion does not yield a verifiable correlation between verb class and the order of the direct object (henceforth *Od*) and indirect object (henceforth *Oi*) in a sentence. In our reexamination of verb classes conducted in section 2, the formulation of a different analysis will be proposed. Since the verb in OBI basically appears to be classified as one with the feature [+request] or [-request], henceforth [+req]/[-req], this is the criterion which will be tested in this study.

The possible convergence of the two opposite orders in OBI, i.e., *Od* + *Oi* and *Oi* + *Od*, as a result of influence from other dialects or languages, will be given further consideration in section 3. Section 4 will pursue this "dialect/language mixture" possibility as vigorously as possible. If we use the aforementioned [+req] and [-req] verb categories, we can account for most of the word order variation evident in the double-object construction. For example, [+req] verbs generally conform to a *V* [+req] + *Od* + *Oi* formula; whereas, [-req] verbs are typically associated with the reverse -- *Od* following *Oi*. However, there is still a significant number of examples of [+req]/[-req] verbs which do not conform to the word order specified. This is something which alludes to elements of complexity in the alternation of word order that is still unresolved. We have thus entertained the possibility of allowing the [+directional] feature, henceforth [+dir], to have participated in the double-object construction. Here the [+dir] feature seems automatic with the [+req] verbs (which is logical because the act of request is directed to someone). On the other hand, the [+dir] feature may be required as an additional feature distinct from the [+req] verbs. This is because the main semantic function of the [+dir] verb is to indicate the method of offering a sacrificial victim or item to a recipient. We shall consider this further in 4.3.

Regarding the use of the particle/marker *yu* 于 in connection with certain [+req] and [+dir] verbs, there are interesting exceptions which defy easy explanation. At one point Shen Pei writes that the use and non-use of the Oi marker 于 in OBI is best summed up as something occurring "at random." Rather than settling for such a seemingly offhand conclusion, we will instead offer an explanation which takes factors such as time and space into consideration. However, the reader is cautioned: there is still much in-depth work to be done on the problem of the particle/marker *yu*.

If we can see how linguistic change in a modern language is possible when significant influence is introduced from a dialect or language, the same phenomenon in the context of OBI should be more readily understood.¹ This form of comparison will be even more fruitful if we look at differences of word order in double-object constructions that are found in a language spoken in the present day. Section 5 presents just such an examination of the changes that Cantonese spoken in Hong Kong has undergone in roughly the last 20 to 30 years. A lengthy and detailed survey based on field work conducted in 1981 by Alain Peyraube outlines the impact that the influx of mainland Chinese into Hong Kong has had in terms of language change since 1949.

2. The double-object construction

Shen (1992:79ff) discusses the double-object construction under two major categories according to whether the verb relates to sacrifice or not.² Each major category is further divided into subcategories according to the subclassification of the verb in correlation with word order.

¹ William Wang (1998) makes an interesting point that the further we go back in the history of Chinese the more linguistic diversity is likely to be found. This paper is the first attempt at showing the possibility of such linguistic diversity in the latter half of the second millennium B.C.

² The modern Chinese term for [+sacr] is *jisi* 祭祀; whereas, that for [-sacr] is *fei jisi* 非祭祀. As an example of imprecise terminology, *jisi* fails to distinguish "sacrificial verbs," i.e., verbs which imply the offering of something to a deity in propitiation or homage, from "ritual verbs," i.e., verbs associated with the conducting of (religious) ceremonies which may, or may not, accompany sacrifices. On the whole, this modern terminology does not seem to correlate with any syntactically significant facts. However, by virtue of certain cultural elements innate to ritualism, it may be possible to investigate syntax by observing the distinction between ritual and non-ritual verbs. That is, a certain set of ritual verbs require four participants--subject, direct and indirect objects, and instrumental object. This is something Chow Kwok-ching attempts to investigate in his 1982 Ph.D. dissertation (Chow 1982:191-264), and Shen Pei expands upon Chow's analysis further. In our view, as will become clear, sacrificial verbs fall under non-ritual verbs and are nothing more than an extension of ordinary verbs. This view is the result of adopting a more universal classification of verbs: those that may fall into a "natural" class, one which has a wider range of applicability in various other languages.

2.1. With [-sacr] verbs

For the [-sacr] verbs, the following three subcategories are established:

Va: 受, 錫, 畀 — all with the general meaning of “to give”

Vb: 求, 丐, 乞 — all with the general meaning of “to obtain” (*sic*)³

Vc: 降 ‘to send down’, 作 ‘to make’, 以 ‘to bring’, 肇 ‘to make’⁴ — with the meaning of neither “to give” nor “to obtain” (*sic*; see fn.3).

The word order in the case of Va is **Va + Oi + Od** with the indirect object always preceding the direct object.⁵ With regard to Vb, the word order is **Vb + Od + (于) Oi**. In this case, the direct object always precedes the indirect object which is optionally marked with 于. Finally, the word order of Vc is predominantly **Vc + Oi + Od**, al-

³The Chinese term Shen Pei gives is *qude* 取得 ‘gain, acquire, obtain’; however, the meaning “to request” seems closer to the Chinese original as it encompasses the three verbs given here: 求 ‘to entreat’, 丐 ‘ask for’, 乞 ‘to request’.

⁴It is difficult to justify the gloss given here by Shen Pei. Referring to p.9, we find that he is also inclined to understand the word as meaning “to open up, to deploy” (*qidong* 啓動) as opposed to “make” which is the interpretation he follows here. Of the two glosses, the former has a stronger historical basis and should be adopted here, as well.

⁵Shen Pei (p.81) cites a couple of identical, albeit incomplete inscriptions which constitute exceptions to the Va + Oi + Od pattern. They read as follows:

貞錫牛于... 貞錫牛于... (*Yingguo* 787)

Shen interprets the missing graph after *yu* 于 to be the name of a place, rather than an indirect object. Since a locative and an indirect object are semantically and grammatically similar, it is not clear if one can clearly distinguish between the two. However, if Shen is correct in his interpretation of this inscription, the difference is “+directional” vs. “+locative”, and the inscription cited above can be taken to mean “Tested: Give cattle at ...”. Shen supports this locative interpretation of *yu* by comparing it with *zai* 在 ‘to be at’ in the expression that partly reads as 錫 N 在 X. In our view, however, this expression means “(So-and-so) conferred N: (it) was at X” or “(So-and-so)’s conferring N was at X”. If interpreted in this manner, the above expression does not support Shen’s interpretation, for there is no evidence that *yu* is a full-fledged verb as is the case with *zai*.

The following inscription from *Tunnan* 2576 is also given a locative interpretation of a sort, i.e., “temporal,” as Shen takes 茲三鼓 as referring to time:

... 畀束于茲三鼓.

Presumably, he understands this example to mean: “Give a weapon at this three-drum-time”. But, as far as we know, the Shang did not use numerals to indicate time. Thus, it is also possible to take this as meaning: “Give a weapon (?) to these three drummers”, the validity of which requires further testing.

For a study proposing that *yu* often contains a meaning of “futuraity” (and thus, by extension, a “+directional” inclination), see Takashima (1990:36-39; 1996:467-470). The locative *yu* is also possible when the verb is existential; for example, 貞乙亥彫我呂伐于廳(=庭) ‘Tested: (On) the *yihai* day, you-cut the *fa*-human victims (or *decapituri*) of our Lü in the courtyard’ (*Bingbian* 47[1,3,5]).

though **Vc + Od + Oi** is also found, albeit rarely. The latter word order is only found in examples containing the verbs 以 or 作.⁶ A few examples of Va, Vb, and Vc, indicated with dotted underline, are given below:⁷

- (1) 貞禱于上甲受我祐(1171)

Tested: (When we) pray to Shang Jia, (he will) grant us aid.

- (2) 王求雨于土(32301)

The king will ask for rain from the God of Earth.

- (3) 貞帝其作我孽(14184)

Tested: Di might cause us trouble.

- (4) ...大貞作孽小司亡桷 (23711)

... Da tested: (X) will make trouble (for) Lesser Officer; there will be no x [meaning unknown].

2.2 With [+sacr] verbs

For the [+sacr] verbs, two subcategories are established by Shen Pei.

2.2.1 With Vx

The first subcategory (henceforth Vx) includes 禱 ‘to pray for’, 御 ‘to lustrate, exorcize’, 告 ‘to make a ritual announcement’, 寧 ‘to pacify’, 醔 ‘to you-cut’, 祝 ‘to invoke’, 祐 ‘to perform the *zuo*-sacrifice’, and 裸 ‘to make libation’. Vx consists of verbs which typically involve the following participants: 1) an invoked object, i.e., a deity, which we shall equate with “Oi”; 2) an object prayed for, which Shen Pei calls an “object of cause,” but which we shall equate with “Od” since grammatically there is no difference between the two; and 3) a sacrificial object which we shall equate with “Oins” or “Od”, the latter designation being used only when there is no conflict with its earlier occurrence within the same sentence (i.e., no two direct objects associated with a single verb in different syntactic positions). When only the invoked object and the prayed-for object appear, the word order is **Vx + Od + (于) Oi**, with the deity object optionally marked with 于.⁸ For example:

⁶ The interpretation Shen gives for his examples of the verb *yi* in the Vc + Od + Oi pattern is far from conclusive. That is, 以王伐 could be understood as 以 ‘to lead, bring’ + NP, i.e., 王伐 can be construed as a noun phrase meaning “the king’s *fa*-human victims (= *decapituri*)” or “the *decapituri* belonging to/set aside for/etc. the king”. Another example, 以齒王, could also be understood similarly as embodying the 以 + NP structure, i.e., 齒王 is a noun phrase meaning something like the ‘afflicted/troubled king’ (齒 = 齟?). Thus, with the verb 以, it is more prudent to maintain a normal syntax of Vc + Oi + Od, because its meaning contains a directional feature in the Vc. On the other hand, the verb 作 in 作喪小司 and 作孽小司 seems to be used as a causative marker (Takashima 1990:56-61) literally meaning “to cause a *Xiao Si* (Junior Officer in Charge) to suffer a loss” and “to cause a *Xiao Si* to suffer a calamity”, respectively.

⁷ All examples are from Shen Pei (1992).

⁸ Shen (p.95) provides two dubious examples with the word order Vx + 于 Oi + Od which hardly ever occurred.