

# Toward a New Pronominal Hypothesis of *Qi* in Shang Chinese

1

*Ken-ichi Takashima*

For more than twenty years I have had the privilege of knowing Professor David Nivison; on occasion, my work has been the object of his criticism as his has been of mine—the two of us never seem to be able to agree on certain major issues.<sup>1</sup> The present paper, however, is different, in that even though our perspectives and assumptions are not in perfect consonance,<sup>2</sup> there just may be some issues about which Nivison and I once disagreed, but where we now are more in agreement. The scholarly issues involved are quite thorny ones: (1) the possibility that *qi* in the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions (hereafter abbreviated as “OBI” or, when we wish to focus more on their linguistic aspect, as “OBL”) might have been used as an anaphoric pronoun; (2) the possibility that *qi* might have been used as a subordinate sentence marker of the embedment type,<sup>3</sup> and (3) the possibility that *qi* might have been used as a function word representing what amounts to the “subjunctive mood” in traditional grammar. All of these possibilities are closely connected, so that the acceptance of any one of them may entail the acceptance of them all.

The single most serious obstacle to exploring the above-mentioned possibilities is that for these usages, unlike the rich corpus of inscriptions available for testing my separate theory that *qi* is a modal and aspectual particle in the OBL, we are faced with a relatively small number of examples upon which to make our judgment. But, as we shall see in section 2, there are a few striking examples and some consistent patterns of occurrence which suggest that the possibilities may just be borne out.

First, however, as a background to section 2 where I address the pronominal hypothesis, it is necessary to present the gist of my interpretation that *qi* functions as a kind of adverbial particle, conveying a variety of modal as well as aspectual meanings.

## 1. The Modal and Aspectual Theory of *Qi*

### 1.1 The Nature of Modal *Qi*

One major controversy surrounding *qi* is whether or not it conveys a sense of uncertainty or certainty. Most specialists have taken the former interpretation, while the single, most consistent advocator of the latter interpretation has been Nivison (e.g., 1971a, 1992, 1992a, 1992b). Only Serruys (1972; 1974, 94, n.8) reacted against the interpretation that *qi* conveyed a sense of uncertainty (Takashima 1970; 29–32), and had the following to say about the matter:

*Qi* does not express primarily “uncertain feelings” but a definitely certain judgment and opinion, *viz.* that the proposition carrying the particle *qi* represents the “less desired alternative,” and the English “perhaps, may be” does not seem to account for the real meaning implied by absence and presence of *qi* in certain opposite sentences.

This interpretation is similar, though not identical, to Nivison’s in that *qi* is used in statements of firm intent as in the following example:

(1) 余其作邑. *Qianbian* 4.10.6

“I will found a settlement here.” (Nivison 1992, 7)

Nivison argues as follows:

The objector would interpret it “I will perhaps found a settlement (here).” He wants the line to mean, “I intend to found a settlement here, but I am uncertain whether I should do so.” But what it *says* is, “I will found a settlement here,” i.e., I hereby announce my intention to do so—for the purpose of conducting a divination test. The announcement is tentative, but the tentativeness is *not* expressed in the language used. The tentativeness is revealed only in the fact that the sentence is a *charge* in a divination rite.

Although Serruys did not provide a translation for the inscription just quoted, his rule of “undesirable *qi*” (1974, 25)<sup>4</sup> would lead one to interpret it as “I might (*qi*: but would rather not) found a settlement here.”<sup>5</sup> It follows that to Serruys, the *qi* might be translatable as “might,” but it does not express any meaning of uncertainty, conveying instead a clear preference on the part of the king for not building a settlement. The illocutionary force of Nivison’s understanding and that of Serruys’ are thus completely opposite to each other. They cannot both be right. And, then, there is of course the third possibility against which Nivison was reacting: “I will perhaps found a settlement” or “I might found a settlement,” expressing a genuine uncertainty as to the wisdom of carrying out the project.

In order to be able to decide which, if either, of these rival interpretations is the correct choice, we need to examine the inscription in a context greater than that in which it is found. First, we need to pay attention to the left or right placement of the inscription on the bone—something which is not always easy to establish for small fragments. We also need to interpret each divinatory charge in the context of the greater inscription, for this might indicate whether the content of the charge would or would not have been something the Shang really desired. The latter has the danger of imposing upon the Shang our own notion of what is “good,” which may not necessarily have been regarded as “good” by the Shang themselves. But there are examples which, when placed in a larger context, are quite suggestive.

Example (1), cited above, occurs on a fragmentary piece of bone, and it is probable that it had occurred in a context such as the following:

(2A) 壬子卜爭貞我其作邑帝弗左若. (R) *Bingbian* 147(1)

Crack-making on the *renzi* day [49], Zheng tested: We will found a settlement, (for) Di will not oppose (but) will approve.

(2B) 癸丑卜爭貞勿作邑帝若. (L) *Ibid.* (2)

Crack-making on the *guichou* day [50], Zheng tested: (We) should not found a settlement, (for) Di will approve.

It is generally agreed among specialists that the semantically positive charge, that is, positive or desirable to the Shang, was carved on

the right side of a shell (R), and the semantically negative or undesirable charge was carved on the left (L). Keightley (1978; 51, n. 124) provides the following charge pair as illustrating a preferred distribution of *qi* in the semantically negative:

(3A) ↓貞子〔商〕亡〔疾〕. (R) *Zhuihe* 292

Tested: Zi Shang shall have no sickness.

(3B) ↑子商其有疾. (L) *Ibid.*

Tested: Zi Shang might have sickness.

Although (3A) is grammatically negative and (3B) positive, (3A) is inscribed on the R and (3B) on the L side of the shell. I agree with Keightley's characterization that "since Zi Shang was an ally and perhaps a member of the royal family, his possible sickness was undesirable, . . . the inscription was carved on the left side of the shell."

Now if we examine (2A) and (2B), we find that (2A) occurs on the "desirable R" and (2B) on the "undesirable L" and that *qi* occurs on the R but not on the L. The literal application of Serruys' rule would be that (2A) was undesirable to the Shang, i.e., the Shang didn't want to found a settlement. This is not impossible, but it is unlikely for three reasons: for one, the reason clause<sup>6</sup> which follows 我其作邑 says specifically that Di will not oppose such an undertaking but will approve of it, indicating a clear intention, if not wish, that the Shang had the desire to perform this action. To be sure, the negative counterpart (2B) says the opposite, so it cancels the force of the first argument—almost, but not quite, when one considers the second reason, which is that (2A) and (2B) are followed by the ensuing divinations:

(4A) ↓癸丑卜爭貞我宅茲邑大賓帝若. (R) *Bingbian* 147(3)

Crack-making on the *guichou* day [50], Zheng tested: We will take up residence in this settlement and conduct a great entertainment ritual, (for) Di will approve.

(4B) ↑癸丑卜爭貞帝弗若. (L) *Ibid.* (4)

Crack-making on the *guichou* day [50], Zheng tested: Di will not approve.

In (4A) it is clear that the Shang contemplated the next move after the founding of a settlement—taking up residence and conducting an (ancestral) ceremony there. Again, (4A) is inscribed on the R; Di not approving in (4B) was undesired, and so was inscribed on the L. The third reason, which may not be totally unequivocal, is that sentence parallelism suggests that the degree of modality of *qi* be taken as equal, except that *qi zuo* is positive and *wu zuo* 勿作 'don't build' is negative. That is, because *wu* is a modally strong prohibitive negative, it is matched, as pointed out by Nivison and Keightley (1993, 35), with an equally strong modal word. I would maintain this interpretation is applicable to *qi* in (2A), but not to the same in (3B), for it is difficult to think that the Shang expressed a strong statement such as "Zi Shang shall have sickness." In terms of the degree of modality, then, I suggest that *qi* behaves in such a way as to change its modal force at will.

As far as can be established, I find that the "desirable R" and the "undesirable L" placement of the inscriptions is, on the whole, not violated<sup>7</sup> (so much so, in fact, that one can conjure up the *yin* and *yang* forces at work in the OBL). It thus seems prudent to interpret examples (1), (2A), (3A), and (4A) as representing the desired alternative to the Shang.

As seen in the above examples, the placement of *qi* is observed on both sides of a shell expressing a possibly strong intention as in (1) and (2A), as well as a not so strong "possibility" of Zi Shang succumbing to illness as in (3B). (I will later argue that it is not so much the "possibility" which is at issue here as the diviner's "wish" [sc. *qi*] that Zi Shang *not* succumb to illness.) Examination of as many examples as could be mustered reveals that where the verb is characterized as having an element of human will, symbolized as "+will," *qi* is invariably associated with the "intention" and "wish" scale of modality, and that where the verb is characterized as having no element of will, symbolized as "–will," *qi* is associated, at least on the surface, with the "possibility" and "certainty" scale of modality. The +will verb, in other words, is controllable, and the –will verb is uncontrollable. The verb *zuo* 作 'make' in (1), (2A) and (2B), and the verb *zhai* 宅 'reside' in (4A) are +will and controllable, while *you* 有 'have, there is' as used in (3B) is –will and uncontrollable. *Qi*, when combined with these verbs, moves

on the modal scales of “intention/wish” and of “possibility/certainty.” I would suggest that it means “certainly, definitely,”<sup>8</sup> as well as “perhaps, may be.” One must decide case by case. The prognostication portion of (5A) below shows a case of the use of *qi* operating on the modal scale of the decidedly “wish” side, which amounts to optative:

(5A) 𠄎甲辰卜穀貞奚來白馬·王占曰其來· (R) *Bingbian*  
157(11)

Crack-making on the *jiachen* day, Que (?) tested: Xi shall bring white horses. The king, having prognosticated, said “Lucky. May (Xi) be going to bring (them).”

(5B) 𠄎甲辰卜穀貞奚不其來白馬· (L) *Ibid.* 157(12)

Crack-making on the *jiachen* day, Que (?) tested: Xi may not be going to bring white horses.

The verb 來 *lai* ‘bring (< lit. cause to come)’ in the above examples is inflected as –will or uncontrollable from the Shang point of view. But it is clear from the prognostication portion of (5A) that the king wished Xi to contribute white horses. That is, the modal *qi* here incorporates the +will feature of what was presented as the –will nature of the verb *lai*. The king wanted to transform the uncontrollable into the controllable. The meaning here is clearly one of wish or hope. This is essentially what Nivison (1978a) argued, and I agree (cf. also Takashima 1973, 191).

Now apply this meaning to the same *qi* in (5B). We cannot translate this as “Xi will hopefully not bring white horses” or anything like this. We would have to work within the modal scale of “possibility/certainty,” and more on the side of possibility. Thus, my proposed translation reads “Xi may not be going to bring white horses,” expressing in this case a genuine uncertainty on the part of the diviner. It is awkward to understand *qi* here as meaning “definitely.” By contrast, however, it is not totally out of the range of the intention side of the “intention/wish” scale to translate the same *qi* as “definitely” or “certainly” in (1) and (2A). If the modality of *qi* is operating on the epistemological scale of both “possibility/certainty” and “intention/wish,” and the distribution of *qi* is split between both the “desirable R” and the “undesirable L,” *qi* must be responding not really to its own intrinsic

meaning, but to some sort of stimulus which must be located outside the confines of “sentence grammar.” I have come to hold the view that the modal *qi* responds to the intricacies of what linguists and logicians call “presupposition.” According to Lyons’ (1977, 2.762) characterization of presupposition,

To investigate and formalize the presuppositions of different kinds of questions is one of the central concerns of erotetic logic . . . . Another is to decide what constitutes a valid answer to a question. That these parts of the logic of questions are interconnected will be clear from the fact . . . that either to assert or to deny the presupposition of a question is to fail to answer it. But there are other ways in which one can respond to a question without answering it . . . . Responses may be appropriate or inappropriate; and answers, complete or partial, constitute but one of the subclasses of appropriate responses.

Without wishing to get involved in the controversy of whether the charges in the Shang OBI were questions or not (but cf. e.g., Nivison 1982, 1989; Takashima 1988–1989, 1989), we could adopt a heuristic approach by taking Lyons’ characterization of the presuppositions underlying different kinds of charges.

Let us examine a set of examples in which *yu* ‘rain’, modulated by *qi*, was desired by the Shang:

(6A) 𠄎(辛亥卜內貞)翌癸丑其雨· (R) *Bingbian* (154[2]) +  
153[13]

Crack-making on the *xinhai* day, Nei tested: On the following *guichou* day [50], it shall be going to rain.

(6B) 𠄎辛亥卜內〔貞〕翌甲寅其雨· (L) *Ibid.* (154[2]) +  
153(14)

Crack-making on the *xinhai* day, Nei tested: On the following *jiayin* day [51], it shall (?) be going to rain.

(6C) 〔王〕占曰癸其雨三日癸丑允雨· *Ibid.* 154 (3)

The king, having prognosticated, said, “On a *gui* day, it shall be going to rain.” (Or: “May it be going to rain on a *gui* day.”) (In) three days, on the *guichou* day it indeed rained.

(6C) confirms that the charge in (6A), inscribed on the R, was desired. In these examples, we seem to be dealing with a presumption on the part of the diviner and the king—in that they were in a position to be able to expect rain to fall on the days specified (cf. Keightley 1993, 26). *Qi*, in other words, represented their presupposition that the rain was indeed forthcoming. The answer to the unasked hypothetical question, “Will it be (*qi*) raining?,” would have been “Yes, it shall be going to rain.” I interpret the modality of *qi* in this context to be marked +will operating on the “wish” side of the “intention/wish” scale. This is superimposed on the basically uncontrollable event of raining. For a controllable verb such as *zuo* ‘make’, *qi* modalizes it on the scale of “intention/wish” where the presupposition and the surface form match.

On the other hand, when negation is involved as in (5B) 奚不其來白馬 ‘Xi may not be going to bring white horses’, the presupposition to the hypothetical question “Will Xi not bring white horses?” would take a different form: “No, my [= diviner’s] formulation of not bringing white horses should be rejected.” *Qi* in (5B), occurring on the L, responds to that presupposition. Here, too, we see the modality of *qi* being superimposed on the uncontrollable and eventive verb *lai* ‘to bring’.

According to the interpretation just presented, *qi* is used to either affirm or deny the diviner’s presumption that the oracle would respond in a certain specific way. But it is possible that the analytic framework allowed in my scheme, where either Yes or No was the answer to be expected, may quite possibly be too narrow and constraining. Since I characterized the modality of *qi* as operating on the scale of “possibility/certainty” and “intention/wish,” there is no reason for me not to allow the fluctuation of modality in the diviner’s presupposition of Yes or No itself. That is, as it were, “Perhaps yes,” “Definitely yes,” and so on almost *ad infinitum*. In fact, I believe this to be the nature of modality. So, to formalize this usage is not easy, and if attempted (as I did in Takashima 1993, sec. 2.3.6), there are bound to be problems and the result may be greeted with some skepticism. But we must begin somewhere, and if we do so by considering examples such as (5B) 奚不其來白馬 and (6A) 翌癸丑其雨, it is quite possible that *qi* in (5B) had a strong modality of “No,” and that *qi* in (6A) had a strong modality of “Yes.”

## 1.2 The Aspectual *Qi*

Linguists recognize the existence of the aspectual character of a verb as either “grammaticalized” or “lexicalized” (Lyons 1977, 2.706). The English progressive aspect with such a meaning as “be +V-ing” (e.g., I am writing now) is grammaticalized. And apart from certain subclasses of English verbs (i.e., stative verbs) which do not occur in the progressive aspect (e.g., “know,” “have,” “belong,” etc.), verbs with a dynamic meaning occur in this grammaticalized pattern. While the modern Chinese progressive aspect can be grammaticalized (e.g., by the attachment of *zhe*), classical Chinese generally expresses the aspectual meanings through the use of particles, and is thus lexicalized. In the case of Shang Chinese—and possibly Zhou Chinese as well—I would like to propose that there is what I call the “anticipative” or “prospective” aspect, lexicalized (or represented) by *qi*. Furthermore, partly because the anticipative/prospective aspect interacts with the system of negatives which are also aspectual in character (Takashima 1988), I also wish to reserve, in my repertory of the aspectual description, the term “mutative” in the sense of “being transformed into something.”

In his discussion of the prospective aspect of English and Russian, Comrie (1976, 64) defines it as follows:

Perfect is retrospective, in that it establishes a relation between a state at one time and a situation at an earlier time. . . . one might equally well expect to find prospective forms, where a state is related to some subsequent situation, for instance *where someone is in a state of being about to do something*.

The italicized portion should easily be adopted to cases where the subject is not necessarily human, leading us to the equally valid aspectual interpretation of “prospective forms, where a state is related to some subsequent situation, e.g., the weather is in a state of turning to rain.” It goes without saying that rain can be negated, notably by the stative/eventive negative of *bu* 不. The expression *bu qi* is, then, a realization of near aspectual concord or agreement, because “stative/eventive” and “prospective” are different only in their relationship to a subsequent situation.

In connection with this, it is interesting to note that Graham (1983, 68) says “there is a change of state which makes it suitable to translate

[*fu* 弗] by ‘no longer,’ and he further speculates that “*fu* in the *Documents* is what might be called a ‘prospect closing’ negative, in contrast with the ‘prospect opening’ modal *qi* 其.” While this deserves further study in classical Chinese, there is at least one instance of the combination “*fu* + *qi*” in the *Documents* (SSTJ 33/0223), and more examples than can easily be counted in the OBL (cf. Takashima 1985a, 483–89). One would therefore think that if *qi* embodies, as is quite possible, the “prospect-opening” aspect, it should not be contrasted with the “prospect-closing” negative *fu*. I have suggested that *fu*/*\*pjət*, a non-modal *\*p*-type negative in the OBL, is indeed a negative used to negate a non-stative/non-eventive verb (Takashima 1988). Because I used a binary analysis in 1988, this non-stative/non-eventive verb is equivalent to, or paraphrased as, the “mutative” verb. Thus, *fu qi* is a combination which should yield a general meaning of “mutatively prospective,” i.e., the prospective aspect is superimposed on something being transformed into something else, stated negatively in this case.

For the negation of a stative and eventive verb, either *bu*/*\*pjəg* 不 or *wu*/*\*mjəg* 毋 is used. For details of my argument with examples, I must refer the reader to Takashima (1988). On page 125 I characterized them as meaning “be +V-ing, not so much in its progressive aspect but as in its eventive or happening aspect.” I think we can improve upon this interpretation even further on the basis of Comrie’s discussion of English aspect (Comrie 1976, 64). He says:

Typical English expressions of prospective meaning are the constructions *to be going to*, *to be about to*, *to be on the point of*, as in *the ship is about to sail*, *the ship is on the point of sailing*—both of which describe the ship’s present state relative to some future event, with these constructions an imminently future event—and *the ship is going to sail*, where there is again a present state related to a future event, but here without any implication of imminent futurity.

What we find in the OBL is that the stative/eventive verb is also accompanied by a temporal adverb (e.g., 今夕其雨 “This evening it *qi* rain”), so that we would want *qi* to have such a meaning as “to be going to,” rather than “to be about to” or “to be on the point of”—though I do not wish to abandon the latter meanings, should the context require them. Thus, 今夕其雨 should be rendered “It shall be going to rain this evening.” Applied to the negative (as in our example “[R]”

不其雨 in note 7), we also need to take the modality and presupposition into account, yielding an accurate, albeit perhaps trite, translation of “It will perhaps not be going to rain” (sc. presupposition: “No, it will rain”). In my translations of the inscriptions with *qi* cited so far, I have reflected this aspectual interpretation of the word.

## 2. The Pronominal Hypothesis of *Qi*

The more vexing problems than the modal and aspectual ones sketched in section 1 above (more elaborate and full treatment can be found in Takashima [1993]) concern what may be called the pronominal hypothesis of *qi*. As known to many in the field of early Chinese studies, it is David Nivison who has continued to do research in this area, first as a problem in classical Chinese, and then in the inscriptional language of the Shang and Zhou periods (Nivison 1968, 1971, 1971a, 1991, 1992, 1992a, 1992b). I myself once dubbed this the problem of trying to account for the use of the same graph in two different functions, one modal and the other pronominal, in classical Chinese, while seeking their origins in the OBL (Takashima 1970). The problem was so daunting that after three years I withdrew my claim of the same-origin hypothesis of the “two” *qi*’s (Takashima 1973, 267–305). It is in a way ironic that Nivison was instrumental in my change of view which had, in substance, agreed with his. So after all of these years, what is new? The inscriptional material available for our studies is about the same and there have been no dramatic methodological advances. But the way we look at the inscriptions is new—at least in my own case—and Nivison makes his arguments more airtight and sophisticated than before. Sometimes, however, examples can speak more powerfully than this little linguistic game of mine (though I play this very seriously) or the philosophico-logical argumentation of Nivison. We need to look at the inscriptions more straightforwardly than before.

### 2.1 *Qi* as Anaphoric Pronoun

Let us begin with an observation of Nivison’s (hereafter abbreviated as “N”) best examples:

(7A) ↓貞有虎. (R) *Bingbian* 366(1)

N (1992, 11): "Testing: There will be tigers."

N (1992a, 9): "There are (going to be) tigers."

Takashima (T): (Same as N [1992], except that the modality of "wish" should be assigned to the verb *you*, leading to a translation "There shall be tigers.")

(7B) ↑貞亡其虎. (L) *Ibid.* (2)

N (1992, 11): "Testing: There will not be the (supposed) tigers."

N (1992a, 9): "There are none of the/these tigers (in question)."

T: (Same as N[1992a].)

In (7B), which occurs on the left (L) side of the plastron, the pre-verbal, modal *qi* theory does not fair well, for it occurs before the noun *hu* 'tiger'. Other similar examples have *lu* 鹿 'deer' (*Bingbian* 286 [2] and [4]) or other animals in the same position where *hu* occurs, thus leaving no question as to the nominal interpretation of what follows *wang qi*.

Nivison (1992, 12) criticizes my previous treatment of taking *qi* in cases like (7B) as a post-posed particle acting on the preceding verb (first put forth in Takashima [1970, 13–15] and repeated, without satisfaction, in Takashima [1973, 268–69; 1988a, 657, n. 1; 683, n. 25]). He points out that my "'way out' is impossible. Always, *qi* is to be grouped with the following word or phrase . . ." I agree. One might entertain the possibility that the verb *you* "there is; have" has been omitted after *qi*. This would mean that (7B), for example, had the underlying structure, \**wang qi you hu*, from which *you* was deleted because of redundancy (*wang*, though a negative, entails the meaning of *you*). Such a transformational operation seems just as unsatisfactory as the one I assumed in 1970: that the surface *wang qi hu* was derived from \**qi wang hu* by transformation. Not only are both hypotheses untestable, the deletion of *you* after *wang*—considered here mainly in deference to the more normal pattern of *wang qi* + V—produces a highly eccentric underlying structure in the context of (8B): \**wo wang you huo* "we have not have misfortune". Even the staunchest Chomskyan might be brought up short by such a grotesque agglomeration. On the other hand, as Shen Pei (1992, 168) has also pointed out, *qi* in this position behaves like other adverbs such as *yi* 亦 'also' and *xiang* 詳 'specifically' (cf. Takashima 1973, 389–92). The *yi* occurs after the negative *bu* and *wang* (*Heji* 22258, where *ji* 疾 'illness; suffer from illness' occurs as

object). The *xiang* occurs after the negatives *bu*, *wu*, and *wang* (*Tunnan* 994, where a nominalized VP, *qin* 擒 Tufang 擒土方 'capture the Tufang', occurs as object). *Qi* also occurs after the negatives *bu*, *fu*, *wu*, and *wang*—more frequently than one cares to count in the OBL. It would therefore seem justified in considering *qi* to belong to a class of adverbs like *yi* and *xiang*. But if so, could one expect to have an adverb before a "pure" noun? Just changing "adverb" to "particle" will not do (cf. also Nivison 1971, 12). The most straightforward interpretation, therefore, is what Nivison has been saying all along: *qi* is, in fact, used as a pronoun having anaphoric reference.

If it is as simple as that, it would not have met with such consistent resistance by specialists. There are also problems with such a straightforward interpretation. Let us reconsider one problem I myself raised for Nivison (and for Keightley's earlier version of 1992) in Takashima (1992, 5):

While the hypothetical demonstrative *qi* in the *wang qi you* 亡其雨 may work in the sense that *qi* refers back to the positive *you you* 有雨, it does not work in the following pair, in which *qi* appears in the positive counterpart:

(8A) ↓貞我其有禍. (R) *Bingbian* 3 (11)

Tested: We might be going to have misfortunes.

(8B) ↑貞我亡禍. (L) *Ibid.* (12)

Tested: We will have no misfortunes.

The only way the demonstrative or pronominal interpretation of *qi* can work is by assuming that the negative statement was made first, and that *qi* in the positive statement refers to the non-occurrence of the *huo* being divined about—a rather bizarre situation.

This still seems to be a difficult problem to explain. Even if we can in fact assume that (8B)—which we should now characterize as a semantically positive or desirable alternative to the Shang—was uttered first, why do we not have \*我有其禍? There are quite a few inscriptions in which the object of the verb *you* is *huo*, but the order is invariably *qi you huo*.

Perhaps there is a basis for the non-occurrence of \**you qi huo*. A possible reason, which may turn out to be quite simple, is that the Shang didn't want to say *you qi huo*, even though they could have.<sup>9</sup>

Recall that in section 1 I interpreted *qi* as a modal and aspectual particle: the modality operated on the scales of “possibility/certainty” and “intention/wish,” further involving the presupposition of the speaker to deny or affirm it (with varying degrees of modality), and the aspectual character involved the “anticipative/prospective/mutative” meanings. When applied to the use of *qi* in (8A), we can say that for the Shang the *prospect* of having misfortunes was a possibility. But it was inscribed on the “desirable R” side, so the presupposition of the diviner in this case must surely be one which denies it: “My [= diviner’s] formulation of us having the possibility of misfortunes is to be rejected.” The modality of the diviner’s rejection must have been a rather strong “No.” It is, therefore, difficult to assign the modal *qi* in (8A) such a “certainty” sense as “definitely.” That would be sacrilegious. I have thus chosen a weaker sense of “might,” but “perhaps” will also do. Now, if (8A) had been expressed as \*我有其禍, we would *lose* all the analyses provided in section 1, because *qi* is no longer the modal or aspectual particle; it would have to be treated as simply pronominal.

Another problem that needs addressing is the order of utterance in the divinatory charges. We need to determine which of two inscribed sentences in a charge pair was *said* first. (Here the question of which was *written* first is not necessarily crucial.) The order of utterance is important particularly for charges such as (7A) and (7B) on the one hand, and (8A) and (8B) on the other. In the former, (7A) *must* be considered to have been uttered first for the pronominal *qi* hypothesis to be valid. In the latter, however, it should be noted that (8A) does not depend on the order of utterance for the modal and aspectual *qi* theory to be valid (for this theory is based on the syntax *wo qi you huo* rather than \**wo you qi huo*). However, the order of utterance becomes relevant to the degree of the modal force which one can assign to *qi* in the context of presuppositions associated, as discussed in section 1.1, with the “desirable R” and “undesirable L” placement.

Concerning this problem of the order of utterance, Nivison (1992, 13) makes the following observation:

Serruys’ observation, accepted as a rule by Keightley, that *qi* marks the less desired alternative in a *duizhen* pair may be accidentally right most of the time: normally the desired alternative is tested first; *qi* in the alternative is thus acting on an idea already introduced, which is implicitly being referred back to as “old information.”

Keightley (1992, 23–26) picked up this “old information” hypothesis for *qi* and developed his “delimiting *qi*” hypothesis, which he subsequently withdrew (1993). But his conclusion, cited below, is a fair characterization of the problems involved.

In short, placement alone cannot tell us which charge in a charge-pair was divined first. Any conclusion about the delimiting use of *qi* that depends on determining which charge was primary must depend upon the assumption, not always testable, that the desirable charge was the one that the diviner first proposed to the shell (and, of course, on the additional assumption that we can determine Shang preferences). These considerations do not invalidate the “old-new” hypothesis but they make it impossible to test in every case.

I would add to this, however, that there are inscriptions which, when placed in larger context, can suggest to us which charge was desirable to the Shang. The examples selected so far in this paper (i.e., [1], [2A], [3A], [4A], [5A], [6A], [7A], [8B]) are all those, which in my judgment, represent the desirable alternatives. Used with caution, therefore, Nivison’s assumption is acceptable as a working hypothesis.<sup>10</sup> In the case of (7A) and (7B), it seems natural to assume that the Shang wanted to get tigers, and if so, (7A) was uttered first.

If the pronominal *qi* is indeed considered acceptable, Nivison’s (1992b, 8) second best example (though not translated by him) is no longer a puzzle. It is pronominal, pure and simple:

(9) 更寅卜王余燎于其配. *Yingguo* 1864

Crack-making on the *gengyin* day, the king [tested]: I will make a burnt-offering to his mate.

Unfortunately, since the piece on which this inscription occurs lacks a fuller context, we don’t know to which ancestral spirit *qi* may have referred.<sup>11</sup> But the inscription is authentic and clearly inscribed.

## 2.2 *Qi* as Subordinator

The use of *qi* as subordinator of what may be referred to as the “embedding” type or “finite clause” type (cf. Quirk et. al. 1980, 832–33) was first suggested by Chang Tsung-tung (1970, 117, n. 1) and taken up by Serruys (1974, 57–58), though neither has developed this analysis any further than what is cited below.



Chang: [Qi] fungiert hier als subordinierende Partikel und steht für das Subjekt des Nebensatzes. [Example to follow shortly.]

Serruys: Among these [referring to sentences in which *qi* is treated as subordinator of “if,” “when,” and the like] must be counted the cases where the *qi* clause follows the main verb . . . . The most striking case of *qi* functions is the . . . quite exceptional pattern *wang qi* 亡其 as for instance in 亡其雨: “there will be no rain” (*qi*, less desirable alternative) . . . . The hypothesis presented to explain this exception is simply that *wang* is treated as a main verb “not have” followed by what is really an object clause, and that *wang qi* literally means “not have [chance] that it might rain.” (N.B. No analysis of the pattern *wang qi* + N is provided.)

The aim of this subsection is to advance the *qi*-as-subordinator hypothesis even further than what is quoted above. But first, working separately from Chang Tsung-tung and earlier than Serruys whose views were just quoted, Nivison (1971a, 18–19) also had the seminal idea that the clause after *wang qi* should be analyzed as “nominalized.” He says that *qi*

as verbal adjective, where no subject is thought of (where there is no restriction with regard to agent) will yield a definite descriptor translatable (if necessary) as the/that (process, act of . . .), (For, obviously, “this X which there is,” i.e. “definitely existing X,” just means “this X.”) One would assume that there must be certain idiomatic contexts generating this attributive-demonstrative use of the verb of definite existence [here Nivison is assuming *qi* to be a “verb of definite existence”] . . . . The contents “亡其 + nominalized verb” . . . , “亡其 + noun” . . . are obvious candidates.

This analysis, an important aspect of which (i.e., “the verb of definite existence” for *qi*) I still find hard to accept, is further developed by Nivison (1992, 10–11), idem (1992a, 9), and idem (1992b, 3ff.). Since the gist of these three papers is more or less the same (but stated a little differently), I shall quote from one here:

N (1992, 10–11): My . . . theory is that *qi* is (1) a verb of strong assertion: “it is the case that . . .,” or “this will be, namely . . .” (of uncontrollable happenings); speaker “will make it the case that . . .” (of controllable actions); (2) an adverb, “definitely;” and (3) a verbal adjective amounting to “the” (which would indicate definite existence

or occurrence). Before a noun it might amount to “the . . . in question,” and even “his . . .,” etc.; and before a verb it could in its “adjective” phase convert the verb into a verbal noun, “the . . . -ing.” Before a verb-phrase or sentence it could thus create a noun phrase: “the fact that . . .,” or simply “that . . .”

It is this last point of Nivison’s theory that I would like to follow up, except that I do not start with his assumption (of which he himself is unsure) that *qi* is a verb.<sup>12</sup> I start with the apparent fact, as presented in section 2.1, that *qi* is used as a pronoun.

Let us first look, then, at Chang Tsung-tung’s example, quoted in the beginning of section 2.2:

(10) 已未貞王其告其從亞侯. *Cuibian* 367

Chang: Am Tage Jiwei wurde das Orakel befragt: “Soll der König eine rituelle Mitteilung darüber machen, daß er in Begleitung des Fürsten Ya in den Krieg ziehen wird?”

T: On the *jiwei* day tested: The king shall be going to perform the announcement ritual (that he) follow Ya Hou. (More smoothly: “The king shall be going to announce his [intention to] follow Ya Hou.”)

Chang’s comment applies to the second *qi* in (10); he translated it as “daß er.” I think he is (almost) right. Here we are looking at the same *qi* as observed in section 2.1, except that 其從亞侯 is the object clause or, if we use the terminology of Quirk et. al. (1980, 832–34), the “finite clause object.” However, noticing that *qi* in (7B) and (9) is used more like “possessive, attributive” as it is in classical Chinese, the more literal translation should be “The king shall be going to announce his following Ya Hou.” And, if we also apply, as we should, the aspectual interpretation of *qi*, we obtain “The king shall be going to announce his (intention) to follow Ya Hou.” The first occurrence of *qi* is modal and aspectual, as discussed in section 1 and reflected in my translation, and the second should be analyzed the same except that *qi* also functions anaphorically.

The freedom gained by us to analyze *qi* in this way will lead us to find a respectable number of examples of this type. Some typical cases include the following:

(11) 丁卯貞其告于父丁其獸一牛. *Cuibian* 374

On the *dingmao* day tested: The king shall be going to announce to Fu Ding his (intention) to keep [ $>$  set aside for sacrificial use?]<sup>13</sup> one ox.

(12) 辛未貞今日告其步于父丁一牛,在秘. *Ninghu* 1.346

On the *xinwei* day tested: Today the king will announce to Fu Ding his (intention) to go on foot (the announcement ritual to be carried out by the sacrifice of) one ox. It was at Mi (we) did the crack-making.

These examples embody the structure in which the finite clause object comes under the scope of the performative verb *gao* 'to make the ritual announcement, to announce' which was normally carried out by the king (Takashima 1988a, 680–83). The surface realization of this is in (10), whereas in (11) and (12) it is not realized. It can, however, be supplied. There are also examples in which the second clause may not come under the scope of the verb in the first clause, as in the following:

(13) 王其田其告妣辛王受祐. *Xucun* 2.769

As for the king's going to hunt [or: When the king is going to hunt], he shall be going to announce it to Bi Xin. The king shall receive blessing.

(14) 未貞王其令望乘歸其告〔于〕祖〔乙〕一牛父丁一〔牛〕. *Cuibian* 506 (rejoined to yield a fuller context in *Hebian* 334)

On . . . *wei* day tested: As for the king's going to order Wang Cheng to return [or: When the king is going to order Wang Cheng to return], he shall be going to announce it to Zu Yi (with the sacrifice of) one ox (and to) Fu Ding (with the sacrifice of) one ox.

It might be possible to interpret the second *qi* clauses in (13) and (14) as if there were not the first; that is, the second *qi* clauses were simply successive activities proposed for the oracle. If we allow for this possibility, then there would not be any need to construe *qi* as having any anaphoric reference. The reasoning that underlies this analytical possibility is that we have not yet assigned any anaphoric function to *qi* in its first occurrence; we have been interpreting it as being modal and aspectual. Is this interpretation all that there is to know about the function and meaning of *qi*? The answer is "No, most likely not."

It is quite possible to interpret that *qi* occurring after *wang* 'king' in (13), (14), and indeed in many other examples where *qi* follows after a

noun has, in fact, the anaphoric function of a genitive nature. One could explore this possibility on theoretical grounds, but I shall appeal here to some comparative materials taken from the *Shangshu* and the *Shijing*. Even though they will not *prove* that the OBL had worked in the same way, they are highly suggestive of such, and we can discern some historical changes that might have taken place.

(15) 王若曰,孟侯,朕其弟,小子封. . . . (康誥)  
(*SSTJ* 29/0056)

"The king spoke thus: Oh you leading prince, my younger brother, youngster Feng! . . ."

Karlgren (1950a, 39)

(16) 王其德之用祈天永命. (召誥) (*SSTJ* 33/0602)

"May the king [by the virtue's use =] by means of [his] virtue pray for Heaven's eternal mandate."

Karlgren (1950a, 51)

(17) 孺子其朋,孺子其朋往. (洛誥) (*SSTJ* 33/0209)

"The young son's associates! The young son's associates, go!"

Karlgren's translation (1950, 52) modified

(18) 王命作册逸祝册,惟告周公其後. (洛語)  
(*SSTJ* 33/0730)

"The king gave order to *zuoce*, Yi, to recite a brevet in order (for him) to announce Duke of Zhou's successor [sc. in Lu]."

Karlgren's translation (1950, 55) modified

There are more examples of this type where *qi* occurs between two nouns, the first noun (often a topic) followed by what should be analyzed not as a modal particle but as a genitivized anaphoric-pronoun *qi*.<sup>14</sup> Thus, the second noun following *qi* is really the one that is attributed by *qi*. In the *Shijing* we also find examples such as:

(19) 彼其之子,不與我戍申. . . . (揚之水等)  
(*H-Y* 15/68/1,2,3; 17/80/1,2,3; 22/108/1,2,3; etc.)

"That person there [sc. my wife], she is not with me keeping guard at Shen . . ."

Karlgren (1950, 46)

- (20) 築室百堵,西南其戶,爰居,爰處..... (斯干)  
(HJ42/189/2)

“He builds a house of a hundred *du* measures; to the west and the south are its doors; and then he will live and dwell . . .”

Karlgren (1950, 130)

- (21) 誰調爾無牛,九十其犝..... (無羊) (HJ42/190/1)

“Who says that you have no cattle? Ninety are those which are seven feet high . . .”

Karlgren (1950, 131)

- (22) 我疆我理,南東其畝.(信南山) (HJ5/210/1)

“We draw boundaries, we divide them into sections; running towards the south or running towards the east are the acres.”

Karlgren (1950, 164)

I am aware of no scholar of the *Shijing* who has proposed that *qi* functions anaphorically in these examples, but because *qi* is flanked by two nouns, the genitivized-anaphoric-pronoun theory would explain this use most cogently. If we adapt the same interpretation for the pattern “descriptive adjective (predicate) + *qi* + N” (cf. Yang and Hé 1992, 487), as did Yu Min (1949, 79), we have literally hundreds of examples in the *Shijing*.

If the above analysis of the genitive-pronominal *qi* in the *Shangshu* and *Shijing* holds true, it is reasonable to assume that it also had a similar function in stages of language earlier than that represented in the *Shu* and the *Shi*. Nivison (1991, 15) quotes the use of *qi* in the phrase 朕宗君其休 “my ancestral lord’s grace” in the second Diao sheng *gui* 琯生殷 bronze inscription of Western Zhou (cf. Shirakawa 1970, 633). He ends with a parenthetical comment “Compare ‘John his book’, for ‘John’s book’ in earlier English,” and this hits the mark exactly. There is, of course, a plethora of Western Zhou bronze inscriptions in which *qi* appears as the cliché “May the sons and the grandsons forever treasure and use this vessel,” but in addition to Nivison’s example we find more instances of *qi* being used genitive-pronominally (Chou Fa-kao 1975, 6.2819 <0057>, 2823 <1183>, 2824 <1224>,

2832 <2897>, 2832 <2921>). There is no question about this use in the Western Zhou bronze inscriptions.<sup>15</sup>

Returning now to the OBL, the situation is slightly different in that, although *qi* is still to be construed as a genitive pronoun, it does not occur between two nouns (cf. Takashima 1984, 255–57). Instead, it predominantly occurs after a noun—which is optional—and before a verb. Here I find myself substantially agreeing with Nivison (1992b, 4):

“*Qi* . . . could be used (my theory goes) as an adjective, nominalizing the verb or verb-phrase that follows, so that the *noun-phrase* “*qi* X(ing)” refers to the “X(ing),” actual or hypothetical, that would have been asserted by the *sentence* “*qi* X.” The resulting idiom is a quasi “that” clause that functions as a subordinate clause (just as the form “subject *zhi* verb *ye*” does in later Chinese), the commonest use being as a conditional clause. But “conditional *qi*” and “modal *qi*” are merely transforms of each other: “*qi wei geng ji*” means “(as for the case of its being on a *geng*-day = ) if it is on a *geng*-day, it will be fortunate.” The component “*wei geng*” can be exposed and resumed by “*qi*” (now “modal”), giving “*wei geng qi ji*,” which means exactly the same thing—i.e., “as for its being on a *geng*-day, in this case it will be fortunate.”

I take issue with two points, one minor and one not. The minor point is terminological: I wish to avoid “adjective” for the use of *qi*, even though it is in a way adjectival—lest one lose the important feature of referentiality in *qi*. The not-so-minor point I question is Nivison’s claim that 其佳庚吉 means exactly the same as 佳庚其吉.<sup>16</sup> In the former, the modal and aspectual *qi* are modulating the copula *wei* ‘to be’, whereas in the latter the same *qi* is modulating *ji* ‘to be auspicious, lucky’. If one translates them, the former means “It may turn out to be a *geng* day [*< lit. ‘may be going to be . . .’*] that is auspicious,” and the latter, “It is a *geng* day that may turn out to be auspicious.” The illocutionary message of the two may be the same, but their modality and aspect are appreciably different. Furthermore, if one applies the subordinating *qi* hypothesis I am now advancing, 其佳庚吉 embodies a structure consisting of the NP (其佳庚) and VP (吉), whereas (其吉) embodies a different structure of the VP (佳庚) + NP (其吉). The latter, of course, is commonly referred to as a “cleft sentence” (cf. Lyons 1977, 2.598; Takashima 1990, 38).

Apart from these comments on Nivison's formulation, everything else is acceptable: *qi* has a nominalizing effect, entailing a quasi "that" clause which functions like "subject *zhi* verb *ye*" in classical Chinese. In fact, *zhi* in the OBI is also pronominal, meaning "this, that," and its later development into a genitive marker parallels the case of *qi*. The only difference is that in this stage of the OBL, *qi* is already genitive-pronominal. The translations I have provided for the representative examples in this section ([10]–[14]) have reflected all the analyses presented so far. I shall, however, make one final comment upon the significance of the structural difference I pointed out for (13) and (14), i.e., the second clauses which have *qi*, but which do not come under the scope of the verb in the first clauses. If a sentence (e.g., 王其田其告妣辛) has this structure, it is possible to interpret the first clause as dependent meaning "when + V<sub>1</sub>," or "V<sub>1</sub>-ing." Otherwise, we should interpret the second clause as being dependent with the meaning "that he/she/it/they." It is also possible to analyze these first clauses as having been deliberately taken out of the scope of the verb in the second clauses. If so, one could interpret them as topical, in the objective case. We could then maintain a consistent analysis of *qi* clauses as meaning "X's V-ing," so that in (13), for example, "the king's hunting" was topically preposed as the object of the verb *gao* "announce." This analysis seems more attractive than assigning a dependent meaning of "when + V1" in (13) and (14). However, in other contexts, the "when + V2" interpretation may well be more appropriate.

### 2.3 *Qi* as "Subjunctive Mood"

Strictly speaking, the heading I give to this last section, "Subjunctive Mood," is a misnomer. This traditional name should be used when the choice of modality is determined entirely by syntactic dependency, rather than by independent semantic criteria. That is, the modality is determined by the character or type of the sentence itself, and, in a complex sentence, by its relation to the main clause on which it is dependent. It is widely known, for example, that in French the indicative and subjunctive forms of the verb appear to be in complementary distribution, because in certain contexts the subjunctive form is required regardless of the speaker's attitude regarding what he says.

We are taught that we cannot say "Je ne pense pas qu'il *vient*," where *vient* is the indicative form; we must say instead "Je ne pense pas qu'il *vienne*," *vienne* being the subjunctive form. The sentence involves "negation," implying (very roughly) a modal quality of "doubt, subjectivity, or hypothesis" which can be defined more precisely in terms of the modal scales of "possibility/certainty," "intention/wish," and "obligation/necessity." (This last scale is something I have not discussed in this paper.) In any event, let us keep in mind that the subjunctive *vienne* is predictable, but as I discuss below, the use of *qi* is not dictated wholly by surface grammar, but partly by grammar and partly by semantic criteria. It is a kind of hybrid.

I should like to approach this subject by reconsidering example (7B) in section 2.1. Contrary to the interpretation put forward by Nivison which I have accepted, it came to my attention that Shen Pei (1992, 169) offered the speculation that *wang qi* was formed analogically from the ubiquitous pattern "Neg + *qi* + VP" "(是由'不/弗/毋+其+VP'句類推而成的)". His opinion is not very convincing, because we also get the pattern in which *qi* precedes, though infrequently, nearly all the negatives in the OBL. Thus, the real task is to account for their differences. Let us first examine an example in which *qi* precedes the negative verb *wang*:

(23) 王占曰吉佳其亡攻,舌其直. *Bingbian* 77 (2)

The king, having prognosticated, said, "Lucky. It [= omen] means (that [the Fang]) will not, in fact [ $<$  have no occasions to], be going to make a (successful) attack; it should be (that) Shé is to straighten [the Fang]."<sup>17</sup>

This inscription occurs on exactly the opposite side of (24), below:

(24) 貞方弗戎我史. *Ibid.* 76 (3)

Tested: The Fang will not harm our emissaries.

Here the subject is the Fang, a group hostile to the Shang, so that the king's prognostication in (23) is undoubtedly a response to (24). In fact, the above example occurring on this shell constitutes a set of related inscriptions (*chengtao* 成套) with *Bingbian* 386, from which particularly significant inscriptions are quoted below:

(25A) ↓貞我史亡其攻. (R) *Bingbian* 386 (9)

Tested: Our emissaries will not, in fact [ $<$  have occasions to], be going to make a (successful) attack [against the Fang].

(25B) ↑貞我史有攻. (L) *Ibid.* (10)

Tested: Our emissaries will, in fact, make a (successful) attack [against the Fang].

Provided as we are with a fuller context such as the above, we can be reasonably sure that *qi* in (23) does refer to the Fang. It is pronominal, and genitive at that. This explains the reason why *qi* occurs before the VP, *wang gong* 亡攻, because *qi* is preceded by the explanatory copula *wei*, turning 其亡攻 into an embedded sentence. Thus, the expression 佳其亡攻 literally means “it means [ $<$  is]/his going to/have no (occasions)/to attack.” On the other hand, in (25A) the syntactic order of *wang qi gong* 亡其攻 is required because the main verb is *wang*, and the subject is *wo shi* 我史 ‘our emissaries’. Thus, *qi* in this structure should be analyzed as resuming the subject, *wo shi*, and further genitivizing the embedded verb *gong*. Literally translated, this should be: “(As for) our emissaries, (they) shall have no (occasions of) their going to make a (successful) attack [against the Fang].” Furthermore, if one takes into account the presupposition theory of *qi*, one obtains that because (25A) is inscribed on the “desirable R,” *qi* implies a strong “No” in the sense of: “Our emissaries, on the contrary, will be going to make a successful attack against the Fang.”

Once we accept this genitive-pronominal function of *qi* as valid, we can begin looking at the inscriptional language with different analytical perspectives than what we have been schooling ourselves in for a long time. It just so happens that example (23) contains another use of *qi* as a genitive-pronoun, namely, in 舌其直.<sup>18</sup> Following what I have just done for the two other sentences, this sentence should be literally translated: “As for Shé it should be (that) s/he is to straighten [the Fang].” Syntactically, this sentence is to be compared with 王其出直 (*Bingbian* 22[7]) ‘It should be (the act of) taking the field to straighten that the king does’. In the latter there is no hedging in the modal implication of the king’s action. That is, the modality of the verb *zhi* is unmarked (probably coming within the scope of *hui* ‘it

should be’), and the anaphora is not materialized (sc. \*王其出直). On the other hand, the use of *qi* in 舌其直 suggests not only the genitive-pronominal function, but also the aspectual character as well. However, it is not clear whether it also suggests the existence of modal meanings. The reason is that the *qi* in this context is almost predictable. Given the subject Shé, to which *qi* anaphorically refers, *qi* occurs in the syntactic position determined by the prescriptive copula *hui* ‘it should be’. Therefore, the modality associated with *qi* seems overridden by that associated with *hui* (i.e., operating on the modal scale of “obligation/necessity”). This is a case of the “subjunctive mood” characterized in the beginning of this section. But one cannot say that *qi* is dictated wholly by grammar, because the aspectual character of *qi* is left unaccounted for. It is difficult to think that the aspectual character of “prospect” could be determined by a copula, whether it be a descriptive one of *wei*, or a prescriptive one of *hui*. (Here, I shall not get into the area of the possible “stative-aspectual” nature of the copulas.)

Now if my analysis for the string 舌其直 is correct, it should be applicable, *mutatis mutandis*, not only to 佳其亡攻 in (23) but also to 亡其攻 in (25A). In the former, I argued that the copula *wei* is free of, or unmarked for, modality (Takashima 1990). Because 亡其攻 is syntactically embedded in such a modally neutral copula as *wei*, one is not bound by the constraints experienced in the case of 舌其直. In fact, the king’s prognostication in (23) as a response to the diviner’s charge in (24), “The Fang will not harm our emissaries,” strongly suggests his presumption that the Fang “will not indeed be going to make a successful attack (against our emissaries).”<sup>19</sup> So here the modal *qi* is “flexing its muscle,” as it were, reflecting the strong wish of the king. *Qi*, in this sense, is not predictable, and thus the subjunctive-mood analysis does not apply. It goes without saying that the aspectual character of *qi* should also be recognized, as it is not predictable. Finally, 我史亡其攻 should be analyzed, in a way similar to 舌其直, as a structure embodying a kind of hybrid “subjunctive mood.” On the one hand, one can predict the pronominal and modal *qi* to occur in this position because, as already mentioned, *qi* refers to *wo shi* ‘our emissaries’, and at the same time it gets embedded by the main verb *wang*, which, as my theory dictates (see notes 16 and 18),

produces an emphatic effect. This emphatic effect can easily be interpreted in terms of the modal scale of “possibility/certainty,” with the weight moving more to the certainty side. It is in this sense that *qi* is predictable, thus qualifying itself as a case of “subjunctive mood.” But then, its aspectual character cannot be accounted for by such syntactic dependency.

### 3. Closing Remarks

It is obvious throughout this paper that Nivison’s contribution to the study of *qi* is enormous. Without it, I could not have developed my theory of the modal and aspectual *qi*, nor the pronominal hypothesis of *qi* as found in the preceding pages.

Apart from several points of detail where Nivison and I differ, our greatest difference is that, while Nivison starts his inquiry on the assumption that *qi* was originally a verb, I start mine on the observed fact that *qi* is to be recognized as a pronoun present in the Shang OBL. If one speculates upon even earlier stages of the language, it is not impossible to derive the anaphoric use of *qi* from the aspectual meaning of the anticipative/prospective/mutative “to be going to, to be about to,” rather than from the modal meanings of “possibility/certainty,” “intention/wish,” and “obligation/necessity.” That is, the modality can easily be thought of as being closely related to subordination, condition, or syntactic dependency in general, whereas aspect—because it captures the state of a verb—has the potential of being referred to. Reference is just to that aspect of a verb. However, I have avoided such speculation. Instead, I have appealed to empiricism in this paper: there are quite a few striking examples in which one is encouraged to see the genitive-pronominal use of *qi* already in Shang Chinese. I might add that this hypothesis will make it much easier to interpret how the modal (and perhaps also aspectual) *qi* could have had the same origin. But while Nivison (1992a, 11) concluded “we must recognize *already in Shang Chinese* uses of the same word *qi* as a modal and as in effect a demonstrative adjective,” I would simply reverse the order of “modal” and “demonstrative adjective.”

### NOTES

1. On the controversy involving the use of the verb you 出/又/有 in pre-classical Chinese, Nivison (1971a, 1977, 1978, 1991, 1992, 1992a) has maintained that the verb can be used pronominally, while I have not (Takashima 1978, 1980; Takashima and Itō 1996). On the interpretation of the word zhen 貞 and its related problems, we also have disagreements (Nivison 1982, 1989; Takashima 1988–1989, 1989). These are only a couple of the things that have been published, and it goes without saying that there have been many personal exchanges characterizable as critical of each other’s work. However, I consider myself very lucky to be able to study in Nivison’s company, and feel very grateful to the unfailingly helpful and gentlemanly way in which he has always responded.

2. Nowhere have the differences in our assumptions been more clearly brought out than in Nivison (1992b, 1), where he takes issue with my explicit statement in Takashima (1988a, 688) that my conclusions are “based on the fundamental assumption that whenever the form differs there must be some underlying semantic motivation.” Nivison argues that in a homely example in English, “It will rain tomorrow,” there is no difference in meaning between this statement and “It is going to rain.” I disagree. There are a number of studies in the field of English linguistics available in which specialists are concerned precisely with the difference between such examples as Nivison provided. For example, Comrie (1976, 64–65) has the following to say about it:

It is important to appreciate the difference between these expressions of prospective meaning and expressions of straight future reference, e.g. between *Bill is going to throw himself off the cliff* and *Bill will throw himself off the cliff*. If we imagine a situation where someone says one of these two sentences, and then Bill is in fact prevented from throwing himself off the cliff, then if the speaker said *Bill will throw himself off the cliff*, he was wrong, his prediction was not borne out. If, however, he said *Bill is going to throw himself off the cliff*, then he was not necessarily wrong, since all he was alluding to was Bill’s intention to throw himself off the cliff, i.e. to the already present seeds of some future situation, which future situation might well be prevented from coming about by intervening factor.

As it turns out, the problem of the use or non-use of *qi* is very much related to such an aspectual nature as that to which Comrie draws our attention, as

well as to the range of modal meanings associated with *qi*. I shall sketch them in section 1.

3. Regarding the claim made, for example, by Serruys (1974, 48–57), that *qi* is a clear marker for subordination of the “dependent clause + main clause” type (such as may be expressed by “if” or “when”), I have taken the contrary position as discussed in Takashima (1977). See also Takashima (1993, section 2.3.4).

4. To quote from Serruys’ own work:

We find that the presence or absence of *qi* is a sign of very clear contrasts between two different kinds of oracular propositions: presence of *qi* marks the proposition or the alternative among possible courses of action, which is considered less desirable, less preferred, often positively feared and resorted to only if really unavoidable. This rule applies regardless of whether the proposition is expressed in negative or affirmative sentences.

The above is often referred to as “Serruys’ rule of undesirable *qi*.”

5. Consider, for example, Serruys’ own translation (1974, 33) provided for the following inscription:

↓丙辰卜串串貞改羌。(R)

“At divination on Ping-ch’en day, Chung tests (the proposition): we might [*ch’i*: but rather not] beat the Ch’iang.” *Bingbian* 7(1)

↑貞于庚申伐羌。(L)

“Coming to Keng-shen day we shall sacrifice [i.e., behead] a Ch’iang.”

*Ibid.* (2)

I should also point out that in the more recent work of Serruys (1985), he consistently takes *qi* as a verb meaning “to expect.” This, in my judgment, has more problems than his earlier modal *qi* formulation. See also note 12.

6. For a study showing that the second clause is to be interpreted as a reason clause, I refer the reader to Chow Kwok-ching (1982, 171–87). Keightley (1978, 66, n. 44 [citing Nivison]; 77–79; 1992, 5; 1993, 50–51) also interprets it similarly.

7. Keightley (1978, 51, n. 124) finds an exception to this in *Bingbian* 235(1) and (2), translations of which are mine:

(R) ↓己卯卜穀貞不其雨。

Crack-making on the *jimao* day, Que [?] tested: It will not perhaps be going to rain.

(L) ↑己卯卜穀貞雨。王占曰其雨佳壬。壬午允雨。

Crack-making on the *jimao* day, Que [?] tested: It shall rain. The king, having prognosticated, [said], “(The day on which it) is, hopefully, going to rain is a *ren* (day).” On the *renwu* day it indeed rained.

The grammatically negative charge at the R is, however, semantically positive or desirable to the Shang because “not rain” was intervened by *qi* “undesirable” (if one takes Serruys’ rule), thus rain was desired. But the charge at the L, with its accompanying prognostication and verification, suggests that rain was also desired—yet it was placed on the left. Exactly the same phenomenon is observed in *Bingbian* 3(11) and (12), which I discuss later in section 2.1 (my [8A] and [8B]).

8. If one characterizes this a bit more colorfully, one obtains what Keightley (1993, 33–34) called the “executive use of *qi*” which he finds often used in the inscriptions by the Li-group diviners of Period II. But that is only accidental and is not reflective of how the language worked in the Shang.

9. As Shen Pei (1992, 166) has noticed, there are quite a few examples of the pattern “*you* + *qi* + NP” as in the following:

(1) 戊戌卜貞有其疾。

Crack-making on the *wuxu* day, tested: There will be such illness. *Heji* 21045

(2) 癸亥卜王貞有其降禍。

Crack-making on the *guihai* day, the king tested: There will be (a possibility that Di) might send down misfortunes. *Heji* 21300 (= *Jiabian* 3827)

N.B. Another *you qi jiang* expression occurs on a fragmentary piece of *Yicun* 713.

(3) 辛亥卜王〔貞〕余有其命。

Crack-making on the *xinhai* day, the king [tested]: I will have such orders [?]/I will, in fact [ $\leq$ have occasions to], issue an order [?] *Heji* 40823

## (4a) 癸酉卜有其...

Crack-making on the *guiyou* day: There will be such . . . . *Heji* 2060

## (4b) 癸酉卜亡其...

Crack-making on the *guiyou* day: There will be no such . . . . *Ibid.*

10. If I am correct in interpreting the following passages from the Jin Teng chapter of the *Shangshu* (chapter 26) as representing Zhou scapulimantic charges (Takashima 1989, 46), then the positive and the desirable charge, (A), must have been uttered first:

## (A) 爾之許我,我其以璧與珪,歸俟爾命. (SSTJ 26/0181)

"If you grant me my wish [sc. that the king may recover], I will with the *bi* jade disc and the *gui* tesserera return and wait for your order [sc. to be called away by death]."

Karlgren (1950a: 35)

(B) 爾不許我,我乃屏璧與珪. (SSTJ 26/0191 for *bu*)

"If you do not grant me my wish, I will shut up the jade disc and the tesserera [i.e. no more function as officiant in sacrifice]."

*Ibid.*

This, of course, does not prove the Shang practice, but suggests a better alternative for us to maintain the hypothesis first suggested by Nivison (1992, 13). As a Shang example clearly illustrating which of the charge pairs was uttered first, we have the following:

## (A) ↓貞侑犬于父庚劉羊.

Tested: Offer dog(s) to Fu Geng (and) cut open sheep.

*Bingbian* 12(7)


## (B) ↑貞祝氏之,疾齒鼎龍.

Tested: (If) the prayer-master brings them [= dogs and sheep] on, the ailing teeth will certainly improve. *Ibid.*

In the above pair, (A) must have been uttered first because the word *zhi* 'them' in (B) must refer to the dog(s) and sheep in (A). Another excellent example is found in our sentences (2A) and (2B) which, in terms of placement and the positive/negative polarity, satisfy the requirements of a charge pair *except* for the fact that (2A) was uttered on the *renzi* day and (2B) on the following day.

11. Judging from the fact that it is a Period I piece, it is possible that *qi* here referred to the consort of Huang Yin 黃尹 who appears frequently as a recipient of the burnt-sacrifice. The use of Huang Shi 黃奭 as in 貞于黃奭燎 'Tested: To Huang's consort we will make a burnt-offering' (*Bingbian* 122[8]) is suggestive. There are two problems with this interpretation. One is that the consort of the ancestors is normally expressed, as in the above example, by the word *shi* 奭 (there are different interpretations for this, but all agree that it refers to a consort). Another is that the word *pei* 配 is also used as a ritual verb of some kind. In (9), however, the use of *yu* 于 'to' compels us to take *qi pei* as a nominal term.

12. My analysis presented in section 1 will make it clear that we are dealing with an adverb-like word, since there is *always* a verb which carries the main semantic load of a sentence. *Qi* does not occupy the kernel of a sentence; it is auxiliary at best. More discussion on this point is found in Section 2.3.5 of Takashima (1993).

13. The palaeograph , which I transcribed as *shou* 獸 'to hunt; to keep', follows Guo Moruo (1965, 58b). Normally, *shou* means "to hunt," but 獸一牛 'to hunt one ox' is quite unnatural, because "one ox" is singled out as though it were a category or class, which it does not seem to be. I have taken this graph to have stood for the word *shou* 守 'to keep, guard' (see also S: 446.2).

14. Other examples are SSTJ 14/0210 (先王其訓), 24/0534 (于帝其訓), 27/0521 (民養其勸), 34/0815 (天其澤), some of which have already been discussed by Yu Min (1949, 79-80) (though not all of his examples are susceptible to interpretations different from what he has proposed).

15. Keightley (1993, 53) cites the cliché mentioned above from the famous Qiu Wei *gui* (裘衛殷) bronze inscription of the Western Zhou: "衛其子 子孫孫永寶用" taken from Shaughnessy (1991, 87), repeating Shaughnessy's translation "May Wei's sons' sons and grandsons' grandsons



eternally treasure and use (it)." I briefly mentioned (6 January 1994) my recent ideas on the genitive-pronominal *qi* to Derek Herforth, who quickly pointed out Keightley's case as another sample to add to my list. (Shaughnessy's translation of "may" for this cliché is correct for wrong reasons, but I shall refrain from getting into them here.)

16. Nivison's claim here is a critical response to my fundamental assumption that "whenever the form differs there must be some underlying semantic motivation," mentioned in note 2. I still uphold this assumption, thus requiring me to respond to his criticism.

17. For a theory proposing that the *you/wang* + VP pattern produces, in effect, a kind of emphasis, I refer the reader to Takashima (1988a). The graph normally transcribed as *she* 舌 is commonly used as a sacrificial verb of some sort, but it is also used as the name of an officer. It is accompanied in *Yibian* 8892 with the epithet *duo* 多 (which is comparable to *bai* 百 as in *baigong* 百工 'hundred artisans' in the Zhou). It is possible that the graph I transcribed here as *zhi* 直 'to straighten' may have stood for the word *de* 德 meaning "to display one's *de* to . . . , i.e., 'show the flag' and build up royal prestige, relying on his *de* and not actually using force," an interpretation proposed by Nivison (1977–1978, 53).

18. For the semantic interpretation of " $N_1 + hui + N_2 + VP$ " which represents 舌其直, cf. Takashima (1990, 53–54).

19. Note that the emphatic theory of the *you/wang* + VP pattern (see note 17) works quite well in a contextual discourse-analysis such as the kind being pursued here.

## ABBREVIATIONS

I have used standard abbreviations for various collections of oracular inscriptions. Full citations for these can be found in Keightley (1978, 229–31). The only source not included there is *Heji* (for *Jiaguwen Heji*). See Guo Moruo and Hu Houxuan (1978–82).

*BIHP* *Bulletin of the Institute of History and Philology* (= *Lishi yuyan yanjiusuo jikan* 歷史語言研究所集刊). (Taipei: Academia Sinica)

- BMFEA* *Bulletin of the Museum of Far Eastern Antiquities* (Stockholm)  
*EC* *Early China* (The Annual Journal of the Society for the Study of Early China). (Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley)  
*H-Y* *Harvard-Yenching Institute Sinological Index Series*  
*JWGL* *Jinwen gulin* 金文詁林. (See Chou Fa-kao under references.)  
*MS* *Monumenta Serica*  
*S* *Inkyo bokujū sōrui* 殷墟卜辭綜類. (See Shima Kunio under references.)  
*SSTJ* *Shangshu tongjian* 尚書通檢. (See Gu Jiegang under references.)  
*TP* *T'oung Pao*  
*YJXB* *Yanjing xuebao* 燕京學報.

## REFERENCES

- Chang, Tsung-tung. 1970. *Der Kult der Shang-Dynastie im Spiegel der Orakelschriften*. Weisbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.  
 Chou, Fa-kao (Zhou Fagao) 周法高, ed. 1975. *Jinwen gulin* 金文詁林. 16 vols. Compiled by Cheung Yat-shing (Zhang Risheng) 張日昇, Tsui Chee-ye (Xu Zhiyi) 徐芷儀, Lam Kit-ming (Lin Jieming) 林潔明. Hong Kong: Chinese University of Hong Kong Press. (Abbreviated as *JWGL*.)  
 Chow, Kwok-ching 周國正. 1982. *Aspects of Subordinative Composite Sentences in the Period I Oracle-Bone Inscriptions*. Ph.D. dissertation. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.  
 Comrie, Bernard. 1976. *Aspect: An Introduction to the Study of Aspect and Related Problems*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
 Graham, Angus C. 1983. "Yún 云 and Yuē 曰 as Verbs and Particles." *Acta Orientalia* 44: 33–71.  
 Gu, Jiegang 顧頡剛, ed. *Shangshu tongjian* 尚書通檢. 1966. Reprint. Taipei: Chinese Materials and Research Aids Service Center, Inc.  
 Guo, Moruo 郭沫若. 1965. *Yinqi cuibian kaoshi* 殷契粹編考釋. *Kaoguxue zhuan kan jiazhong di shi'er hao* 考古學專刊甲種第十二號. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe 科學出版社. (Originally published in Tokyo: Bunkyo-dō, 1937.)  
 Guo, Moruo, ed., Hu, Houxuan, ed.-in-chief 郭沫若, 胡厚宣. 1978–82.

- Jiaguwen Heji* 甲骨文合集. 13 vols. Shanghai: Zhonghua Shuju. (Abbreviated as *Heji*.)
- Karlgren, Bernhard. 1950. *The Book of Odes*. Reprinted from the *BMFEA*, nos. 16 and 17.
- . 1950a. *The Book of Documents*. Reprinted from the *BMFEA*, no. 22.
- Keightley, David N. 1978. *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- . 1992. "Shang Charges and Prognostications: The Strong and the Weak?" Paper presented to the 25th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Berkeley, 15 October.
- . 1993. "Certainty and Control in Late Shang China: Modal *Qi* in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions." Typescript, 28 July.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nivison, David S. 1968. "So-called 'Modal Ch'i' in Classical Chinese." Paper presented to the American Oriental Society, Annual Meeting, Berkeley, 19 March.
- . 1971. "Modal *Ch'i* 其 and Related Expressions in Chinese of the Chou and the Early Empire." Paper presented to the American Oriental Society, Western Branch Meeting, Santa Barbara, 27 March.
- . 1971a. "A New Analysis of 'Modal Ch'i' 其, and a Suggestion for a New Theory of the Archaic Chinese Demonstrative and Indefinite Substitutes." Manuscript with *Addenda et Corrigenda*. 41 pp.
- . 1977. "The Pronominal Use of the Verb *Yu* (\*giüŋ 出, 入, 有) in Early Archaic Chinese." *EC* 3: 1-17.
- . 1978. "Reply to Professor Takashima." *EC* 4: 30-36.
- . 1978a. "The Grammar and Theology of the Shang King's 'Crack Reading'." Paper presented at the Annual A.O.S. Meetings, Toronto, 12 April.
- . 1978-79. "Royal 'Virtue' in Shang Oracle Inscriptions." *EC* 4: 52-55.
- . 1982. "The 'Question' Question." Paper prepared for the International Conference on Shang Civilization, Honolulu, Hawaii, 7-11 September.
- . 1989. "The 'Question' Question." *EC* 14: 115-25. (The 1982 paper contains an appendix which is not reproduced in the *EC* article.)
- . 1991. "Notes on 'Notes'. A Reply to Paul Serruys." Manuscript, December.
- . 1992. "A New Attempt on 'Modal *Qi*': Another Note on Serruys' 'Notes'." Manuscript, January and September.
- . 1992a. "'Modal *Qi*' in Shang and Early Zhou Chinese." (Typescript dated 15 July.) Paper presented to the 25th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Languages and Linguistics, Berkeley, 15 October.

- . 1992b. "'Modal' *Qi*: Statement for the Sino-Tibetan Workshop." 25th International Conference on Sino-Tibetan Linguistics, Berkeley, 15 October.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. 1980. *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Revised edition. Burnt Mill: Longman Group Ltd.
- Serruys, Paul L-M. 1972. "[Review of] *Der Kult der Shang-Dynastie im Spiegel der Orakelinschriften: Eine paläographische Studie zur Religion im archaischen China* (Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1970)." Typescript; published as Serruys 1974.
- . 1974. "Studies in the Language of the Shang Oracle Inscriptions." *TP* 60 nos. 1-3: 12-120.
- . 1985. "Notes on the Grammar of the Oracular Inscriptions of Shang." *Contributions to Sino-Tibetan Studies*. Ed. John McCoy and Timothy Light, 204-57. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. 1991. *Sources of Western Zhou History: Inscribed Bronze Vessels*. Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.
- Shen, Pei 沈培. 1992. *Yinxu jiagu buci yuxu yanjiu* 殷墟甲骨卜辭語序研究. (Ph.D. dissertation, Beijing University, 1991). Taipei: Wenjin Chubanshe 文津出版社.
- Shima, Kunio 島邦男. *Inkyo bokuji sōrui* 殷墟卜辭綜類. Revised edition. Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin 汲古書院 1971. (Abbreviated as *S*.)
- Shirakawa, Shizuka 白川靜. 1970. *Kimbun tsūshaku* 金文通釋. Hakutsuru Bijutsukan-shi 白鴻美術館誌, no. 29. Kobe: Hakutsuru Bijutsukan. (*Kimbun tsūshaku*, no. 1 was published in 1962 and no. 56, last issue, in 1984).
- Takashima, Ken-ichi 高嶋謙一. 1970. "Amphibolous *Ch'i* 其 in the Bone Inscriptions of the King Wu Ting Period." Typescript. 48 pp.
- . 1973. Negatives in the King Wu Ting Bone Inscriptions. Ph.D. dissertation. Seattle: University of Washington.
- . 1977. "Subordinate Structure in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions: With Particular Reference to the Particle *Ch'i*." *MS* 33 (1977-1978): 36-61.
- . 1978. "Decipherment of the Word *Yu* 出, 入, 有 in the Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions and in Pre-Classical Chinese." *EC* 4: 19-29.
- . 1980. "The Early Archaic Chinese Word *Yu* in the Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions: Word-Family, Etymology, Grammar, Semantics and Sacrifice." *Cahiers de Linguistique Asie Orientale*, no. 8: 81-112.
- . 1984. "Noun Phrases in the Oracle-Bone Inscriptions." *MS* 36 (1984-1985): 229-302.

- . 1985a. *Yinxu wenzi bingbian tongjian* 殷墟文字丙編通檢. (A Concordance to Fascicle Three of Inscriptions from the Yin Ruins). Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- . 1988. "Morphology of the Negatives in Oracle Bone Inscriptions." *Computational Analysis of Asian and African Languages*, 113–33. Tokyo: National Inter-University Research Institute of Asian and African Languages and Cultures.
- . 1988a. "An Emphatic Verb Phrase in Oracle-Bone Inscriptions." *BIHP* 59, part IV: 653–94.
- . 1988–89. "An Evaluation of the Theories Concerning the Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions." *The Journal of Intercultural Studies*, nos. 15 & 16: 11–54.
- . 1989. "Indai teiboku gengo no honshitsu" 殷代貞卜言語の本質. *Tōyō Bunka Kenkyūsho Kiyō* (Tokyo Daigaku) 東洋文化研究所紀要 (東京大學) (*The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture*, University of Tokyo) 110: 1–165.
- . 1990. "A Study of the Copulas in Shang Chinese." *The Memoirs of the Institute of Oriental Culture* (University of Tokyo), no. 112: 1–92.
- . 1992. "On the Particle *Qi*." Typescript, 24 May.
- . 1993. "The Modal and Aspectual Particle *Qi* in Shang Chinese." Paper prepared for the International Symposium on Ancient Chinese Grammar, University of Zürich, Switzerland, 21–25 February.
- Takashima, Ken-ichi, and Itō, Michiharu. 1996. *Studies in Early Chinese Civilization: Religion, Society, Language, and Palaeography*. 2 vols. Hirakata: Kansai Gaidai University.
- Yang, Bojun and He, Leshi 楊伯俊, 何樂士. 1992. *Gu Hanyu yufa ji qi fazhan* 古漢語語法及其發展. Beijing: Yuwen Chubanshe 語文出版社.
- Yu, Min 俞敏. 1949. "Hanyu de 'qi' gen Zangyu de 'gi'" 漢語的'其'跟藏語的'gi'. *YJXB* 37: 75–94.

## Zou 鄒 and Lu 魯 and the Sinification of Shandong<sup>1</sup>

E. G. Pulleyblank

2

The archaeological discoveries of the last hundred years have transformed our knowledge of early China. The simple, unilinear, legendary beginnings recorded by Sima Qian—which attributed the creation of Chinese civilization to the work of ancient sage rulers, culminating in the founding of the first dynasty, Xia 夏, around the end of the third millennium B.C.E., followed by Shang 商 and Zhou 周, around the end of the second millennium—have been replaced by a much more complex picture of a variety of neolithic cultures stretching back as far as the seventh millennium out of which bronze age civilization did indeed emerge around the time traditionally associated with the first dynasty. The discovery of the Shang oracle bones has verified the real historical status of the second dynasty, even though many problems still remain in the interpretation of these documents from a linguistic point of view and many new problems have arisen and keep arising about the nature of the society that created them and its relation to what came before and what came after. It is in the long-lasting Zhou period, however, that the problems of reconciling the traditional historical records, so much more abundant than for earlier times, with the expanded picture that has been created by archaeology, really become acute. It is at this time that China as we know it, the China that forms the focus of national and cultural identity for nearly a quarter of the world's population, takes shape and emerges into the full light of day.

How can we reconcile the cultural diversity in prehistoric China as revealed by archaeology with the high degree of cultural uniformity that has characterized Chinese civilization in historical times? The traditional story is of a single people, the Chinese, creating the arts of civilization, surrounded and threatened at every stage by other peoples at