Abstracts

Hu Pingsheng 胡平生

Some Notes on the Organization of the Han Dynasty Bamboo "Annals" Found at Fuyang

The Fuyang bamboo-strip "Annals" was compiled prior to 165 B.C., at least sixty or seventy years earlier than Sima Qian edited the various chronological tables in the *Shiji*. The "Annals," which begins about the time of the Gong He interregnum of the Western Zhou and continues through the time of Qin Shi huangdi, seems to be incompatible with the "Qin Records" and was perhaps compiled using the "Historical Records" of some state other than Qin. It possibly includes two different types of tables: one in which years denominate the vertical columns and statenames the horizontal rows, with events recorded therein horizontally; and one that records the number of years that the feudal lords reigned. Although extensive damage makes it impossible to reconstitute the "Annals," it can still provide useful information regarding some historical questions, such as the Warring States-period states of "East Zhou" and "West Zhou," the appellations "Current King" and "Current Duke," etc.

阜陽漢簡〈年表〉整理札記

阜陽 漢簡〈年表〉編成于 165 B.C. 之前, 比司馬遷編製〈史記〉諸表至少早六, 七十年.〈年表〉起始于西周共和行政前後, 迄止于秦始皇. 它可能包括兩種體例不同的表, 一種按年經國緯, 橫填 事實方式製成; 一種記諸侯在位年數. 盡管〈年表〉因殘破嚴重而無法復原, 但仍能為考證若干歷史問題, 如戰國時代的東周, 西周及 "今王", "今公" 等, 提供有用的材料.〈年表〉似不能與〈秦記〉系統相合, 它也許是利用秦以外別國 "史記" 編成的.

Rudolf G. Wagner 魯道夫瓦格納

The Wang Bi Recension of the *Laozi*

There are seventy-nine places in Wang Bi's *Laozi zhu* where the text of the *Laozi* transmitted over this commentary differs from quotations of it contained within the commentary. Building on the textual studies of Professor Shima Kunio, this essay demonstrates that the readings given

v

in the commentary are supported in practically every case by a series of early quotations and texts of the *Laozi*, such as the Mawangdui manuscripts and the "Old Manuscripts" that form the basis of Fu Yi and Fan Yingyuan's editions. A comparison of all of these differences shows that Wang Bi's original text must have belonged to the same broad textual family as these early manuscripts, being most closely linked to the two "Old Manuscripts" and less directly related to the Mawangdui manuscripts. In most of the these cases, the *textus receptus* has been supplanted by the reading transmitted through the Heshang Gong commentary. Consequently, it is now necessary to replace the *textus receptus* of Wang Bi's *Laozi* with a conflated version of the two "Old Manuscripts" and, in some cases, the Mawangdui manuscripts.

論王弼之老子

王弼老子注中所引錄之老子與現今王弼老子注本中之老子本有異. 而王弼注所引錄之老子是與比其為時更早引錄的老子及部分老子古本相符; 以馬王堆老子 (甲, 乙) 本及傅奕, 范應元之老子古本為例. 王弼老子注中有七十九條, 直接或間 接的老子引錄, 與王弼老子傳 本存異. 比較之, 王弼老子原本與以上提及的古本實屬于同一系統. 王弼老子原本與古本聯係密切, 與馬王堆本聯係更直接. 而王弼老子傳本中的老子部分與王弼注中所引不符之處, 往往取于河上公老本. 因此, 王弼老子傳 本是沒有真實價值的. 王弼老子本應由傅奕, 范應元古本匯集而成, 以馬王堆本為補助本, 從而取代傳本. 王弼老子傳本學者島邦男的研究, 本文受益甚深.

Karen Turner 高道蘊

Theory of Law in the *Ching-fa*

The *Ching-fa*, one of the four "lost" books attached to the Ma-wang-tui *Lao tzu*, addresses issues of universal concern for legal theory. This paper examines how the *Ching-fa*'s nine short theaties present *fa* linked with tao as a Law or model for guiding and judging the legitimacy of the ruler's use of coercion. I attempt to demonstrate that the conception of a universal and timeless Law offered a more universally applicable standard for governing than did the old laws based on the practices of the ancient sage kings. The text's notion of law linked with a timeless, natural principle, *tao*, is compared with early Western theories of

universal law and its relation to justice. I conclude that the content and ultimate purposes of law are different in these early traditions but that in both cases the emerging imperial states were better served by theories of law based on abstract standards rather than on particular histories and customs.

〈經法〉的法律理論

　　〈經法〉為馬王堆帛書〈老子〉乙本卷前所附四種佚書中之一種, 其內容涉及人們所普遍關心的法律理論問題. 本文考察了〈經法〉所含之九章是怎樣將法與 "道" 系聯起來, 並以此作為一種法律或準則來指導君主如何使用高壓政治及判定在哪些狀況下使用才是合法的. 筆者試圖證明此種恆定的普遍法之理念為統治者提供了一個比上古聖王所行之 "古法" 更為實用可行的標準. 本文也對〈經法〉九章所包含的法與無始無終且賦有自然性的 "道" 相關這種思想, 與早期西方普遍法之理論及其和正義的關係做了比較. 筆者認為在中, 西方的早期文明中, 雖然法律之內容與其終極目的都是不相同的, 但對這兩種文明中行將出現的帝國而言, 基於抽象標準的普遍法理論都比基於任何一特定的傳統或習慣所形成的法律更為實用.

Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭

An Examination of Whether the Charges in Shang Oracle-Bone Inscriptions are Questions

　　Oracle-bone scholars have long uniformly read the charges (i.e., the portion that mentions the event being divined) of Shang oracle-bone inscriptions as questions. Since the 1970's, many foreign oracle-bone scholars have proposed a new view that the charges are never questions, or at least are generally not questions. Whether or not the charges are actually questions is a very important question bearing not only on oracle bone studies, but also on research on ancient divination and on ancient Chinese grammar. Based on an examination of a great number of Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, the author of this essay believes that charges that can now be determined to be questions are mainly those choice-type charges in early inscriptions that contain the final particles *yi* 抑 and *zhi* 執, and true-or-false type charges that contain *yi*. Charges of the type "V *bu* 不 V" (such as "rain not rain" [*yu bu yu* 雨不雨]) and "V *bu*," regarded by many as choice-type questions,

vii

are actually comprised of the charge and a verification or use notation, the "*bu* V" being a verification and the "*bu*" being either a verification or a use notation (similar to the notation *bu yong* 不用, "do not use"). Charges that can now be determined not to be questions are mainly in those inscriptions with complex charges, such as "this *spring the king ought not ally with Wang Cheng to attack Xia Wei, (for if he does) he will not receive divine assistance" (*jin ?chun wang wu bi* Wang Cheng *fa* Xia? Wei, *fu qi shou you you* 今吿不勿比望乘伐下𡉏 (?), 弗其受有祐), and "On *ren* we ought not hunt, (for if we do) it will rain" (*ren wu tian, qi yu* 壬勿田, 其雨), the syntax of which shows that they cannot be questions.

關於殷墟卜辭是否問句的考察

甲骨學者長期以來把殷墟卜辭的命辭 (提出所要占卜的事情的話) 一律看作問句. 70 年代以來, 不少中國以外的甲骨學者提出了命辭都不是或基本上都不是問句的新看法. 命辭究竟是不是問句, 對甲骨學, 古代占卜的研究以及古漢語語法的研究來說, 都是一個很重要的問題. 本文作者考察了大量殷墟卜辭, 認為目前能夠確定的是問句的命辭, 主要是早期卜辭中那些帶句末語氣詞 "抑" 和 "執" 的選擇問句式命辭以及帶 "抑" 的是非問句式命辭. 被很多人看作反復問句的 "V-不-V" (如 "雨不雨") 和 "V-不" 式卜辭, 實際上是由命辭和驗辭或用辭組成的. "不-V" 是驗辭, "不" 是驗辭或用辭 (作為用辭, 跟 "不用" 同意). 目前能夠確定不是問句的命辭, 主要是一部分複句式命辭, 如 "今吿王勿比望乘伐下𡉏, 弗其受有祐", "壬勿田, 其雨" 等, 這些卜辭從語義上看不可能是問句.

David S. Nivison 倪德衛

The 'Question' Question

When we read Shang oracle-bone inscriptions, we should distinguish between what the diviner is *saying* (in the "charge," *mingci*) and what he is *doing* in the whole divination rite. What he is doing is not always seeking information; and even when he is doing this, what he says is usually not a question. This paper offers various arguments and examples to show this. For example, Li Xueqin's research proves that the oracle language possessed grammatical forms, such as final particles

viii

and final negatives, for marking a sentence as a question. Therefore, the first assumption should be that when a diviner does not use these forms, he does not intend a sentence to be understood as a question. And when two sentences in the same inscription — e.g., the charge and the prognostication — are alike in form (both of them being without final negatives or interrogative particles), it is a mistake to construe one of them as a question and the
other as a statement.

問 '問'

我們應區別貞人 (在 "命辭" 中) 的言語和貞人在占卜之禮中的行為. 他的行為不一定都是在求取消息. 而即使他的確在求取消息, 他的言語也不一定都是問話. 本文以各種論點和例證, 對此加以闡釋. 例如, (一) 李學勤 的研究, 證明了卜辭中的確能找到標示問句的語法形式. 如語尾否定等. 因此, 我們的第一假定應該是: 當他不用這些語法形式時, 他就不是要寫一個問句. (二) 當同一條刻辭中的兩個句子 (如命辭和占辭) 在形式上並無差異 (兩者都沒有語尾否定或質問助詞) 時, 我們偏要認為其中之一是問句, 而另一是陳述句, 是錯誤的.

ix