

A CONCORDANCE TO FASCICLE THREE
OF
INSCRIPTIONS FROM THE YIN RUINS

K. TAKASHIMA

殷虛文字甲編通檢

高鳴謙 一

INSTITUTE OF HISTORY AND PHILOLOGY
ACADEMIA SINICA

中央研究院歷史語言研究所出版

殷虛文字兩編通檢

中央研究院歷史語言研究所專刊之八十五

殷虛文字丙編通檢

定價：平裝新臺幣 270 元，美金 7 元
精裝新臺幣 350 元，美金 9 元

不准翻印

主編者	高 鳴 謙 一
發行者	中央研究院歷史語言研究所 臺北市南港區
印刷者	久忠實業有限公司 三重市成功路41巷11弄6號
代售處	臺灣商務印書館 臺北市重慶南路一段37號
	學生書局 臺北市和平東路一段198號
	三民書局 臺北市重慶南路一段61號


中華民國七十四年十二月出版

INTRODUCTION

The present work is a concordance to *Archaeologia Sinica: Hsiao-t'un (The Yin-Shang Site at Anyang, Honan), Volume II: Inscriptions, Fascicle 3: Inksqueezes of the Restored Specimens of Inscribed Tortoise Shells* with Annotations, known widely by the short name or "Ping-pien," 6 folio vols., by Chang Ping-ch'uan, published between 1957 and 1972 by the Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica, Taipei, Taiwan, Republic of China. This is one of the most important collections of Chinese oracle-bone inscriptions yet published. Not only were the oracle-bones in this collection scientifically excavated but also, as the title indicates, they were reassembled by the expert hands of Chang Ping-ch'uan, who also provided copious scholarly annotations. The *Ping-pien*, I believe, will increasingly take on special significance in future in-depth studies of oracle-bone inscriptions, as it provides a larger context in which each inscription may be considered.

The finds of the inscribed oracle bones made at the Anyang excavations, which were carried out between 1928 and 1937, were published in the *Hsiao-t'un* series, specifically in *Chia-pien*, *Yi-pien*, and *Ping-pien*, by the Academia Sinica, three volumes of which the last two contain findings from 1936 and 1937. The entire corpus consists of over 300 restored plastrons. Many of these are inscribed on both the obverse and reverse sides, bringing the total number of plates to 632, as seen in *Ping-pien*. The actual number of plates, however, is 613, since nineteen plastrons were later restored more effectively than had been done earlier. The fuller plastrons were published in their entirety, along with the new plastron and often with new inscription numbers, in volumes published later than those in which the nineteen plastrons first appeared. A list of those plastrons is given on p. 654. The total number of inscriptions comes to about 17,000 sentences, each sentence usually consisting of between five and ten characters, though quite often longer. Most of these inscriptions come from the so-called "Period I" (ca. 1339–1281 B.C., according to Tung Tso-pin's periodization), and are therefore the earliest examples of Chinese writing so far discovered, pre-dating the earliest known texts by approximately 1000 years. Needless to say, the historical value of such material is beyond estimation. Through the decipherment of these inscriptions, not only is the development of the Chinese language, one of the major languages of the world, becoming clearer, but also the formative stages of Chinese civilization are coming to be understood in far greater detail than ever before.

However, the decipherment of these inscriptions presents its own peculiar problems, which are quite different from those encountered in the decipherment of a language written in a phonetic -- alphabetic or syllabic -- script. In the case of a phonetic script, when one symbol is known, it can then be applied to thousands of other words in which it occurs. By contrast, in the case of the Chinese script, a logographic character was created for each word more often independently than systematically, and thus each word must be deciphered separately. To decipher one word does not unlock the key to the understanding of a plethora of other words. It is because of this that the use of context in decipherment assumes such crucial importance. By examining the occurrence of an unknown graph in combination with commoner graphs that have already been deciphered, the area of meaning of the former can be narrowed to a considerable extent, thus providing an invaluable heuristic aid to decipherment. It is to fill such a need that the present concordance has been created.

The concordance is based on transcription into modern graphs by Chang Ping-ch'uan. The method of compilation is quite simple. A filing system was made in which a space was provided for every character occurring in the corpus. The characters were arranged according to K'ang-hsi radicals, though not always consistently, I must point out. In the case of graphs used as both common and proper nouns, their use as common nouns was put first, followed by their use as proper nouns. In order to facilitate inclusion in the radical system, as many characters as possible were given modern or pseudo-modern forms in the heading, as well as in the "Cf." section in the radical index (p. 580 ff.). Undeciphered graphs which, nevertheless, contained an element identifiable through a modern radical were filed under that radical (e.g.,  was filed under the radical #9 人). Bone graphs not containing such an element were filed, as far as possible, according to the system of bone-graph radicals devised by Shima Kunio in his *Inkyō Bokuji Sōrui* (Tokyo: Kyūko Shoin, 1971), pp. 590–601. Certain frequently occurring graphs, such as the

names of diviners, negatives, alien states, various ancestors, etc., were also grouped together at the end for ease of reference (pp. 439–579). The transcriptions were then photocopied, each page being copied enough to enable each sentence to be filed under each of its constituent characters. Each photocopy was then dissected into its constituent sentences, then filed. When this process was complete, the files were emptied in turn and pasted down on to blank sheets of paper according to the order in which they occur in the corpus. It was at this stage that the radical index was added. A *p'in-yin* index, which includes a few English words, is also provided. What is omitted in this concordance are the characters 卜 and 貞, as well as the dating notations with the heavenly stems and earthly branches, since their inclusion would take up too much space. However, examples in which these characters seem uniquely used are included in this concordance. For some of the other patterns in which they occur, see David N. Keightley, *Sources of Shang History: The Oracle-Bone Inscriptions of Bronze Age China* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press, 1978), pp. 196–197, p. 200, p. 216, pp. 218–220. Since I believe that the use of this concordance is nearly self-explanatory, I shall not include a separate guide to it. A few words, however, are in order here: Under the heading of each character or bone graph, all the inscriptions containing it are given. They are identified by a number indicating the plastron from which it came and its position on that plastron. When no plastron number (from 001 to 632) is given, the user is to read the plastron number given earlier. Thus, for example,

- 523 (1) 貞：王 𠄎[多]𠄎[四]不若左(句)下上？」一 二
(2) 貞：王 𠄎[多]𠄎[四]不左若干下上？」一 二

means that inscription (2) belongs to plastron 523. A special feature of this concordance, the user may find, is that in many places, particularly in the radical index (pp. 580–614), I have tried to make cross-references in an attempt better to understand the graphs used in the *Ping-pien*. The user may also find some of my own opinions about the interpretation of the meanings of words. They are indicated by such short-hand notations as slashes, /, which mean "and/or," with an emphasis on "or," and by equal signs which propose some possible interpretations. The commas are to be read as "and," generally indicating Chang Ping-ch'üan's treatment.

It may be pointed out by some scholars that the concordance compiled by Shima Kunio (*op. cit.*) in some way overlaps with the present work. However, in trying to embrace some sixty-three collections of inscriptions and still to keep his book within manageable size, he was often forced to omit occurrences of certain graphs and expressions such as grammatical particles and function words, so that one is unable to make definitive statements about their use. This means that many of the inscriptions in the important corpus upon which the present work is based are not included. Another drawback is that many of those that are included from this corpus are referred to according to their location in an initial publication, *Yi-pien* (*op. cit.*), which was issued before the fragmented oracle bones had been reconstructed by Chang Ping-ch'üan. It thus contains many fragmentary inscriptions which have since been filled in. Considering the importance of this corpus, it is only right that it should have a concordance which is devoted to it and which is complete. This will enable any scholar to check the full context of any graph in this collection at a glance and will also enable him, by consulting the original work, to check the inscriptions in which that graph occurs against all the other inscriptions on the same plastron. Chang Ping-ch'üan's copious annotations, mentioned above, running to some quarter-million words, will aid him immensely towards an accurate understanding of the *Ping-pien* inscriptions presented here. Another indispensable work which should be used together with this one and Chang Ping-ch'üan's annotations is Li Hsiao-ting's *Collected Interpretations of the Oracle-Bone Graphs* (*Chia-ku wen-tzu chi-shih*), 8 vols., published also by the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica in 1965, a *magnum opus* running to 4,765 pages that made it possible for Shima Kunio to omit interpretation of the oracle-bone graphs in his *Inkyo Bokuji Shui* (*op. cit.*).

I should like to thank all those who made this concordance possible: Vernon K. Fowler and Barbara Kong, two graduate students at U.B.C., who tirelessly worked in the summer of 1983 for meagre remuneration, and Setsuko Otomo, my sister-in-law, as well as my wife, Reiko, two unpaid but patient

workers. In the initial stage, Vernon Fowler directed everything from the voluminous photocopying and the tedious cutting/pasting work of Chang Ping-ch'uan's transcriptions to the making of a draft character index. In the final stage, as I was learning how to use the U.B.C. computer, my colleague, Kenneth E. Bryant, a Hindi-Urdu scholar and a computer expert, helped me greatly by making programs to create the *p'in-yin* index and the list of all plastrons and inscription numbers appearing on each page. The latter list, in particular, will also enable a scholar, even when he happens not to be able to carry the entire *Ping-pien* collection about with him, to find the full context reconstructed by Chang Ping-ch'uan. Before the final computer print-out was made, the said list also helped me locate many errors. At times, unpredictable gaps, as well as the addition in odd places of inscriptions, occur in the body of the texts; this is due to my editing. I believe, however, that the concordance is relatively error-free, thanks to the use of the computer. Frank Flynn, a programmer analyst at the U.B.C. Faculty of Arts Centre for Computing and Data Analysis, also helped me with the text form. Ch'en Feng-tzu, an eminent seal-carver, graced not only the entry headings but also the cover jacket with his calligraphy. (All the bone graphs were written by myself.) I should also like to acknowledge my gratitude to my teacher Paul L.-M. Serruys, who taught me how to read oracle-bone inscriptions, and to Ting Pang-hsin, Director of the Institute of History and Philology of the Academia Sinica, a linguist of wideranging interests and expertise. It was they who suggested that I publish this work. Finally, it is my pleasant duty to record my gratitude to the U.B.C. Humanities and Social Sciences Grants Committee for providing me with a research grant and to Professor A.N. Akhujar, Head of the Department of Asian Studies, who not only helped me to obtain funds from the Summer Youth Employment of the B.C. Government but also allocated some computer dollars to me.

本通檢為中國考古報告集小屯第二本殷墟文字丙編一書而編製。該書簡稱丙編，全六冊，編著者張東權，由中華民國·台北，中央研究院歷史語言研究所在一九五七年至一九七二年間陸續出版。丙編是最重要的甲骨文集之一。書中所收集的龜甲不僅是科學發掘所得，而且由專家張東權先生綴合，並且作出詳贍的考釋。本人相信，由於綴合龜版提供了每條卜辭的上下文，對日後甲骨文的深入研究丙編會日益重要。


一九二八至一九三七年間安陽發掘所得的有字甲骨已經在中央研究院定名為小屯的一系列書籍中發表，即小屯甲編，乙編，丙編；後兩者所包括的是一九三六，一九三七年間的發掘所得。丙編內包含三百多面綴合的龜版，由於大部份龜版的正反兩面都有刻辭，所以拓本共有六百三十二片。但是，拓本的確數應該是六百一十三片，因為其中有十九片在前幾冊書

中發表後又再加以更完整的綴合，於是再和新的龜版一併在後幾冊再次發表，裏面的卜辭亦往往加上新的編號。這些重拓本的名單見本通檢第六百五十四頁。六百一十三片拓本中，卜辭總數約共一萬七千條，每條字數多在五字至十字之間，超逾十字的亦為數不少。這些卜辭絕大部份屬於所謂「第一期」（據董作賓先生的分期，約在公元前一三三九至一二八一年之間），是目前所知最古的中國文字之一，較其他已知的最早典籍資料更早約一千年，歷史價值之高不待多言。考釋這些卜辭不但對世界主要語言之一——漢語的發展情況得以更為明瞭，而且對中國文明形成期的認識亦能够比以前大大加強。

但是，甲骨文考釋有本身特殊的困難。以考釋用字母或音綴寫成的拼音文字而言，只要辨識了其中一個符號，就可以將成果應用到千百個出現這個符號的語詞之中。但中國文字中

每個語詞都個別用一個表音表意的字去代表，各字往往獨立而缺乏系統，因此每個字必須獨立辨識，考釋了一個字並不能就此得出辨認其他字的關鍵。正因如此，上下文是考釋甲骨文極重要的樞紐。當一個待考的字和某些常見的，意義已知的文字在上下文中並見的時候，就比較容易決定這個待考字的大略意義。因此提供待考字的上下文是考釋過程中的重大幫助，本通檢就是為針對這個需要而設的。

本通檢中各字依循張秉權先生的隸定，編排方法簡易便捷。某字在其中出現的語句臚列在該字項下，該字出現的位置則以空格□代表。各字基本上依照康熙字典的部首先後排列（其中有若干例外），一字兼用為普通名詞和專有名詞的，以普通名詞的句例先行。為使各字便於依照部首排列，條目中每字都盡量隸定為楷書形式，而部首索引的備註部份亦作同樣處理（第五八〇頁以下）。如果未能辨釋的文字中

某一成份和現代某部首相符的話，這個字就排列在該部首之下（例如：排在第九部首「亼」之下）。至於連與現代某部首相符的成份都闕如的文字就依照島邦男先生在殷墟卜辭綜類（東京汲古書院一九七一年出版）一書中所創制的甲骨文部首編排（綜類五九零至六零一頁）。某些常見字，如貞人名，否定詞，方國名，先祖名等等亦集中排在最後，以便查檢（見四三九至五七九頁）。跟著就把所有隸定書頁大量複印，一條卜辭中有多少個字就複印多少份，使每個字下都可以排出這個字所出現的卜辭，跟著剪下卜辭，每條分類。依上述程序依次抽空每一字檔，再依每條卜辭在原書中出現的先後黏貼在白紙上。本通檢亦編有拼音索引，其中包括若干英文語詞。由於「卜」「貞」及日干字為數極夥，為省篇幅，所以本通檢基本上不收。不過，其中用例特殊的亦有列入。有關這些字的其他用例可以參考大衛基尼著商史資料

：青銅時代中國的甲骨文（伯克萊，洛杉磯，倫敦：加州大學出版社，一九七八）第一九六至一九七頁，二零零頁，二一六頁，二一八至二二零頁。

由於本通檢的使用法簡單易明，因此，無需再列出凡例。其中要說明的是：在每一甲骨文字條目之下臚列所有出現此字的卜辭語句，每句後以數字標明所在的龜版及版內的位置，至於與上一條卜辭同版的則不再標明龜版號數

例如： 523 （1）貞：王麻[多]匹不若左(于)下上？」一二
（2）貞：王麻多匹不左若于下上？」一二

即卜辭（2）同見於龜版五二三。

另一個特點是在不少地方，尤其是部首索引（五八零至六一四頁）之中，一字可能並列在不同的類屬之下，本人希望藉此令到使用這本通檢的人士加深對兩編中甲骨文字的了解。又本人不時就字義提出個人意見，文中的斜槓符號「/」表示「和/或」，以本人認為較可

信的置於斜槓右方；另外又用等號「=」代表某些可備一說的意見；至於逗號「，」則代表「和」，一般上代表張秉權先生的意見。

有人可能覺得本通檢和島邦男先生的殷墟卜辭綜類會有所重複。事實上，島邦男先生一方面要匯集六十三種甲骨摹拓集，而另一方面又要顧慮到篇幅的限制，所以往往要將某些字或詞組（例如助詞，虛詞）等等略去。因此研究者難以利用綜類對這些字詞的作用加以詳確的分析；換言之，在本通檢所根據的丙編之中，不少刻辭在綜類中並未列入。另一個缺點是不少在丙編中出現的卜辭在綜類中只標上最初在乙編出現時的位置，乙編是在張秉權先生綴合工作完成之前出版的，而丙編在綴合中却陸續收入不少乙編所未見的碎甲。鑒於丙編的重要性，實在需要一本專為此書而設的完備引得，使到研究者既可以輕易查得某個字在丙編中的上下文，又可以再翻檢原書以查看同版中並

見的其他卜辭。上文所提及張秉權先生詳贍的考釋約共二十五萬字，亦可以大大幫助研究者正確了解兩編的卜辭。此外，使用本通檢時和張秉權先生的考釋同樣不可或缺的參考書是李孝定先生的甲骨文字集釋（共八冊），（中央研究院歷史語言研究所一九六五年出版），全書四千七百六十五頁，洋洋巨著，由於這本書的出版，使到島邦男先生無需再在綜類中加上考釋。

本人在此謹向使本通檢得以完成的人士致謝：英屬哥倫比亞大學的兩位研究生華農浮勒和芭芭拉龔，他們在一九八三年暑假中辛勤工作，僅支取微薄的研究費。本人的大姨大友節子和拙荆玲子細心不懈，「枵腹從公」。工作初期，華農浮勒一力擔承影印大量文稿，仔細剪貼張氏的考釋和編定文字索引的初稿；到了工作的後期，當本人在學習使用大學裡的電腦的時候，本人的同事，印度烏爾都學學者和電

腦專家肯尼夫拜倫替本通檢編定電腦程序以排出拼音索引和編出每頁內全部龜版及卜辭號碼的目錄，大大促進了工作的進度。即使手邊沒有全套兩編的研究者也可以藉著這些目錄找到由張秉權先生綴合的上下文。在電腦編出定稿之前，這些目錄亦有助於查核錯誤。本通檢內間中會有些缺漏或是勉強插入些卜辭，這是本人需要負責的。不過，本人相信這通檢基本上是什麼錯誤的，這要歸功於電腦。大學內文科電腦中心的程序分析員法蘭斐連亦幫助本人把通檢編成書的形式。名篆刻家陳風子先生為通檢封面題簽及封內題字，令本書生色不少。本人更要感謝教導本人研讀甲骨文的恩師舒球神父和中央研究院歷史語言研究所所長丁邦新先生，他是一位學識淵博興趣廣泛的語言學者。這本通檢的出版，也是由他們兩位提議的。英屬哥倫比亞大學人文及社會科學撥款委員會為本計劃提供了研究經費，亞洲研究系系主任

任亞高志格除了為本人取得夏季青年僱用計劃的款項外，還撥出若干電腦使用費，本人謹此一併致謝！（本文原稿為英文，由周國正先生譯成中文。於此謹致謝忱。）

CONTENTS

目 錄

Introduction	序 文	iii
Introduction in Chinese	中 文 序	vi
The Concordance	通 檢		
A. Unclassified Graphs	未 類 別 字	1-439
B. Classified Graphs	類 別 字	439-579
1. Diviners	貞 人	439
2. Negatives	否 定 詞	468
3. X-Fang	某 方	510
4. Tzu X	子 某	512
5. X-Tzu	某 子	517
6. Fu X	帝 某	518
7. X-Fu	某 帝	522
8. Mu X	母 某	523
9. X-Mu	某 母	524
10. Former Kings and Ministers	先 王 · 先 臣	525
11. Ta X, Hsiung X, and X-Hsiung	大 某 · 兄 某 · 某 兄	533
12. Fu X	父 某	535
13. Pi X	妣 某	543
14. X-Pi	某 妣	547
15. Tsu X	祖 某	548
16. To X	多 某	556
17. Numbers	數 字	558
18. Four Directions	四 方	574
19. Heavenly Stems and Earthly Branches	天 干 地 支	577

20. Omissions 遺漏	579
Radical Index 部首索引	580
The Shima Radical or Hard-to-Find-Graph Index	604
島氏部首或難索文字索引	
Classified Graph Index 類別索引	606
P'in-yin Index 拼音索引	615
List of Page Entries for Each Plastron and Inscription	654-735
各龜版及刻辭分布頁數	