# A

# CONCORDANCE

# OF THE

# XIAOTUN NANDI

# ORACLE-BONE INSCRIPTIONS

小屯南地甲骨索引

by

Cai Fangpei
Edward L. Shaughnessy
James F. Shaughnessy, Jr.

蔡芳沛
夏含夷
夏含理

合編

# A

# CONCORDANCE

# OF THE

# XIAOTUN NANDI

# ORACLE-BONE INSCRIPTIONS

# 小 屯 南 地 甲 骨 索 引

Cai Fangpei
Edward L. Shaughnessy
James F. Shaughnessy, Jr.

蔡 芳 沛

夏 含 夷

夏 含 理

The Early China Special Monograph Series is intended to provide a convenient publication outlet for research aids and scholarly monographs dealing with topics in the study of ancient China. Submissions and inquiries should be sent to the editor of Early China:

Prof. Edward L. Shaughnessy
East Asian Languages and Civilizations
University of Chicago
Chicago, IL 60637

The name Xiaotun 小屯 needs no introduction to anyone familiar with
the historiography of ancient China. Since the beginning of the
twentieth century when bone and shell pieces bearing archaic
inscriptions were first traced to this village on the outskirts of the
city of Anyang 安陽 in Henan province, Xiaotun has been virtually
synonymous with the newly developing field of oracle-bone studies.
Xiaotun has also played an almost equally important role in the
development of modern archaeology within China. When Academia Sinica
was established in the mid-1920's, its first intensive project, spanning
the years 1928-1937, was the archaeological excavation of Xiaotun. And
after the establishment of the People's Republic of China in 1949,
Xiaotun was given the honor of being among the first sites to be
declared a National Cultural Preservation Site. This status has not
only preserved Xiaotun but has also allowed archaeological work there to
proceed on an almost continual basis until the present day.

Despite the great archaeological importance of Xiaotun as the
primary source of inscribed oracle bones from the Shang dynasty,
however, it was not until 1972 that a significant corpus of these bones
was excavated under conditions of scholarly control.[1] Working in an
area to the south of Xiaotun village (whence the name Xiaotun nandi 南地
or Locus South), archaeologists from the Institute of Archaeology of the
then Chinese Academy of Sciences (since transferred to the Chinese
Academy of Social Sciences) discovered over four-thousand pieces of
inscribed oracle bone bearing more than · seven-thousand discrete
inscriptions.[2] The publication of the initial excavation report, which
included detailed records of the stratigraphic context of the bones,
prompted a vigorous debate over the periodization of all oracle-bone
inscriptions and has already led to conclusions that almost certainly
require significant revisions in this most basic of methodologies in

---

[1]. In the winter of 1936-37, archaeologists affiliated with
Academia Sinica excavated a pit, YH 127, that would prove to contain
some seventeen-thousand pieces of turtleshell. While this discovery
certainly ranks as one of, if not the, greatest in the history of
oracle-bone studies, its archaeological significance was diminished
somewhat because the turmoil prevailing in north China at that time did
not allow the archaeologists to carefully excavate the pit in situ.

[2]. For the initial site report, Zhongguo kexueyuan kaogu
yanjiusuo Anyang gongzuodui 中國科學院考古研究所安陽工作隊, "1973 nian
Anyang Xiaotun nandi fajue jianbao"年安陽小屯南地發掘簡報, Kaogu 考古
1975.1: 27-46. The first report on the significance of the inscriptions
themselves is found in Xiao Nan 肖楠, "Anyang Xiaotun nandi faxian de
Duizu buci - jianlun Duizu buci de shidai ji qi xiangguan wenti" 安陽小
屯南地發現的自組卜辭-兼論自組卜辭的時代及其相關問題, Kaogu 1976.4:234-
241. The final report is included in Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan kaogu
yanjiusuo 中國社會科學院考古研究所, Xiaotun nandi jiagu 小屯南地甲骨
(Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 1980), vol. I, pt. 1, 3-72.

oracle-bone studies.[3]   With the recent publication of rubbings and transcriptions of the complete corpus of these inscriptions,[4] similar advances in such related fields as Shang history and linguistics can be expected as well.

It is often said that bibliography is the key to research in the social sciences.    In a similar fashion, it might be said that concordances are the keys to philological research.    That this is particularly true for the field of oracle-bone studies, which by now contains an inscriptional corpus that no individual could hope to master, has been well demonstrated by the enthusiastic reception accorded the monumental concordance Inkyo bokuji sōrui 殷虛卜辭綜類, compiled and first issued in 1969 by the late Shima Kunio 島邦南, which set as its goal the inclusion of virtually all inscriptions published to that date.[5]    Since the Xiaotun nandi inscriptions were discovered only after the publication of this concordance, however, they are of course not included in it.    We therefore decided to prepare the present concordance in an attempt to fill this significant lacuna in oracle-bone reference aids.

---

[3].       The first notice of the ramifications of the Xiaotun nandi oracle bones with regard to the broader question of all oracle-bone periodization was the article "Anyang Xiaotun nandi faxian de Duizu buci" (see note 2) published by the excavators of the site.   They subsequently published further research in an article entitled "Lun Wu Yi Wen Ding buci" 論武乙文丁卜辭, Guwenzi yanjiu 古文字研究 3 (1980), 43-79, but the conclusions presented there have been challenged by a series of authoritative studies; see Li Xueqin 李學勤, "Xiaotun nandi jiagu yu jiagu fenqi" 小屯南地甲骨與甲骨分期, Wenwu 文物 1981.5:27-33; Qiu Xigui 裘錫圭, "Lun Lizu buci de shidai" 論歷組卜辭的時代, Guwenzi yanjiu 6 (1981), 262-320, and Lin Yun 林澐, "Xiaotun nandi fajue yu Yinxu jiagu duandai" 小屯南地發掘與殷虛甲骨斷代, Guwenzi yanjiu 9 (1984), 111-154.   For a brief discussion of this debate, see Edward L. Shaughnessy, "Recent Approaches to Oracle-Bone Periodization: A Review," Early China 8 (1982-83), 1-13.

[4].       Rubbings of all of the inscriptions are contained in the two parts of Volume One of Xiaotun nandi jiagu (see note 2).   Volume Two of this work (bearing a publication date of 1983 but not actually issued until 1986) is in three parts, containing hand-copies of all of the inscriptions, a complete transcription into kaishu xx xx forms, and a concordance of individual graphs and particularly those identified as proper nouns.   Just before the transcription in this work was issued, a separate transcription was published by the same press: Yao Xiaosui 姚孝遂 and Xiao Ding 肖丁, Xiaotun nandi jiagu kaoshi 小屯南地甲骨考釋 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985).   Some remarks concerning the relative merits of these several works are given on the following pages.

[5].       Shima Kunio, Inkyo bokuji sōrui (Tokyo: Kyuko shoin, 1969; revised second edition, 1971).

iv

In preparing the concordance, we have followed Professor Shima's lead in one important technical respect. As in Inkyo bokuji sorui, each entry in the present concordance is given together with the entire text of the inscription in which it appears. This complete linguistic context is crucial to determining the specific use or meaning of a word in question and seems to us to be a necessary condition for any true concordance of oracle-bone inscriptions. The present concordance also incorporates two important technical differences from Shima's concordance. First, unlike <u>Inkyo bokuji sōrui</u>, in which inscriptions are rendered in a stylized version of oracle-bone script, we have decided to present the text transcribed, whenever possible, into modern Chinese graph forms. While transcription inevitably entails a greater degree of interpretation than does copying and thus introduces greater possibility of error, we decided that this liability was outweighed by the benefits of making the concordance accessible to scholars in related fields who may not be familiar with oracle-bone script. Second, also unlike <u>Inkyo bokuji sōrui</u> and other concordances of oracle-bone inscriptions in which frequently occurring lexical items are abridged, the present concordance provides complete listings for each and every word in the inscriptional corpus. (The only exception to this rule is in the case of ganzhi compounds, which have been treated as single entries but which are complete in that respect.) It is our belief that such complete listings will allow some statistical control to be brought to the analysis of these common words and in the case of the ganzhi days of divination, for instance, may help us to understand the patterns of Shang daily life.

In producing any concordance, the first and most crucial decision is to establish the basic text. The transcription that we have chosen to use as the basis for the concordance, and which is given on pages 1-125 of the text, is that prepared by Yao Xiaosui 姚孝遂 and Xiao Ding 肖丁 as <u>Xiaotun nandi jiagu kaoshi</u> 小屯南地甲骨考释 and published in 1985. Although, as noted above, transcription invariably involves interpretation and there will certainly be places where the readings given by the authors of this transcription are open to question, the same would be true of any other transcription or of any revisions that we might suggest. Since Professor Yao and Mister Xiao are among the most eminent paleographers now active in the study of oracle-bone inscriptions, we decided that the interests of consistency would be best served by following their readings systematically and for us not to introduce any substantive changes into their text. The few changes that we have made have been on the order of correcting copyists' mistakes. These changes have been of three types. First and simplest, several cases in which the entry numbers of inscriptions were miswritten have been corrected.[6] Second, several cases in which graphs have been

---

6. For example, number 283 in their text should read 583, 107.3 should read 107.1, 333.3 should read 333.2, 1020 should read 1012, the second 2842.1 should read 2842.3, 3758.1-5 should read 3759.1-5, and 4554.1-2 should read 4555.1-2. It should be noted too that for the purposes of this concordance, we have changed the notation of the

miswritten as graphically similar graphs have been corrected. For instance, in inscription 607 <u>wu jia</u> 戊甲 is obviously a copyist's error for the ganzhi compound <u>wushen</u> 戊申 and has been corrected accordingly.[7] Third, in a few cases where a failure to indicate breaks within incomplete inscriptions has obviously altered the content of the inscription, ellipses have been added. For instance, in Yao and Xiao's text number 2438.7 reads 「 ... 今止或 」. Comparison with inscription 2438.5 on the same piece, which reads 「今宰直彞止或」, reveals that 2438.7 should actually read 「 ... 今 ... 止或 」, as given in our transcription on page 73. However, since this sort of change involves a degree of interpretation, we have corrected only the most egregious examples.[8] Finally, there are also a number of cases in which the reading of graphs on a single piece of bone is unclear as to direction (whether to be read from right-to-left or from left-to-right) or to the relationship between two or more inscriptions. Yao and Xiao have frequently declined to transcribe these ambiguous cases, giving instead a rough facsimile of the piece. Since due to the structure of the concordance this resort was not available to us, we have generally redrawn these inscription in linear form and have provided together with the transcription a note indicating that the reading is uncertain. In doing so, we have followed a convention used by Yao and Xiao elsewhere in their transcription, providing notes calling attention to particular aspects of unusual inscriptions. These notes too have been included in the transcription presented by us.

There is one other feature of Yao and Xiao's transcription that we would have liked to have corrected. Due perhaps to the fact that it was the result of a collaboration between two scholars working separately, there are a number of orthographic inconsistencies within the transcription. For instance, the oracle-bone graph ⊹ is sometimes rendered <u>zai</u> 在 and sometimes <u>cai</u> 才; the oracle-bone graph ὑ is sometimes rendered <u>yi</u> 目 and sometimes <u>yi</u> 以, the oracle-bone graph 𝓂 is sometimes rendered as <u>zhong</u> 眾, sometimes as 𝓂 and sometimes as 𝔀, and so on, with one collaborator usually preferring a more direct transcription and the other a more extended one. Since there were too many of these cases for us to indicate systematically all possible readings, and since at any rate these decisions involve levels of interpretation that we had resolved to avoid, we have simply given the reading that appears in the transcription. This has unfortunately resulted in two different concordance entries for these single oracle-

---

twenty-three pieces given in the appendix from 附寸 1-23 to 5001-5023.

7.　　　Other examples of miswritten graphs would include the <u>gong</u> 肯 of 249.4 written incorrectly as <u>guan</u> 肯 , ⊹ of 1126 written incorrectly as <u>cai</u> 才, the <u>wang zai</u> 亡㞢 of 2172 written incorrectly as <u>wang</u> 王 <u>zai</u>, and the <u>dui</u> 肖 of 3423 written incorrectly as <u>yi</u> 目 .

8.　　　Other inscriptions in which we have inserted ellipses are number 4071, where 「又伐于高 」 has been rewritten as 「 又伐于高且... 」.

bone graphs. In most cases, it has been possible to juxtapose them within the body of the concordance so that 山, 𣎆 and 𣎴, for instance, appear sequentially as numbers 08.080601, 08.080602 and 08.081002. However, in a few cases, such as with zai 在 and cai 才, since the different graphs have distinct radicals, and since the concordance is arranged on the basis of the 540 Shuowen radicals, as is traditional in reference works dealing with Chinese paleography, it has not been possible to indicate their identity. Our frustration in this regard points to the need for rigorous consistency in future transcription projects.

We are confident at least that the present concordance reflects the most rigorous standards of consistency. This confidence derives from the fact that the concordance has been generated almost entirely by computer. The transcription was first entered into the computer as it appears on pages 1-125. The most difficult feature of this entry process, aside from making every effort to ensure that the text was as error-free as possible, was the creation of over one-thousand graphic forms that do not exist in standard Chinese orthography. In this regard, too, the graphs were drawn to resemble as closely as possible the stylized transcriptions given by Yao Xiaosui and Xiao Ding. Although it is probably not possible, at least at the present stage of technological development, for computer-drawn graphs to be as precise or elegant as those that are hand-drawn, nevertheless we believe that the graphs presented here are both accurate and reasonably attractive.[9] After having entered the transcription into the computer, it was then translated into an ASCII-file and sorted with a standard database program. The first step was to create a list of all unique graphs. Each graph was then assigned a sequence number based on its Shuowen radical and total stroke number, and then resorted on the basis of this sequence. The complete text was next subjected to a global search and sort operation, according to this sequence, for each unique graph, retrieving the complete text of each inscription in which the graph appears.[10] This sorted database file was reconverted to a Chinese word-processing file and printed using a Chinese-character print driver. Finally, it was also possible to use the same unique-graph file to generate a separate index (pp. 347-359) based on total stroke number and to indicate in that index the total number of occurrences of each graph.

---

9. In fact, of all the graphs encountered in the text, there was only one, concordance number 15.003501, that could not be drawn within the parameters of a 24x24 bit-map. As a tribute to the complexity of this graph, and as a challenge to others who are interested in using computers to work with Chinese inscriptions, we have used the rubbing of one of the two inscriptions in which the graph occurs, number 2598, as the cover illustration for this book.

10. In cases where a single graph is found two or more times within a single inscription, the inscription has been retrieved once for each occurrence. For further details regarding the organization of the concordance, see the Specifications of Organization on p. ix.

While this entire process is conceptually straight-forward, it is necessary to mention one major problem that haunted us throughout the work. The Chinese word-processing system that we used supports only a single created character file of no more than 606 characters at any one time. Since it was necessary to create more than one-thousand graphs for the transcription, this constraint on the number of created characters therefore made it impossible to treat the text as a whole. Instead, it was necessary to divide it roughly in half, with one character file used for the first half and two others used for the second half. Since this affected not only the sort routine but also the printer functions as well, it was necessary to print three separate concordances and then to use the traditional method of cutting and pasting to combine them into a single concordance. Although this made the final generation of the concordance cumbersome for us and somewhat less attractive on the printed page, we remain confident that we have accounted for all graphs and occurrences.

The work that went into the production of this concordance was a collaboration in the fullest and best sense of the word.[11] Three different people with three different skills cooperated to produce an end result that could not have been achieved by any of them individually. Ed was responsible for the conception and design of the project, and for the final reading of the transcription and the sequence of the concordance. Fangpei was solely responsible for the major task of entering the entire text into the Chinese word-processing system and also drawing all of the created character forms. Jim was not only responsible for all phases of the database computer work but he also brought his considerable organizational skills to the final production job, enabling the three of us, working together, to produce the camera-ready copy in just over three days. We look forward to the day when the computer generation of concordances for all sorts of Chinese language materials will be routine. In the meantime, we offer this concordance of the Xiaotun nandi oracle-bone inscriptions both as a practical reference aid for scholars working in the field of oracle-bone studies and also as a first attempt to apply computer technology to that field.

---

SPECIFICATIONS OF ORGANIZATION

1.  With certain minor revisions, the transcription is as given in Yao Xiaosui and Xiao Ding, <u>Xiaotun nandi jiagu kaoshi</u> (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 1985).

2.  The concordance is arranged according to the sequence of the 540 <u>Shuowen</u> radicals.  Each graph has been assigned a nine-place number indicating its place in the sequence: the two digits before the decimal indicate the chapter in <u>Shuowen</u> in which the radical is found; the first two digits after the decimal indicate the sequential order of the radical within each chapter (see the <u>Shuowen</u> Radical Chart on pages xii-xiii), the next two digits indicate the total number of strokes in the graph itself, and the final two digits are an arbitrary sequence number for this concordance.  Thus, the number 14.240500 for the graph 中 indicates that the graph's radical is the twenty-fourth radical of chapter fourteen, that the graph has five strokes, and that it is the first graph listed in this concordance under that radical (by convention in this concordance when the graph is itself a Shuowen radical, its sequence number is 00).  This numbering system is used not only for standard kaishu forms but also, to the extent possible, for oracle-bone forms of graphs.  In cases where a graph does not occur in the <u>Shuowen</u> or in other dictionaries and has two or more components that might be identified as its radical, the component that is most prominent has been arbitrarily selected as the radical and the graph is not indexed twice. Oracle-bone graphs for which it has not been possible to determine any <u>Shuowen</u>  radical have been placed in a fifteenth chapter and are arranged by order of total strokes.

3.  As a further aid to locating graphs, there is a separate index arranged according to total stroke number (pages 347-359).  For oracle-bone forms of graphs, each apparent incision has been counted as one stroke.  In the case of curved strokes, a semi-circle is regarded as one stroke (thus, ᵆ is counted as four strokes, ⊙ as three strokes), while a semi-oval is counted as two strokes (thus, � is counted as three strokes).  Since some variation is inevitable in the counting of these strokes, it may be necessary to search under two or more stroke numbers in the Stroke-Number Index to locate a particular oracle-bone graph.

4.  In addition to the numerical code for each graph, the <u>Cang Jie</u> alphabetic code by which it is accessed in the Chinese computer system is also supplied.

5.  Each inscription in which a graph occurs is listed in its entirety in the order of the entry number of the inscription.  If a graph occurs two or more times in a single inscription, the inscription is listed the number of times the graph occurs.

6.  Complete ganzhi compounds are sub-indexed as a unit under the individual gan and appear only once.

# 凡　例

1. 除了少數更改之外，本索引之正文部份以姚孝遂、肖丁合著的《小屯南地甲骨考釋》（北京：中華書局，1985）之隸定為依據。

2. 本索引按《說文》五百四十部編排。每字均有九位數字以定其次序先後：圓點前的兩位數字指該字所從部首在《說文》中的卷號；點後的頭兩位數字指該部首在卷內次序（見說文部首表，頁12-13）；次兩位數字為該字的筆劃總數；最後兩位數字為本索引的專用順序號。例如「甲」字以 14.240500 為號：「14.24」指甲字所從之部首為《說文》卷十四中的第二十四個部首，「05」表示甲字之筆劃共為五筆，而最後的「00」則表示甲字為本所引所列該部下之第一字。《說文》所無之甲骨字形亦以《說文》部首為序。倘若某一甲骨字形含有兩個或兩個以上的說文部首時，則擇最顯明的一個為其部首，在其他的部首下該字便不再列入。至於有些甲骨字形根本無法找到相應的《說文》部首，這些字就都列在本索引之第十五卷，其先後順序完全看該字筆劃之多寡。

3. 本索引亦備有筆劃檢字表（頁347-359）。甲骨字形的筆劃則視刻痕的多寡而定。遇到曲刻時，凡半圓形的刻痕都算作一劃。（例如「凵」數作四劃，「☉」字數作三劃）。凡半隔圓形之刻痕都算作兩劃，因此「屮」則算作三劃。由于有些甲骨字形的筆劃較難確定，讀者與編者對某一字的數法便有可能不盡相同，遇到這種情況，請讀者費心在相鄰的筆劃中查找一下。

4. 除了數字以外，本索引亦給出電子計算機中文輸入所最常用的倉頡碼，凡前面冠有「Z」者為編者自繪之文字，不在中文電腦所提供的標準漢字之內。

5. 多條卜辭含有同一字符，其在該字下之排列亦以卜辭在正文中順序之先後為準。如同一字在某一條卜辭多次出現，則按該字出現的次數將全條卜辭反復列出相應之次數。

6. 干支作為一整體來處理，分別列在各天干之下並僅出現一次。

# CONTENTS

卷8　01人 02匕 03匕 04从 05比 06北 07丘 08印 09壬 10重 11臥 12身 13月 14衣 15裘 16老 17毛 18毳
　　19尸 20尺 21尾 22履 23舟 24方 25儿 26兄 27兂 28兒 29卯 30先 31禿 32見 33覞 34欠 35㱃 36次
　　37旡

卷9　01頁 02百 03面 04丏 05首 06㬐 07須 08彡 09彣 10文 11髟 12后 13司 14卮 15卩 16印 17色 18卯
　　19辟 20勹 21包 22茍 23鬼 24甶 25厶 26嵬 27山 28屾 29屵 30广 31厂 32丸 33危 34石 35長 36勿
　　37冄 38而 39豕 40㣇 41互 42豚 43豸 44舄 45易 46象

卷10　01馬 02廌 03鹿 04麤 05㲋 06兔 07莧 08犬 09狀 10鼠 11能 12熊 13火 14炎 15黑 16囱 17焱 18炙
　　19赤 20大 21亦 22矢 23夭 24交 25尢 26壺 27壹 28幸 29奢 30兂 31夲 32夰 33六 34夫 35立 36竝
　　37囟 38思 39心 40惢

卷11　01水 02沝 03瀕 04く 05巜 06川 07泉 08灥 09永 10辰 11谷 12仌 13雨 14雲 15魚 16䰻 17燕 18龍
　　19飛 20非 21凡

卷12　01乙 02不 03至 04西 05鹵 06鹽 07戶 08門 09耳 10臣 11手 12丞 13女 14毋 15民 16丿 17厂 18乀
　　19氏 20氐 21戈 22戉 23我 24亅 25癸 26乚 27亡 28匸 29匚 30曲 31甾 32瓦 33弓 34弜 35弦 36系

卷13　01糸 02素 03絲 04率 05虫 06蚰 07蟲 08風 09它 10龜 11黽 12卵 13二 14土 15垚 16堇 17里 18田
　　19畕 20黃 21男 22力 23劦

卷14　01金 02幵 03勺 04几 05且 06斤 07斗 08矛 09車 10自 11𠂤 12𨸏 13厽 14四 15宁 16叕 17亞 18五
　　19六 20七 21九 22内 23嘼 24甲 25乙 26丙 27丁 28戊 29己 30巴 31庚 32辛 33辡 34壬 35癸 36子
　　37了 38弄 39云 40丑 41寅 42卯 43辰 44巳 45午 46未 47申 48酉 49酋 50戌 51亥

1.1 「癸...貞...亡田」
1.2 「癸巳貞旬亡田」
2 「...貞其ㄓ自囲卆大示其...」
3 「不罕」
4 「...牢王受又」
6.1 「今日戊王其田不雨」 「吉」
6.2 「戊不狃雨」 「吉」
7.1 「丁酉...」
7.2 「多射ㄓ馬..于戰」
8.1 「馬...先王...每雨」
8.2 「馬重朚旦先戊王兌比不雨」
8.3 「馬弜先王其每雨」
9.1 「癸卯貞卆至于...」
9.2 「癸卯貞射ㄓ以羌其用重...」
9.3 「丁未貞奠以牛其用自囲卆大示」
9.4 「己酉貞奠以牛其用自囲三牢卆...」
9.5 「己酉貞奠以牛其用自囲卆大示重牛」
9.6 「庚戌...奠...牛...重...」
9.7 「甲辰貞射ㄓ以羌其用自囲卆至于...」
9.8 「己酉貞奠以牛其（用）自囲五牢卆大示五牢」
10.1 「壬午卜其戎戛」
10.2 「壬午貞弗戎戛」
11 「癸卯貞彭ㄓ戋」
12.1 「吉」
12.2 「...日...」
13 「...重卆...」
14 「不用」
15 「癸酉貞旬亡田」
16 「重䰧祝」
17 「弜罘」
18.1 「甲申卜...」
18.2 「二牛王受又」
18.3 「三牛王受又」
18.4 「...王...」
19.1 「庚寅今馬中人北」
19.2 「㲋或用若」
19.3 「朚內」
20.1 「丙申卜...莫戋二...」
20.2 「牢王受又」
21 「吉」
22.1 「重...用」
22.2 「重庚彭」
23 「召在冎...」
24 「弗䁆雙」
25 「重乙巳用伐」
26 「...匕壬罘...」
27.1 「...乙...彭小乙日...」
27.2 「...隹...」
28 「乙丑卜貞王其田亡戋」
29.1 「甲申卜今以丁先步」
29.2 「弜先狌王步」
30.1 「甲寅卜...」
30.2 「弗罕其每」
31.1 「丁亥卜先彭大...自...」
31.2 「乙未卜又于公」
32 「㘴亡田」
33 「...禾于...」
34.1 「又戠又戋于且乙丝用」
34.2 「...戠又戋于且辛丝用」
35 「...虎䰧甲重...」

1

36.1 「叀羊用」
36.2 「... 牢」
36.3 「其至牢 ... 」
36.4 「羊」
37.1 「庚寅卜㞢自戠來年」
37.2 「... 自上囲來年」
38 「丙子貞今 ... 比 ... 佛召方率」
39.1 「不 ... 」
39.2 「不雨」
39.3 「其雨」
39.4 「翌日辛不雨」
39.5 「辛其雨」
39.6 「壬王其田敢不雨」
39.7 「壬其雨」
39.8 「... 雨」
39.9 「弘吉」
39.10 「吉」
39.11 「丝邘」
41 「... 卜且丁伐二牢」
42.1 「旁田其冓大雨」
42.2 「自旦至食日不雨」
42.3 「食日至中日不雨」
42.4 「中日至昃不雨」
43 「丝受（又）」
44 「... 沈牛囲 ... 」
46 「不冎」
47.1 「癸亥」
47.2 「㞢▨」
48.1 「壬子卜王生田亡戋」
48.2 「乙卯卜王生田亡戋」
49 「... 卜翌日乙王逆于四亡戋」
50.1 「慶禾于汅」
50.2 「㞢▨王受又」
51.1 「癸酉貞又伐于 ... 羌廿」
51.2 「丁卯貞己巳㝷隹于且辛眔父丁」 「丝用」
51.3 「己卯卜不雨」
51.4 「... 酉貞 ... 」
52.1 「叀甲午彭」
52.2 「于甲辰彭▨」
52.3 「雨」
52.4 「不」
53 「... 日戊王其田昚叀又戠」 「吉」
54 「敗」
55 「三牢丝用」
56.1 「庚午貞今夕亡田在逄」
56.2 「辛未貞今夕亡田在 ... 」
56.3 「癸酉貞今夕亡田」
56.4 「甲戌貞今夕亡田至厤」
56.5 「... 寅 ... 今夕 ... 至厤」
57.1 「奴▨」
57.2 「叀牛」
57.3 「其牢」
58 「大吉」
59.1 「今 ... 」
59.2 「其奉于亳土」
60.1 「旁帥」
60.2 「入叀癸帥」
60.3 「于 ... 帥」
60.4 「于且丁旦帥」
60.5 「于寅旦帥」

60.6 「于大∷師」
61.1 「辛巳」
61.2 「其雨」
62.1 「卯日...不雨」
62.2 「其雨」
63.1 「重止或門我用若」
63.2 「重...門...」
63.3 「于大示告方」
63.4 「壬辰...」
63.5 「...⊞...」
64.1 「弜...丝用」
64.2 「不雨」
65.1 「戊戌王令...」
65.2 「庚戌貞辛亥令∷...」
65.3 「乙卯貞丁巳其枣」
67.1 「甲子卜穀且乙舌」
67.2 「征」
68.1 「弜帆」
68.2 「弜又」
68.3 「丙申卜昪⺉彭且丁罘父丁」
68.4 「...昪...」
69 「...用王雨」
70 「壬辰卜祝至...」
71 「吉」
73.1 「己...來丁...王受」
73.2 「其...父...」
73.3 「奴∷」　　　　　（雜有習刻）
74 「癸亥貞旬...⊞」
75.1 「卽日」
75.2 「其又公父」
75.3 「卽日」
76.1 「癸...」
76.2 「沮牢又一牛」
76.3 「三牢」
76.4 「癸巳卜其沮勿牛」
76.5 「弜勿」
76.6 「牛」
77 「高且乙」
78 「辛巳卜...モ于⺉」
79.1 「辛」
79.2 「十人王受又」　　　　（十人合文作⺉）
80.1 「乙卯貞自上甲兇...」
80.2 「王弜伐」
81.1 「丁卯貞王比址...伐召方受...才且乙宗卜五月」
81.2 「丝見」
81.3 「辛未貞王比址或伐召方」
81.4 「丁丑貞王比址或伐召...」
82.1 「庚午貞王步自共丁」
82.2 「甾」
82.3 「辛巳卜...」
83.1 「大吉」
83.2 「重小牢」
83.3 「重羊」
84.1 「乙卯卜重...」
84.2 「重属」
84.3 「弜...」
85 「弜又」
86 「...寅卜王其射彰白㹥湄日亡戈」
87.1 「甲戌卜...」
87.2 「甲戌卜今日雨不雨」

3