

Abstracts

Robert Eno 伊若白

Was there a High God *Ti* in Shang Religion?

This paper calls into question a consensus belief that the term “*ti*” 帝 (and the term “*shang-ti*” 上帝), as used in the Shang oracle texts, denoted a supreme deity. Such an interpretation of the term is entirely satisfactory for textual sources postdating the first century of Chou rule, but the evidence of Shang texts suggests that term *ti* was employed therein as a corporate term denoting deities collectively, as a generic term referring to members of the Shang pantheon individually but not by name, or as an honorific term for the father of the Shang ruler. By exploring the semantics of the term *ti* through Shang usage and cognate words, a speculative root meaning of “father” is proposed, the graph being a representation of the ancestral altar or of altar figures. If this theory is valid, it calls into question the extent to which proto-bureaucratic features can be ascribed to the Shang pantheon. It also suggests that the concept of supreme divinity in China was either derived from the pre-conquest religion of the Chou, centered upon the deity T’ien, or through a post-conquest universalization of the Chou religion.

商人宗教信仰中的“帝”是否真為一至上之神？

把殷墟卜辭中的卜“帝”字解釋成商王朝宗教中最有權威的至上之神早已被研究甲文的學者視為理所當然之事。對於晚於西周立國百年後的文獻來說，這種解釋當然是無可厚非的。但甲文中卻有相當多的證據表明卜辭中的“帝”字未必指一至上之神。本文試圖通過對這些文例的分析來證明卜辭中的“帝”字實際有以下三種含義：其一，帝為一團體性之稱謂，意即群神；其二，為一含有指代意味之詞，泛指商人所信奉的諸神之一但卻不明言其名；其三，為一尊敬之稱謂，特指商王之父考。如不以周時的概念去釋卜辭，則甲文中的“帝”字代表至上之神的說法就難以成立。據卜辭用例和帝之假借字的用法來考證“帝”字之字形及本義，則其原義蓋為父考。字形或像祭祖之壇，或像先祖之偶像。假如商代還沒有至上神之概念，則商王朝衆神的組織中也未必顯示出後代神界的官僚性。如至上神的概念非商時已有，則

很可能起源於以天為中心的原始周民之宗教, 或有可能是隨着周克商後周民宗教的普及化才演變出來的。

Victor H. Mair

Old Sinitic **mʷag*, Old Persian *maguš* and English “Magician”

The 1980 discovery at Chou-yüan (site of an important Western Chou palace complex) of two small human heads with Caucasoid features sculpted from mollusk shell raises questions concerning East-West contact during the early Chou period (roughly eighth century B.C.E.). A similar head from Anyang dating to about half a millennium earlier suggests that the contact was of long standing and that it centered in the Shang and Chou courts. On top of one of the Chou heads is engraved the oracle bone form of the graph for *wu*, namely 𠄎, identifying the figure as a ritual specialist. Normally *wu* is translated as “shaman,” but it is here proposed that “mage” be adopted as a more accurate equivalent. Various types of evidence are adduced in support of this proposal, including the Old Sinitic reconstruction of *wu*, i.e., **mʷag*, which indicates a direct linkage with Old Persian *maguš*, the original source of Magianism.

1980年在周原(西周宮殿群所在地)發現了兩個蚌雕的具有高加索人特徵的小型頭像,這就引出周代早期(大概是紀元前八世紀)東西方接觸的問題。安陽亦有類似的人頭像出土,年代比這兩個小型頭像約早五百年。這更使人聯想到此種東西方的接觸時間持續很長,且以商周宮廷為其中心。

出土於周原的兩小型人頭像之一的頭頂部刻有一甲骨字形“𠄎,”即今之巫字,義為“掌管宗教儀式的人。”“巫”通常譯成 shaman,不過也許譯作 mage 意義更為準確。多種類型不同的證據可以用來支持這種新譯法,其中包括“巫”字的上古音構擬,即 **mʷag*,它與古波斯文 *maguš* (Magianism 的來源)有直接聯系。

Barry B. Blakeley 蒲百瑞

On the Location of the Chu Capital in Early Chunqiu Times
in Light of the Handong Campaign of 701 B.C.

The location of the Chu core area during the reign of King Wu (740-690) is a question rendered uncertain by two issues: 1) the date of

the move from Danyang to Ying, and 2) the locations of these capitals. In the traditional literature, both were considered to have been situated along the Yangzi, in southwest Hubei. Recent suggestions, on the other hand, place Danyang in either the Dan Valley (southwest Henan) or west-central Hubei (Nanzhang or Yicheng counties); and arguments have been offered that Ying was also in the Yicheng area.

In the arguments both for and against these hypotheses, a commonly employed assumption is that Chu military activities under King Wu hold the potential for indicating the area from which the campaigns were launched. The present paper analyzes one of these campaigns, the military encounter at Pusao between Chu and Yun, east of the Han River (Handong), in 701. This episode is noteworthy for the number of states and placenames that occur in the *Zuozhuan* account of it.

The present study suggests that in plotting the states and placenames appearing in this account, geographical sources dating from the sixth century through the early Qing that are frequently cited in defense of the Southern School (Yangzi Valley) view exhibit several deficiencies. Correcting these leads to the conclusion that regardless of whether Danyang or Ying was the capital at the time, in 701 the Chu force could well have set forth from the Nanzhang/Yicheng region.

從前701年的蒲騷之戰看春秋早期楚都的地望

楚武王時代楚國核心地區究竟位於何處，迄今仍是一片撲朔迷離，這是由於以下兩個與此密切相關，但又衆說紛紜的問題造成的。其一，楚都何時由丹陽遷移至郢？其二，這兩個都城的確切地望。在傳統的輿地之學中，居主導地位的是所謂“南說”，即丹陽與郢均位於鄂西南的沿江地區。但近年來許多學者不斷提出新見，有人認為丹陽應位於豫西南的丹水流域，有人則置丹陽於湖北中西部的南漳或宜城地區。並且還有學者論證郢都也應位於宜城一帶。

無論是贊成還是反對這些假說，在許多論證中，都普遍援引了楚武王時期軍事行動所提供的證據。因為這些軍事行動潛在地指示着楚師出發之地，也即楚都所在的核心地區。本文試圖分析前701年發生在漢東地區的楚鄖蒲騷之戰，因為對於探索《左傳》所載漢水下游地區的一系列國名與地名來說，這一事件具有不容忽視的價值。

這一分析表明，自六世紀至清代早期，通常被引證來支持“南說”的地理資料，在論證《左傳》記載的漢東地區一系列國名與地名時，顯

示出以下三個特點：首先，有些記載錯誤甚明，不足據信，至少在鄖國地望這一重要問題上即是如此。其次，有些結論，特別是關於雙方交戰之地蒲騷的位置，則係建立在對鄖國地望的錯誤定位並假定楚都位於沿江地區的雙重基礎上。雖然楚都位於沿江地區之說沿襲已久，尚可說言之有據，但在目前的這場爭論中，它已構成明顯的循環論證，其結論自然難以成立。第三，還有一些地名的位置記載，由於直接證據不足，僅僅是出自推斷，因而同樣是不可靠的。

本文的結論是，無論該時楚國的國都是在丹陽還是郢，前 701 年楚師的出發之地很可能在今之南漳，宜城一帶。

Li Ling 李零

Formulaic Structure of Chu Divinatory Bamboo Slips

In recent decades, divination records written on bamboo slips have been discovered at such sites as Wangshan, Tianxingguan and Baoshan, all in Hubei province. These slips derive from the ancient state of Chu and date between 350 and 300 B.C. In this paper, the author suggests that these divination records are of two types: an "initial divination" and a "follow-up divination." He also demonstrates that the "initial divination" type, which is the fuller form, usually consists of five discrete portions: a Prologue, First Charge, First Prognostication, Second Charge, and Second Prognostication; and provides detailed notes on the terminology found in each portion. Finally, he considers such associated questions as whether the Second Charge is a prayer or divination, whether divination was stated in the form of a question or statement, and the nature of the "follow-up divination."

楚占卜竹簡之格式

近年來，湖北省的望山，天星觀，以及包山等遺址都有數量可觀的占卜竹簡出土，顯然均係楚國遺物，竹簡的寫製年代當在公元前 350 至公元前 300 年之間。在本文中，著者建議這批占卜資料應分成兩類：一類為“初占”，一類為“習占。”“初占”的內容較為充實，通常由五個分立的部份組成：計為前辭，第一命辭，第一占辭，第二命辭，和第二占辭。並且對每一部份中的占卜術語著者都做了詳細的說明。最後，對某些相關的，諸如第二命辭應該是“禱辭”還是“貞辭”，貞卜本身

是由疑問句還是陳術句的形式構成的，以及“習占”之性質等問題，著者也都做了一定程度的探討。

D. S. Nivison and K. D. Pang

Astronomical Evidence for the *Bamboo Annals'* Chronicle of Early Xia

Tradition says that Yu, first ruler of the Xia Dynasty, was chosen by the “sage emperor” Shun as Shun’s successor. The “Modern Text” *Bamboo Annals* (*Jinben Zhushu jinian*) dates this act of choice to the fourteenth year of Shun. (With E. L. Shaughnessy, “On the Authenticity of the *Bamboo Annals*,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 46 (1986), we accept this text as at least in part the text found in a royal tomb of Wei in A.D. 281.) Following D. Pankenier’s argument (“Mozi and the Dates of Xia, Shang and Zhou,” *Early China* 9-10 [1983-85]), we date this event to 1953 B.C., the year of a dramatic five-planet conjunction. (K. Pang independently dated this conjunction to Yu’s reign in his article “Extraordinary Floods in Early Chinese History and their Absolute Dates,” *Journal of Hydrology* 96 [1987].)

We next use K. Pang’s discovery (“Extraordinary Floods”) that there was an eclipse of the sun on 16 October 1876 B.C., that exactly satisfies descriptions in the *Zuo zhuan* (Zhao 17) and in the *Bamboo Annals* for Xia, Zhong Kang fifth year, of an eclipse associated with the (post-Han *Shang shu*) “Punitive Expedition of Yin” (except for the day-cycle in the *Annals*, which we assume to be a later calculation); i.e., it occurred on the first of the ninth lunar month (Xia calendar), the sun’s location at the time (188^a) was in lunar lodge Fang, and the eclipse was visible in the probable Xia capital area. No other eclipse within many centuries satisfies these criteria.

Extending D. Nivison’s theory (“The Dates of Western Chou,” *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 43 (1983)) that Western Zhou royal calendars began only after completion of mourning, i.e., two years after accession, we then assume that there were similar two-year mourning breaks between Xia royal calendars (possibly reflected in the irregular interregnums in the present *Annals*). For a demonstration of this chronology, see the chart on page 94.

按照傳統的說法，“聖王”舜選擇夏代的開國之君禹作他的繼承人。據《今本竹書紀年》記載，此一禪讓事件發生於舜在位的第十四年。（我們同意夏含夷發表在哈佛亞洲學報第46期（1986）“也談武王的卒年--兼論《今本竹書紀年的真偽》一文中的看法，認為《今本紀

年》與公元 281 年於汲縣魏襄王墓中出土之《基本紀年》至少在部份上是相同的。) 根據班大為的說法 (“墨子和夏, 商, 周年代的關係: 研究記要.” 《早期中國》 [9-10 合刊本, 1983-85]), 我們把這一事件定在公元前 1953, 亦即為引人注目的五星聚合現象發生之年. (在發表於《水文學報》第 96 期 (1987) 的題為 “中國早期歷史上發生的特大洪水及其絕對年代” 一文中, K. Pang 獨立地得出相同之結論: 即五星聚合發生在禹在位之時.

其次, 我們採用 K. Pang 的發現 (詳見 “特大洪水” 一文): 公元前 1876 年 10 月 16 日曾有日食發生, 這恰好與《左傳》(昭 17) 及《竹書紀年》夏紀年中記載的發生在仲康五年的日食相合, 在漢以後的《尚書》中, 這一日食總是與 “胤征” 繫聯在一起的 (《紀年》中記載的干支日與其他材料有出入, 但我們以為這些干支日都是後來推算出來的). 也就是說, 此一日食發生在太陰曆九月的第一天 (夏曆). 該時太陽位於房室 (188a), 並能在其地望今大致可確定的夏都附近看到. 在前後相臨的數世紀內, 沒有任何一次其他日食能滿足上述所有之條件.

根據倪德衛的推測 (見 “西周年代考,” 哈佛亞洲學報第 43 期 [1983]), 西周王室只有在服喪期滿後, 亦即在新王踐阼兩年之後才改用新王年曆. 據此我們假定夏代亦應有類似的兩年喪滿才改用新王年曆的制度. (這一制度大概可以從《今本紀年》中新舊兩王之間的或長或短的空位期得到反映.) 我們的年代結果印在表上, 第 94 頁.