

**STUDIA ORIENTALIA**

**111**



**STUDIA  
ORIENTALIA  
VOLUME 111**

*Published by the Finnish Oriental Society*



Helsinki 2011

**Studia Orientalia, vol. 111, 2011**

Copyright © 2011 by the Finnish Oriental Society  
Societas Orientalis Fennica  
c/o Department of World Cultures  
P.O. Box 59 (Unioninkatu 38 B)  
FI-00014 University of Helsinki  
FINLAND

**Editor**

Lotta Aunio

**Advisory Editorial Board**

Axel Fleisch (*African Studies*)  
Jaakko Hämeen-Anttila (*Arabic and Islamic Studies*)  
Tapani Harviainen (*Semitic Studies*)  
Arvi Hurskainen (*African Studies*)  
Juha Janhunen (*Altaic and East Asian Studies*)  
Hannu Juusola (*Semitic Studies*)  
Klaus Karttunen (*South Asian Studies*)  
Kaj Öhrnberg (*Librarian of the Society*)  
Heikki Palva (*Arabic Linguistics*)  
Asko Parpola (*South Asian Studies*)  
Simo Parpola (*Assyriology*)  
Rein Raud (*Japanese Studies*)  
Riikka Tuori (*Secretary of the Society*)

**Typesetting**

Lotta Aunio

ISSN 0039-3282  
ISBN 978-951-9380-79-7

WS Bookwell Oy  
Jyväskylä 2011

## CONTENTS

Ordenanzas jerezanas sobre la guarda de la frontera frente a Ronda y su serranía a comienzos de la guerra de Granada (1482–1484).....	1
JUAN ABELLÁN PÉREZ	
Categories of Proper Language in Classical Arabic Literature .....	23
LALE BEHZADI	
Algerische Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert .....	39
MAREK M. DZIEKAN	
Economía de los Centros de Culto del Reino de Granada: Los bienes habices de la mezquita y rábitas del Padúl (Valle de Lecrín, Granada) .....	59
MANUEL ESPINAR MORENO	
Studies in the Gṛhya Prayogas of the Jaiminīya Sāmaveda: 5. Pratisarabandha.....	83
KLAUS KARTTUNEN	
The Good, the Beautiful, and the True Aesthetical Issues in Islamic Philosophy .....	87
TANELI KUKKONEN	
New Considerations Regarding the Identity of Vedic <i>sóma</i> as the Mushroom Fly-Agaric .....	105
STEPHAN HILLYER LEVITT	
Semantic Borrowings and Grammatical Change in Written Arabic in Israel under the Influence of Hebrew: The function of DPs and the peculiar <i>ماحش</i> .....	119
TORKEL LINDQUIST	
Anti-Religious Views in the Works of Ibn al-Rāwandī and Abū l-‘Alā’ al-Ma‘arrī .....	131
ILKKA LINDSTEDT	

Falcons and Falconry in Al-Andalus .....	159
VIRGILIO MARTÍNEZ ENAMORADO	
Un pionero en los estudios de árabe marroquí: el P. Fr. Patricio José de la Torre. Refranes y adagios .....	185
FRANCISCO MOSCOSO GARCÍA	
Summarized Beauty: The microcosm-macrocosm analogy and Islamic aesthetics .....	251
INKA NOKSO-KOIVISTO	
Mujeres en cursos de alfabetización en el norte de Marruecos: Un estudio de caso en el círculo rural de Asila .....	271
CARMELO PÉREZ BELTRÁN	
Access and Repression in Korea ... ..	297
TARU SALMENKARI	
Arabic Loanwords in Hebrew .....	327
HASEEB SHEHADEH	
Kosovo Turks: From privileged status to fear of assimilation.....	345
LAURI TAINIO	
“More Didactic Than Lyrical”: Modern views on Karaite Hebrew poetry .....	371
RIIKKA TUORI	
New Wine from Medina: Aesthetics of popular qawwali lyrics .....	393
MIKKO VIITAMÄKI	
The Great Migration: Inception of the Zhou identity.....	407
SHU-HUI WU	
Review Article: Ancient Art and Archaeology from Central Asia .....	447
JUHA JANHUNEN	
Book Reviews.....	455
Contributors.....	477

# THE GREAT MIGRATION: INCEPTION OF THE ZHOU IDENTITY

*Shu-bui Wu*

## ABSTRACT

This essay explores the process of the accretion of the Zhou 周 people through migration, warfare, and intermarriage prior to the founding of the Western Zhou dynasty in 1045 BCE.<sup>1</sup> It highlights two arguments: first, prior to the consolidation of the Zhou dynasty the Zhou ancestors had already laid the foundation of a unique Chinese cultural pattern for generations in the millennia to follow; and second, the Zhou people mostly consisted of the “Other”, namely the ethnic groups historians have called Rong Di 戎狄 and Qiang 羌 peoples, in addition to the Zhou ancestors, the descendants of the Yellow Emperor who, some six centuries before the Zhou took over the Shang dynasty, had migrated to the world of the “barbarians” and intermarried with them.

\*\*\*

Our knowledge of the earliest Zhou history comes from the narrative of Sima Qian 司馬遷 (c.145–86 BCE). Sima’s narratives on the ancestors of the Xia 夏, Shang 商, and Zhou dynasties in the *Shiji* 史記 are, however, understandably over-simplified.<sup>2</sup> The inscriptions on oracle-bones, bronzes, and bamboo strips discovered through recent archaeological excavations have, along with the efforts of hundreds of modern Chinese scholars, helped to fill in gaps in the *Shiji* and shed new light on the history of the great transition from Shang to Zhou. This study focuses on the inception of the Zhou identity built up over twelve centuries of pre-Zhou (*xian Zhou* 先周) history, during which time the Tai 台, Bin 邠, Zhouyuan 周原, and Zhou peoples played central roles.

---

1 Shaughnessy 1999b: 309.

2 “When Sima Qian recorded the history of the ancestors of the Xia, Shang, and Zhou, his narrative was short and events were described briefly, *shi wen jian lue*” 事文簡略. Yang Yanqi, Chen Keqing & Lai Changyang (eds) 2005: 284; Liu Xianxin 劉咸忻.

According to the *Shiji*, the Zhou ancestor Qi 棄, like the Shang ancestor Xie 契, resided in the *tianxia* 天下 of Shun 舜 and Yu 禹, with Yu later founding the Xia dynasty.<sup>3</sup> Shun bestowed lands, people, and cognomens upon Qi and Xie due to their outstanding contributions.<sup>4</sup> Xie headed the Zi 子 lineage group at Shang. One of his successors, Tang 湯, eventually grew powerful after his predecessors had migrated around and changed their capitals over several generations. As the Xia was declining under its last ruler, Jie 桀, Tang emerged and took over the Xia. In the meantime, one of the successors of Qi led his Ji 姬 lineage group out of Tai. For some time they wandered between Shanxi and Shaanxi in search of a suitable place to reside.

The Jis eventually prospered through intermarriage and interaction with local Rong Di people after having settled in a place they also called Tai in the area of modern Shaanxi. Due to the pressures of ever-growing population and external threats, the Tai people migrated to Bin to their north, where they founded a state and assimilated more ethnic groups. After about three hundred years, however, the Bin people had to relocate again due to dual pressures: from the Shang people, who had long before founded a mighty dynasty and expanded westward, and from the nomadic groups that had migrated into Shaanxi and Shanxi. Zhouyuan was the new home for the Ji-Rong 姬戎 immigrants. They then intermarried with the local power, the Jiang 姜 lineage group, that had long assimilated the local Qiang people through marriage, wars, and trade, and together they shaped the Jiang-Qiang 姜羌 culture. The new Zhouyuan people, or the Zhou, as the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions call them, united under the Ji-Rong and Jiang-Qiang groups and established hegemony over their world through warfare against surrounding ethnic groups. They eventually moved beyond Zhouyuan and conquered the Shang (c.1570–1045 BCE).<sup>5</sup>

## 1. THE TAI PEOPLE

Sima Qian originated the legendary founding father Qi of the Zhou people and endowed him with the same characteristics as those possessed by the Yellow Emperor. Sima portrayed Qi as an individual with a remarkable personality and an outstanding intellect who greatly contributed to the benefit of the world. From

3 Sima Qian. *Shiji*. Wudi benji 1986: 47. Henceforth I refer to the *Shiji* only without including the name Sima Qian.

4 Qi was instructed to take charge of agriculture and teach people to sow and plant the hundred grains. Xie became Minister of Instruction of Shun. He preached the teachings of the five relations and tolerance. *Shiji*. Wudi benji 1986: 47.

5 The dynastic and reign dates appearing in this essay are derived from Shaughnessy 1999a: 19–29.



childhood, Qi was fond of raising trees, hemp, and beans. He had a natural talent for growing food when he matured into adulthood during the reign of Emperor Yao, who appointed him Agrarian Master (*nongshi* 農師). Qi's greatness was, however, more than an avocation. He taught people to cultivate the "hundred grains, *bai gu* 百穀", which sated the people's hunger and in turn benefitted the *tianxia*. Due to his talent, Emperor Shun bestowed upon him his mother's native place at Tai, designated him Lord of Millet (*houji* 後稷), and honored him with the cognomen Ji.<sup>6</sup> The greatness of the Lord of Millet lasted for several generations, well into the time of the late Xia dynasty. This simple narrative of Sima Qian does not satisfy historians' curiosity about the ancestry of the great Zhou dynasty (1045–221 BCE), which shaped the contours of Chinese culture over the subsequent three millennia.

Questions about the meaning and genealogy of the term *houji* have been raised and debated, and scholars have been confused by Sima's claim that Qi was the Houji who had lived through the long reigns of Yao 堯, Shun, and Yu. One interpretation has ultimately prevailed: the term *houji* did not refer to a particular individual but to an official title of the person in charge of agricultural activities.<sup>7</sup> In other words, the first person who carried this title was Qi of the Ji, and subsequently the title was passed down to Qi's descendants over several generations.<sup>8</sup> Recent archaeological excavations have helped clarify what Sima meant by the "hundred grains" Qi taught people to grow. Remains of wheat and barley at Tai, where Qi was enfeoffed, have been discovered and identified,<sup>9</sup> and scholars have concluded that Qi's achievement was his introduction of new crops, namely wheat and barley, which grew and thrived in the northern climate and soil. Oracle-bone inscriptions excavated at Tai in present-day Wugong 武功 county, Shaanxi, indicate that wheat was written as "*lai* 來".<sup>10</sup> This discovery has confirmed the passage in the *Shijing* 詩經 (*Book of Poetry*) celebrating Qi's agricultural achievements.<sup>11</sup>

Sima Qian seems to want to link Zhou's origin to that of the Shang when he posits Qi's supernatural birth by his mother, Jiang Yuan 姜原, who was a

6 Nienauser (ed. & tr.) 1994: 55.

7 Wang Hui 2008: 42. Sima Qian gives slightly different information regarding Qi and *houji* in another chapter. There, Sima mentions that "Qi was a *houji* when Shun called upon him and asked him to solve the problem of a hungry population by teaching people to grow the hundred grains according to the seasons. *Shun yue Qi limin shi ji, ru houji bo shi baigu* 舜曰棄黎 民始飢汝 后稷播時百穀." *Shiji*. Wudi benji 1986: 47.

8 Wang Hui & He Shuqin 2009: 119.

9 Wang Hui & He Shuqin 2009: 119. Wang and He believe that millet and corn were the original crops grown along the Yellow River during the New Stone Age before wheat and barley were introduced.

10 Wang Hui & He Shuqin 2009: 121.

11 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 499 "Yi wo lai mou, di ming shuai yu 貽我來麩 帝命率育."

daughter of the Youtai clan 有邰氏 and a major wife of Diku 帝嚳.<sup>12</sup> Sima Qian tells us that she became pregnant by stepping into the footprint of a giant when she was walking in a field, an event similar to the legendary birth of Shang's ancestor, Xie.<sup>13</sup> Modern historians interpret the transition from Jiang Yuan to Qi, when he became the head of a tribal society based on the Youtai clan,<sup>14</sup> as a watershed event transforming a matriarchal society into a patriarchal one.<sup>15</sup> The location of Tai is, however, under dispute among scholars. Some believe that Tai was located in Wugong, mentioned above,<sup>16</sup> while others argue that Tai was in southern Shanxi, where Zhou ancestors since Qi had lived.<sup>17</sup> This division of scholarly opinion has its origins in Sima's historical carelessness and errors.

The son and successor of Houji, Buqu 不窳, continued the agricultural work of his father, and according to the *Shiji*, in his old age Buqu abandoned his position as an Agrarian Master because Xiahoushi 夏后氏 (King Kongjia 孔甲 of Xia) neglected agriculture, thus forcing Buqu to leave his hometown and take refuge among the Rong Di people.<sup>18</sup> Scholars have been perplexed by Sima's genealogical account ever since; if Buqu was the son of Qi, how could Qi have appeared in the time of Yao, Shun, and Yu, and Buqu lived during late Xia? (Three generations after Xiahoushi, the Xia was ended by Tang, who founded the Shang state.)<sup>19</sup> Did Sima Qian erase the history of the Xia? The most reasonable explanation could only be that the Houji did not refer to Qi, but to Buqu's father, who, without a

---

12 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 71. Some modern historians have regarded her name as meaning that she was originally from the Qiang people, because her clan name Jiang was phonetically equivalent to the Qiang (Ma Changshou 2006: 82). Pulleyblank (2000: 25) leaves this an unresolved question after a phonetic analysis on Jiang and Qiang. The ancestor of the Jiang lineage was one of the Siyue 四岳, the four advisers to Emperor Yao. Without giving his name, Sima Qian claimed that he was a *zhuhou* 諸侯 who assisted Yu in controlling the floods and who received an enfeoffment. The great Zhou strategist Jiang Taigong 姜太公 was his descendant. (*Shiji*. Qi shijia 1986: 499)

13 Xie's mother, Jian Di 簡狄, was a daughter of the Yousong 有娥氏 lineage. She was the secondary wife of Di Ku, according to the *Shiji*. She became pregnant after swallowing a bird egg. (*Shiji*. Yin benji 1986: 64)

14 Song Zhenhao 2007: 353.

15 Wang Yuzhe 2003: 464.

16 Yang Kuan 2003: 29; Yang Shanqun 1991: 41.

17 Yang Shengnan 1984: 75.

18 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 71. In his biography of the Xionggnu, Sima Qian is mistaken in claiming that it was Gongliu, not Buqu, who lost his position and fled to the Rong Di people (*Shiji*. Xionggnu liezhuan 1986: 1064). Sima also asserts that Xiahoushi had a *zhuhou* named Liu Lei 劉累, who was the descendant of Yao. He received an enfeoffment in Shiwei 豕韋, but he failed to feed Xiahoushi dragon meat for more than one time, so he fled out of fear (*Shiji*. Xia benji. 1986: 61). The story of Liu Lei could be connected to the experience of Buqu, who also fled Xiahoushi.

19 *Shiji*. Xia benji 1986: 62.

name, succeeded to the position of a *houji*.<sup>20</sup> In other words, Buqu was not the son of Qi, but of someone who had the title of *houji*.

Sima Qian tells us neither whence Buqu left nor where he went, an oversight that has caused centuries of speculation and dispute among scholars. Modern scholar Yang Shanqun claims that Tai was located in the Qiju 漆沮 River Basin in Shaanxi and argues that Buqu left Tai and took refuge in present-day Qingyang 慶陽 County in eastern Gansu.<sup>21</sup> Recent archaeological excavations have uncovered evidence of the activities of pre-Zhou people in Qingyang, and a gazetteer from the Tang period (618–907) supports Yang's argument.<sup>22</sup> Archaeologists are now able to trace the route from Tai to Qingyang along the Qiju River which connects the Jing 涇 River to its tributary, the Malian 馬蓮 River in eastern Gansu.<sup>23</sup> However, Yang Shanqun and others have difficulty establishing that Yao, Shun, Yu, and the Xia people then had to reside in Shaanxi, because Buqu and his ancestors had been living in the world of Yao, Shun, and Yu.<sup>24</sup> In sum, the Tai in Shaanxi could not have been the place Buqu left.

Yang Shengnan, on the other hand, claims that there were two Tais. The old Tai, where Qi was enfeoffed and Buqu grew up, was located in southwestern Shanxi where two rivers, the Fengshui 灃水 and the Taoshui 洮水, meet at the big bend of the Yellow River. He believes that Buqu left this Tai and followed the Yellow River down to the Wei 渭 River where it joins the Qiju River in Shaanxi. Yang concludes that Buqu then settled in a new place where he was surrounded by the Rong Di and that he named the place Tai as well.<sup>25</sup> Yang's claim has also been supported by archaeological digs at the old Tai in Shanxi and at the new Tai in Shaanxi. These digs provide evidence of the activities of pre-Zhou people in these areas. I concur with Yang Shengnan. It seems plausible, from a geographical perspective, that early Zhou migrations were possible because of the extensive and rich river system of Henan, Shanxi and Shaanxi. They must have travelled by boats from river to river. The fertile soil of the Qiju River Basin must also have attracted Buqu to settle there. Nevertheless, Buqu and his people established an agricultural community in

20 Yang Shanqun 1991: 42. Sima Qian states that Buqu lost his position as a *ji* 稷, which somehow confirms the argument (*Shiji*. Zhou beniji 1986: 71).

21 Yang Shanqun 1991: 43.

22 A local gazetteer of the Tang period, *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi*, records that Buqu had built and then abandoned a town three *li* southeast of Qingzhou (Li Linfu 1979: 57).

23 Li Zhongli 1985: 88.

24 With the support of archaeological excavations, modern scholars have agreed that the area of western Henan and southern Shanxi was the center of the Xia civilization and beyond. When Tang founded the Shang dynasty, the activities of the Shang people remained basically in the old Xia areas. (Zhou Shucan 2008: 79) See also Zhang Guoshou 2006: 26.

25 Yang Shengnan 1984: 80.

the new Tai and remained there until his grandson, Gongliu 公劉, moved the Tai people away. Qingyang in eastern Gansu was part of the Bin state that Gongliu and his successors founded when they established their new colony.

## 2. THE BIN PEOPLE

Gongliu was born and grew up in the world of the Rong Di. He inherited his family's passion and talent for farming. Due to his diligence and agricultural skills, the population in new Tai grew rapidly. The *Book of Poetry* documents Gongliu's hard work and achievements,<sup>26</sup> but it also indicates a shortage of food, which limited development in Tai due to its burgeoning population. Gongliu needed to find new land to increase food production,<sup>27</sup> and for the second time the Zhou ancestors had to migrate. Sima Qian explains that Gongliu's relocation was motivated by the political oppression of Jie, the last king of the Xia dynasty, and that the movement was well planned. The Tai people carried with them limited resources, but they prospered soon after they found their new place and settled down: "*Xing zhe you zi, ju zhe you jixu* 行者有資居者有積蓄."<sup>28</sup> Modern scholars question whether the Xia ruler could have "abused" remote Gongliu, who resided in the area of Rong Di, because this would mean that the sphere of influence of the Xia dynasty under Jie had reached Shaanxi.<sup>29</sup> They have further suggested that the pressure of the Quanrong 犬戎 group might have been the reason, since they had migrated southward and entered Shaanxi.<sup>30</sup> Some scholars have speculated about the rise of the early Shang, which threatened the survival of the Xia and forced the Tai people of the Qiju Basin to relocate.<sup>31</sup>

Thus, Gongliu led his people out of the region of the Rong Di to a place where his son, Qingjie 慶節, had established a settlement, Bin.<sup>32</sup> Scholars are puzzled by the precise location of Bin and the place whence Gongliu came, and their confusion results from ambiguous statements in the *Shiji* concerning the whereabouts of Gongliu's predecessors. As to the location of Bin, modern scholars are in agree-

26 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 428.

27 Yang Kuan 2003: 30.

28 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 71.

29 Jiang Linchang (2000a: 50) confirms this suggestion by listing historical sources regarding Xia territory, and he leaves Shaanxi out of his list.

30 Quanrong was one of the Rong Di groups residing at Quanqiu 犬丘 during the Shang period (Yang Dongchen 1993: 48). On the location of Quanqiu, see Tan Qixiang (ed.) 1982: 17–18.

31 Liu Junshe 1994: 52. The pre-Zhou cultural expression at the Qiju River Basin manifested an interruption during the Erligang period, which could have been the direct cause of Gongliu's relocation to Bin (Liu Junshe 1994: 58).

32 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 71.

ment that it was somewhere in the vicinity of the middle and upper reaches of the Jing River, between present-day Bin 彬 county in Shaanxi and Qingyang in Gansu.<sup>33</sup> This time Sima Qian gives us a “little hint” about where Bin could have been, although it is imprecise. According to the *Shiji*, Gongliu crossed the Wei River from the Qiju Basin, but there is no indication of where he went.<sup>34</sup> Sima Qian could have derived this information from the *Book of Poetry*, which states where the Tai people went: “They crossed the Wei River to reach Bin, *yu bin si guan, she Wei wei luan* 於豳斯館涉渭為亂.”<sup>35</sup> If Bin was located on the eastern bank of the Jing River to the north, as most modern scholars agree, Gongliu could not have crossed at the Wei River because he would have been heading southward. It makes more sense to assume that Gongliu and his people crossed at the Jing River. In other words, they headed northward from the Qiju Basin via its rich river system to reach Bin.

Bin was situated in a wide plain with fertile soil, an abundant water supply, and a wonderful climate suitable for agriculture.<sup>36</sup> The *Book of Poetry* celebrates its well-defined four seasons and describes the activities of the Bin people and the food they grew each month.<sup>37</sup> It can be assumed, however, that there were no Shang people among the Bin, but only the Ji lineage, local Rong Di, and perhaps some Xia survivors. In other words, the *tianxia* of pre-Zhou at that time belonged to the Bin people, who were overwhelmingly the Rong Di. The *Book of Poetry* documents the laborers and craftsmen who were the majority of the Bin. It had a typical agricultural and sericultural society, with the men plowing, women weaving, and domestic animals being raised. There were also occasional hunts for foxes and wild pigs.<sup>38</sup>

Archaeologists have excavated subterranean housing units and tombs in a village named Nianzipo 碾子坡 at Bin. Here housing units were built along the hillsides and appeared in two shapes, round and rectangular. Inside the caves were heating stoves and supporting columns. Archaeologists have further discovered oracle bones made from animal bones (but without inscriptions) and pottery called *taoli* 陶鬲, which was used mainly for cooking, in storage basements attached to the living quarters.<sup>39</sup> Modern scholars believe that this type of housing unit began in Bin from Gongliu’s time and continued to the period of Xibo 西伯 (later King

---

33 Yang Shanqun 1991: 43.

34 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 71.

35 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 430.

36 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 428.

37 Zhao Yu 2003: 48.

38 *Shijing quanyi*. 1981: 201–203.

39 Qi Shexiang 2003: 124.

Wen 文 of Zhou, 1099/56–1050 BCE), who built another city at Feng 豐.<sup>40</sup> In other words, for more than a thousand years the pre-Zhou ancestors resided in this type of house. In the tombs at Bin there was no bronze ware, but only pottery.

In Bin, the Zhou consolidated and established a state with Gongliu as the founding father, or *Zhou dao zhi xing* 周道之興, in the words of Sima Qian.<sup>41</sup> More Tai people followed Gongliu and they prospered, living on agriculture, hunting, and animal husbandry.<sup>42</sup> They pursued a settled lifestyle combining the Rong Di and Shang cultures.<sup>43</sup> Although the state and its people had an identity, the Bin people, *Bin ren* 邠人, they were like an island in a sea of Rong Di. Gongliu's wise decision to relocate in Bin benefitted his people. His descendants resided in Bin for nine generations over a span of three hundred years until the time of Gugong Danfu 古公亶父, who led his people out of Bin.<sup>44</sup>

By the time the Zhou ancestors began to consolidate in Bin, the Shang people had risen to power, replaced the Xia, and grown powerful.<sup>45</sup> Late Shang rulers were enthusiastic about conquering the non-Shang *fang* 方 states, especially those to their west. It is difficult to trace Shang-Bin relations because for three centuries the Bin state is nearly invisible in extant historical records. To the present there is insufficient archaeological evidence to give us a complete picture of Bin history, other than a few oracle-bone inscriptions from the Wu Ding 武丁 (1250?–1189 BCE) era which offer a glimpse into the late years of Bin, or the Zhoufang 周方 as the Shang oracle-bone inscriptions call it. The following inscriptions reveal a period of armed conflict between the Shang and Bin states:<sup>46</sup>

Crack-making on *bingchen*. Diviner Bin 賓: Should the King attack Zhoufang?  
 Divination: The King should not attack Zhoufang. *Bingchen bu bin zhen wang wei Zhoufang zheng*. *Zhen, wang wu wang zhoufang zheng* 丙辰卜賓貞王惟周方正, 貞王勿往周方正. (丙444)<sup>47</sup>

The Shang king ignored the admonitions of the diviner and continued to attack the Bin:

40 Jiang Linchang 2000b: 62. In the two cities, Feng and Hao, there were similar housing units with caved-in storage basements and excavated pottery. Fifteen units of this type of subterranean housing from the early Western Zhou period have been excavated in Zhangjiapo on the western bank of the Fengshui River.

41 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

42 Liu Jiahe 1982: 62.

43 Wang Kelin 1994: 68.

44 Liu Junshe 2000: 11.

45 Liu Junshe 1994: 52.

46 The following inscriptions are cited from Wang Shenxing 1994: 8–9. After Wu Ding's reign there were no more inscription mentionings the Shang's war against Zhoufang (Cheng Mengjia 1956: 292).

47 This was an inscription from the Wu Ding era because Bin was his diviner (Ma Rusen 1993: 221).

On *Renzi*, crack-making. The king ordered Que to invade Zhou, the tenth month. *Renzi bu wang ling Que fa Zhou shiyue* 壬子卜王令雀伐周十月 ([後]下 19.3)

Que was the general of King Wu Ding.<sup>48</sup> It was during the Shang that the term Zhou appeared,<sup>49</sup> and it referred to the Bin people who were defeated and had to accept Shang's hegemony:

On *jimao*. Crack-making. Diviner Chong 充: The King ordered the army of royal lineage, *Duozizu* 多子族, to assist Quan Zhi 犬止 in attacking Zhou, in the service of the King, the fifth month. *Jimao bu yun zhen ling Duozizu bi Quan Zhi fa Zhou gu wang shi wu yue* 己卯卜充貞令多子族比犬止戡周 古王事 五月.<sup>50</sup> ([續].5.2.2.)

Here diviner Chong served King Wu Ding,<sup>51</sup> and Quan Zhi referred to Quanrong's leader named Zhi. Zhi headed the state of Quanfang 犬方 and allied with the Shang after being defeated by Wu Ding.<sup>52</sup>

In this joint attack the Shang army could have come from the east via southern Shanxi, where Wu Ding had fought many wars against the *fang*-states and where the Quanrong in Quanqiu could have come from the south to seize Bin. This event reflects two historical facts: that Shang's sphere of influence during Wu Ding's reign had reached the Shaanxi and Gansu areas, and that the Shang intended to take Bin as a military post in an ongoing struggle with its enemies from borderland states such as Gongfang 工方 and Tufang 土方, which occupied the Jinan 晉南 Basin in southern Shanxi.<sup>53</sup>

48 Lin Xiaolan 1983: 225.

49 Historians believe that Wu Ding was responsible for the inception of the name Zhou (Sun Binlai 1986: 27).

50 This inscription is cited from Lin Xiaolan 1983: 272. There are sixteen more inscriptions collected by Chen Mengjia regarding Shang's attack on Zhou (Chen Mengjia 1956: 291).

51 Diviner Chong appeared in the first period of the Yinxu oracle-bone inscriptions under the Bin group (Ma Rusen 1993: 221).

52 Quanrong was one of the Rong groups *Yunxing zhi rong* 允姓之戎 that resided in southern Gansu and migrated southward during the late Shang period. Eastern Zhou documents record them as Quanrong (the Rong of the Dogs) because they worshipped dogs. In the oracle-bone inscriptions of the Wu Ding period, the Quanrong were recorded as Guifang 鬼方. They remained on good terms with the Shang. King Wen and King Wu of Zhou launched wars against them. The term Guifang eventually disappeared and was replaced by the name Xianyun, who continued to be the enemies of the Zhou. (Yin Shengping 1985: 69, 71, 74)

53 Wu Ding waged long years of war against the Gongfang and Tufang peoples who intruded into the Jinan Basin of southern Shanxi (Shim 2002: 6). The idea of Shang's interest in Bin is my conclusion. From a strategic point of view Shang could have attacked these intruding powers, Gongfang and Tufang, from both sides, Anyang in the east and Bin in the west, should Shang have succeed in taking the Bin state.

The Shang-Quanrong alliance helped the Shang control the Bin:<sup>54</sup>

[The King] ordered the daughter of Di of the Zhou to be the wife of  
[Quanrong] Zhi. *ling Zhou di zi fu Zhi* 令周氏子婦止. ([前] 6.63.1)

The identity of Di is unknown, but it is clear that her marriage to the leader of Quanrong was decided by the Shang king.

It is to advise [the King] not to dispatch the Zhou to Bi. *Wu ling Zhou wangyu bi* 勿令周往于莒 [sic]. ([續] 3.28.3)

Since the inscription Bi is undecipherable, it remains uncertain where the Zhou intended to go. Presumably, they were leaving Bin for Qi 岐, their new colony in Zhouyuan as described below. Under pressure, Danfu and his people had to move away from Bin. Their relocation marked the end of a life among the Rong Di for nearly five hundred years,<sup>55</sup> the inception of a new identity, and the formation of a new relationship with the Shang.

### 3. THE ZHOUYUAN PEOPLE

Historical records of the activities of Zhou ancestors are very scarce. Most material available to historians so far pertains to history since the founding of the Zhou dynasty.<sup>56</sup> This is especially true regarding the periods of Gugong Danfu and his three successors, Ji Li 季歷, Chang 昌 (also known as Xibo or King Wen), and Fa 發 (known as King Wu 武, 1049/45–1043 BCE), who resided in a new place, Zhouyuan, for nearly a century before they took over the Shang. It is generally believed that this was a time equivalent to the third and fourth periods of the Yinxu culture, namely during the reigns of Shang kings from Lin Xin 廩辛 (1157–1149 BCE) to Di Xin 帝辛 (1086–1045 BCE, the last king of Shang, also known as King Zhou 紂).<sup>57</sup> The Yinxu oracle-bone inscriptions and the oracle

54 The following inscriptions are cited from Wang Yuzhe 2003: 388.

55 Jiang Linchang 1999: 5.

56 Yang Kuan 2003: 7–11.

57 Liu Junshe 1994: 52. Scholars have various opinions on the periodization of Yinxu culture. The most commonly used is the four-period one. The first period was under the reign of King Wu Ding, ranging from the late thirteenth century BC to the early twelfth century BC. (It was said that he ruled some fifty or sixty years.) The second period was during the reigns of Zu Geng and Zu Jia in the mid-twelfth century BC. The third period covered the reigns of Bing Xin, Kang Ding, Wu Yi and Wen Ding, ranging roughly from the late twelfth century BC to the early eleventh century BC. The fourth period covered the reigns of Di Yi and Di Xin in about the mid-eleventh century BC. (Wang Yuxin & Xu Yihua 2006: 150)



bones excavated in Zhouyuan in 1977–1978 shed new light on the Shang and pre-Zhou relationship during the Zhouyuan period.<sup>58</sup>

### 3.1 Pre-Zhou exodus

Danfu's migration is mentioned in the *Shiji* and the *Book of Poetry*. Sima Qian succinctly narrates the long years of migration in only twelve characters: Danfu “left Bin, crossed Qiju, passed by Liangshan, and stopped at the foothills of Mount Qi, *Qu Bin du Qiju yu Liangshan zhiyu Qi xia* 去邕渡漆沮踰梁山止於岐下”.<sup>59</sup> Archaeological excavations have offered more support of this laconic narrative. Several major sites between Bin and Qi have been discovered and studied, and ten or more of them in Yongshou county, located in the mid-Liangshan mountain range, have yielded evidence of activities of pre-Zhou peoples during the migration period of Danfu.<sup>60</sup> Unfortunately, however, neither Sima Qian nor modern archaeology can tell us anything about the living conditions of the immigrants.

The *Book of Poetry* describes life during this time of great transition as “living in clay caves covered with [more] clay, without houses or property, *tao fu tao xue, wei you jia shi* 陶覆陶穴未有家室”.<sup>61</sup> The *Book of Poetry* does not specify times or places for this, however, and this has led to general confusion. Scholars have wondered whether Zhou's venerable ancestor Danfu lived like a caveman. Commentators on the *Book of Poetry* believe that life during the time of Danfu was indeed primitive, but they have speculated that this was merely a temporary situation and that life changed after Danfu and his people settled in Zhouyuan. They also suggest that two prior phrases in the text should not be overlooked because they indicate the time and circumstances of the relocation: “As people began to relocate, they moved (from Bin at) Du River to (Liangshan 梁山 at) Qiju River, *Min zhi chu sheng zi tu ju qi* 民之初生自土沮漆.”<sup>62</sup> In fact, there is archaeological evidence of a temporary settlement at Liangshan before Danfu and his people arrived at their final destination.

58 It is especially significant that in Fufeng in 1977–1978, thirty-four tombs were excavated dating from the period of Gugong Danfu through King Wu. In 1977–1982, fifty-four more tombs were excavated, corresponding to the fourth period of Yin Xu Shang culture. (Shaanxi Zhouyuan kaogudui 1979: 42)

59 *Shiji*. Zhou benji. 1986: 72.

60 Wang Ying & Wang Fengying 2005: 7.

61 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 394.

62 The word “*tu* 土, earth” here refers to the Du 杜 River, a tributary of the Jing River, where Bin was located (*Shijing quanyi* 1981: 394). Liangshan was located in the northwest of present-day Qian County (Jiang Linchang 2000b: 56).

At the Qiju River archaeologists have excavated subterranean or partial subterranean housing units similar to those excavated at Bin. They have demonstrated that two construction projects took place at two different periods of time and that the later one was a reconstruction built upon a previously existing, older structure. The newer construction corresponds to the third period of Yin Xu Shang culture, matching the time of Danfu's migration. The older structure could have been built back in the time of Buqu.<sup>63</sup> It appears that upon arrival, Danfu and his people reconstructed these subterranean units, which Liu Junshe describes in the following terms: "The entrance at the upper part of this subterranean structure is larger than the underground portion. The underground part is caved in like the bottom of a pot."<sup>64</sup> This type of subterranean construction appears in many places in the world where winds are strong, temperatures are extreme, and potential intruders threaten security. (I have visited this type of subterranean housing unit on an island along the coast of Taiwan. Its entrance was obscured, but it opened above ground level. The living quarters inside were underground, but they remained cool in summer and warm in winter.) The *Book of Poetry* describes the climate in Bin as follows: "It is as hot as fire in the seventh month, *qiyu liuhuo* 七月流火, and in the ninth month people already prepare clothing for winter, *jiuyue shouyi* 九月授衣."<sup>65</sup>

Danfu and the Bin people had finally settled at the northern foothills of the Mount Qi, a place the *Book of Poetry* calls "the origin of the Zhou, Zhouyuan".<sup>66</sup> Zhouyuan was bounded on three sides by water. The distance from south of the Wei River Valley to north of Qi Mountain is around twenty-five kilometers, and the distance from the east bank of the Qiju River to the Qian 泝 River on the west is approximately one hundred fifty kilometers.<sup>67</sup> Archaeologists have discovered evidence of Bin activities in four present-day counties: Fengxiang, Qishan, Fufeng, and Wugong, as well as in small portions of Baoji, Mei, Qian, and Yongshou counties.<sup>68</sup> This suggests that the Zhou ancestors went back to the Qiju River Basin,

---

63 Liu Junshe 1992: 41.

64 Liu Junshe 1992: 41. In view of the presence of the massive clay deposits from which the First Emperor of China in nearby Xianyang fashioned terra-cotta soldiers, Danfu and his predecessors could have used this natural resource from the river banks to reinforce the walls of subterranean cave houses. For photos of the excavation sites of the subterranean cave houses, see Yang Kuan 2003: 659. The photos do not show the subterranean sites, but only the caves.

65 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 203.

66 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 394.

67 Yin Shengping 2005: 597.

68 Yongshou was located on what would become the Silk Road trade route (Wang Ying & Wang Fengying 2005: 5).

where they had settled eleven generations earlier, when Buqu took refuge at Tai.<sup>69</sup> Xu Zhuoyun in fact maintains that they had returned to their ancestral home after traveling in a big circle between the Wei and Jing Rivers.<sup>70</sup>

Zhouyuan nevertheless was a perfect place for the Bin settlers to grow, expand, and defend their new colony from outside invaders. Historians have looked into the motivation behind Danfu's choice of Zhouyuan and into the political impacts of his choice. The Zhouyuan people soon prospered in their new colony under the leadership of the Ji lineage led by Gugong Danfu during the late Shang period. Although the natural environment determined the choice of this place, strategic reasons might have motivated Danfu as well. In the face of the growing westward expansion of the Shang<sup>71</sup> and the threat from nomadic groups who migrated southward, the new regime needed an ally. Mount Qi is not far away from Tai in eastern Qiju Basin, but Tai was possibly occupied by Shang's ally, the Quanrong, when Danfu and his people arrived. Danfu had looked to the Jiang lineage group, the people who had practiced agriculture and settled at the southern foothills of Mount Qi and on the northwestern side of Tai, possibly before the Zhou ancestor Buqu arrived in the Qiju River Basin.<sup>72</sup>

The early Jiang ancestors successfully expanded their colony to present-day Baoji, Zhouzhi, and Mei counties in Shaanxi through their agricultural skills.<sup>73</sup> They interacted, assimilated, and intermarried with the surrounding Qiang and Rong peoples and formed a distinct hybrid culture of Jiang-Qiang or Jiang-Rong, which was equivalent to the second and third periods of the YinXu culture of the Shang.<sup>74</sup> Jiang tombs and settlements were unearthed at Liujia Village in Fufeng and Baoji in Shaanxi in 1980s, and from these excavated burial sites scholars have determined that the earliest Jiang-Qiang culture had entered the Bronze Age, but later than the Longshan culture (c.3000–2000 BCE).<sup>75</sup> Small bronze tools, tubes, and bells have been unearthed, but neither heavy bronze vessels for ritual purposes nor weapons have been found. This might be why

---

69 The pre-Zhou genealogy is based on *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73.

70 Xu Zhuoyun 1990: 34.

71 Song Xinchao 1992:12. In Zhouyuan along the Wei River, archaeologists have excavated several Shang colonies built during the Erlingang and YinXu periods. These strongly reflect Shang cultural influence.

72 The Jiang lineage group was descended from Shennongshi, who was honored as the god of agriculture (Wang Hui 2008: 42). The Jiangs and the Xia people originated in Songshan, Henan and developed close ties. Upon the fall of the Xia dynasty, the Jiang, like the Xia survivors, fled their home area. One of the Jiang groups moved northward to southern Shanxi, and the other group relocated to Shaanxi in the west. (Jiang Linchang 2000b: 62)

73 Shen Changyun 1983: 80.

74 Jiang Linchang 2000a: 52.

75 Shaanxi Zhouyuan kaogudui 1984: 26.

the Jiang-Qiang people welcomed the newcomers, the Ji-Rong group of the Bin, who were militarily stronger. Many bronze weapons, including knives, helmets, and body armor have been excavated from tombs and settlements where the Ji-Rong people were active. Judging from the appearance of these weapons, historians have concluded that they originated not from the Shang, but from northern nomadic cultures.<sup>76</sup>

Although the Jiang lineage included the Qiang and the Rong peoples as part of their population, they faced the Quanrong as their enemies. Shang oracle-bone inscriptions note that the Quanrong people, like the Shang, hunted the Qiang and used them for sacrificial purposes:<sup>77</sup>

Will [the leader] of Quan[rong] Zhi sacrifice Qiang people to honor [the Shang king ancestor] Da Jia? *Quan Zhi yi Qiang yong yu da jia* 犬止以羌用于大甲 ([存]2755), or Will Quan Hou use Qiang for sacrificial ceremony at ..., *Quan Hou yi Qiang qi yong zi* 犬侯以羌其用自...

This Shang ally had obviously fallen under the strong cultural influence of the Shang in terms of sacrificial ceremony. The name of Quanrong's leader, Zhi or Quan Zhi, continued to appear in the inscriptions of the Shang kings Zu Geng 祖庚 (1188–1178 BCE) and Zu Jia 祖甲 (1177–1158 BCE). At the time, Danfu had left Bin and was about to enter Zhouyuan,<sup>78</sup> and resisting the Quanrong was in the common interest of the Ji-Rong and Jiang-Qiang groups. Danfu married a Jiang woman, Tai Jiang 太姜, who gave birth to Ji Li, although Danfu already had two sons. To ensure the Ji-Jiang alliance, Danfu passed his rulership to Ji Li instead of to Ji Li's two elder half-brothers, Taibo 太伯 and Zhongyong 仲庸.<sup>79</sup> Sima Qian tells us that the two brothers "fled to the lands of the barbarian Jing Man, *ben Jing Man* 奔荆蠻" in southern China and founded the state of Wu, which emerged as a hegemon during the Spring and Autumn period.<sup>80</sup>

While it is true that Gugong Danfu was forced to leave Bin, his plan to rebuild the world for his people was carefully conceived. Sima Qian portrays Danfu as a virtuous but weak man who left behind lands and people because other groups of Rong Di desired them and because he wanted to avoid war and the attendant

76 Wang Kelin 1994: 69.

77 The following inscriptions are cited from Yao Xiaosui & Xiao Ding 2004: 98 & 110.

78 Xie Qi 1986: 91.

79 According to Sima Qian, Taibo and Yuzhong left because they realized that their father intended to pass the throne to Ji Li (*Shiji*. Taibo shijia 1986: 489). Sima Qian arranged the biography of Taibo in the first chapter of the Hereditary Houses to honor their willingness to give the throne to their half-brother.

80 *Shiji*. Taibo shijia 1986: 489.

loss of life.<sup>81</sup> In reality, however, judging from his deeds and successes in shaping Zhouyuan, Danfu truly possessed a strong character. He was determined to ward off threats to his people and prepare for them a secure and stable future. This Zhou ancestor led his people with wisdom and courage to a new stage of development and paved the path to a world of their own, Zhouyuan the beautiful.

The inception of the Zhouyuan identity was a unique event, one that embraced various cultural traditions and socio-political innovations. This new identity was supported by a combination of two cultures: Ji-Rong and Jiang-Qiang.<sup>82</sup> They shaped what modern historians call a Pre-Zhou culture before the Zhou dynasty was formally founded. More settlers came from Bin, mostly the Rong Di, to join Danfu in Zhouyuan. The new identity of Zhouyuan encouraged them to “abandon the Rong Di customs, *bian Rong Di zhi su* 貶戎狄之俗”, as Sima Qian writes.<sup>83</sup> Scholars have interpreted this development as a transformation from the nomadic lifestyle of the Rong Di to a settled semi-agrarian society, living by farming, hunting, and animal husbandry.<sup>84</sup> It involved a full-scale reform movement aimed at state-building based on ethnic diversity in Zhouyuan.

### 3.2 Qiyi 岐邑: a city-state

The core objective of Danfu’s reform was to develop a city, an *yi* 邑, at Qi, as the Shang king had done at Anyang in his domain and at Tang 唐 in southern Shanxi.<sup>85</sup> Sima Qian describes the process of building Qiyi as fairly simple: “Building a walled city and separating the housing units and property. *Yingzhu cheng guo shi wu er yi bie ju zhi* 營筑城郭室屋而邑別居之。”<sup>86</sup> The capital Qiyi was actually meant to be a city-state. It was built according to the model of a Shang *yi* and functioned as a political, economical, and religious center.<sup>87</sup> The 1977–1978 excavation at Zhouyuan offered a comprehensive overview of the structure at Qiyi. Although the excavated Qiyi was rebuilt and expanded during the Western Zhou period (1045–771 BCE), from the reign of King Cheng 成 (1042/35–1006 BCE) to that of King Zhao 昭 (977/75–957 BCE),<sup>88</sup> we can still get some glimpse of

81 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

82 Liu Junshe 1994: 48.

83 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

84 Xu Zhuoyun 1990: 69. In fact, as discussed before, during their three-century long sojourn in Bin, both the Ji lineage and the local Rong Di developed a semi-agrarian society. They were not nomadic. (Ge Yizhi 1991: 125)

85 Hu Houxuan & Hu Zhenyu 2003: 467.

86 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

87 Ma Xin 2010: 35.

88 Yang Kuan 2003: 52.

what it was like during the Zhouyuan era. After decades of work, archaeologists have excavated four palaces: Fengchu Palace in Qishan and three other palaces, Yuntang, Qizhen, and Zhaochen, in Fufeng County.<sup>89</sup> Qiyi was magnificent. It had palaces, a state temple for sacrificial ceremonies, and a center for crafts and industry as separated from agricultural activities.<sup>90</sup> In addition to this layout of the entire settlement, the city was designed to facilitate improved production by opening more wasteland for residential and agricultural purposes.<sup>91</sup>

The construction of palaces and the royal temple for worshipping ancestors and deities took place at the same time.<sup>92</sup> Two specialists, an architect-engineer *sikong* 司空 and a manager for construction, labor, and supplies, *situ* 司徒, were in charge. The palace was separated from the residential areas for commoners.<sup>93</sup> Its grandeur was expressed by the two bold gates, the inner gate Yingmen 應門 and the outer gate Gaomen 皋門.<sup>94</sup> Both the palace and the royal temple were constructed with large quantities of timber for supports and clay for walls. Roads, *xingdao* 行道, were also built connecting one structure with another, while trees and bushes in the way were removed. A sacrificial altar *she* 社 and a burial site *zhongtu* 冢土 were also included.<sup>95</sup> Furthermore, Danfu developed an oligarchic governing system administered by five officials, *zuo wuguan you si* 作五官有司.<sup>96</sup> This can be interpreted or regarded as constituting a complete state bureaucratic system with Danfu as the head and five ministers beneath him.<sup>97</sup>

During the Western Zhou period the walls and surfaces of the foundation of Fengchu Palace were made of a mixture of loess, fine sand, and lime, which lit up the rooms. Zhou people also applied various types of tiles, some of them

89 Du Jinpeng 2009: 435. Yang Kuan offers a drawing attempting to reconstruct the palace of Shaochen (Yang Kuan 2003: 57).

90 Zhouyuan people during the Danfu era produced pottery, agricultural tools, wooden and copper weapons, jade items, and wine (Yang Jianguo & Yang Dongchen 2004: 24).

91 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 395. “*Zhushi yuzi* 築室於茲, *nai zuo nai you* 乃左乃右, *nai jiang nai li* 乃疆乃理, *nai xuan nai mu* 乃宣乃畝。”

92 Scholars have been able to provide a blueprint of the palace at Fengchu, Qishan. It had a rectangular shape with large front and back courtyards. It is estimated that the entire complex was active c.3,100 years ago, in the later years of King Wen. (Du Jinpeng 2009: 437 (blueprint) & 438)

93 Southeast of the palaces mentioned above was an area for craft works. At Yuntang, Qizhen, and Qijia villages, archaeologists have excavated workshops for wares made of pottery, bronze, and bone. Residential areas were located close by. (Yang Kuan 2003: 43)

94 One of Danfu's successors added one more gate, the Lunmen 路門. Later the kings and *zhuhou* of the Western Zhou period built palaces with three gates. (Yang Kuan 2003: 46–47) Yang claims that Gugong Danfu was responsible for pioneering the idea of palace gates.

95 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 396.

96 *Shiji*. Zhou benji. 1986: 72. The Son of Heaven had five ministers, *situ*, *sikong*, *sima*, *sikou*, and *sishi*. (*Liji Quli* b 2007: 57). It is not certain whether Danfu had the latter three ministers.

97 Ge Yizhi 1991: 126.

engraved with symbols. These were the earliest tiles produced in the world.<sup>98</sup> The palace units were equipped with an underground sewage system and an outlet into a pond beyond the eastern part of the palace. The other astonishing discovery at Fengchu Palace was a vast quantity of oracle-bone inscriptions stored in two rooms in a basement. Here were found more than 17,000 pieces of oracle bones from turtles and the scapulae of oxen. By 2009, scholars had deciphered nine hundred three characters on two hundred eighty-nine pieces of bones.<sup>99</sup>

A few oracle-bone inscriptions recorded that the Zhouyuan rulers worshipped the ancestors of Shang kings, a practice the rulers of Shang's federated states usually followed.<sup>100</sup> Modern scholars are confused about the ownership of these bones and wonder why oracle bones of the Shang would appear in Zhouyuan and where exactly the crack-making was practiced. Some claim that the Shang owned the bones and that after the fall of the Shang the survivors, mostly Zhou prisoners of war, brought them to Fengchu. Other scholars argue that the Zhou people themselves practiced crack-making and carefully stored cracked oracle bones as records. There is general agreement that the bones belonged to the Zhouyuan people and that their practice of worshipping the ancestors of Shang kings reflected the Shang's lordship over the Zhouyuan state.<sup>101</sup>

Many people think of bronze vessels in connection with oracle bones. In the 1930s archaeologists excavated pottery, bronzeware, and some bronze tools at the Wali tomb in Doujitai of Baoji County. They discovered, however, that these bronze vessels were mostly for ritual purposes and did not belong to the Zhouyuan period but to the early Western Zhou.<sup>102</sup> Although some of the bronzes were made by the Zhouyuan people themselves, most of them came from the Shang or imitated the Shang style.<sup>103</sup> The earlier-mentioned bronze weapons reflect the influence of northern nomadic culture, but it is not clear if the Zhou ancestors made them. In other words, Zhouyuan people did not have their own bronze culture and did not have their own writing system.<sup>104</sup> There is also no evidence of bronze inscription

---

98 Chen Quanfang 1980: 90.

99 Chen Quanfang 1980: 90.

100 Lin Xiaolan 1983: 224.

101 Yang Shengnan 1987: 16. Cultural expressions in the neighboring areas show great variation. For example, the sites in present-day Xi'an reflect the dominance of Shang culture, ranging from the late Erligang period to the fourth period of the Yinxu culture.

102 Yang Kuan 2003: 52. There is no record of bronze vessels in the archaeological excavation report (Baojishi kaogu gongzuodui 1984: 1–15).

103 Yang Kuan 2003: 53. It was on the eve of the foundation of the Western Zhou that the Zhou people developed bronze-making with their own characteristics.

104 Wang Yuzhe 2003: 472. The *Tian wang gui* 天亡簋 was a product of the post-conquest period. Yang Kuan (2003: 59) lists several bronze items excavated from Zhouyuan and claims that more than a thousand bronze items have been unearthed in that area in the past. However, he

from the excavation sites. Even the idea of the oracle-bone inscriptions excavated at Zhouyuan was borrowed from the Shang. In sum, the whole pre-Zhou culture lagged behind that of the Shang, although later Zhouyuan manifested a dazzling culture of its own after its conquest of Shang.

New and regular houses and public buildings were constructed, but commoners at Zhouyuan continued to live in subterranean houses in quarters separated from their rulers.<sup>105</sup> Subterranean cave housing units have been excavated in the village named Zhengjiapo in Wugong County. Although they were equipped with heating stoves and ventilation channels reaching outside, the single rooms appear to have been very small – no larger than ten square meters. The ground was at least well leveled, however, and these houses seem to have resisted humidity. The quality of life for Zhouyuan commoners was, however, far behind that of their rulers.

### 3.3 The Shang-Zhouyuan relationship

Fengchu Palace was the center of Qiyi, but it also symbolized the pervasive political and cultural influence of the Shang for at least a century when the Zhou ancestors resided in Zhouyuan. Its structure differed from other palaces, although it bore a great similarity to a three-thousand-year old edifice excavated at Laoniupo in the modern city of Xi'an. Scholars have suggested that Laoniupo Palace was the product of Shang expansionism into Shaanxi and Fengchu because of the strong Shang influence it expressed.<sup>106</sup> (Laoniupo, however, could have been built by a Shang ally.) These scholars believe that whichever state occupied Laoniupo was later exterminated by the Zhouyuan people during their eastward advance and conquest of the Shang.

The dominion and privileges of Shang kings over some *fang*-states were demonstrated in various ways. For example, the Shang king would show his concern for the wellbeing of the federated *fang*-state, or the Shang king would demand tribute, give orders, and require assistance when he hunted in their territory. He would hold sacrificial ceremonies there as well.<sup>107</sup> These *fang*-states were his enemies or rivals at first but became Shang's federated states after defeat in battle. King Wu Yi 武乙 (1131–1117 BCE) might have acknowledged Danfu's ownership of Zhouyuan and “bestowed, *ci* 賜” Qiyi upon him.<sup>108</sup> Nevertheless, for nearly a

---

does not say whether they were pre-Zhou or Zhou.

105 Yang Kuan 2003: 658.

106 Du Jipeng 2009: 459.

107 Zhang Jie 2002: 18–19.

108 “In the third year of Wu Yi, the King ordered that Qiyi be awarded to Danfu” (*Guben zhushu jinben zhu shu jinian jijiao* 1997: 103).



century, from Danfu to Xibo, Zhouyuan was never free and independent. Shang's control over Zhou ancestors in the Bin extended to the Zhouyuan period, as evidenced by the content of oracle-bone inscriptions:<sup>109</sup>

Is Zhoufang not going to face disaster? *Zhoufang fu qi you huo* 周方弗其有禍?  
 ([乙] 3536). Zhoufang is not going to have a disaster, *Zhoufang qi wuhuo* 周方  
 其無禍. ([乙] 2170)

Oracle-bone inscriptions also reveal that the Shang king demanded tribute such as sacrificial animals, diviners, and women from the Zhou:

Zhou submitted ten [turtle shells], *Zhou ru shi* 周入十 (乙5452), or  
 Crack-making on *dingsi*. Diviner Zhong 鼎: Is Zhou not to deliver women?  
 Divination: Zhou is not to deliver women. *Dingsi bu Zhong zhen Zhou fu shi*  
 (zhi) qin. *Zhen, Zhou fu shi (zhi) qin* 丁巳卜鼎貞周弗氏(致)嫪. 貞周弗氏(致)  
 嫪. (乙7312)

These inscriptions belonged to the Yinxu culture, but they could be from the post-Wu Ding period. Historians are aware that diviners such as Bin, Gu, and Zhong could have served Wu Ding and his successors, Zu Geng and Zu Jia, after Danfu left the Bin state for Zhouyuan.<sup>110</sup> Moreover, the Shang king had the right to hold sacrificial ceremonies in Zhou's territory:

*Qi jiao yu zhou* 其火交于周. ([後下] 15.2)

This particular sacrificial ceremony, *jiao* 火交, was a prayer for rain that entailed burning a human being, usually a female.<sup>111</sup> The oracle-bone inscription for the burning ceremony looked like a person on the fire, which was transcribed as *jiao* or *liao* 燎, with the wish to reach the will of the divine realm through the ascending smoke.<sup>112</sup> Sometimes the Shang king would entrust a general to hold the sacrificial ceremony for him:

Crack-making on *xinwei*. Diviner Zheng: Should [General] Que be allowed to hold burning sacrifices at the mountain on the morning of *guiyou*? *Xinwei bu Zheng zhen yi guiyou hu que liao yu yue* 辛未卜爭貞翌癸酉呼雀燎于岳? (合集 4112)<sup>113</sup>

109 The following inscriptions are cited from Wang Shenxing 1994: 8–11.

110 Xie Qi 1986: 91.

111 Qiu Xigui 1983: 22.

112 The wish to reach the gods, one's ancestors, or the dead through the ascension of smoke was a common feature of the sacrificial ceremony in imperial China (Wu 2002: 33).

113 The inscription is derived from Lin Xiaolan 1983: 286.

Some modern historians have claimed that Zhouyuan rulers pioneered the idea of worshipping Heaven, which replaced the high deities believed in by the Shang people. This unique innovation of Zhou religion entailed an inclusive meaning, namely the concept of Heaven having embraced Shang's high deities during its formative years.<sup>114</sup> The character Heaven, 天 *tian*, once appeared on an incomplete oracle bone inscription found in Zhouyuan, for example: "River, sacrifice to Heaven, will not have disaster 川(河)告于天惠亡咎?" (H11: 96)<sup>115</sup> Later it had become a state ceremony for the Zhou to hold sacrifices to worship Heaven in a royal temple erected on a mountain, and Mount Qi was chosen for this.<sup>116</sup> After the Zhou dynasty was founded, the Zhou people worshipped Heaven and their ancestor, Houji, instead of the ancestors of the Shang.<sup>117</sup>

The Shang-Zhouyuan relationship experienced a dramatic turn when Danfu's son, Ji Li, succeeded to the throne during the reigns of Wu Yi and Wen Ding 文丁 (1116–1106 BCE). Sima Qian volunteers very little information about Ji Li, stating only that Ji Li followed his father's policies, ruled with justice, and won support of all the lords, *zhuhou* 諸侯.<sup>118</sup> Other historical records such as the *Hou Han shu* and the *Old Bamboo Annals* (*Guben zhushu jinian* 古本竹書紀年), however, offer more fragments of information about Ji Li's rise and fall. According to the *Old Bamboo Annals*, King Wu Yi in his later years enfeoffed Ji Li with land and awarded him jade and horses before allowing him to subdue several different Rong groups.<sup>119</sup> Modern historians suspect that Ji Li served as a diviner during the Wu Yi and Wen Ding periods;<sup>120</sup> it was common practice for the ruler of a federated *fang*-state to serve as a diviner to the Shang king.<sup>121</sup> The Li group of oracle-bone inscriptions discovered at Yinxu belong to the period of the said two kings, and coincidentally they had only one diviner named Li.<sup>122</sup>

Ji Li's consolidation of power could have been associated with his marriage to a Shang woman named Da Ren 大任.<sup>123</sup> Da Ren gave birth to Chang (later

114 Li Shaolian 1990: 13.

115 This inscription is cited from Wang Yuxin 1984: 102.

116 Wang Guisheng 2008: 100–101.

117 Zhang Hequan 1990: 13.

118 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

119 Fan Ye 2010: 2870; Wang Xianqian 2006: 969; *Guben zhushu jinian yizhu* 1990: 52–54. The text referred to Ji Li as the Zhou king, *zhou wang*, and Shang King Wen Ding as Tai Ding 太丁.

120 Ding Shan 2008: 147.

121 Li Xueshan 2005: 284.

122 Xiao Nan 1980: 49. The inscriptions in the Li-group of the periods of Wu Yi and Wen Ding concern warfare and agriculture. They bear information about wars, mostly against the Zhi-*fang* 旨方 and other *fang*-states, that does not appear in the Bin-group inscriptions of the Wu Ding period. (Zhang Yongshan & Luo Kun 1984: 88–89)

123 *Shijing quanyi* 1981: 391. The text was "Zhibizhongshi ren, zi bi Yin Shang 摯仲氏任自彼殷商",

Xibo, or King Wen), who became Ji Li's successor. Ji Li's conquest continued into the era of the new Shang king, Wen Ding, who then awarded him the Shang title Military Governor, *mushi* 牧師.<sup>124</sup> Modern scholars claim that during Ji Li's reign, the Zhou people had already expanded their territory out of Shaanxi and advanced eastward into Shanxi (close to Shang territory) because the various Rong groups Ji Li had subdued were in the Shanxi area.<sup>125</sup> They also believe that Ji Li's ambition and success aroused the ire of King Wen Ding, who summoned Ji Li and had him killed.<sup>126</sup>

Ji Li's demise, nevertheless, could have already begun during the reign of Wu Yi, who, according to the *Shiji*, had died "at the confluence of the Yellow and Wei Rivers",<sup>127</sup> that is, in Zhouyuan territory. Modern scholars interpret the death of the Shang king as a consequence of war: Wu Yi was killed when he launched an expedition against the Zhouyuan.<sup>128</sup> Shang's new king, Wen Ding, might have acknowledged Ji Li's role at first with the intention of winning him over to serve Shang interests. (He was successful at this, as mentioned above.) He did, however, have Ji Li killed at the last moment before he himself passed away, probably to eliminate a potential threat to his successor, King Di Yi 帝乙 (1105–1087 BCE).

While we grapple with making sense of pre-Zhou history based on information from late Shang oracle-bone inscriptions at Yinxu, the inscriptions on Zhouyuan oracle bones illuminate the darkness for us, even though only four pieces of oracle bones were pertinent to the Shang-Zhouyuan relationship have been discovered so far.<sup>129</sup> One of them is of particular interest:

Divination. Will the [Shang] King<sup>130</sup> pray to ancestor Da Jia for blessing the event of enfeoffment of Li (?) as *Zhou fangbo* at Tianzheng (?). Will he receive

---

which made it clear that Daren was from the Zhizhong lineage of the Shang. Scholars have different opinions with regard to her state. Yin Shengping claims that she was from the Ren lineage that ruled Zhi state in present-day Henan and was descended from the Xia, in other words, an enemy state of the Shang. (Yin Shengping 2005: 599)

124 *Guben zhushu jinian yizhu* 1990: 52–54. In a total of five battles he was defeated only once. I assume that the title *mu* came from the term *jiu mu* 九牧, which means nine governors, and that *shi* is related to military affairs. The Zhou dynasty had the Six Troops, *liu shi*, and the Eight Troops, *ba shi*. Li Xueqin 1987: 210.

125 Yin Shengping 2005: 600.

126 This was in the eleventh year of Wen Ding, just before his death (*Guben zhushu jinian yizhu* 1990: 54).

127 *Shiji*. Yin benji 1986: 68. Sima Qian reports that King Wu Yi was stricken by lightning and died during a hunting excursion.

128 Ding Shan 2008: 148. Ding Shan provided several oracle-bone inscriptions indicating that King Wu Yi was a militant ruler who launched several expeditions against various *fang*-states.

129 Chang Yaohua 2002: 94.

130 Li Xueqin (1988a: 72) claims that the king here could only have been from the Shang, not the Zhou. Xu Xitai (1988: 59), however, concludes that the king was a Zhou king who prayed to

protection, [or not]? *Zhen: wang qi ju you da jia, ce zhou fang bo li (?) tian zheng, bu zuo yu shou you you* 貞王其舉(祈)又(佑)大甲冊口周方伯歷(?)田正不左于受有佑.<sup>131</sup>

Identifying the Shang king and Zhou Fangbo is a challenge because the name Zhou Fangbo engraved on the bone is indecipherable. Scholars have offered two speculations about this; one suggests that it was King Wu Ding, who enfeoffed Gugong Danfu's father, Zhu Li 諸歷, the Zhou Fangbo, because the inscription Li (?) was part the name of Zhu Li;<sup>132</sup> the other claims that King Di Xin enfeoffed Xibo, because *bo* was a title similar to *fangbo*.<sup>133</sup> Thus far there has therefore been no agreement about Li's (?) identity. Should the indecipherable name of Zhou Fangbo turn out to be the "Li", I would assume that Ji Li was very likely the Zhou Fangbo. The second major dispute is over the interpretation of the character *ce* 冊口, with a "mouth 口" beneath it, which differs from the usual *ce* 冊. Scholars have argued over the positive or negative meaning of the former *ce*. Was the Shang king to enfeoff or remove Zhou Fangbo?<sup>134</sup> This question is also still being debated.

#### 4. THE ZHOU PEOPLE

The reign of Xibo, Ji Li's son and successor, corresponded to the reigns of Shang kings Di Yi and Di Xin. This was the time that the Zhou ancestors in Zhouyuan finally emerged from the shadow of the Rong Di, and according to the *Shiji* a new element of "Chineseness" was added to their identity, namely the devotion to benefitting the people, or to the greater good, *gong* 功. This complemented classical virtues such as kindness, respect, and compassion,<sup>135</sup> and Xibo fostered these new qualities in his people. The people of Zhouyuan thus had shaped their

the Shang ancestor Da Jia. I am certain that Xu is mistaken here because Zhou Fangbo was mentioned at the same time. He could not have been the king who prayed.

131 There is an original copy of this inscription in Shaanxi Zhouyuan kaogudui 1979: 43, Image no. 13.

132 Fan Yuzhou 1981: 15. Fan's argument is based on the commentary of *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72. Commentator Huangfu Mi 皇甫謐 explains that Dafu's father, Gongshu Zulei 公叔祖頹, was also called Zhu Li. Fan's argument is anachronistic because Danfu's father should have lived in the era of Bin, not Zhouyuan.

133 Wang Yuxin 1983: 357.

134 Li Xueqin (1988a: 72) concludes that this character *ce* with a "mouth" beneath it should be interpreted as enfeoffment, *dian* 典, like the regular *ce*. Qing scholar Duan Yucai 段玉裁 perceived *ce* to mean awarding enfeoffment, while *ce* with a "mouth" beneath it meant to remove the enfeoffment (Ma Rusen 2008: 114 no. 0345).

135 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73. Pulleyblank (1983: 421) explains that the transition from Shang to Zhou was a continuation of cultural "Sinification" that "created the necessary basis for the Zhou to supplant the Shang as overlords of the merging civilization".

identity and received recognition from the Shang people (according to Sima Qian), who then acknowledged Zhouyuan as the *tianxia* of the Zhou people *Zhou ren* 周人.<sup>136</sup> Xibo's new virtues qualified him for the Mandate of Heaven, which Sima Qian perceived as the sign of a king, *wang rui* 王瑞. When several men of dignity, *shi* 士 such as Bo Yi 伯夷 and Shu Qi 叔齊 allied with him, and when worthy people from the four directions sought to follow him,<sup>137</sup> Xibo's leadership was well consolidated. With its human-centered approach, the historical development of the Zhouyuan state assumed a new and unique direction.

#### 4.1 The formation of Zhou Chinese culture

Research on the Bamboo Strips of Chu (acquired and collected by Qinghua University in Beijing in 2008)<sup>138</sup> offers a new perspective on Xibo's cultivation of "Chineseness". Among these Warring States period bamboo strips, the Baoxun 保訓 text stands out because it contains the instructions of King Wen to his son just before his own death, although according to a scientific test, the bamboo strips were prepared around 305 to 330 BC.<sup>139</sup> The Baoxun text in general corresponds with the core of Confucian political ideals as developed a few centuries later. The concept of the Middle (Way) *zhong* 中 (interpreted as *zhongdao* 中道) appears frequently on these bamboo strip texts and embraces the three-dimensional meaning of the "Middle Way": individual self-restraint, respecting the will of the people, and ruling the state with justice, "*zi ji jue zhi, buwei yu shuwanxing zhi duoyu* 自稽厥志不違于庶萬姓之多欲". These concepts later formed the backbone of Chinese political culture.<sup>140</sup> The concept of the "Middle Way" was incorporated into Confucian ideals and is reflected in well-known phrases such as holding to the Middle [Way], "*yun zhi qi zhong* 允執其中" found in the Analects.<sup>141</sup>

The contribution of the Zhou people in pioneering a unique cultural identity based on civility *wen* 文 for the Chinese was celebrated by Confucius: "Oh! what a glorious civil culture! I want to follow the Way of the Zhou, *yu yu hu wen zai, wu*

136 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73.

137 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72. These men, such as Tai Dian, Hong Yao, Sanyisheng, Xinjia, and Yuzi, came from north, west, east, and south of Zhouyuan, and this symbolically reflected support for Xibo on all sides.

138 Qinghua daxue chutu wenxian yanjiu yu baohu zhongxin 2009: 73–75. The Baoxun text was written on eleven bamboo strips, each bearing twenty-two to twenty-four characters (although some were missing or damaged). In total there were 242–264 characters.

139 Lin Zhipeng 2010.

140 Li Junming 2009: 11; Li Xueqin 2009: 77.

141 *Lunyu jin zhu jin yi* 1984: 300.

*cong zhou* 乎文哉吾從周!”<sup>142</sup> The Confucian emphasis on *wen* could be related to King Wen, as when Confucius explained, “After the death of King Wen, I chose to carry on the civil culture tradition, *wen wang ji mo, wen bu zai zi hu* 文王既沒文不在茲乎.”<sup>143</sup> The idea of cultivating people instead of coercing or suppressing them was indeed rooted in the practices and teachings of the early Zhou.<sup>144</sup> Thus, the three concepts of benefiting the people (the greater good *gong*), civility/*wen*, and the Middle Way *Zhong* constituted the core of Zhou Chinese culture.

#### 4.2 The early Zhou-Shang relationship

In two different chapters of the *Shiji*, Sima Qian offers contradictory observations regarding Xibo’s relationship with the Shang. In the Basic Annals of Yin he stated that Xibo, Jiu Hou 九侯, and E Hou 鄂侯 served King Di Xin as three “Rulers *gong* 公”. When Di Xin killed Jiu Hou and E Hou, Xibo sighed (to express his sorrow) in secret. Hu 虎, Marquis of Chong 崇, heard of this and reported on it to the King, who then had Xibo imprisoned at Youli.<sup>145</sup> In the Basic Annals of Zhou, however, Sima Qian offers another reason for Xibo’s imprisonment: Xibo was too popular among the *zhuhou* due to his accumulation of good deeds, just as Hu, Marquis of Chong, had warned the King.<sup>146</sup>

Sima Qian was also confused by Xibo’s release, the circumstances of which he describes in the Basic Annals of Yin:

Xibo’s followers, such as Hong Yao and others, sought out beautiful women, rare treasures, and fine horses and offered them to Di Xin. Xibo was therefore pardoned and released. Xibo then turned over the land west of the Luo River to the Shang and requested in return that the King abolish the punishment of roasting people on a rack. Di Xin agreed and bestowed upon him weapons such as bows, arrows, small axes, and battle-axes. Xibo was made Lord of the West and received the privilege of chastising rebels.<sup>147</sup>

In the Basic Annals of Zhou, however, Sima Qian states that Xibo offered Di Xin the land west of the Luo River after he had received the weapons and the

142 *Lunyu jin zhu jin yi* 1984: 36.

143 *Lunyu jin zhu jin yi* 1984: 127.

144 Many texts expressing this idea can be found in the *Book of Documents* and the Remainder of the Zhou Documents (*Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 257–269; *Yi Zhou shu quanyi* 2000: 56 & 90).

145 *Shiji*. Yin benji 1986: 69. Youli, also called Yongli, is located in present-day Tangyin County in Henan (Chen Quanfang 1992: 4).

146 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

147 *Shiji*. Yin benji 1986: 69.

privilege of chastising rebels from the king.<sup>148</sup> Here he does not mention Xibo being made Lord of the West.

The length of Xibo's imprisonment varies in historical records, ranging from about one hundred days to seven years.<sup>149</sup> What matters, however, in pre-Zhou history is what Xibo accomplished after his release. Back in Zhouyuan, Xibo employed a dual foreign policy: continuing good relations with the Shang through submission and forbearance on the other hand and, on the other, consolidating and expanding his relations with allied states. Oracle-bone inscriptions excavated in Zhouyuan record that the ruler of Zhouyuan wished to hold a sacrificial ceremony to honor an ancestor of the Shang royal house, Tang:<sup>150</sup>

On the *guisi*. Is the Shao ceremony to be held by King [Wen] in the temple of Wen Wu Di Yi [King Di Yi] to honor [King] Cheng Tang *Guizi yi Wen Wu Di Yi zong zhen wang qi Shao ji cheng tang* 癸子(巳)彝文武帝乙宗貞王其邵祭成唐(湯)

Although the identity of the king in this inscription is disputed, some scholars have held that it belonged to the period of Xibo.<sup>151</sup> The historical significance of this event is that the Zhouyuan people built a temple to honor Shang kings, thus reflecting the lordship of the Shang over Zhouyuan.

Xibo's strategy of winning support from allied states employed not only virtue but also compromise at the expense of the weak. He and his allies reached an agreement to surrender escaped slaves to the original master after capture.<sup>152</sup> (I assume that Xibo's world defined justice and fairness from the perspective of ownership – the lords owned the slaves, and therefore when they escaped the other states, these states were obliged to return them to their rightful owner after they had been captured.) Xibo spent many years cultivating his power and influence by strengthening Zhouyuan connections with rulers of other states. According to Sima Qian, Xibo's sense of justice and virtue won him great support from the *zhuhou*, who "all came to him to have cases decided without bias".<sup>153</sup> In other words, they looked up to him as if he were their lord. The request of the two states, Yu 虞 and Rui 芮, for Xibo to settle a legal case confirmed Xibo's ability and Zhouyuan's authority,

148 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 72.

149 The *Zuozhuan* records the earliest the imprisonment of King Wen for seven years (*Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*. Xiang 31. Vol. I, 2006: 43).

150 The inscription is cited from Xu Xitai 1988: 11.

151 Li Xueqin 1988a: 69.

152 *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*. Zhao 7. Vol. IV, 2006: 1284. "Zhou wenwang zhi fa yue, you wang huangyue, suoyi de tianxia ye 周文王之法曰有亡荒闕所以得天下也." The phrase *you wang huangyue* is regarded as a general search for, or hunting down of, escaped slaves (Wang Shenxing 1994: 14).

153 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73.

and modern historians regard this as a watershed in Xibo's policies towards Shang. A series of campaigns against the neighboring states and the Rong Di followed, culminating in Xibo's attack on Shang. With support from allied states Yu and Rui, which controlled a strategic location on the route to Shang,<sup>154</sup> Zhouyuan seized an opportunity to secure eastward military advancement.

#### 4.3 The Zhou marches east

Sima Qian narrates the series of Xibo's campaigns as follows:

On the following year he subdued [his old archenemy] Quanrong. The next year he attacked Mixu 密須. One year later he defeated the Ji 劓 [also known as Qi 耆 or Li 黎] state.<sup>155</sup> The year after that he destroyed the state of Yu 邶 [or 孟]. The next year he seized the state of Chong. In the end he built a city, Feng, and relocated his capital to this new city.<sup>156</sup>

Modern scholars are in agreement about the sequence of the conquests of states Sima Qian gives, and they also concur that Xibo did conquer five states within five years.<sup>157</sup> From a geographical and strategic point of view, Xibo first secured his rear by subduing Quanrong and Mixu and then advanced eastward to conquer the states lined up on the route from Zhouyuan to Shang's border in southern Shanxi and western Henan.<sup>158</sup>

The founder of Mixu was not from the Rong Di but from the Ji 媯 lineage, a line of the Great Yu's descendants.<sup>159</sup> The state of Mixu existed during the Xia and Shang periods, and Xibo conquered it because it grew powerful. Xibo did not destroy the state of Mixu after his victory but relocated its people and reappointed his own relative to rule Mixu. In the 1970s archaeologists excavated twenty-three tombs and found that their contents reflect one hundred fifty years of Zhou dominance, from the period of King Wu to that of King Gong 共 (917/15–900 BCE), in the Mixu area. Many large bronzeware items were unearthed.

Recent studies of the Bamboo Strips of Chu identify nine states (not five as previously thought) that resisted Xibo's advances at first but ultimately switched

154 Wang Hui 2003: 147. Yu and Rui controlled the Tongguan and Yaohanguan passes.

155 The state of Qi is regarded as the Li state by Li Min and Wang Jian, annotators of the *Book of Documents* (*Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 184). The Li state, a Shang ally, was located in Shanxi (*Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 185, fn. 2).

156 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73.

157 Yang Dongcheng 1994: 28. Yang claims that except for the Quanrong, the five states were non-Rong Di.

158 Wang Shenxing 1994: 17.

159 Yang Dongcheng 1994: 28. The following information about Mixu comes from this essay.



sides to help him attack Shang after they themselves had been defeated by Xibo. Feng and Hao were recorded as two of the nine states, “*Feng Hao bu fu, Wen Wang nai qi shi xiang* 豐鎬不服文王乃起師向”.<sup>160</sup> The remaining seven states were Mixu, Li (Qi), Yu, Chong, Lu 鹿, Ba, and Zhou 舟. The identities of the last three states are unknown.

The Li state was located two or three hundred *li* west of Shang. The Shang king inquired several times about wars against Li.

Divination: Attacking Li for the second time. *Zhen er fa Li* 貞二伐利[黎] (合集7043) Divination: Attacking Li for the third time. *Zhen san fa Li* 貞三伐利[黎] (合集7044)

After the victory Li became one of Shang’s federated states. King Wu Ding enfeoffed one of his sons as the ruler of Li and built a city there.<sup>161</sup>

[The King was] in the city of Li. *Yu Li yi* 于利[黎]邑 (西甲11:42)<sup>162</sup>

When Xibo campaigned against the Li, *Xibo kan li* 西伯勘黎, the Shang court reacted with panic. “Out of great fear, Zu Yi 祖伊 rushed to report to King Zhou. *Zu Yi kong, ben gao yu Zhou* 祖伊恐奔告於紂”,<sup>163</sup> because Li had been an important Shang city for a century. Sima Qian states that Di Xin did not react to the warning of his official. The modern scholar Wang Jian, however, believes that Di Xin relocated the Shang capital to Chaoge 朝歌, south of Anyang 安陽, in response to the crisis in Li or after the initiation of the battle at Yu by Xibo.<sup>164</sup> Chaoge is strategically easier to defend than Anyang and was located at the western side of the Yellow River and close to the militarily stronger ally, the Chong 崇 state. The *Zuo zhuan* records that Shang was facing another threat from the Yi 夷 people to the east, who took advantage of Shang’s crisis in Li and invaded Shang.<sup>165</sup> Historical documents do not reveal the Shang king’s decision during the time of crisis from both east and west. However, Xibo quickly moved on to take the state of Yu for reinforcement before the Shang counterattacked.

Yu was originally a non-Shang state, and Shang kings fought several battles to subdue it. Oracle-bone inscriptions from the Di Yi and Di Xin periods bear relevant information. For example, the king inquired about his conquest against the Yu state, the leader of which was named Yan, “*wei wang lai zheng yu fangbo Yan* 惟

160 Shen Jianhua 2005: 273.

161 Yang Dongchen 1994: 31.

162 The inscriptions are derived from Shen Jianhua 2005: 276.

163 *Shiji*. Yin benji 1986: 69 & Zhou benji 1986: 73.

164 Wang Jian 1988: 19.

165 *Chunqiu zuozhuan zhu*. Zhao 4. Vol. 4, 2006: 1252.

王來征孟方伯炎”。<sup>166</sup> After subjugation, the Yu was incorporated into the Greater Shang and became one of the Shang’s economic centers. Located at the foothills of the Taihang Mountains, it was Shang’s major source of rice and other agricultural products.<sup>167</sup> Oracle-bone inscriptions frequently record that the Shang King Di Yi or Di Xin prayed for rain for the state of Yu and that he personally went hunting there.<sup>168</sup> Yu also became an important political and military base for Shang, which often sent out troops to attack other *fang*-states via Yu. At Yu, Shang built a palace with an architectural style called *yuting* 孟廳 for the king’s temporary stays.<sup>169</sup> After Xibo seized Yu, Zhouyuan troops overcame Shang’s defenses in the region and secured Xibo’s financial needs for war against the Shang.

From Li and Yu, Xibo’s troops could oversee Shang’s capitals Anyang and Chaoge. However, he did not engage Shang again but instead turned south to seize the state of Chong.<sup>170</sup> Xibo’s decision to invade Chong was not motivated by vengeance against its leader, Marquis Hu of Chong, for his defamatory report that caused Xibo’s imprisonment, at least according to the *Shiji*. It was, rather, rooted in valid strategic considerations. Chong was in fact Shang’s final defensive outpost to the south and southwest. If Xibo seized the Shang capital right after his conquests of Li and Yu, Marquis Hu of Chong, who had served the Shang king with great loyalty, could easily have attacked him from the rear and sabotaged his campaign. On the other hand, if Xibo could bring Chong under control after the wars against Li and Yu, his army could surround and attack the Shang from the west and south, a course that could more likely have achieved victory.

The battle at Chong was fought with great ferocity. With its high and thick walls, Chong was difficult to seize. Xibo spent three months in this attack, using ladders, heavy wagons, and other siege weapons.<sup>171</sup> Finally the Zhou army won the victory, but at the cost of Xibo’s life: he died the year following the battle.<sup>172</sup>

---

166 This inscription is derived from Li Xueqin 1959: 93. Li speculates that the conquest was led by Di Xin. Yu was located in present-day Qinyang County, Henan. Note that the leader of the Yu, Yan, also carried the title of a *fangbo*, which revealed their status as Shang federated states.

167 Li Xueqin 1959: 23.

168 The Shang king’s hunting activity included training military troops (Meng Shikai 1983: 204).

169 Cheng Feng 1999: 93.

170 Chong’s ancestors could be traced back to the Great Yu, founder of the Xia dynasty. The Chong people migrated and settled on Mount Chong in Shanxi and Mount Song in Henan. This division might be the reason for disputes among modern scholars who believe that Chong was located in southern Shanxi or in Song County of Henan. (Chen Changyuan 1992: 23) After the fall of the Xia, the state of Chong became a strong ally of the Shang and served Shang kings faithfully (He Guangyue 1991: 124).

171 Ma Shizhi 1989: 21. For a description of the battle at Chong, see *Shijing quanyi*. Daya. Huangyi 1981: 407–408.

172 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73.

It is uncertain whether Xibo attacked Shang after Chong. One more piece of evidence might explain the possible cause of Xibo's death. According to recent studies of the Bamboo Strips of Chu mentioned above, Xibo launched an attack on Shang with nine states, including the Chong.<sup>173</sup> If the interpretation of Shen Jianhua is correct, Xibo invaded the Shang and died after he had conquered the Chong and made it his ally.

The *Shiji* does not record all battles Xibo fought. Oracle-bone inscriptions excavated at Zhouyuan reveal Xibo's campaigns in the areas to the south of Zhouyuan before he turned eastward. This move to the south was strategically understandable because Xibo needed the military resources available there and had to secure Zhouyuan's rear when he marched east. According to the inscriptions, the Zhou king inquired about the invasions of the Zhouyuan army against the Shu 蜀 and Chao 巢. Unfortunately, the two brief characters on each bone, *fa Shu* 伐蜀 and *zheng Chao* 征巢, provide very little information about these states.<sup>174</sup> Modern scholars can only assume that they were located along the banks of the Han River 漢水, a major tributary to the Yangzi River and an important waterway linking north and south China.<sup>175</sup> Nevertheless, Shu and Chao are notable in Zhou history. Shu was a member of the alliance of eight ethnic powers that followed King Wu to conquer Shang, as will be discussed below. Chao remained committed to the cause of the Zhou dynasty until Chao was destroyed by the state of Wu during the Spring and Autumn period.<sup>176</sup>

With Xibo's ultimate success, Zhouyuan's sphere of influence expanded eastward into Shang territory in central Henan and southern Shanxi and westward into Shaanxi and Gansu.<sup>177</sup> Xibo laid a solid foundation for his son and successor Fa (King Wu) to launch attacks on Shang two years after Xibo's death and to bring it to its end quickly. Did King Di Xin give King Wu the vital opportunity for conquest because the Shang king reacted with ignorance and became more abusive after he learned about the death of Xibo, as Sima Qian narrates? In fact, King Di Xin might have been engaged in war against the Yifang 夷方 or Renfang 人方 in the east after Xibo returned to the west.<sup>178</sup> Both oracle-bone and bronze

173 Shen Jianhua 2005: 277.

174 Chen Quanfang 1988: 148.

175 Fan Yuzhou 1981: 19.

176 Li Zhonglin 2006: 78.

177 Wang Shenxing 1994: 18.

178 Li Xueqin 1959: 37–40 & 46. Most Chinese historians believe that Yifang was the same as Renfang 人方. Huang Lihong, however, attributes all Shang campaigns against Yifang to Di Xin. He records that Di Xin launched the wars during the fourth, tenth, fifteenth, twentieth, twenty-first, and twenty-second years of his reign. I am not certain about the accuracy of his dates, but the fact that Di Xin launched campaigns against Yifang over three consecutive years could be connected

inscriptions document in detail the wars of the Shang king Di Yi against his eastern enemies in Renfang, and King Di Xin continued this task.<sup>179</sup> The inscription on the bronze ware Zuoce Pan Yan 作冊盤鬲 records that the Shang king successfully subdued Renfang and captured its leader, Wuzi 無茲. The Shang king killed Wuzi in a sacrificial ceremony and engraved his title, *Ren fangbo* 人方伯, on his skull. Modern historian Wang Guanying speculates that this was possibility done after the campaign of King Di Xin against the Renfang.<sup>180</sup>

Seizing the opportunity of Shang's engagement in the east, King Wu mobilized his forces and marched east. Twice he led his Zhouyuan troops and convened his *zhuhou* alliance at Mengjin, in the ninth and eleventh years of his reign,<sup>181</sup> before he launched a full-scale assault at the Battle of Muye and advanced to Chaoge.<sup>182</sup> Edward Shaughnessy's essay determines the date when this great event took place and narrates the subsequent mopping-up operations against the states, which struggled to reverse the fate of the doomed Shang while the Zhou army was returning to its homeland.<sup>183</sup> Shaughnessy highlights the authenticity and value of two written historical resources, the *Remainder of the Zhou Documents* and *Bamboo Annals*, which had been underappreciated by scholars but which have proven indispensable for understanding early Zhou history.

It is true, as Shaughnessy has put it, that modern scholars are excited whenever new evidence is unearthed, whether a piece of bronze, an oracle bone, or a bamboo strip inscription. The above-mentioned Bamboo Strips of Chu offer two long-hidden pieces of information regarding the location of Mengjin and whence King Wu launched the attack on Chaoge. Scholars have not yet paid much attention to these important clues. I hope that my analysis will help locate this historical place and more or less settle the millennium-long dispute. The text on bamboo strip no. 512 of "Rongchengshi 容成氏" says:<sup>184</sup>

---

to the campaigns of Xibo and King Wu of Zhou. (Huang Lihong & Wu Jinsheng 2000: 19–20)

179 Wu 2011: forthcoming.

180 Wang Guanying 1994: 45.

181 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73. Sima Qian did not specify the year of King Wu's reign. The numbers nine and eleven here appear to refer to the second and fourth years of King Wu's reign, since King Wu continued the official seven-year reign of his father beyond his death. (Liu Qiyi 1996: 22–23)

182 Scholars have expressed different opinions regarding the distance between Muye and Chaoge, ranging from seventeen to seventy *li*. However, they all agree that King Wu's army attacked Chaoge from the south on a stormy and rainy day. (Chen Changyuan 1988: 35)

183 Shaughnessy 1997: 54, 31–68 & 69–100.

184 Rongchengshi was from one of the lineage-tribes under the Yellow Emperor and served as a scribe, *shiguan* 史官. The Rongcheng lineage later built the Yong state, which joined King Wu's alliance. After the founding of the Zhou dynasty, the Yong state was under the suzerainty of Guan Shu 管叔. It was annexed by the Chu during the Spring and Autumn period. Rongchengshi thereafter served the Chu court. (Yang Dongchen 1995: 34–35)

On the *wuwu* day,<sup>185</sup> [King Wu] thus led a thousand war wagons covered with leather, *ge che* 革車, and ten thousand armed soldiers, crossed at Mengjin, and reached between the Gong and Teng, whence three armies launched a full-scale attack. [*Wu Wang*] *shi hu zuowei geche qiansheng, daijia anren, wuwu zhi ri, sheyu mengjin, zhiyu Gong Teng zhi jian, sanjun dafan* [武王]是乎作為革車千乘帶甲萬人戊午之日涉于孟津至于共滕之間三軍大犯。<sup>186</sup>

The description of the army in this text varies slightly from the narrative of Sima Qian, who describes only King Wu's army of three hundred wagons from the Rong, *rong che* 戎車, three thousand elite vanguard warriors (*huben* 虎奮), and forty-five thousand soldiers.<sup>187</sup> The *rong*-wagon carried weapons during battle. The driver stood in the front of the wagon, and it carried drums and gongs in addition to weapons, a practice the Chinese learned from the Rong people.<sup>188</sup> I believe that the *huben*-warriors wore tiger-masks and protective armor and built a unit of ten men followed by one Rong-wagon, in a ratio of ten men to one wagon.

The texts of the Bamboo Strips of Chu confirm the existence of Mengjin and verify Sima Qian's account. Mengjin's location has been a topic of dispute, but modern scholars mostly agree that it was located along the southern bank of Yellow River. Muye was located between Gong 共 and Teng 滕, where the decisive battle was fought. Gong and Teng were two cities of the state of Wey 衛 during the Spring and Autumn period.<sup>189</sup> Gong could also refer to the Mount Gong, or Gongtoushan 共頭山, which is located nine *li* north of present-day Hui county in Henan.<sup>190</sup> Teng was located northwest of Hui County. It was originally occupied by the Teng lineage, a line of descendants of the Yellow Emperor. After the conquest, King Wu bestowed upon his half-brother, Shu Xiu 叔秀, the Teng lineage. The Ji lineage subsequently ruled the Teng in Henan until Duke Dan of

185 There are more than fifty different estimates of the date, ranging from the twelfth century BC to the late eleventh century BC. Edward Shaughnessy (1997: 54) gives the date as 9 January 1045. Shaughnessy also states that King Wu's army marched for sixty days from Mengjin to Muye. Yang Kuan (2003: 89) claims, however, that it should have taken no more than ten days, judging from the distance of about 300 *li* and marching approximately 50 *li* per day.

186 Cited from Yu Kai 2006: 20.

187 *Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 73. *Huben* is the same as *Huchen* 虎臣 that appeared in bronze inscriptions referring to the royal army, the duty of which was to protect the king and the palace. *Huben* could be sent to invade other states as vanguard troops. The main source of *huben* was warriors captured from non-Zhou groups. (Wang Xiang 1960: 34–35)

188 Wang Xianqian 2006: 1309.

189 Gu Zuyu 1981: 2118. Gong belonged to Wei during the Warring States period. Under the Han dynasty it became Gong County and remained a county through the Tang and Song periods. Xunzi named more places where King Wu might have passed on his way to Muye after crossing Mengjin, such as Si 汜, Huai 懷, Qi 戚, and Baiquan 百泉. (Wang Xianqian 2007: 135)

190 Chen Changyuan 1988: 34. Chen, however, disputes the existence of the conference at Mengjin.

Zhou 周公旦 suppressed the rebellion in the east, at which point the Teng was relocated to Shangdong.<sup>191</sup>

According to historical accounts, the Battle of Muye was not excessively brutal. Historians have been more surprised by the speed of the Zhou victory, which was achieved within one day even though the Zhou army was badly outnumbered and the Shang king was prepared for its arrival.<sup>192</sup> Most scholars have agreed that in addition to the well-planned conquest from the Zhou side, an internal struggle in the Shang government and the defection of its allied forces were the root causes of their defeat. I, on the other hand, attribute the Zhou's victory to the uniqueness of King Wu's strike force, which embraced great ethnic diversity. In addition to his own Zhouyuan army, King Wu rallied support from the people of the allied states led by *zhuhou*<sup>193</sup> and eight ethnic powers, such as the Yong 庸, Shu,<sup>194</sup> Qiang, Wei 微, Mao 髦, Lu 廬, Peng 澎, and Pu 濮.<sup>195</sup> King Wu's ways in warfare originated in his allied ethnic groups, including their soldiers, their martial arts,<sup>196</sup> *rong*-wagons, and weapons.<sup>197</sup> They danced to motivate the troops and to encourage their spirits. After the conquest, Zhouyuan remained the political, economic, and cultural center of the Zhou dynasty, although King Wu moved the capital to Hao 鎬. Zhou's ancestral place, Bin, continued to be an important military outpost in the northwest part of the Zhou.<sup>198</sup>

191 He Guangyue 1996: 65. The Ji Teng 姬滕 in Shandong was politically weak during the Warring States period. It was eventually annexed by the Song, but culturally it became famous due to the conversation between Duke Wen of Teng and Mengzi (*Mengzi yizhu* 2000: 149–180)

192 Wang Yuzhe 2003: 492. It was said that the Shang king had sent out seventy thousand men.

193 The *zhuhou* probably numbered more than eight hundred (*Shiji*. Zhou benji 1986: 74). The leaders of the allied states were called *you bang zhong jun* 友邦冢君 (*Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 204)

194 There were obviously two Shu states involved in the conquest. The Shu that supported King Wu's conquest must have been the state to the south of Zhouyuan that was subdued by Xibo, as previously mentioned. The other Shu was conquered by King Wu on his return home according to the *Yi Zhou shu*. (*Yi Zhou shu quanyi* 2000: 143) Li Xueqin (1988b: 3) notes that this Shu state must have been in Henan, not far from Chaoge, judging from the short period of time over which King Wu had conquered seven states. Neither Shu state, however, had any connection with the Shu later founded in Sichuan. For more information about the Shu, see Yang Dongchen 1995: 35.

195 Yang Dongchen (1995: 40) claims that five of them, Yong, Shu, Wei, Peng, and Pu were *Huaxia* people, not Rong Di. Among them, the Wei 微 people were awarded a clan name, a noble status, and several bronzewares by Zhou kings for their service over generations. Many bronze vessels of the Wei were excavated in 1976. The Wei lineage lasted for more than two hundred years, almost as long as the Western Zhou. (Zhao Yanjiao 2009: 67)

196 Scholars have connected the description of footsteps four, five, six, and seven in the *Book of Documents* with ethnic group dance for warfare, *Da wu wu* 大武舞. They believe that the number of footsteps reflected the rhythm of the dance. (Yang Hua 1996: 3)

197 *Rong*-wagon was used for combat. Fan Ye gives a list of fourteen weapons of the ethnic powers carried by *rong*-wagons. (Fan Ye 2010: 3646; Wang Xianqian 2006: 1309)

198 Sun Zuoyun 1983: 31.

Zhou rulers quickly identified their newly conquered *tianxia* with its great ethnic diversity as a legitimate continuation of the Shang dynasty, and they called the land they occupied and ruled *Qu Xia* 區夏, or *You Xia* 有夏.<sup>199</sup> Though they did not view themselves as descendants of the Xia people, they nevertheless embraced the descendants of the Xia, survivors of the Shang, and numerous other ethnic groups of the *fang* 方 and *bang* 邦 states the Zhou had conquered or with which they had allied. The birth of the new Zhou people therefore met Heaven's will and satisfied the aspirations of the diverse "You Xia" peoples from all sides, *danying tianming, yi fu fang Xia* 誕膺天命以撫方夏.<sup>200</sup> The new Zhou identity hence manifested a strong determination to unify two opposed worlds: the Chinese of the *Huaxia* 華夏 and the non-Chinese: the Man 蠻 in the south and the Mo 貊 in the north, *Huaxia manmo wang bu shuai bi* 華夏蠻貊罔不率俾.<sup>201</sup> To this end, the new Zhou regime enfeoffed royal family members and sent them to the periphery where they formed the *Zhu Xia* 諸夏 states such as Qi 齊, Yan 燕, Jin 晉, and Lu 魯. They were expected to assimilate the non-Chinese and transform them into the *Huaxia* by force or acculturation. With the foundation of the new Zhou dynasty, the age of the Great Migration ended and a new type of rulership began, one based on the unique cultural ideologies and religious innovations established by the Zhou ancestors for millennia to follow.

## REFERENCES

- BAOJISHI KAOGU GONGZUODUI 寶雞市考古工作隊 1984. Shaanxi wugong Liujiapo Xian Zhou yizhi fajue jianbao 陝西武功劉家坡先周遺址發掘簡報. *Wenwu* 7: 1–15.
- CHANG YAOHUA 常耀華 2002. Shi Shang buci haishi Zhou buci 是商卜辭還是周卜辭. *Zhongguo shehui kexueyuan yanjiushengyuan xuebao* 1: 93–97.
- CHEN CHANGYUAN 陳昌遠 1988. Zai tan Wu Wang fa Zhou jinjun luxian 再談武王伐紂進軍路線. *Henan Daxue xuebao* 4: 30–37.
- CHEN CHANGYUAN 1992. Chongbo yu Wen Wang fa Chong diwang yanjiu 虫伯與文王伐崇地望研究. *Henan Daxue xuebao* 32(1): 22–25.
- CHEN MENGJIA 陳夢家 1956. *Yinxu buci zongshu* 殷墟卜辭綜述. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.
- CHEN QUANFANG 陳全方 1980. Zhouyuan chutu wenwu congfan 周原出土文物叢談. *Renwen zazhi* 6: 90–92.

199 See various chapters in the *Book of Documents*, such as Kanggao, Junshi, and Lizheng. The Zhou people termed the area of the former Shang Shi Xia 時夏 (in Shangshu, Zhou song). The term Xia puzzled modern scholars. One acceptable explanation is that Xia refers to the Xia dynasty or means simply greatness, while *qu* 區 means to achieve. In other words, the term *qu xia* refers to the Zhou's legitimacy to rule instead of to the Zhou identity. (Yan Shian 2007: 58)

200 *Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 211.

201 *Shangshu yizhu* 2006: 211.

- CHEN QUANFANG 1988. *Zhouyuan yu Zhou wenhua* 周原與周文化. Shanghai: Renmin.
- CHEN QUANFANG 1992. Cong Zhouyuan xin chutu wenwu tan Xi Zhou Wen Wu Wang he Zhougong de yeji 從周原新出土文物談西周文武王和周公的業績. *Wenbo* 4: 3–16.
- CHENG FENG 程鋒 1999. Jianlun Zhou Wen Wang fa Yu 簡論周文王伐邶. *Yiyang Shizhuan xuebao* 4: 91–93.
- Chunqiu Zuozhuan zhu* 春秋左傳注 2006 edn. Yang Bojun 楊伯峻 (annot.). Beijing: Zhonghua.
- DING SHAN 丁山 2008. *Shang Zhou shiliao kaozheng* 商周史料考證. Beijing: Beijing Guojia Tushuguan.
- DU JINPENG 杜金鵬 2009. Zhouyuan gongdian jianzhu leixing ji xiangguan wenti tantao 周原宮殿建築類型及相關問題探討. *Kaogu xuebao* 4: 435–467.
- FAN YE 范曄 (398–445) 2010. *Hou Han Shu* 後漢書. Beijing: Zhonghua.
- FAN YUZHOU 范毓周 1981. Shilun mie Shang yiqian de Shang Zhou guanxi 試論滅商以前的商周關係. *Shixue yuekan* 1: 14–19.
- GE YIZHI 葛毅志 1991. Zhounan bian Rong fu Xia kao 周人變戎復夏考. *Zhongguoshi yanjiu* 4: 122–129.
- GU ZUYU 顧祖禹 (1631–1692) 1981. *Du shi fang yu jiyao* 讀史方輿紀要. Taipei: Hongshi chubanshe.
- Guben zhushu jinben zhushu jinian jijiao* 古本竹書今本竹書紀年輯校 1997. Huang Yongnian 黃永年 (annot.), Zhu Youzeng 朱祐曾 (ed.), Wang Guowei 王國維 (commt.). Shenyang: Liaoning jiaoyu.
- Guben zhushu jinian yizhu* 古本竹書紀年譯注 1990 edn. Li Min 李民 et al. (annots). Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji.
- HE GUANGYUE 何光岳 1991. Chongguo de lai yuan he qianxi 崇國的來源和遷徙. *Qiusuo*: 124–128.
- HE GUANGYUE 1996. Tengguo kao 滕國考. *Yiyang Shizhuan xuebao* 2: 65–68.
- HU HOXUAN (ed.) 1983. *Jiaguwen yu Yin Shang shi* 甲骨文與殷商史, 2 vols. Shanghai: Guji.
- HU HOXUAN 胡厚宣 & HU ZHENYU 胡振宇 2003. *Yin Shang shi* 殷商史. Shanghai: Renmin.
- HUANG LIHONG 黃歷鴻 & WU JINSHENG 吳晉生 2000. Yin Wang Di Xin si zheng yifang kaoshi 殷王帝辛四征夷方考釋. *Yindu xuekan* 1: 16–21.
- JIANG LINCHANG 江林昌 1999. Ji Zhou zu cuanyu Rong Di zhi jian yu jingshui liuyu kaogu yicun 姬周族竄於戎狄之間與涇水流域考古遺存. *Qi Lu xuekan* 5: 4–8.
- JIANG LINCHANG 2000a. You Jiang yu Xia de guanxi kan Jiang yuanzu de qi yuan yu qian yi 由姜與夏的關係看姜原族的起源與遷移. *Huaxia kaogu* 3: 48–54.
- JIANG LINCHANG 2000b. Gugong Danfu zhi yu Qixia yu Weishui liuyu Xian Zhou kaogu wenhua 古公亶父至於岐下與渭水流域先周考古文化. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 2: 56–63.
- KEIGHTLY, David (ed.) 1983. *The Origins of Chinese Civilization*. Berkeley: UC Press.
- LI JUNMING 李均明 2009. Baoxun yu Zhou Wen Wang de zhiguo linian 保訓與周文王的治國理念. *Zhongguoshi yanjiu* 3: 9–12.
- LI LINFU 李林甫 (Tang era). *Yuanhe junxian tuzhi* 元和郡縣圖志. 1979 edn. Taipei: Zhongwen.



- LI SHAOLIAN 李紹連 1990. Yin de shangdi yu Zhou de tian 殷的上帝與周的天. *Shixue yuekan* 4: 9–15.
- LI XUEQIN 李學勤 1959. *Yindai dili jianlun* 殷代地理簡論. Beijing: Kexue chubanshe.
- LI XUEQIN 1987. Lun Xi Zhou jinwen de liushiba shi 論西周金文的六師八師. *Huaxia kaogu* 2: 207–210.
- LI XUEQIN 1988a. Zhou Wen Wang shiqi bujia yu Shang Zhou wenhua guanxi 周文王時期卜甲與商周文化關係. *Renwen zazhi* 2: 69–73.
- LI XUEQIN 1988b. Shifu pian yanjiu 世俘篇研究. *Shixue yuekan* 2: 1–6.
- LI XUEQIN (ed.) 2007. *Zhongguo gudai wenming yu guojia xingcheng yanjiu* 中國古代文明與國家形成研究. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe.
- LI XUEQIN 2009. Tan Qinghuajian baoxun de jige wenti 談清華簡保訓的幾個問題. *Wenwu* 6: 76–78.
- LI XUESHAN 李雪山 2005. Zhenren wei fengguo shouling lai chao zhizhang zhanbu jisi zhi guan 貞人為封國首領來朝職掌占卜祭祀之官. In: WANG YUXIN, SONG ZHENHAO & MENG XIANWU (eds): 284–293.
- LI ZHONGLI 李仲立 1985. Gongliu qian Bin bianxi 公劉遷豳辨析. *Gansu shehui kexue* 1: 86–88.
- LI ZHONGLIN 李忠林 2006. Gu Chaoguo kao 古巢國考. *Chaohu Xueyuan xuebao* 8(5): 73–78.
- Liji 禮記 2007 edn. Jiang Yihua 姜義華 (annot.). Taipei: Sanmin.
- LIN XIAOAN 林小安 1983. Yin Wu Ding chenshu zhengfa yu xing ji kao 殷武丁臣屬征伐與行祭考. In: HU HOXUAN (ed.), II: 223–301.
- LIN ZHIPENG 林志鵬 2010. Qinghua Daxue cang Zhanguo zhushu baoxun jiaoshi 清華大學藏戰國竹書保訓校釋. *Jianbo wangzhan* <www.bsm.org.cn> no. 999, accessed 1 Apr. 2009.
- LIU JIAHE 劉家和 1982. Shuo Shi Daya Gongliu suo fanying de shishi 說詩大雅公劉所反映的史事. *Beijing Shifan Daxue xuebao* 5: 60–68.
- LIU JUNSHI 劉軍社 1992. Tao fu tao xue bian 陶覆陶穴辨. *Xibei Dier Minzu Xueyuan xuebao* 3: 38–42.
- LIU JUNSHI 1994. Shilun Xian Zhou wenhua yu xiangling zhu wenhua de guanxi 試論先周文化與相鄰諸文化的關係. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 4: 48–59 & 28.
- LIU JUNSHI 2000. Gugong qian qi de yuanyin ji qi yiyi 古公遷岐的原因及其意義. *Wenbo* 5: 11–14.
- LIU QIYI 劉啟益 1996. Wen Wang shouming zhi Cheng Wang wunian nianbiao 文王受命至成王五年年表. *Chuantong wenhua yu xiandaihua* 5: 22–27.
- LOEWE, Michael & Edward SHAUGHNESSY (eds) 1999. *The Cambridge History of Ancient China: From the Origins of Civilization to 221 BC*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Lunyu quan jin zhu jin yi 論語今註今譯 1984 edn. Mao Zishui 毛子水 (annot.). Taipei: Sanmin.
- MA CHANGSHOU 馬長壽 2006. *Diyu Qiang* 狄與羌. Guilin: Guangxi Shifan Daxue chubanshe.
- MA RUSEN 馬如森 1993. *Yinxu jiaguwen yinlun* 殷墟甲骨文引論. Shenyang: Dongbei Shifan Daxue.

- MA RUSEN 2008. *Yinxu jiaguwen shiyong zidian* 殷墟甲骨文實用字典. Shanghai: Shanghai Daxue.
- MA SHIZHI 馬世之 1998. Wen Wang fa Chong kao 文王伐崇考. *Shixue yuekan* 2: 20–23.
- MA XIN 馬新 2010. Yin Shang cunyi xingtai chutan 殷墟村邑形態初探. *Dongyue luncong* 31(1): 32–36.
- MENG SHIKAI 孟世凱 1983. Shangdai tianlie xingzhi chutan 商代田獵性質初探. In: HU HOUXUAN (ed.), I: 204–222.
- Mengzi yizhu* 孟子譯注 2000 edn. Yang Bojun (annot.). Taipei: Wunan.
- NIENHAUSER, William (ed. & tr.) 1994. *The Grand Scribe's Records*, vol. I. Bloomington: IU Press.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin 1983. The Chinese and Their Neighbours in Prehistoric and Early Historic Times. In: KEIGHTLEY (ed.): 411–466.
- PULLEYBLANK, Edwin 2000. Ji and Jiang: The Role of Exogamic Clans in the Organization of the Zhou Polity. *Early China* 25: 1–28.
- QI SHEXIANG 齊社祥 2003. Gong Liu jiu yi kao 公劉舊邑考. *Gansu shehui kexue* 3: 121–126.
- QINGHUA DAXUE CHUTU WENXIAN YANJIU YU BAOHU ZHONGXIN 清華大學出土文獻研究與保護中心 2009. Qinghua Daxue cang Zhanguo zhujian baoxun shiwen 清華大學藏戰國竹簡保訓釋文. *Wenwu* 6: 73–75.
- QIU XIGUI 裘錫圭 1983. Shuo buci de fen wuhui yu zuo tulong 說卜辭的焚巫尪與作土龍. In: HU HOUXUAN (ed.), I: 21–35.
- SHAANXI ZHOUYUAN KAOGUDUI 陝西周原考古隊 1979. Shaanxi Qishan Fengchucun faxian Zhou chu jiaguwen 陝西岐山鳳雛村發現周初甲骨文. *Wenwu* 10: 38–47.
- SHAANXI ZHOUYUAN KAOGUDUI 1984. Fufeng Liujia Jiang Rong muzang fajue jianbao 扶風劉家姜戎墓葬發掘簡報. *Wenwu* 7: 16–29.
- Shangshu yizhu* 尚書譯注 2006. Li Min 李民 & Wang Jian 王健 (annots). Shanghai: Guji.
- SHAUGHNESSY, Edward 1997. *Before Confucius: Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics*. NY: SUNY Press.
- SHAUGHNESSY, Edward 1999a. Calendar and Chronology. In: LOEWE & SHAUGHNESSY (eds): 19–29.
- SHAUGHNESSY, Edward 1999b. Western Zhou History. In: LOEWE & SHAUGHNESSY (eds): 292–351.
- SHEN CHANGYUN 沈長雲 1983. Xianyun guifang Jiangshi zhi Rong butong zubie kao 獫狁鬼方姜氏之戎不同族別考. *Renwen zazhi* 3: 75–81.
- SHEN JIANHUA 沈建華 2005. Jiaguwenzhong suojian Chu jian jiubang zhuguo 甲骨文中所見楚簡九邦諸國. In: WANG YUXIN, SONG ZHENHAO & MENG XIANWU (eds): 273–277.
- SHIM, Jae-Hoon 2002. The Political Geography of Shanxi on the Eve of the Zhou Conquest of Shang. *T'oung Pao* 88(1, 3): 1–26.
- Shijing quanyi* 詩經全譯. 1981 edn. Yuan Yu'an 袁愈安 & Tang Moyao 唐莫堯 (annots). Guiyang: Guizhou renmin.
- SIMA QIAN 司馬遷. *Shiji* 史記. Baina edn. 1986. Taipei: Shangwu.

- SONG XINCHAO 宋新潮 1992. Shilun Laoniupo Shang wenhua fenqi ji tezheng 試論老牛坡商文化分期及特徵. *Wenbo* 2: 12–18.
- SONG ZHENHAO 宋鎮豪 2007. Zhaoche Zhoubang: Zhou de jianguo ji Huaxia guojia de xingcheng 肇徹周邦- 周的建國及華夏國家的形成. In: LI XUEQIN (ed.) 2007: 345–390.
- SUN BINLAI 孫斌來 1986. Xian Zhou shi heshi cheng Zhou de 先周是何時稱周的. *Jilin Shifan Daxue xuebao* 4: 26–28.
- SUN ZUOYUN 孫作雲 1983. Shuo Bin zai Xi Zhou shidai wei beifang junshi zhongzhen 說幽在西周時代為北方軍事重鎮. *Henan Shida xuebao* 1: 31–49.
- TAN QIXIANG 譚其驤 (ed.) 1982. *Zhongguo lishi dituji* 中國歷史地圖集, vol I. Beijing: Ditu chubanshe.
- WANG GUANYING 王冠英 1994. Yin mo yixin suo fa renfang shouling kao 殷末乙辛所伐人方首領考. *Zhongguo lishi bowuguan guankan* 1: 24–25 & 45.
- WANG GUISENG 王貴生 2008. Zhou chu liaoji yishi kaobian 周初燎祭儀式考辨. *Zhongguo dianji yu wenhua* 1: 99–106.
- WANG HUI 王暉 2003. Lun Wen Wang ping Yu Rui zhi song yu Shang Zhou zhanlue xingshi zhi jubian 論文王評虞芮之訟與商周戰略形勢之遽變. *Shehui kexue zhanxian* 1: 147–154.
- WANG HUI 2008. Yan Jiang Ji Zhou liang houji de shidai ji qi dai xing kao 炎姜姬周兩后稷的時代及其代興考. *Baoji Wenli Xueyuan xuebao* 28, 1: 42–46.
- WANG HUI & HE SHUQIN 何淑琴 2009. Cong Shijing Zhou Song chengong kan Zhou xianzu houji qi zai Zhongguo nongshi shang de zhongyao gongxian 從詩經周頌臣工看周先祖后稷棄在中國農史上的重要貢獻. *Renwen zazhi* 5: 119–126.
- WANG JIAN 王健 1988. Di Xin houqi qiandu chaoge Yinxu shitan 帝辛後期遷都朝歌殷墟試探. *Zhengzhou Daxue xuebao* 2: 18–23.
- WANG KELIN 王克林 1994. Ji Zhou rong di shuo 姬周戎狄說. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 4: 62–74.
- WANG SHENXING 王慎行 1994. Wen Wang fei Zhou chen kaobian 文王非紂臣考辨. *Lishi yanjiu* 5: 5–20.
- WANG XIANG 王祥 1960. Shuo hu chen yu yong 說虎臣與庸. *Kaogu* 5: 33–36.
- WANG XIANQIAN 王先謙. *Hou Han Shu jijie* 後漢書集解. 2006 edn. Yangzhou: Guangling.
- WANG XIANQIAN. *Xunzi jijie* 荀子集解. 2007 edn. Beijing: Zhonghua.
- WANG YING 王鷹 & WANG FENGYING 王鳳英 2005. Shaanxi Yongshou Xian faxian de Xian Zhou wenhua yicun 陝西永壽縣發現的先周文化遺存. *Kaogu yu wenwu* 6: 5–7.
- WANG YUXIN 王宇信 1983. Xizhou jiagu shulun 西周甲骨文述論. In: HU HOUXUAN (ed.), II: 338–413.
- WANG YUXIN 1984. *Xizhou jiagu tanlun* 西周甲骨探論. Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue.
- WANG YUXIN, SONG ZHENHAO & MENG XIANWU (eds) 2005. *2004 nian Anyang Yin Shang wenming guoji xueshu yantaohui lunwenji* 2004 年安陽殷商文明國際學術研討會論文集. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian.
- WANG YUXIN & XU YIHUA 徐義華 2006. *Shang Zhou jiaguwen* 商周甲骨文. Beijing: Wenwu.

- WANG YUZHE 王玉哲 2003. *Zhonghua yuanguoshi* 中華遠古史. Shanghai: Renmin.
- WU, Shu-hui 吳淑惠 2002. On Chinese Sacrificial Orations. *Monumenta Serica* 50: 1–33.
- WU, Shu-hui 2011. Fighting for His Majesty I: Accretion of the Greater Shang. *Journal of Chinese Military History* 1: forthcoming.
- XIAO NAN 蕭南 1980. Lun Wu Yi Wen Ding buci 論武乙文丁卜辭. *Guwenzi yanjiu* 3: 43–79.
- XIE QI 謝齊 1983. Zu Geng Zu Jia buci yu lizu buci de fenqi 祖庚祖甲卜辭與歷組卜辭的分期. In: HU HOXUAN (ed.), II: 84–159.
- XU XITAI 徐錫臺 1988. *Zhouyuan jiaguwen zongshu* 周原甲骨文綜述. Xi'an: Sanqin.
- XU Zhuoyun 許倬雲 1990. *Xi Zhou shi* 西周史. Taipei: Lianjing.
- YAN SHIAN 顏世安 2007. Zhou chu Xia guannian yu wangzu wenhuaquan yishi 周初夏觀念與王族文化圈意識. *Beijing Shifan Daxue xuebao* 4: 55–63.
- YANG DONGCHEN 楊東晨 1993. Lun Quanrong de zushu yu bianqian 論犬戎的族屬與變遷. *Guyuan Shizhuan xuebao* 14(3): 48–52.
- YANG DONGCHENG 1994. Zhou Wen Wang zhengfa de wuguo shi tanwei 周文王征伐的五國史探微. *Tiedao shiyuan xuebao* 1: 27–32.
- YANG DONGCHEN 1995. Gensui Wu Wang fa Zhou de baguo kao 跟隨武王伐紂的八國考. *Tiedao shiyuan xuebao* 4: 34–40.
- YANG HUA 楊華 1996. Shangshu Mu Shi xinkao 尚書牧誓新考. *Shixue yuekan* 5: 2–5.
- YANG JIANGUO 楊建國 & YANG DONGCHEN 2004. Gugong Danfu de zhongyao lishi gongxian 古公亶父的重要歷史貢獻. *Wenbo* 1: 20–24.
- YANG KUAN 楊寬 2003. *Xi Zhou shi* 西周史. Shanghai: Renmin.
- YANG SHANQUN 楊善群 1991. Zhouzu de qiyuandi ji qi qianxi luxian 周族的起源地及其遷徙路線. *Shilin* 3: 39–45.
- YANG SHENGNAN 楊升南 1984. Zhouzu de qiyuan ji qi boqian 周族的起源及其播遷. *Renwen zazhi* 6: 75–80.
- YANG SHENGNAN 1987. Zhouyuan jiagu zushu kaobian 周原甲骨族屬考辨. *Yinduxuekan* 4: 6–18.
- YANG YANQI 楊燕起, CHEN KEQING 陳可卿 & LAI CHANGYANG 賴長揚 (eds) 2005. *Shiji jiping* 史記集評. Beijing: Huawen.
- YAO XIAOSUI 姚孝遂 & XIAO DING 蕭丁 2004. *Xiaotun nandi jiagu kaoshi* 小屯南地甲骨考釋. Beijing: Zhonghua.
- Yi Zhou shu quanyi* 逸周書全譯, 2000 edn. Zhang Wenyu 張聞玉 (annot.). Guiyang: Guizhou renmin.
- YIN SHENGPING 尹盛平 1985. Xianyun guifang de zushu ji qi yu Zhouzu de guanxi 獫狁鬼方的族屬及其與周族的關係. *Renwen zazhi* 1: 69–74.
- YIN SHENGPING 2005. Zhouyuan yu Zhouzu faxiang 周原與周族發祥. In: WANG Yuxin (ed.): 596–602.
- YU KAI 于凱 2006. Cong Shanghai Bowuguan suocang Chu jian Rongchengshi kan Xia Shang shi 從上海博物館所藏楚簡容成氏看夏商史. *Zhongnan Minzu Daxue xuebao* 26(6): 18–20.
- ZHANG GUOSHUO 張國碩 2006. Jinnan Xiaxu kao 晉南夏墟考. *Zhongyuan wenwu* 4: 26–31.

- ZHANG HEQUAN 張鶴泉 1990. Zhoudai Jiao Tian zhi ji chutan 周代郊天之祭初探. *Shixue jikan* 1: 12–15.
- ZHANG JIE 張杰 2002. Shilun fangguo chenfu yu Shang de zhuyao biaoqian ji qi tedian 試論方國臣服于商的主要表現及其特點. *Yindu xuekan* 2: 17–21.
- ZHANG YONGSHAN 張永山 & LUO KUN 羅琨 1984. Lun Lizu buci de niandai 論歷組卜辭的年代. *Guwenzi yanjiu* 3: 80–103.
- ZHAO YANJIAO 趙燕姣 2009. Cong Weishi qiang pan kan Yin yimin ru Zhou hou de jingyu 從微氏牆盤看殷遺民入周後的經遇. *Wenbo* 1: 64–68.
- ZHAO YU 趙雨 2003. Shi binfeng qiyue shilun 詩豳風七月釋論. *Xiangfan Xueyuan xuebao* 24(4): 48–56.
- ZHOU SHUCAN 周書燦 2008. Shangdai dui Jinnan diqu de jingying 商代對晉南地區的經營. *Jinyang xuekan* 6: 79–83.