

**WESTERN ZHOU HISTORY IN THE COLLECTIVE MEMORY
OF THE PEOPLE OF THE WESTERN ZHOU:
AN INTERPRETATION OF THE INSCRIPTION
OF THE “LAI PAN”**

MATSUI Yoshinori

Introduction

On January 19, 2003, twenty-seven bronze pieces were excavated from a hoard at Yangjiacun (Meixian county, Baoji city, Shaanxi province).¹ All the bronzes, which include twelve *dīng* 鼎, nine *lǐ* 鬲, two *fanghu* 方壺, one *pan* 盤, one *he* 盃, one *yǐ* 匜, and one *yu* 盂, have inscriptions. Among them, the bronzes labeled “Forty-second-year Lai *dīng*” 逯鼎 (of which there are two pieces), “Forty-third-year Lai *dīng*” (ten pieces), and “Lai *pan*” 逯盤 (one piece) have inscriptions that are particularly long for inscriptions from the Western Zhou period and run respectively to 281, 316 and 372 characters in length. The inscription of the “Lai *pan*,” containing 372 characters, is divided into two parts, the first part is narrated from Lai’s point of view but employs the third-person voice, opening with the phrase, “Lai said.” The second part records an appointment (*ceming* 册命) ceremony that opens, “The King said.” The very exceptional first part records the service of generations of Lai’s ancestors to successive Zhou Kings. The inscription mentions eleven former kings, King Wen 文王, King Wu 武王, King Cheng 成王, King Kang 康王, King Zhao 昭王, King Mu 穆王, King Gong 共王, King Yi 懿王, King Xiao 考(孝)王, King Yi 夷(夷)王, King Li 剌(厲)王 and the current “Son of Heaven,” whom Lai served, who was undoubtedly King Xuan 宣王. The dates on two of bronze *dīng* excavated together with the “Lai *pan*,” i.e. “the 42nd year, the 5th month, after the growing brightness, *yimao* (52nd) day” and “the 43rd year, the 6th month, after the growing brightness, *dinghai* (24th) day” do not contradict the record of King Xuan’s reign having lasted 46 years as found in written sources.²

¹ Shaanxisheng Kaoguanjijusuo, Baojishi Kaogugongzuodui, and Meixian Wenhuaquan 2003a; 2003b; Shaanxisheng Wenwuju and Zhonghua Shijitan Yishuguan 2003.

² The “Zhoubenji” of the *Shiji* states, “In the 46th year of his reign, King Xuan died.” However, as many scholars have already pointed out, the two dates “the 42nd year, the 5th month, after the

This indicates that counting from King Wen, thirteen kings succeeded to the throne in the Western Zhou period before King You's demise in 771 B.C. The *Shiji* records the disputes over the royal succession in this period, stating that after the death of King Yi (the 8th king), King Xiao (the younger brother of King Yi's father, King Gong) succeeded, and after King Xiao's death, King Yi (who had been crown prince under King Yi) succeeded to the throne.³ According to these accounts, there were twelve generations from King Wen to King You. Among these twelve generations and thirteen kings, the inscription of the "Lai pan" mentions twelve kings including King Xuan, the current "Son of Heaven." King You alone cannot be directly identified from the bronze inscriptions. Unfortunately, there is no information showing the family relationships of the kings to one another such as the use of the terms "*fu*" (father), "*zu*" (grandfather), and "*xiong*" (elder brother) seen in the oracle bones that reveal the family relationships of the Shang kings, however, excavation of the "Lai pan" with its inscription recording twelve Zhou kings and their successive reigns makes the royal genealogy of the Western Zhou dynasty nearly certain.

Wang Guowei once proposed using the "double-evidence method" of relying on both "written materials" and "excavated materials" and demonstrated the high reliability of oracle bones and bamboo-wooden strips as evidence.⁴ Now, with the excavation of the inscriptions on the "Lai pan," it has finally become possible to test the genealogy of the Western Zhou dynasty by this method. If this method potentially has the "ability to correct written materials" on the basis of newly excavated materials as Wang claimed,⁵ what kind of correction can the newly excavated inscription of the "Lai pan" add to the written record of the Western Zhou?

1 Two Royal Genealogies

In December, 1976, about a quarter century before the excavation of the "Lai pan," another "royal genealogy" was excavated from "hoard 1" at Zhuangbai

growing brightness, *yimao* (52nd) day" and "the 43rd year, the 6th month, after the growing brightness, *dinghai* (24th) day" cannot be reconciled with any reconstructed calendar.

³ The "Zhoubenji" of the *Shiji* states, "King Yi died, and Bifang, King Gong's younger brother succeeded to the throne, he is King Xiao. King Xiao died, the state rulers recovered and enthroned Xie, King Yi's crown prince, he is King Yi."

⁴ For Wang Guowei's "double-evidence method," see Inami 2000.

⁵ Wang Guowei (1925) said, "I was born in the present age, in which I am fortunately able to acquire newly excavated materials in addition to written materials; with these types of materials, I can naturally correct written materials."

(Fufeng county, Shaanxi province). The genealogy is the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” 史牆盤 (10175-II),⁶ one of the so-called Wei 微 family bronze assemblages, which contained 103 pieces in total, 74 of which had inscriptions. The inscription cast onto the face of the *pan*, made of 284 characters, is divided into two parts separated by a blank strip; the first part is devoted to the achievements of successive Zhou kings, and the second (strictly speaking, from the 3rd character of the last line of the first part) to a description of the Wei family. The first part reads as follows:

Accordant with antiquity was King Wen! (He) first brought harmony to government. The Lord on High sent down fine virtue and great security. Extending to the high and low, he joined the ten thousand states. Capturing and controlling was King Wu! (He) proceeded and campaigned through the four quarters, piercing Yin and governing its people. Eternally fearless of the Di (Distant Ones), oh, he attacked the Yi minions. Model and sagely was King Cheng! To the left and right (he) cast and gathered his net and line, therewith opening and integrating the Zhou state. Deep and wise was King Kang! (He) divided command and pacified the borders. Vast and substantial was King Zhao! (He) broadly tamed Chujing; it was to connect the southern route. Reverent and illustrious was King Mu! (He) patterned (himself) on and followed the great counsels. Continuing and tranquil is the Son of Heaven! The Son of Heaven strives to carry on the long valor of (kings) Wen and Wu. The Son of Heaven is diligent and without flaw, faithfully making offerings to (the spirits) above and below, and reverently glorifying the great plan(s), heavenly, radiantly and incorruptibly. The Lord on High is sacrificed and actually gives to the Son of Heaven an extensive mandate, thick blessings, and abundant harvests. Among the borderland (peoples) and the man-savages, there are none who do not hasten to appear (at court).

In this way, it records a royal genealogy including seven kings in total, that is, King Wen, King Wu, King Cheng, King Kang, King Zhao, King Mu, and the “Son of Heaven,” whom Shi Qiang, the donor, served.

⁶ Shaanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 1978; Yin Shengping 1992. Whenever a bronze piece is mentioned in this article, the registration number of YZ and the dating from the scheme of Hayashi 1984 are cited on the first appearance. When a bronze is not registered in YZ, I have supplied numbers and information from JC or elsewhere.

The second part of this inscription, mentioning the ancestors of the donor (Shi Qiang) parallels the first section, recording the achievements of six generations of the Wei family, which are characterized by two-character modifiers, just as were the kings, i.e., Wen was “the accordant with antiquity King Wen” 曰古文王 and Wu “the capturing and controlling King Wu” 赧圉武王, so we see Gaozu called the “pure and retiring Gaozu (the High Ancestor)” 靜幽高祖, and likewise “the Wei scribe Liezu” 微史刺祖 were “the happy and helpful Yizu” (Ancestor Yi)” 勇惠乙祖, “the clear-eyed and bright Grandfather Xin of the branch lineage” 彝明亞祖祖辛, “the extending and even Wenkao Yigong (my cultured deceased-father, Duke Yi)” 舒遲文考乙公, and “the filial and convivial Shiqiang (the Scribe Qiang)” 孝友史牆. However, the direct relationship between the successive generations of Wei ancestors and corresponding Zhou kings is scarcely mentioned, except in the following one sentence: “When King Wu had already defeated Yin, the Wei scribe Liezu then came to present himself (in audience) to King Wu. King Wu then commanded the Duke of Zhou to establish (his) residence, let (him) reside,” which simply makes clear that “the Wei scribe Liezu” had been a loyal follower of the Zhou during King Wu’s conquest of Yin.

On the other hand, the first part of the inscription of the “Lai pan” that mentions the twelve successive reigns of the Western Zhou kings is at pains to describe relations between Lai’s ancestors and successive Zhou kings. It reads as follows:

Lai said, illustrious my Huanggaozu (August High Ancestor) Shangong was valiantly willing to make clear and wise his virtue, and supported and assisted King Wen and King Wu. [They] attacked Yin, received the generous mandate, extensively possessed the four quarters. Both settled in the territory for which they had toiled, and thereby were counterparts of the Lord on High. Then, my Huanggaozu Gongshu was willing to assist(?) King Cheng. [He] completely received a great mandate, stayed clear of those everywhere who did not enjoy [Zhou rule], thereby securing a domain in the four directions and the ten thousand states. Then, my Huanggaozu Xinshizhong was willing to make solitary and clear his mind, be gentle with the distant ones and handle the near ones, assisted(?) King Kang. [He] won over those who did not come to court. Then, my Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu brought harmony to government, gained success for [his] plan, and thereby assisted King Zhao and King Mu. [They] extended [Zhou] rule to the four quarters, assaulting and attacking Chuqing. Then, my Huanggaozu

Lingbo made intelligent his mind, did not lose X domain, thereby served King Gong and King Yi. Then, my Huangyazu (Subordinate Ancestor) Yizhong was great as possible, willing to assist and protect his lords King Xiao and King Yi. [They] gained success for the Zhou state. Then, dignified and orderly was my Huangkao (August Deceased Father) Gongshu, harmoniously sincere to government, made clear and luxuriant his mind, assisted King Li. Lai [I] firstly continue my Huangkao's duty, morning and night ferociously, take care of my duty to [my] death. Thereby, the Son of Heaven bestowed much grace on Lai [me]. Son of Heaven! Ten thousand years without limit, until with gray hair and wrinkled face, maintain and secure the Zhou state, admonish and govern the four quarters.

This records that seven generations of the family, beginning with Huanggaozu Shangong 皇高祖單公, and followed in order by Huanggaozu Gongshu 皇高祖公叔, Huanggaozu Xinshizhong 皇高祖新室仲, Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu 皇高祖惠仲蠡父, Huanggaozu Lingbo 皇高祖零伯, Huangyazu Yizhong 皇亞祖懿仲, and Huangkao Gongshu 皇考共叔 who served and brought about various achievements for both kings Wen and Wu, King Cheng, King Kang, kings Zhao and Mu, kings Gong and Yi, kings Xiao and Yi, and finally King Li. Lai, the donor, who followed in the footsteps of his the "August High Ancestors" succeeded them in their official capacities and enjoyed a bestowal from the "Son of Heaven" (King Xuan). In contrast to the inscription of the "Shi Qiang pan," whose two separate parts had described the achievements of successive Zhou kings and those of the donor's own ancestors separately, the inscription of the "Lai pan" displays no intention of distinguishing the two. On the contrary, it gives an impression of a desire to utilize the Zhou kings to underscore the achievements of Lai's own ancestors.⁷ The intention is to highlight each ancestors' achievements in terms of their relationships with successive Zhou kings, but as a result it also tells us of the royal genealogy of the Western Zhou dynasty.

Table 1 illustrates the relation of successive Zhou kings and the two family lines.⁸ Compared with the inscription of the "Shi Qiang pan," which describes

⁷ For the differences in the concerns of the donors of the inscriptions of the "Shi Qiang pan" and the "Lai pan," see Ma Chengyuan et.al. 2003. Liu Junshe noted, "The inscription of the "Shi Qiang pan" emphasized the achievements of the Zhou kings, the inscription of the "Lai pan" emphasized the achievements of ancestors of the Shan family."

⁸ Liu Shie also attempted to compare these two inscriptions; however, his views differ from those found in this article. For further reference, see Liu Shie 2004.

Table 1: The relationships of Zhou kings and the two family lines

The “Shi Qiang pan”	Zhou king	The “Lai pan”
Gaozu 高祖		
	King Wen	Huanggaozu Shangong 皇高祖單公
Liezu 刺祖	King Wu	
Yizu 乙祖	King Cheng	Huanggaozu Gongzshu 皇高祖公叔
Yazu Zuxin 亞祖祖辛	King Kang	Huanggaozu Xinshizhong 皇高祖新室仲
Wenkao Yigong 文考乙公	King Zhao	Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu 皇高祖惠仲盭父
Shiqiang 史牆	King Mu	
	King Gong	Huanggaozu Lingbo 皇高祖零伯
	King Yi	
	King Xiao	Huangyazu Yizhong 皇亞祖懿仲
	King Yi	
	King Li	Huangkao Gongsu 皇考共叔
	King Xuan	Lai 漼

achievements of successive Zhou kings one by one, the immediately obvious special characteristic of the inscription on the “Lai pan” is that eight kings are combined into four pairs, i.e., King Wen and King Wu, King Zhao and King Mu, King Gong and King Yi, and King Xiao and King Yi, and the pairs are coupled with four generations of Lai’s ancestors, Huanggaozu Shangong, Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu, Huanggaozu Lingbo, and Huangyazu Yizhong. Considering that the characteristic of the inscription of the “Lai pan” was to highlight the family’s achievements in relationship to successive Zhou kings, the link between Lai’s ancestors and successive Zhou kings was likely a rhetorical devise, and if this is the case, we must ask, why were these four pairs of eight kings selected, and why then do King Cheng, King Kang, and King Li appear alone?

King Wen and King Wu, whom the “Lai pan” inscription combines into a single pair, were both engaged in the establishment of the dynasty, however, their achievements should be fundamentally distinguished. This is seen in royal edicts of the inscriptions of the “He zun” 何尊 (6014·IA) (with a date of the 5th year of King Cheng’s reign), which reads:

The king announced *zongxiaozi* 宗小子 in the Jingshi 京室, ...Therefore, King Wen received this great mandate. Thereby, King Wu had already overcome Dayi (grand city) Shang 大邑商, then announced in the court: “Therefore I have settled in this *Zhongguo* 中國 (central region), will rule

populations from here.”

and the “Da Yu ding” 大盂鼎 (2837-IB) (dated to King Kang’s reign) , which reads:

The king said as follows, “Illustrious King Wen received the mandate the High possessed. As for King Wu, [he] succeeded the state [King] Wen established, opened up its secluded areas, extensively possessed the four quarters, and reformed its populations.”

King Wen was the king who received the mandate, and King Wu was the king who conquered the “Dayi Shang” and “extensively possessed the four quarters.” The achievements of these two kings are strictly distinguished. The royal genealogy recorded on the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan,” edited during King Gong’s reign in the Middle Western Zhou, also basically re-traced the traditional discourse found in the inscriptions of the “He zun” and “Da Yu ding.” It reads as follows:

Accordant with antiquity was King Wen! (He) first brought harmony to government. The Lord on High sent down fine virtue and great security. Extending it to the high and low, he joined the ten thousand states. Capturing and controlling was King Wu! (He) proceeded and campaigned through the four quarters, penetrated Yin allowed eminent people be eternally fearless, kept Lu and Wei away, and attacked the Yi minions.

However, the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” describes the “Son of Heaven,” i.e. King Gong, in the following manner:

The Son of Heaven strives to carry on the long valor of (kings) Wen [and] Wu. The Son of Heaven is diligent and without flaw.

This discourse that combined King Wen and King Wu into a single unit “Wen [and] Wu” also existed elsewhere at this time. A similar style of discourse is preserved in the Luogao, which is classified as one of the oldest chapters of the *Shangshu*.⁹

⁹ The expression “Wen Wu” is also seen in other chapters of the *Shangshu*, such as the latter part of the “Guming” (the “Kangwangzhigao”) and the “Wenhoushiming.” Concerning the fact that formation of the *ming* 命 was later than the *gao* 誥, see Matsumoto 1966, pp. 1-14.

The following examples are illustrative. “I, notwithstanding my youth, may display a brilliant merit like that of Wen [and] Wu,” and “you fail in nothing of the earnest lessons of Wen and Wu,” and “greatly preserving the people whom Wen and Wu received,” and “then the Duke of Zhou greatly sustained the decree which Wen and Wu had received.”

Among bronze inscriptions, we can find similar examples going back to the Middle Western Zhou, such as those on the “Xun gui” 詢簋 (4321·IIB), “The King said as follows, ‘Xun! Illustrious Wen [and] Wu received the mandate,’” the “Shi Xun gui” 師詢簋 (4342), “The King said as follows, ‘Shi Xun! Illustrious Wen [and] Wu confidently received the mandate, greatly had piety for the Yin people,’” and the “Kuaibo gui” 乖伯簋 (4331), “The King said as follows, ‘Kuaibo! Illustrious my ancestors Wen [and] Wu received the great mandate.’”

In these bronze inscriptions, discourse designed to distinguish the achievements of King Wen and King Wu has gradually retreated into the background, and instead a discourse that combines the two kings as “Wen Wu,” a compound, has become the order of the day. The inscription of the “Third Xing zhong” 興鐘 (251-56·III), ordered by Xing who was one generation later than Shi Qiang, reads as follows:

Accordant with antiquity was King Wen! (He) first brought harmony to government. The Lord on High sent down fine virtue and great security. Extensively possessing the four quarters, he joined the ten thousand states. When King Wu had already defeated Yin, the Wei scribe Liezu then came to present himself (in audience) to King Wu.

Although the content of the description is nearly identical to the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan,” the achievement “Extensively possessed the four quarters,” which originally belonged in the description of King Wu, is now applied instead to King Wen. This indicates that the intent of distinguishing the achievements of King Wen and King Wu had become attenuated. The expression “the territory for which Wen [and] Wu had toiled” in the “Zongzhou zhong” 宗周鐘 (260·III), which was donated by King Li himself, is a rhetorical device that combines the two kings into the compound “Wen Wu,” which served as the premise for the discourse on territorial rule.

The latter part of the inscription of the “Lai pan,” recording the appointment ceremony of Lai, begins in the following manner.

The King said as follows, ‘Lai! Illustrious Wen [and] Wu received the great mandate and extensively possessed the four quarters, then, originally your old holy ancestors assisted the ancestral kings and achieved their duties by great commands.

This demonstrates not only a historical recognition that King Wen and King Wu received the mandate and extensively possessed the four quarters, but also refers favorably to great assistance of the “Xiansheng Zukao” 先聖祖考 (old holy ancestors) of Lai. A nearly identical consciousness can be seen in the royal edicts recorded in the inscriptions of the “Forty-second-year Lai ding” and the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” where we see the following.

Lai, illustrious Wen [and] Wu received the great mandate and extensively possessed the four quarters, then, originally your old holy ancestors assisted the ancestral kings, and achieved their duties by great commands, secured the Zhou state.

We find the almost same language in the contemporary inscription of the “Shi Ke xu” 師克盥 (4468), which reads as follows.

The King said as follows, ‘Shi Ke! Illustrious Wen [and] Wu received the great mandate and extensively possessed the four quarters, then, originally your old ancestors had titles in the Zhou state, guarded the kings’ bodies and made themselves their nails and fangs.

During the reign of King Xuan, the people of Zhou had already grown accustomed to the discourse that treated “Wen [and] Wu” as a unit, and which had become associated with the stock phrase “illustrious Wen [and] Wu received the great mandate, and extensively possessed the four quarters.”¹⁰

The inscription of the “Lai pan” boasts of Huanggaozu Shangong’s assistance to King Wen and King Wu when they “attacked Yin, received the generous mandate and extensively possessed the four quarters,” which is based on the contemporary discourse combining King Wen and King Wu into a pair when narrating the

¹⁰ The same consciousness is shared by the “Maogong ding” 毛公鼎 (2841·IIIB) which states, “The king said as follows, ‘Fuyin! Illustrious Wen [and] Wu, the August High widely satisfied their virtues, made us Zhou a counterpart [of him]. [They] received the great mandate, won over states which did not come to court, no one was not connected by the brilliant glory of Wen [and] Wu.”

establishment of the dynasty, and one should not assume that the writer intended to precisely record historical facts. Lai did not intend to record that his ancestor Huanggaozu Shangong actually served King Wen and King Wu, but simply attempted to fit the achievements of Huanggaozu Shangong into the shared discourse current at the time.

2 The Genealogy of the Shan family

The inscription of the “Lai pan” claims that the family’s genealogy dated back to the reigns of King Wen and King Wu, however, the activities of the Shan family to which Lai belonged become clear only from the Middle Western Zhou at the earliest. The inscription of the “Third-year Qiuwei he” 裘衛盃 (9456·III), excavated from a hoard at Dongjiacun (Qishan county) in 1975, details the course of a land dispute between Jubo and Qiuwei and records Qiuwei’s accusation. It reports the following.

Qiuwei, then, in a formal statement, reported this to Boyifu, Rongbo, Dingbo, Jingbo, and Shanbo. Boyifu, Rongbo, Dingbo, Jingbo, and Shanbo, then, commanded the *canyousi*, Situ Wei Yi, Sima Shan Qi, and Sigong Yiren Fu to receive lands at Bin and Fu together.

Here, we find the name of Shanbo 單伯 as one of the ministers who received Qiuwei’s appeal and rendered judgment.¹¹ Situ Shanbo 嗣徒單伯 is seen as a helper at the appointment ceremony recorded in the inscription of the “Yang gui” 揚簋 (4292). The inscription reads as follows.

The king was at the Zhou Kanggong. At dawn [the king] entered the *dashi* and assumed [his] position. Situ Shanbo entered and helped Yang. The king called out Neishi Shi Nian and let him command Yang with a document.

Although the relation of the Shanbo mentioned here and the Shanbo noted in the “Third-year Qiuwei he” is not clear, it is clear that he was a member of the Shan family from approximately the same period. Furthermore, Shanbo Haosheng 單伯昊生, the donor of the “Shanbo Haosheng zhong” 單伯昊生鐘 (82), the

¹¹ Situ Shan Qi 嗣徒單旗, one of the *canyousi* 參有嗣, may also be a member of the Shan family.

“Haosheng zhong” 昊生鐘 (105), and the “Shan Haosheng dou” 單昊生豆 (4672), and Shanbo Yuanfu 單伯原父, the donor of the “Shanbo Yuanfu li” 單伯原父鬲 (737), were also members of the Shan family. The expression “achieved one’s duty by a grand command” *jueqin daming* 爵勤大命 is seen in the inscription of the “Shanbo Haosheng zhong,” which reads, “Illustrious Huangzu and Liekao assisted ancestral kings, achieved their duties by grand command.” The phrase, which is also seen in the inscriptions of the “Lai pan,” the “Forty-second-year Lai ding,” the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” and the “Maogong ding,” was characteristic of the Late Western Zhou. The Shan family, who seem to have established their position in the Middle Western Zhou, seem to have maintained their power into the Late Western Zhou.

Meanwhile, from the hoard at Yangjiacun where the “Lai pan” was excavated, the “Shan Wufu fanghu” 單五父方壺, the “Shuwufu yi” 叔五父匜, and the “Shan-shu li” 單叔鬲 were also excavated, the names of two of the donors of these items, Shan Wufu 單五父 and Shuwufu 叔五父 may be variants of the name Shanshu Wufu 單叔五父.¹² Shanshu Wufu (Shan Wufu, Shuwufu) is a figure who is distinguished from those in other branches of the Shan family by the seniority title “shu” 叔, and the Shanshu seen in the inscription of the “Shanshu li” is perhaps the same person. Although the relation between this Shanshu Wufu and the Lai cannot be clarified, if we judge the fact that these objects were excavated from the same hoard in a positive manner, it appears highly likely that Lai may have belonged to the Shanshu family. In any case, there were at least two branches of the Shan family in the Late Western Zhou, the Shanbo 單伯 and the Shanshu 單叔.¹³

If one refers to the corresponding relationships between Lai’s ancestors and the Zhou kings in the inscription of the “Lai pan” (Table 1), one sees that it was only after Huangyazu Yizhong, two generations before Lai himself, or perhaps Huanggaozu Lingbo one generation earlier, that the activities of the Shan family became clear.¹⁴ All that is known of the Shan family prior to this period is an in-

¹² For further reference, see Matsui 2002, pp. 178-188.

¹³ Ikezawa (2002: 43-128) concluded that in regard to titles such as Gaozu, Liezu, and Yazu, Gaozu referred to a founder of a “maximum lineage,” Liezu a founder of a “major segment” or branch, that grew out of a maximum lineage, Yazu a founder of a minor segment, that grew out of a major segment. On the basis of his conclusion, the Shanshu family may have split from the Shanbo family in the generation of Lai’s ancestor Huangyazu Yizhong.

¹⁴ In addition, there are other bronzes related to the Shan family such as the “Shanzibo xu” 單子伯盥 (4424) and the “Shanzibo pan” 單子伯盤 (10070). Although YZ dates the *xu* to the Early Spring and Autumn period, and the *pan* to the Early Western Zhou (Zhongguo Shehui Kexueyuan 2001 changed the dating it to the Middle Western Zhou), but considering the existence of the Shan

scription on the “fangding with nipple-nail pattern” (2270) from the Early Western Zhou, held in the National Gallery of Victoria (Melbourne, Australia), which reads, “Shu made (for) Shangong (this) treasured, sacrificial vessel.” Since the excavation of the “Lai pan,” this bronze inscribed with the name Shangong has begun to attract attention. Li Xueqin, who first introduced this bronze, concluded that the Shangong seen on this *fangding*, which is shaped like the “Zuoce Da fangding” 作册大方鼎 (2758-61·IB), was Zhen, the youngest son of King Cheng, said to have been invested with Shan town.¹⁵ However, the legend that the first ancestor of the Shan family was Zhen is thought to be groundless,¹⁶ furthermore, the inscription of the “Lai pan” itself does not make the claim that the family originated from King Cheng. Meanwhile, others concluded Shu, the donor of this bronze, was Gongshu, the second generation Huanggaozu, who served King Cheng, and Shangong, the dedicatee, was Shangong, the first Huanggaozu, who served King Wen and King Wu.¹⁷ However, these do not serve as counter evidence to Li’s dating of this *fangding* to the reign of King Kang or King Zhao. In any case, this inscription cannot support the claim of the inscription of the “Lai pan” that Huanggaozu Shangong “served” King Wen and King Wu. Furthermore, some have attempted to identify Li 盨, the donor of the “Li quzun” 盨駒尊 (6011-12·II), the “fangzun” 方尊 (6013·IIB), and the “fangyi” 方彝 (9899-9900·II) with Huanggaozu Lifu seen in the “Lai pan,” however, the grounds for linking the two are the shared character 盨 (li) in their names, the shared character 仲 (*zhong*) in the names of Wenkao (father) Dazhong 文考大仲, the dedicatee of the “Li quzun,” and Huanggaozu Xin-

family in the Spring and Autumn period, it should probably not be dated that early. Furthermore, YZ registered the *you* excavated from Liulihe M251 (Fangshan, Beijing) as the “Shanzi you” 單子卣, however the character cannot be deciphered as “shan.”

¹⁵ Li Xueqin (1979) stated, “The shape of the *fangding* held in the National Gallery of Victoria most closely resembles the *fangding* (126) seen in the *Shang Zhou Yiqi Tongkao*, and it also resembles some pieces of the “Zuoce Da fangding” 作册大方鼎 excavated at Mapo, Luoyang. A relatively shallow belly is their common characteristic. The “Zuoce Da fangding” is dated to King Kang or King Zhao’s reign, thus, this “Shu fangding” must be dated to the same period. In this way, the Shangong seen in the inscription of the *ding* could be Zhen, the youngest son of King Cheng, the first Shangong.”

¹⁶ Chen Pan (1970: 20 Shan) states, “Some say, (the founder of the Shan family) is Zhen, the youngest son of King Cheng, however, their origin is not known. ...I think that ...the opinion, that (the founder of the Shan family) is Zhen, the youngest son of King Cheng, was already seen in the [*Yuanhe*] *Xingcuan*, ...If the Shan family was a branch of the Zhou, Shanzi would surely have mentioned it himself. The opinion, that (the founder of the Shan family) is Zhen, the youngest son of King Cheng, is to be doubted.” The *Yuanhe Xingcuan*, shangpingsheng, 25 han states, “Shan; King Cheng of Zhou invested Zhen, his youngest son with Shan town, and made him a ruler of territory within the inner domain, thereby (Shan) became the name of the clan.”

shizhong, who was one generation prior to that of Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu, and the proximity of the excavations, but none of these serves as decisive proof. It is likewise impossible to prove the existence of Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu by the existence of the Li bronzes. All the conclusions about Huanggaozu Shangong or Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu share the premise (wishful thinking) that the inscription of the “Lai pan” records historical facts, however, it must not be forgotten that this inscription was lodged in the “collective memory” that narrated the founding of the dynasty and that used the compound Wen [and] Wu when referring to the two kings.

Above all, among those recorded as the ancestor’s of Lai, i.e., Huanggaozu Shangong, Huanggaozu Gongshu, Huanggaozu Xinshizhong, Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu, Huanggaozu Lingbo, Huangyazu Yizhong, and Huangkao Gongshu, the fact that five are labeled “Huanggaozu” is itself strange.¹⁸ Although other bronze inscriptions also mentioned a Gaozu, such as the “Shi Qiang pan” and the “Second Xing zhong” 癸鐘 (247-50·IIIA), which reads, “Xing said, ‘Illustrious Gaozu, Yazu, and Wenkao were willing to make clear their minds, and aided Yin[?]'s dignity, and thereby served the ancestral kings,” or the “Da gui” 大簋 (4125), which states “Da has made a sacrificial *gui*, and thereby sacrifices to Gaozu and Huangkao,” and the “Chugong Ni zhong” 楚公逆鐘 (JC97) which notes, “Chugong Ni sacrifices to his Xian Gaozukai Furen Sifangshou,” from the Late Western Zhou, and in addition, the “Shuyi zhong” 叔夷鐘 (275), from the Late Spring and Autumn period, states, “Yi is going to make Xianjiu and his Gaozu models,” but none of these ever lists multiple Gaozu such as found in the inscription of the “Lai pan.”¹⁹ If one were to repeat names when listing ancestors, one could expect that Liezu

¹⁷ Dong Shan 2003; Zhu Fenghan 2004 and others.

¹⁸ Cao Wei (2003a; 2003b) and Zhu Fenghan (2004) deciphered the second-generation Huanggaozu Gongshu as Xiangaozu 先高祖 Gongshu, however, the inscription should be deciphered as Huanggaozu Gongshu based on my observation of its rubbing and having viewed it in an exhibition.

¹⁹ Although they are no examples of the use of Gaozu, the “Shuxiangfu Yu gui” 叔向父禹簋 (4242·IIIB), which reads, “(I, Yu,) make my Huangzu Youdashu’s sacrificial *gui*” and the “Yu ding” 禹鼎 (2833-34·IIIB), which was ordered by the same donor and reads “Illustrious valiant Huangzu Mugong was willing to assist ancestral kings, secured the four quarters. Then, even Wugong does not forget my Shengzukai Youdashu and Yishu,” use the same title, Huangzu, for two different ancestors. Nevertheless, the use of the same title for more than one ancestor was avoided as in the case of Youdashu who used the title Huangzu in the inscription of the “Shuxiangfuyu gui,” but used Shengzu in the inscription of the “Yu ding.” Also as to the names of ancestors listed in the inscription of the “Shi Yu zhong” 師盂鐘 (Gao Xisheng 1994), “(I, Shi Yu, by myself, make my Huangzu Dagong, Yonggong, Xgong, Luzhong, Xbo, Xiaogong, and my Liekao’s ...hezong,” it is not necessarily the case that the title “Huangzu” was applied to each ancestor.

and Yizu would be used, as seen in the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan,” or Wen-zu, as seen in the inscriptions of the “First Xing zhong” and “Li fangyi.” The preference for the title “Huanggaozu” in the inscription of the “Lai pan” was surely meant to underscore the achievements of the family line, and emphasis the supremacy of each ancestor.²⁰ However, the overuse of the title “Huanggaozu,” on the contrary, reveals the artificiality of his genealogy.

During turbulence of the transition from the Western to the Eastern Zhou, the lineages of many powerful families were severed. However, the Shan family overcame these difficulties and succeeded in leaving records of their names in historical materials. Although the Shan family produced many powerful *qingshi* (dynastic minister) such as Shan Mugong, who assisted King Zhuo and King Qing, and contributed to the final victory in the rebellion of Prince Zhao (520-516 B.C.), which had split the dynasty into two, all that remains regarding their origin are the words of Shan Zhao (Shan Xianggong), “Now, although Zhao, [I], am talentless, [I belong to one of the] branches of the Zhou,” which is seen in the “Zhouyu,” part 2, of the *Guoyu*. As Wei Zhao commented, “[one of] the branches of the Zhou’ means being a royal relative,” and there may have been a tradition that the Shan family belonged to one of the branches of the Zhou, however, we cannot confirm, in fact, the existence of any legend about the founder, except that of Zhen being King Cheng’s youngest son, as mentioned above. The legend of the foundations of the Guo family, which likewise survived into the Eastern Zhou, traces their origins to Guozhong and Guoji, Wangji’s sons, i.e. King Wen’s brothers, as seen in the the *Zuozhuan*, the 5th year of Duke Xi which reads, “Guozhong and Guoji were Wangji’s sons and King Wen’s ministers. Their merits in the service of the royal house are preserved in the repository of covenants.” When this is compared to the legend of the Shan family, the latter’s unreliability cannot be denied. Above all, as mentioned above, there was no intention to show in the family’s genealogy in the “Lai pan” that they were one of the branches of the Zhou, in this sense, the Shan family failed in forming a foundation legend.

Thus, one must ask, on the contrary, what was the intention of Lai in recording such a genealogy in the inscription? In the appointment ceremony recorded in the second half of the inscription of the “Lai pan,” King Xuan issues a royal edict to Lai, asserting, “[I] command you to assist Rong Dui and together administer marshes and forests in the four directions, for the use of the palace.” This com-

²⁰ The character 皇 (*huang*) of Huanggaozu means supreme, as in 皇天 (*huangtian*), 上帝 (*huangshangdi*), and 皇帝 (*huangdi*), meaning the Lord on High, 皇王 (*huangwang*) referring to

mand to assist Rong Dui and administer marshes (*yu* 虞) and forests (*lin* 林) in the four directions is similar to edicts that are recorded in the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” which reads, “I have already commanded you once to assist Rong Dui and together administer marshes and forests in the four directions, for the use of the palace,” and the “Lai bianzhong” 迷編鐘 (JC106-09),²¹ also dedicated by Lai, which was excavated at Yangjiacun in 1985 and reads, “The son of Heaven remembers my ancestors’ services, and bestows [on me] benevolently many commands, letting [me] together administer marshes and forests in the four directions.” If the “marshes and forests in the four directions” were understood literally, it would refer to all marshes and forests within the dynastic domain, and must be understood as so much rhetoric,²² however, it also demonstrates the great power of Lai in being able to elicit such an edict from King Xuan. Among the twenty-seven bronze pieces excavated from the hoard at Yangjiacun, fourteen pieces were certainly dedicated by Lai himself. The first of the two “Forty-second-year Lai ding” is 51cm high, and weighs 35.5kg, and the second is 57.8cm high, and weighs 46kg. Among the ten pieces of the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” the largest is 58cm high, and weighs 44.5kg. The “Lai he” is 48cm in height, boasting perhaps the maximum-scale of any *he* from the Western Zhou. Furthermore, the first of the bronze assemblages compares favorably to the “Zongzhou zhong,” dedicated by King Li, which is 65.6cm in height and weighs 55.5kg, and the “Hu gui,” (4317·IIA), which is 59cm in height, and weighs 60kg. It is perhaps the largest scale bronze assemblage that a vassal could have had made,²³ indicating the extent of Lai’s great power.

Although it is not clear why Lai had such power, he must have been one of the most powerful supporters of King Xuan’s reign.²⁴ Was it perhaps not the final task

the Zhou king.

²¹ Zhang Guangyu (2004) stated that another two bronzes were transmitted; however, I have not been able to confirm this.

²² In the inscriptions of the “Forty-second-year Lai ding” and the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” Lai’s name is written as Yu Lai 虞迷. Because Lai held the post of *yu* 虞, the official who administered mountains, forests, thickets, and marshes, his duty was to control the “marshes and forests” (*yulin* 虞林) “in the four directions” and he was so designated.

²³ As to other contemporary bronze assemblages, Ke 克, and Hanhuangfu 函皇父, and some others are known. Ke assemblages includes the “Da Ke ding” 大克鼎 (93.1cm, 201.5kg), the “Xiao Ke ding” 小克鼎 (the 1st piece; 56.5cm, 47.9kg. the 2nd piece; 34.2cm, the 3rd piece; 35.4cm, the fourth piece; 35.2cm, the fifth piece; unclear, the sixth piece; 29.5cm, the seventh piece; unclear), the “Shanfu Ke xu” 善夫克盨 (19.9 cm), “Ke zhong” 克鐘 (the 1st piece; 35.9cm, the 2nd piece; 54.5cm, the 3rd piece; 30.7cm, the 4th and 5th pieces; unclear), and the “Ke bo” 克罍 (63.5cm, 38.3 kg).

²⁴ The “Forty-second-year Lai ding” records that Lai assisted Zhangfu, who was invested with

of Lai, who was able to have King Xuan command him to administer “marshes and forests in the four directions,” and who arranged a series of gigantic bronze assemblages to show off his own power, to connect the origin of his own family line with King Wen and King Wu and link the Shan family to the glorious “memory” of dynastic foundation?²⁵ As a result of having linked the family genealogy, which could not actually be traced back to the founding of the dynasty and which was probably not very distinguished, to the dynastic genealogy and to the “memory” of King Wen and King Wu, it became necessary to “adjust” contradictions with the real genealogy. As King Wen and King Wu were already paired, Lai could adjust that contradiction by adapting the same discourse style of combining the later Zhou kings into pairs, and “reduce” the number of ancestors at the same time.

3 King Kang, Alone respected

The genealogy of the Lai family recorded in the inscription of the “Lai pan” must not be considered a record of historical facts, but seen instead as an “invented history,” designed to underscore the achievements of the family, and created with Lai’s power as the backdrop. The royal genealogy inserted into the inscription of the “Lai pan” was an important tool, providing a sense of reality to such an “invented history” and acting as a validating site in the “collective memory” of the dynastic foundation which was narrated in a discourse that combined King Wen and King Wu as a pair. Seeing the rhetorical strategy of combining King Wen and King Wu as a unit, Lai must have hit upon the idea of linking his ancestors with three pairs of six kings, i.e. King Zhao and King Mu, King Gong and King Yi, and King Xiao and King Yi. But if this were the case, one must ask

Yang, to attack Xianyun. The record reads, “I first set up Zhangfu, made him *hou* 侯 (ruler) of Yang, and then I commanded you to secure Zhangfu. Graciously, you could secure his garrison, you, then, could model [yourself] after your ancestors, and [attacked?] Xianyun, made a sortie and defeated Li-X at Jing’a. You did not neglect a battle. You [assisted ?] Zhangfu to pursue Rong, then, caught up with them and exceedingly attacked them in Gonggu. You seized prisoners and severed heads, seized vessels and chariots-horses.” In addition, Li Xueqin (2003) introduced descriptions of the investiture in Yang, such as that in the “Zaixiangshixibiao” chapter 1, part 2, of the *Xintangshu*, which states, “the Yang lineage originated from the Ji clan; Shangfu, a son of King Xuan, was invested in Yang,” and the *Yuanhe Xingcuan*, Xiapingsheng 10 yang, which states, “Someone said, a great-grandson of King Xuan of Zhou was invested in Yang, and destroyed by Jin.”

²⁵ Shirakawa (1981: 549-647) pointed out the creation of “the Ya and Song poems that were meant to verify the absolute power of the dynasty by King Wen and King Wu’s receipt of the mandate” occurred in the Late Western Zhou.

how it is that three kings, Cheng, Kang, and Li, escaped from being combined into pairs and, on the contrary, appear alone? The cause needs explaining. King Li would have been paired with King Xuan, who was the current “Son of Heaven,” when the inscription of the “Lai pan” was drafted, so King Li must have appeared alone. Then, one problem remains, how to explain why King Cheng and King Kang were not combined as a pair.²⁶

From the standpoint of the study of bronze inscriptions, King Kang presents a difficult problem. Many bronze inscriptions, recording appointment and other ceremonies, mentioned the king’s location using a formula such as “the king was at X” or “The king arrived at X,” for an example, the “Forty-second-year Lai ding” reads as follows.

It was the 42nd year, fifth month, after the growing brightness, *yimao* [52nd] day; the king was at the Zhou Kangmugong. At dawn the king entered the Dashi and assumed his position. Sigong San helped Yu Lai to enter the gate, stood in the center of the court, and turned to the north. Yinshi presented the king a bestowal document. The king called out to Shi Huo to bestow Lai with a document. The king said as follows...

This records that the king (King Xuan) was at the “Zhou Kangmugong,” early in the morning, he entered the “Dashi,” but in the inscription of the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” this “Zhou Kangmugong” 周康穆宮 is called the “Zhou Kanggong Mugong” 周康宮穆宮. How are we to understand the relation between the various palaces (*gong*) of the Kanggong and King Kang himself? The problem of the “Kanggong” has troubled scholars for many years.

The Early Western Zhou “Ling fangzun” 令方尊 (6016-IB) and “fangyi” 方彝 (991-IB) are the oldest bronzes that record the name of the Kanggong. The inscriptions read:

²⁶ The *Guben Zhushujinian* records that there were 257 years from King Wu’s conquest of Yin to King You’s demise. Lai made a *ding* with the date 43rd year of King Xuan, so if Lai had died this year, King Xuan would have had 3 more years remaining in his reign, and King You’s reign lasted 11 more years, until his demise. If the reign of King Wen, whom Lai claimed his Huang-gaozu Shanggong “served,” was used to offset the three years of King Xuan’s and eleven years of King You’s reign, the average number of years per generation of Lai’s family would be about 32 years. If another of Lai’s ancestors were “saved” by combining King Cheng and King Kang into a pair, the average number of years per generation would be about 37 years, a rather large but not impossible figure, see Yoshimoto 2000.

It was in the 8th month, the *jiashen* (21st) day, the King commanded Mingbao, son of the Duke of Zhou, to rule the *sanshi* (three administrations) and the *sifang* (four directions), entrusting [him] with the *qingshiliao*. On the *dinghai* (24th) day, [The king] commanded Ce to make an announcement in the palace of the Duke of Zhou. Gong commanded an announcement be made and the gathering of the *qingshiliao*. It was in the 10th month, *yueji*, the *guiwei* (20th) day, Minggong arrived at Chengzhou in the morning, and announced, “As to the order of *sanshi*, addressed together to *qingshiliao*, *zhuyin*, *lijun*, and *baigong*, and together with *zhuhou*; *hou*, *dian*, and *nan*, address the order of *sifang*.” When it was over, [Minggong] ordered all [of] them. On the *jiashen* (21st) day, Minggong made a sacrifice at the Jinggong, and on the *yiyou* (22nd) day, made a sacrifice at the Kanggong. All was concluded, [Minggong] used sacrifice at the Wang [suo?]. Minggong came back from the Wang [gong?].

We see that on the *jiashen* (21st) day of the 8th month, the king of Zhou commanded Mingbao (Minggong), a son of the Duke of Zhou, to unify the *qingshiliao* 卿事寮 to rule the *sanshi* 三事 (royal administration) and the *sifang* 四方 (local rulers). Minggong received the command, then 60 days later, on the *guiwei* (20th) day of the 10th month, arrived at Chengzhou, transmitted commands for the *sanshi* and *sifang*, and on the next day, the *jiashen* (21st) day, made a sacrifice at the Jinggong, on the *yiyou* (22nd) day, and made a sacrifice at the Kanggong, then, also made a sacrifice to the Wang (Wangsuo?). This means there were at least two “gong,” one called the “Jinggong” and the other “Kanggong.” Tang Lan argued that the Jinggong was the ancestral mausoleum for Taiwang (Gugong Tanfu), Wangji, King Wen, King Wu, and King Cheng, and the Kanggong was the mausoleum for King Kang, thus, he dated the “Ling fangzun” and “Ling fangyi” to King Zhao’s reign. Furthermore, Tang argued that the other Kanggong palaces seen in other bronze inscriptions, such as Kangzhaogong, Kangmugong, Kanggong Yidashi, and Kangligong are respectively the mausoleum of King Zhao, King Mu, King Yi, and King Li, and the ordering of the mausolea of successive Zhou kings following King Kang was premised on the existence of the Kanggong.²⁷

Objecting to Tang’s arguments, Guo Moruo and Chen Mengjia dated the “Ling fangzun” and “Ling fangyi” to King Cheng’s reign. Guo pointed out that the names

²⁷ Tang Lan 1934. Wang Guowei also pointed out that the Kanggong was King Kang’s mausoleum. See “Mingtang Miaoqin Tongkao” in Wang Guowei 1921.

of the palaces were “isolated examples,” that there was no evidence supporting Tang’s interpretations, and that it was unclear why only the mausoleum of King Kang among successive kings of Western Zhou should be “respected alone.” He also argued that the characters *jing* 京 and *kang* 康, as well as *zhao* 昭, *mu* 穆, and *li* 刺 were only “felicitous characters” used for names of mausolea.²⁸ Meanwhile, Chen argued that words such as *gong* 宮, *qin* 寢, *shi* 室, and *jia* 家 referred to residences of the living and must be distinguished from *miao* 廟, *zong* 宗, and *zongshi* 宗室, which were for the souls of ancestors, and denied Tang’s theory that Kanggong was King Kang’s mausoleum.²⁹ Faced with these arguments, Tang published “The ‘Kanggong’ problem in dating Western Zhou bronzes” in 1962 in an attempt to make a counterargument.³⁰ In the first section, “The location of differences and the importance of the problem,” he clarified the differences between his own arguments and those of Guo and Chen. Then, in the second part, “Why ‘Kanggong’ is King Kang’s mausoleum,” he reaffirmed his own arguments and concluded that the Kanggong seen in the inscriptions of the “Ling fangzun” and “Ling fangyi” was after all King Kang’s mausoleum, that an examination of other bronze inscriptions mentioning the Kanggong supported the theory that Kanggong was King Kang’s mausoleum, that this also could be proved by accounts in historical materials, that because of distinction between the *zhao* 昭 and *mu* 穆 under the Zhou *zongfa* 宗法 system, the Kanggong could be King Kang’s mausoleum, that the Zhaogong and the Mugong were the mausolea of King Zhao and King Mu respectively. In the third section, “Regarding debate on ‘the distinction between *gong* and *miao*,’” he argued against Chen and concluded that “*gong*” was the general name for buildings that could include *miao*, *qin* and *dashi*, that the Kanggong could also have been called Kangmiao or Kangqin, and that it was possible that it had been built in King Kang’s own lifetime. In the fourth section, “Problems of dating of certain Western Zhou bronzes,” he tried to date the bronzes on the basis of accounts of the Kanggong. He argued that bronzes inscribed with the

²⁸ Guo 1957; the Ling yi.

²⁹ Chen Mengjia 1957; (2) “19 Ling fangyi.” But, one of the grounds for his argument, “Western Zhou bronze inscriptions had a principle, that is, an idiomatic expression ‘the king was at X’ was used only for ‘the king was at some area’ or ‘the king was at some *gong* or some *qin*’ ...and never been used for ‘the king was at some *miao*’ was revised in the 2004 edition, with “Western Zhou bronze inscriptions had a principle, ...the inscription of the “Nangongliu ding” has ‘the king was at the Kangmiao,’ but this does not mean the king resided at the Kangmiao, but that the king appointed [someone] at the Kangmiao.”

³⁰ Tang Lan 1962. The author also mentioned the “Kanggong problem” in Tang Lan 1980: part 2.

Table 2: Palaces of the Kanggong and associated institutions

King's location	Bronzes with inscriptions	Hayashi's periodization	YZ and others
Kanggong 康宮	"Ling fangzun/fangyi" 令方尊/令方彝	I B	6016E/9901E
Kanggong/Dashi 大室	*"Ji gui" 卣簋	II B	4259M
Kanggong	"Kang ding" 康鼎	III A	2786M/L
Kanggong/Qiboshi 齊伯室	*"Wu gui" 敵簋		JC483M
Kanggong Dashi	"Junfu gui" 君夫簋		4178M
Kanggong	*"Wei gui" 衛簋	III A	4209-12M
Kanggong	*"Chu gui" 楚簋		4246-9L
Zhou Kanggong 周康宮 /Dashi	*"Fushili gui" 輔師菱簋	II B	4286L
Zhou Kanggong/Dashi	"Xiu pan" 休盤	III A	10170M
Zhou Kanggong/Dashi	"Yang gui" 揚簋	III A	4294-5L
Zhou Kanggong	*"Jia gui" 夾簋		Zhang Guangyu 2002 M
Zhou Kanggong/Dashi	*"Shen gui" 申簋		4267M
Zhou Kanggong/Dashi	*"Shi Mou gui" 師潁簋		4312L
Zhou Kanggong Xingong 周 康宮新宮/Dashi	"Wang gui" 望簋		4272M
Zhou Kangzhaogong 周康 昭宮/Dashi	"Song ding/gui/hu" 頌鼎/簋/ 壺	III B	2827-9/4332-9/ 9731-2L
Zhou Kangzhaogong/Dashi	*"Ma ding" 趺鼎		2815L
Zhou Kangmugong 周康穆 宮	"Shanfu Ke xu" 善夫克盥	III B	4465L →King Xuan
Zhou Kangmugong/Dashi	"Yuan ding/pan" 寰鼎/盤		2819/10172 →King Xuan
Zhou Kangmugong/Dashi	*"Forty-second-year Lai ding" 逯鼎		→King Xuan
Zhou Kanggong Mugong 周 康宮穆宮/Zhoumiao 周廟	*"Forty-third-year Lai ding" 逯鼎		→King Xuan
Zhou Kanggong/Mudashi 穆 大室	"Yi gui" 伊簋	III B	4287L →King Xuan
Zhou Kanggong Yidashi 周 康宮偃大室	"Gezong ding/ gui" 鬲從鼎/ 簋	III B	2818/4278L
Zhou Kanggong Yigong 周 康宮偃宮/Dashi	*"Ci ding/gui" 此鼎/簋	III A	2821-3/4303-10L

Zhou Kanggong Yigong	*“Wu Hu ding” 吳虎鼎		JC364L →King Xuan
Zhou Kangyigong 周康诰宮	*“Cheng zhong” 成鐘		Chen Peifen2000 →King Li
Zhou Kangligong 周康剌宮	“Ke zhong/bo” 克鐘/鐔	III	203-8/209L →King Xuan
Zhou Kangqin 周康寢	“Shi Ju fangyi” 師遽方彝	II	9897M
Kangmiao 康廟	“Nangong Liu ding” 南宮柳鼎	III A	2805L
Zhou/Kangmiao 周/康廟	“First-year Shi Dui gui” 師兌簋	III B	4274-5L
Kang 康	*“Yinghou Jiangong zhong” 應侯見工鐘	III	107-9M/L

*indicates bronzes excavated after the publication of Tang Lan 1962.

Kanggong could not be dated prior to King Kang, and bronzes inscribed with the names of the palaces of Kanggong, such as the Kangzhaogong, Kangmugong, Kanggong Yidashi, and Kangligong, could not either. He later assembled these arguments and published them in 1986.

The “Kanggong problem,” which had begun with Tang’s advocacy of the theory that Kanggong was King Kang’s mausoleum, involved the arguments of Guo and Chen, and Tang’s counterarguments, and later attracted supporting and opposing opinions, continues on today without resolution.³¹ As shown in **Table 2**, during this period, bronze inscriptions mentioning palaces of Kanggong increased in number, the names of palaces such as Zhou Kanggong Mugong, Zhou Kangyigong, and Zhou Kanggong Yigong were newly identified, and the condition of “isolated examples,” which Guo had indicated, being corrected, however, definitive source materials were still lacking,³² when the inscription of the “Lai pan” appeared in 2003. As mentioned above, the inscription of the “Lai pan” recording the genealogy of the successive Zhou kings was meant to highlight the achievements of Lai’s family. Among the kings, the name of King Li, who was identified in 1997 in inscription of the “Wu Hu ding,”³³ was the second case of such an identification following the names of King Xiao and King Yí, who were

³¹ Liu Zheng 2004 introduced the theories about the “Kanggong problem.” Du Yong and Shen Changyun 2002 also had a chapter about this problem.

³² For example, as Liu Zheng (2004) said, “Many scholars interpreted ‘Yigong’ 诰宮 as 夷宮, this hypothesis can be made, but there is no convincing evidence to prove it” and thus there is no definitive evidence to settle the “Kanggong problem.”

³³ Matsui 2004.

first identified in the inscription of the “Lai pan.” Furthermore, the character *yi* 彳 of King Yì corresponds with the character in the Zhou Kangyigong, the Zhou Kanggong Yigong, and the Zhou Kanggong Yidashi, and the *li* 刺 of King Lì corresponds with that of the Zhou Kangligong, and thus Tang’s argument that the Kanggong Yidashi and the Kangligong were mausolea for King Yi and King Li respectively was provided definitive evidence. As the mausolea of King Yi and King Li have already been confirmed among the palaces of the Kanggong, the Kangzhaogong and the Kangmugong (Kanggong Mugong) should also be identified as the mausolea of King Zhao and King Mu respectively, and there is no need for the Kanggong, the basic term used in names of the various palaces of the Kanggong, to be interpreted as “felicitous characters,” but should be understood as the mausoleum of King Kang, just as other palaces of the Kanggong were mausolea. This is not contradicted by Hayashi Minao’s dating of the “Ling fangzun” and “Ling fangyi,” the oldest bronzes on which the name of the Kanggong is inscribed, to Western Zhou IB, and the “Ling yi,” dedicated by the same Ling, to IIA. Although buildings associated with King Gong, King Yì, and King Xiao are as yet unknown, the palaces of Kanggong must undoubtedly have been ordered under the presumption of the existence of the Kanggong as King Kang’s mausoleum. The Kanggong or King Kang was certainly “respected alone.”

Why then was the Kanggong or King Kang “respected alone?” This question once asked by Guo was answered by Tang in the following manner.

In the Early Western Zhou, King Wu, King Cheng, and King Kang appointed many state rulers. As seen in the *Zuozhuan*, the 26th year of Duke Zhao, which reads:

Long ago, King Wu subdued Yin, King Cheng secured tranquility through the four quarters, and King Kang gave the people rest. They all invested their full brothers with the rule of states, which might serve as defenses and screens for Zhou.

Thus appointed, the full brothers of King Wu sacrificed to their father, King Wen, King Cheng’s full brother sacrificed to King Wu, and King Kang’s full brother sacrificed to King Cheng. King Wen, King Wu, and King Cheng were worshipped in the Jinggong, thus, the Jinggong became the common mausoleum of the kings of the Zhou dynasty and state rulers of the same Ji clan. However, after King Kang, when the distribution of territory was almost complete, state rulers could no longer be appointed. Consequently, mausolea after King Kang belonged only to

the Zhou kings, and King Kang's "respected-alone" position appeared. King Kang is the last king who could appoint his full brothers as state rulers, and at the same time, he was the first king who could not appoint his son's generation. Tang tried to explain the "respected-alone" position of King Kang or the Kanggong by focusing on King Kang's unprecedented status in terms of appointments of state rulers. However, Tang considered King Kang to be the founder of the mausoleum for only the Zhou kings, explained the "respected-alone" status of the Kanggong on this basis, and was forced to assume that the Kanggong continued to be "respected alone" after the reign of King Zhao, a son of King Kang. Consequently, Tang's interest was concentrated in seeing the continuity of the Kanggong, and he was not able to distinguish the Kanggong in Chengzhou, seen in the inscription of the "Ling fangzun" and "Ling fangyi," and the Zhou Kanggong, seen in the inscriptions of the "Fushili gui" and elsewhere (see **Table 2**).

As seen in the inscription of "Yinghou Jiangong zhong" 應侯見工鐘 (107·III) that reads: "It was the regular[?] second month, the King came back from Chengzhou, Yinghou Jiangong escorted [him] to Zhou. On the *xinwei* (8th) day, the King arrived at Kang," Chengzhou and Zhou are mutually exclusive. Tang's arguments that did not distinguish the two can not be maintained. Although several opinions have been proposed about the location of Zhou, I have previously argued that those who situate it in Qizhou around the Zhouyuan area are the most persuasive.³⁴ The existence of the "Kanggong in Zhou" can first be identified around period IIB of Hayashi's dating, and in almost the same period, the Zhou Chengdashi, the *dashi* of King Cheng, can be seen in the inscription of the "Wu fangyi" 吳方彝 (9898) and the Zhou Muwangdashi, the *dashi* of King Mu, can be seen in the inscription of the "Hu ding" 魯鼎 (2838). Although its location cannot be confirmed, the Chenggong which is thought to refer to the mausoleum of King Cheng can be seen in the "Hu hu" 魯壺 (9728). In fact, many bronze inscriptions mention Kanggong in Zhou, but that does not immediately signify the "respected-alone" status of the Kanggong. In fact, as Tang realized, it was only in the reigns of King Li and King Xuan, the period from IIIA to IIIB of Hayashi's dating, that all the palaces of the Kanggong, such as the Kangzhaogong and Kangmugong, appeared,³⁵ and thus it must also have been in the reigns of King Li and King Xuan that the Kanggong, which determined the order of these palaces, attained its "respected-

³⁴ See Matsui 2002: 55-88.

³⁵ Yoshimoto (2004) pointed out that the Kangyigong (Kanggong Yigong) and the Kangmugong or the Yidashi and the Mudashi of the Kanggong appeared in King Li's reign, and the Kangligong and the Kangzhaogong appeared in King Xuan's reign.

alone” status. The Kanggong and King Kang did not occupy the “respected-alone” position throughout the period from start to finish and the “respected-alone” status was only confirmed during the reigns of King Li and King Xuan when they came to embody their position in the order of the Kanggong palaces.

Because of the close relationship of the standard bronzes of King Xuan’s reign, such as the “Forty-second-year Lai ding” and the “Forty-third-year Lai ding,” to King Mu’s palaces and halls, such as the Zhou Kanggong Mugong (Zhou Kangmugong) and Zhou Kanggong Mudashi, I had once argued that the people of Zhou may have sought a basis for legitimacy during King Xuan’s reign in King Mu’s existence,³⁶ and that they had also recognized King Kang’s “respected-alone” position in the Zhou Kanggong Mugong and the Zhou Kanggong Mudashi. The inscription of the “Lai pan” linking one of the author’s own ancestors to King Kang, as a solitary king and not pairing him with King Cheng, undoubtedly reflects the Zhou people’s recognition of King Kang’s “respected-alone” position.

4 Memories of Zhou Kings

The inscription of the “Lai pan” was intended to underscore achievements of each of the author’s ancestors in relation to successive Zhou kings. As for Huanggaozu Xinshizhong, who “served” King Kang, it provides the following account.

Then, my Huanggaozu Xinshizhong was willing to make solitary and clear his mind, be gentle with the distant ones and handle the near ones, assisted(?) King Kang. [He] won over those who did not come to court.

This shows that the people of Zhou in King Xuan’s reign remembered King Kang as a king who “won over those who did not come to court. “The phrase “*buling*” 不廷 (those who did not come to court) refers to powers who did not come to offer tribute to the dynasty.³⁷ The term is seen in the inscriptions of the “5th year Hu gui” 𠙴簋 (258), dedicated by King Li himself, and the “Maogong ding” 毛公鼎, thus its usage can be confirmed from the period after the reigns of King Li and King Xuan.³⁸ Many bronze inscriptions from the reigns of King Li and King Xuan

³⁶ Matsui 2004.

³⁷ It was written as *buling* 不庭 in historical materials such as the *Zuozhuan*, the 10th year of Duke Yin: “With the king’s command he was punishing *buling*.”

³⁸ Lexical items such as “*buling*” or “*bulingfang*” are also seen in the inscriptions of the “Cheng xu” 𠙴盥 (4469), the “Rongsheng zhong” 戎生鐘 (JC27-34), the “Qingong gui” 秦公簋

describe expeditions to Xianyun and Huaiyi (Nanhuiyi and Dongyi), the inscription of the “Yu ding” 禹鼎 (2833-4·IIIB) also recorded Ehou Yufan’s rebellion, in which Nanhuiyi and Dongyi were embroiled.³⁹ As is seen in the anguished inscription of the “Maogong ding,” which reads: “Distressed are the four quarters! They are in great turmoil and not peaceful,” it is easy to imagine that the dynasty faced the crisis of the collapse of ruling order at this time, and one therefore sees, in contrast, a rather strong intention to recover the dynastic ruling order, such as in the royal edict inscribed on the “Hu gui,” dedicated by King Li himself, which reads “My mind extends to the four quarters,” and the statements of intent to rule Nanhuiyi inscribed on the “Xijia pan” 兮甲盤 (10174·IIIB), reading, “The King commanded Jia, ‘Administer the achievements accumulated in the four directions of Chengzhou, reach Nanhuiyi. Huaiyi were once my people who contributed silk[?] and crops[?]. Do not let them dare not to contribute their silk, their accumulation, and their conscripts[?].’” Thus, King Kang was remembered as a king who once won over “those who did not come to court” and had never submitted to the dynasty.

All the accounts in the historical record agree that after King Wu’s death, King Cheng and the Duke of Zhou suppressed the so called “Three Supervisor’s Rebellion” and other rebellions that had broken out.⁴⁰ Bronze inscriptions such as the “Dabao gui” 大保簋 (4140·IA) state, “The king attacked Luzisheng,” the “Xiaochen Shan zhi” 小臣單觶 (6512·IA), which reads, “The king’s hou-X overcame Shang, is at the Cheng garrison,” and the “Kanghou gui” 康侯簋 (4059·IA), which asserts, “The king attacked Shang city, gave Kanghou an order, let him found a town in Wei” also mention the suppression of the Three Supervisor’s Re-

(4315·Spring and Autumn IIB), and the “Qingong gui” 秦公簋 (270).

³⁹ Matsui 2004.

⁴⁰ The “Zhoubenji” of the *Shiji*, according to chapters of the *Shangshu*, recounts, “King Cheng was too young. Zhou first subjugated all under Heaven. The Duke of Zhou was afraid of the state rulers’ rebellion against Zhou. The Duke, then, conducted government affairs and ruled the [Zhou]state. Guanshu and Caishu, the younger brothers [of the Duke] doubted [the Duke’s usurpation], and with Wugeng Lufu, rebelled against Zhou. The Duke of Zhou, with a royal edict, attacked and executed Wugeng and Guanshu, exiled Caishu, and as a replacement[for Wugeng], appointed Weizi Kai a successor of Yin, letting him found a state in Song. [The Duke] vastly requisitioned the surviving Yin people, herewith appointed King Wu’s youngest brother a ruler of the Wei state, he was Wei Kangshu. ...First, Guan and Cai rebelled against Zhou, and the Duke of Zhou attacked, subjugating them entirely in three years, so he first made the Dagao, next made the Weizizhiming, then made the Guihe, next made the Jiahe, then made the Kanggao, Jiugao, and Zicai. ...the Duke of Shao became *bao*, the Duke of Zhou became *shi*, and they attacked Huaiyi to the east, destroyed Yan, and moved its ruler to Bogu. King Cheng returned from Yan to Zongzhou, where he made the Duofang.”

bellion and the foundation of the Wei state after that. As to Huanggaozu Gongshu who “served” King Cheng, the inscription of the “Lai pan” records as follows.

Then, my Huanggaozu Gongshu was willing to assist(?) King Cheng. [He] completely received a great mandate, and everywhere stayed clear of those who did not enjoy [Zhou rule], thereby securing domain of the four directions and the ten thousand states.

The “*Buxiang*” 不享 (those who did not enjoy [Zhou rule]) here means those powers who did not come to offer tribute to the dynasty,⁴¹ and this is probably based on the memory of the suppression of the Three Supervisor’s Rebellion and other rebellions. Other military campaigns possibly belonging to King Cheng’s reign are seen in the “Gangque zun” 剛刼尊 (5977·IA) and “Gangque you” 剛刼卣 (5383), which reads, “The king attacked Chu,” the “Qin gui” 禽簋 (4041·IB), which read, “The king attacked Chuhou,” the “Cheng fangding” 豐方鼎 (2739), which reads, “Then, the Duke of Zhou therewith attacked Dongyi, Fengbo, and Baogu, suppressed all [of them],” and the “Lü ding” 旅鼎 (9728), which reads, “It was the year Gongdabao came and attacked the rebellious Yi.” As in the inscription of the “Yihou Ce gui” 宜侯矢簋 (4320·IB), the objects of King Kang’s inspection were divided into “the Shang domain” and “the Eastern domain,” as seen in the inscription: “The King inspected the Shang domain conquered by King Wu and King Cheng and went out to inspect the Eastern domain,” and thus these were still recognized as extension of King Wu’s conquest of Yin. In the inscription on the “Shi Qiang pan” that records King Cheng’s achievement as, “To the left and right (he) cast and gathered his net and line, therewith opening and integrating the Zhou state,” and those of King Kang’s as “(He) divided command and pacified the borders,” the phrase *che Zhoubang* 徹周邦 (opening and integrating the Zhou state) and *yin yijiang* 尹億疆 (pacified the borders)” are parallel, forming a couplet. Although the meaning of “To the left and right (he) cast and gathered his net and line” is not clear, the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” shows a recognition that King Cheng’s achievements were limited mostly to “the Zhou state.”⁴² In con-

⁴¹ “*Bulaixiang*” 不來享 corresponds to the phrase in the Shangsong, Yinwu of the *Shijing*, “Formerly, in the time of Cheng Tang, Even from the Di and Qiang, They dared not but come with their offerings; [Their chiefs]dared not but come to seek acknowledgement; Such is the regular rule of Shang.”

⁴² As is indicated in the inscription of the “Da Yu ding,” “On King Wu, [he] inherited the state [King] Wen established,” “Zhoubang” (the Zhou state) refers to the Zhou dynasty itself as related

trast, King Kang's achievements were related to having "pacified the borders," indicating the further expansion of the domain.⁴³ We can see continuity with the phrase "[He] won over those who did not come to court" in the inscription of the "Lai pan."

It is on the bronze inscriptions dated to periods IB to IIB by Hayashi that are recorded full-scale military campaigns. The "Xiao Yu ding" 小孟鼎 (2839), and the "Da Yu ding" 大孟鼎 (IB) likewise dedicated by Yu, record that Yu, who after making an expedition to Guifang, presented prisoners, severed heads, and booty, described as "2 chieftains, 4,8X2 severed heads, 13,081 seized prisoners, XX seized horses, 30 seized chariots, 355 seized cattle, 38 sheep," and "one chieftain, 237 severed heads, XXX seized prisoners, 4 seized horses, 10X seized chariots." This inscription demonstrates that the largest-scale military campaign in the Western Zhou happened during this period.⁴⁴

It was the 5th month, the King was at Gan. On the *wushu* (the 35th) day, [the King] commanded Zuoce Zhe to bestow Xianghou with the land of Wang, to bestow him with gold, and to bestow him with slaves. [Zhe, I] extolled the King's beneficence. It was the 19th year of the king's reign, herewith [I] made [for] Fuyi a ritual [vessel], may [it] be eternally treasured.

Zuoce Zhe 作册折, the donor of the "Zhe zun" 折尊 (6002), the "gong" 觥 (9303·IB), and the "fangyi" 方彝 (9895·IB), whose inscriptions record that the King was at Gan[?] in the 19th year of his reign and bestowed on Xianghou the land of Wang, was Shi Qiang's Yazu Zuxin, who is seen in the inscription of the "Shi Qiang pan,"⁴⁵ and this cannot be dated back to King Cheng's reign. Considering the fact that Hayashi dated it to IB, it can probably be dated to King Kang's reign, and in regard to Gan, other bronze inscriptions record the inspection of

to King Wen. The "four quarters" consists of the "*wanbang*" (ten thousand of states) of which "Zhoubang" was one.

⁴³ Shirakawa (1979: 15) interpreted the character "*jiang*" 疆 of "*yijiang*" 億疆 in the "Shi Qiang pan" as "*jiang*" 疆 of "*jiangsuo*" 經索 (official discipline). However, all of the examples of the character "*jiang*" 疆 seen in bronze inscriptions mean only land boundaries, except in prayers such as "*wannian wujiang*" 萬年無疆 (ten thousand years without limit).

⁴⁴ For a list of the booty seen in bronze inscriptions, see Matsui 2002: 33-41.

⁴⁵ Yin Shengping 1992.

⁴⁶ "Zuoce Huan zun" 作册盥尊 (5989·IB) and "you" 卣 (5407·IB) "It was the 19th year, the king was at Gan, and Wangjiang commanded Zuoce Huan to inspect Yibo."

Yibo,⁴⁶ and bestowal of a fief to Qian.⁴⁷ Many bronze inscriptions in King Kang's reign show the beginnings of full-scale military campaigns and the enlargement of the domain, marked by the seizure of a great number of prisoners, bestowal of fiefs, and transfer of Huhou Ce's fief to Yi, as recorded in the inscription of the "Yihou Ce gui," which reads, "The king [assumed] [his] position in the *zongshe* at Yi, facing north. The king commanding Huhou Ce, said, "Ah! Become the *hou* of Yi."⁴⁸ The inscription of the "Yihou Ce gui" records that King Kang inspected "the Shang domain conquered by King Wu and King Cheng" and "the Eastern domain," The inscription of the "Da Yu ding" reads:

The king said, "Yu! Support and assist, for the rest of your life be in charge of arms. Diligently press for punishment and litigation, morning and night help me, the One Man, to make me the ruler of the four directions. For me, then, inspect the people whom the ancestral kings bestowed and the domain (they) bestowed."

This indicates that Yu was commanded to inspect "the people whom the ancestral kings bestowed and the domain (they) bestowed" in place of King Kang. The "four quarters" and "me, the One Man," i.e. "king's body," were linked through king's movement (inspection), the discourse of the dynastic order beginning from the "king's body" and stretching to the "four quarters" was starting to take form.⁴⁹

The military campaigns that had become full-scale operations in the Hayashi's period IB were continued in the succeeding periods, IIA and IIB. Expeditions led personally by the Zhou king were frequently recorded, as seen in those concerning Dongyi, which is seen in the inscription of the "Hui ding" 簋 (2740·IIA), which reads, "Then, the king attacked Dongyi," and Chujing, which is seen in the inscriptions of the "Ling gui," 令簋 (4300-4301·IIA) which reads, "Then, the king therewith attacked Chujing and was in Yan," the "Guobo gui" 過伯簋 (3907·IIA), which states, "Guobo attended the king in the attack against the rebellious Jing," and Yufang, which is seen in the inscription of the "Shi Qi ding" 師旂鼎

⁴⁷ "Qian zun" 趙尊 (5992·IB) and "you" 卣 (54022·IB) "It was the 13th month, *xinmao* (28th) day, the king was at Gan, and bestowed a fief on Qian."

⁴⁸ The inscription of the "Da Yu ding" records the bestowal of populations and serfs as follows: "[The king] bestowed 659 *renli*, from *yu* to *sheren*. [He] bestowed 13 *yisi wangchen* and 1050 *renli*." As the inscription of the "Yihou Ce gui" records a similar bestowal; "[The king] bestowed X 7 *xing* of *wangren* located in Yi. [He] bestowed 7 *bo* in Zheng and their X 50 *li*. [He] bestowed 6X6 *sheren* in Yi," large numbers of people and serfs were bestowed during this period.

⁴⁹ For the dynastic order, see Matsui 2002: 25-54.

(2809·IIB), which reads, “Shi Qi’s *zhongpu* did not attend the king’s expedition to Yufang,”⁵⁰ Furthermore, it was known that figures such as Bomaofu, Bobifu, and Boyongfu (Shi Yongfu) were charged with leading military campaigns in this period.⁵¹ And the inscriptions of the “Ban gui” 班簋 (4341·IIA), which reads, “The king commanded Maogong to command *bangzhongjun*, *tuyu*, and *tie[?] ren* and attack Yan[?] *rong* in the eastern domain. ...the 3rd year, [they] suppressed the eastern domain,” and the “Mingong zun” 明公尊 (4029), which reads, “Then, the king commanded Mingong to dispatch *sanzu* and attack the eastern domain,” record that military campaigns to the “Dongguo (eastern domain)” were carried out during this period.⁵²

Following the record of King Kang’s achievements, which are described as, “(He) divided command and pacified the borders,” the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” records King Zhao’s achievements in the following manner. “(He) broadly tamed Chujing; it was to connect the southern route.” King Zhao’s “connecting the southern route” undoubtedly corresponds to expeditions to Chujing personally led by the king that are also seen in the inscriptions of the “Ling gui” and “Guobo gui” quoted above. However, as bronze inscriptions which Hayashi dated to IIA also record expeditions to Dongyi or Dongguo led personally by the king, King Zhao’s personal expeditions should not be limited to those to Chujing. The reason why the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” only mentions King Zhao’s southern expedition could be that it was the most memorable of King Zhao’s achievements, but it would have had an adverse effect of displacing memories of his other achievements. When King Zhao was mentioned, it was his southern expedition that

⁵⁰ For a list of Zhou kings’ personal campaigns, see Matsui 2002: 33-41.

⁵¹ Bronze inscriptions mentioning military campaigns related to each person are as follows. Bomaofu: “Xiaochen Su [?] gui” 小臣譚簋 (4338-39·IIA) “Dongyi widely rebelled, and Bomaofu commanded *Yinbashi* to attack Donyi;” the “Lü xinghu” 呂行壺 (9689), “Bomaofu made an expedition to the north, then, came back.” Bobifu; the “Jing you” 競卣 (5425·IIB), “Then, Bobifu commanded the Chengshi to be assigned to duty in the east, and stationed in the Nanyi.” Boyongfu (Shiyongfu): “Yu yan” 禹鬲 (948·II), “Shiyongfu was stationed in the Gu shi,” the “Yu ding” 禹鼎 (2721·IIB), “Shiyongfu inspected the route, and reached Fu,” the “Lü gui” 录簋 (4122·IIB), “Boyongfu came from Fu,” the “Si[?] you” 稽卣 (5411), “Si attended Shiyongfu and was stationed at the Gushi,” “Lüzhong you” 录戎卣 (5419-20·IIB), “The king commanded Zhong, ‘Ah! Huaiyi dared to attack the inner domain. Let you command the Chengzhou shishi to be stationed in the Gu shi’ And Boyongfu commended Lü’s achievement,” the “Jian[?] zun” 冏尊 (6008), “It was the year when Jian attended Shiyongfu to be stationed in the Gu shi.” For further reference, see Shirakawa 1977. By the way, Shirakawa clung to the opinion that the Zongzhou zhong was dedicated by King Zhao himself, however, it should be understood as having been dedicated by King Li.

⁵² Mingong, the donor of the “Mingong zun,” might be the same person as “Mingbao, son of the Duke of Zhou/ Mingong” who is seen in the inscriptions of the “Ling fangzun/ fangyi.”

promptly came to mind, and memory of it remained unshakeable thereafter and it was adopted in historical materials such as the *Zuozhuan*, 4th year of Duke Xi, “King Zhao made a southern expedition and never came back,” and the *Zhushujinian*, which recounts, “In the 16th year of King Zhao of Zhou’s reign, (the King) made an expedition to Chujing” (the *Chuxueji* vol. 7), and “In the 19th year of King Zhao of Zhou’s reign, (the King) lost six troops on the bank of the Han river” (the *Chuxueji* vol. 7), and “In the last year of King Zhao of Zhou’s reign, ...In the year, the King inspected the south and never came back” (the *Taipingyulan* vol. 874).

Memories of the military campaigns recorded in the bronze inscriptions that Hayashi dated to IIA to IIB, such as expeditions to Dongyi or Dongguo, and Bomaofu’s “northern expedition,” seen in the inscription of the “Lü xinghu,” which reads, “Bomaofu made a northern expedition, then came back,” could not be assigned to King Zhao, who was strongly linked to the southern expedition, and came to be linked increasingly to the familiarization of the kings before and after King Zhao. As regards King Mu, the inscription of the “Shi Qiang pan” describes only abstract achievements, i.e., “(He) patterned (himself) on and followed the great counsels,” but the inscription of the “Lai pan” used a discourse that combines the two kings as a pair. It reads as follows.

Then, my Huanggaozu Huizhong Lifu brought harmony to government, gained success for [his] plan, and thereby assisted King Zhao and King Mu. [They] extended [Zhou] rule to the four quarters, assaulted and attacked Chujing.

The intention is to link King Zhao and King Mu to “the four quarters” or “Chujing.” Although this is an account based on the collective memory of King Zhao’s southern expedition, it could also be understood as an attempt to recognize King Mu’s relation to “the four quarters.”⁵³

The memory of King Mu (Mutianzi) came to be linked to “Mangrong,” and “those areas that did not come to court” as is seen in the inscription of the “Rongsheng zhong” (JC27-34), which reads as follows.

⁵³ As to achievements of King Wen and King Wu, the inscription of the “Lai pan” records, “[they] attacked Yin, received the generous mandate, extensively possessed the four quarters.” This is a combination of King Wen’s achievement of “receiving a generous mandate” and King Wu’s of “attacking Yin” and “extensively possessed the four quarters.”

Rongsheng said, “Gracious! My Huangzu Xiangong, valiantly and orderly, opened his bright mind, enlarged and practiced his plan. [He] could be worthy of Mutianzi’s profound spirit, herewith founded on this outer land, followed and administrated Manrong, and henceforth suppressed those areas that did not come to court.”⁵⁴

As regards King Mu, the *Zuozhuan* records legends of “the meeting at Tushan” (the 4th year of Duke Zhao), “going around the world” (the 12th year of Duke Zhao), the *Zhushujinian* records legends of “the northern expedition” (in the comments of *Shanhaijing*, the *Dahuangbeijing* and elsewhere), “the western expedition” (in the comments of *Shanhaijing*, the *Xishanijing* and elsewhere), the western expedition to Kunlunqiu” (in the commentary on the *Mutianzizhuan* and elsewhere), the “expedition to Chu” (in the *Yiwenleiju* vol. 9 and elsewhere) and “eastern, western, southern, and northern expedition” (in the *Kaiyuanzhanjing* vol. 4). Furthermore, the *Guoyu* and the *Mutianzizhuan* tell of King Mu’s expedition to Qianrong. The wealth of legends about King Mu might originate from memories of his expeditions to “the four quarters,” which the Zhou people linked to him, just as they linked the southern expedition to King Zhao.

The inscription of the “Lai pan” “recorded” achievements of King Wen and King Wu, King Cheng, King Kang, and King Zhao and King Mu in relation to Lai’s own ancestors, however, as to his Huanggaozu Lingbo and Huangyazu Yizhong, it describes only the following:

Then, my Huanggaozu Lingbo made intelligent his mind, did not lose X domain, and thereby served King Gong and King Yi. Then, my Huangyazu Yizhong was as great as possible, willing to assist and protect his lords King Xiao and King Yi, and gained success for the Zhou state.

The inscription mentions nothing of the achievements of other kings, i.e. King Gong and King Yi, King Xiao and King Yi, whom they served.⁵⁵ As previously indicated, appointment inscriptions suddenly increased after the period around King Gong’s reign,⁵⁶ and the transition from the concept of “*shi*” 事, which was current

⁵⁴ Li Xueqin 1999.

⁵⁵ The expression “*Zhoubang you cheng*” 周邦有成 (gained success for the Zhou state) resembles expressions such as “*you chengshi*” 有成事, or “*you jue yu Zhoubang*” 有爵于周邦, referring to the achievements of vassals.

⁵⁶ Kominami 2005 recently pointed out this fact.

in the Yin period, to that of “*si*” 嗣 which was unique to the Zhou, has been recognized.⁵⁷ The transition from what Kaizuka Shigeki has termed the “precious-shell bestowal style inscriptions” to “official-chariot-clothes appointment style inscriptions,” also reflects the same situation,⁵⁸ which also amounted to a change from bestowals for military achievement to those of official appointments. The dynasty started to lose interest in expeditions abroad, and for the Zhou people in later times who sought to revive the ruling political order and to recognize the status of King Kang who won over “those who did not come to court” to be “respected alone,” and it was also the beginning of the period without matters worthy of being committed to memory. Even if one were discount the use of discourse combining kings into pairs, the silence of the inscription of the “Lai pan” corresponds exactly to changes of the Western Zhou cultures that started around the time of King Gong’s reign.

Silence of the inscription of the “Lai pan” also accords with the paucity in the collective memory about these kings. As the *Diwangshiji*, which was edited by Huangfu Bi during the Western Jin period and quoted in the *Taipingyulan*, vol 85, lamented, “During the four generations from King Gong to King Yi, Zhou’s dating is not clear,” it must be admitted that accounts about successive kings after King Gong in historical materials are lacking. The “Zhoubenji” of the *Shiji*, after recounting King Gong’s execution of Duke Kang of Mi, quotes from the *Guoyu*, in regard to the next three kings, King Yi, King Xiao, and King Yi, but only records the confusion in the royal succession, and cannot describe anything of each king’s achievement concretely. It barely manages to describe that “In King Yi’s reign, the royal family thus became weak, and poets made satires.” The “Zhouyu,” part 1, of the *Guoyu*, from which the “Zhoubenji” quotes, inserts King Gong’s execution of Duke Kang of Mi after King Mu’s expedition to Qianrong, and then directly leaps to King Li’s tyranny and his exile to Zhi, revealing the paucity of the collective memory of the four kings from King Mu to King Li.⁵⁹ The execution of Duke Kang of Mi, the sole event recorded, is also a completely isolated legend, if it were not for the inevitable linkage to King Gong, the *Guoyu* and the *Shiji* would have hardly have accounted for these four kings at all.⁶⁰

⁵⁷ For further reference, see Matsui 2002: 122-160.

⁵⁸ Kaizuka 1946.

⁵⁹ The “Luyu,” part 2, of the *Guoyu* records Min Mafu’s remark, “King Gong of Zhou could make up for the losses of King Zhao and King Mu, and thus, got his posthumous title, Gong. King Gong of Chu could recognize his own mistakes, and thus, got his posthumous title, Gong.” However, these cannot be linked to memories of King Gong’s concrete achievements.

⁶⁰ Besides the “Zhoubenji,” the *Shiji* has some accounts such as the “Qinbenji,” which recounts,

The descriptions in the *Zuozhuan* and the *Zhushujinian* are almost identical. The *Zuozhuan* has no account of King Gong, King Yi, or King Xiao at all, and in regard to King Yi, it only records Prince Zhao's statement; "By-and-by, King Yi suffered from an evil disease, and the state rulers all hurried to sacrifice to their hills and rivers, praying for the King's person." (the 26th year of Duke Zhao). The *Zhushujinian* has no accounts about King Gong, King Yi, and King Xiao, with the exception of an account about the eclipse in the first year of the reign of King Yi, and it was only when it came to King Yi did it finally record such incidents as, "in the 2nd year of King Yi's reign, an officer of Shu and one of Lü came and contributed jades," (in the *Taipingyulan*, vol. 85, etc), "the 3rd year, the King summoned the state rulers, boiled Duke Ai of Qi in a *ding*" (in the *Taipingyulan* vol. 85 etc), "King Yi hunted at Dulin and caught a rhinoceros"" (in the *Taipingyulan* vol. 890), "King Yi's [political power] weakened, [tribes in] the Huangfu did not come to court, and then, [the King] commanded the Duke of Guo to command the six troops and attack Rong in Taiyuan" (in the commentary on the "Xiqiangzhuàn" of the *Houhanshu*). The inscription of the "Fifth-year Shi Shi gui" 師旋簋 (4216-17·IIIA) states, "The King said, 'Shi Shi! [I] command you to pursue [them] in Qi,'" and if this were from approximately this period, it suggests that Zhou kings' military campaigns were once again committed to memory from about the period of King Yi's reign. Although the inscription of the "Lai pan," which uses discourse that combines kings into pairs, maintains its silence, this still marks the start of the "period" of the inscription of the "Lai pan."⁶¹

"Feizi resided in Qianqiu, liked horses and cattle, and took care of them well. The Qianqiu people told King Xiao about that, and King Xiao summoned him and let him manage a horse ranch between the Qian and Wei rivers." The *Qitaigongshijia* has, "In Duke Ai's reign, Jihou slandered him to Zhou, and Zhou boiled him (Duke Ai) and appointed his younger brother Jing, he was Duke Hu. Duke Hu transferred the capital to Bogu. It was in the reign of King Yi of Zhou." The *Weikangshushijia* states, "Marquis Qing gave King Yi of Zhou a bribe carefully, and King Yi promoted the ruler of the Wei state to marquis." The *Chushijia* notes, "In the reign of King Yi, the dynasty declined, some state rulers did not come to court and attacked one another. Xiongjiu vastly gained people's concord between the Jiang and Han rivers, and then raised an army to attack Yong and Yangyue, reached E." Although the *Qitaigongshijia* records the same contents, i.e. "Zhou boiled Duke Ai," as the *Zhushujinian*, others only mentioned Zhou kings as indicators of the dates of the reigns of state rulers etc.

⁶¹ Among palaces of Kanggong, those of King Gong, King Yi, and King Xiao are not mentioned, and only that of King Yi is referred to. This might be related to this fact. Incidentally, the inscription of the "Lai pan" also maintains silence about King Li, whom Gongshu, Lai's Huangkao (father), served. Any mention of the tale of King Li would immediately remind readers of his tyranny and exile to Zhi, so, the inscription could tell nothing about King Li in order to underscore the achievements of Lai's family.

Conclusion

King Kang, who was “respected alone” and exempt from being combined rhetorically with King Cheng during King Li and King Xuan’s reigns, was unable to maintain his special position in the historical materials.⁶² As the “Zhoubenji” of the *Shiji* generalized about the reigns of the two kings, King Cheng and King Kang, in the following manner, “During reigns of King Cheng and King Kang, all under Heaven was peaceful, punishments were stopped and not used for forty years,” King Kang came before long to be paired with King Cheng, regarded as one of ideal kings of a peaceful period. As the same account is seen also in the *Zhushujinian* quoted in the *Taipingyulan* and elsewhere, the discourse combining King Cheng and King Kang as a pair, and regarding their reigns as peaceful, might already have become common in the Warring States period.⁶³

The impetus for King Kang’s “respected-alone” status being forgotten and the discourse combining King Cheng and King Kang as a pair was probably the transfer of the Zhou to the east. For the location of Chengzhou was strongly linked to the memory of King Cheng,⁶⁴ and palaces of Kangong, which embodied King Kang’s “respected-alone” status, were not located there. The “Haotianyouchengming” in the Zhou Song 周頌 of the *Shijing*, notes:

⁶² Shen Changyun (1993; 1997) has addressed the differences in descriptions of King Kang between historical materials and bronze inscriptions.

⁶³ The “Dalie” chapter of the *Xunzi* notes, “King Wen executed four persons, King Wu executed two persons, the Duke of Zhou completed the dynastic achievements, and when it came to King Cheng and King Kang, they executed no one,” and it also tells of the peace and order in the reigns of King Cheng and King Kang. The “Zhouyu,” part 3, of the *Guoyu* is similar recording, “From Houji’s time, [Zhou kings were willing to] settle confusion, and in the end King Wen, King Wu, King Cheng, and King Kang could only make people peaceful. Houji first attained the basics for making people peaceful, the 15th king, King Wen, finally subjugated them, and the 18th king, King Kang, could make them peaceful.”

⁶⁴ King Cheng’s establishment of Luoyang (Chengzhou) was recorded in the “Shaogao” and the “Luogao” chapters of the *Shangshu*, and the “Duoluojie” chapter of the *Yizhoushu*. The inscription of the “He zun,” which is priceless in its recording the establishment of Chengzhou, emphasizes it was King Wu’s dying wish. For further reference, see Itô 1978. The discourse combining King Wu and King Cheng as a pair is also seen in the inscription of the “Yihou Ce gui.” Another example is included in “Zuoce Da fangding” 作册大方鼎 (IB), which reads, “Gong Shi made *guanding* for King Wu and King Cheng.” King Cheng was at first combined with King Wu as a pair, but after the Middle Western Zhou the discourse combining King Wen and King Wu became dominant, and moreover, as a result of King Kang’s “respected-alone” status, King Cheng became an isolated king. Zhou’s eastward transfer may have been the impetus for the Zhou people’s reconfirmation of King Cheng’s memory.

Heaven made its determinate appointment, which [our] two sovereigns recovered. King Cheng did not dare to rest, night and day enlarged its foundation by his deep and silent virtue.

This verse that mentions the two sovereigns i.e. King Wen and King Wu, and then mentions King Cheng⁶⁵ might share with the inscription of the “Lai pan” the consciousness that combined King Wen and King Wu as a pair and treated King Cheng and King Kang separately. However, seen in the same Zhusong, Zhijing are the following words.

The arm of King Wu was full of strength; Irresistible was his ardor. Greatly illustrious were Cheng and Kang, enthroned by God. When we consider how Cheng and Kang grandly held all within the four quarters [of the kingdom].

As can be seen by the fact that the praise for the achievements of the two kings, King Cheng and King Kang, in verse followed that for King Wu,⁶⁶ the discourse combining King Cheng and King Kang as a pair had already been created by the period of the Zhusong. If we take the position that the lower limit of the three *song* 頌 is the period of Duke Xi of Lu (r. 659-627 B.C.) and Duke Xiang of Song (r. 650-637 B.C.),⁶⁷ the forgetting of King Kang’s “respected-alone” status

⁶⁵ The “Zhouyu,” part 3, of the *Guoyu* states, “Shuxiang told this and said, ‘...In addition, in his conversation, he was pleased with the “Huantianyouchengming”, it sung of flourishing virtues.’ The verse said, ...it finished royal virtues. King Cheng could shed light on King Wen’s wisdom, and could settle King Wu’s dignity.” The *Zhengjian* interprets this as, “King Wen and King Wu inherited [Houji’s] achievement, enforced virtues, and finished this royal achievements,” it does not mention King Cheng, however, the *Shijizhuan* explains, “Erhou (two sovereigns) refers to King Wen and King Wu. Chengwang (King Cheng) whose name was Song, son of King Wu,” which should be understood as correct.

⁶⁶ The *Shijizhuan* reads, “This is a poem for sacrificing to King Wu, King Cheng, and King Kang. *Jing* 競 means strong. It means King Wu maintained a mind to strengthen himself without rest, so his flourishing achievements were incomparable under the High. How illustrious it was! The virtues of King Cheng and King Kang are also the reason for which the Lord on the High made them princes.” Incidentally, the *Maozhuan* interpreted, “How illustrious his accomplishment of great achievement and stabilization of them were! ...‘*zi bi cheng kang*’ 自彼成康 means using that way of accomplishment and stabilization,” and the *Zhengjian* commented on it, saying, “How illustrious their way of accomplishment and stabilization of their ancestor were!” This means they were still more illustrious. ...King Wu used the way of accomplishment and stabilization of their ancestor, so, he received the mandate and attacked Zhou [Yin King], subjugated it under the High and assumed it to [territory of] Zhou.”

⁶⁷ Matsumoto 1958; Shirakawa 1981.

and the spread of the discourse combining the two kings, King Cheng and King Kang, as a pair might have started in the period not far removed from that of the inscription of the “Lai pan.”

As noted above, Tang Lan explained King Kang’s “respected-alone” status, quoting the *Zuozhuan*, the 26th year of Duke Zhao:

Long ago, King Wu subdued Yin, King Cheng secured tranquility through the four quarters, and King Kang gave the people rest. They all invested their full brothers with the rule of states, which might serve as defenses and screens for Zhou.

The recognition that King Kang was the king who appointed his full brothers as state rulers is seen in the *Zuozhuan*, the 9th year of Duke Zhao, which reads, “Wen, Wu, Cheng, and Kang granted fiefs to their full brothers, that they might be fences and screens to Zhou.” However, actually checking historical materials, we cannot find a single ruler of a state whose ancestor was a full brother of King Kang except for the Shan family in question. As seen in the *Zuozhuan*, the 24th year of Duke Xi, below, legends of appointments of state rulers were concentrated on the generations of the sons of King Wen, King Wu, and of the Duke of Zhou, and finally were related to King Cheng’s reign.⁶⁸

Thus the Duke of Zhou, grieved by the want of harmony in the concluding times of the two previous dynasties, raised the relatives of the royal House to be the rulers of states, that they might act as fences and screens to Zhou. The rulers of Guan, Cai, Cheng, Huo, Lu, Wei, Mao, Dan, Gao, Yong, Cao, Teng, Bi, Yuan, Feng, and Xun were sons of King Wen, those of Yu, Jin, Ying, and Han were sons of King Wu, those of Fan, Jiang, Xing, Mao, Zuo, and Cai were sons of the Duke of Zhou.

Although King Kang had been seen as one of the kings who were appointed state

⁶⁸ See the “Sandaishibiao” of the *Shiji*. The Chushijia of the *Shiji* quotes the *Zuozhuan*, the 12th year of Duke Zhao, “Formerly, my ancestral king Xiongyi, with Lüji, Wangsun Mao, Xiefu, and Qinfu, all served together King Kang,” but changes the date to King Cheng’s reign, writing, “Xiongyi dated to King Cheng’s reign. [Zhou] promoted successors of those who served King Wen and King Wu, appointed Xiongyi as the state ruler of Chumang, invested him with a fief for Zi or Nan title. [He belonged to] the Mi clan, and resided in Danyang.” For further reference, see Yoshimoto 2000; 2003.

rulers, concrete memories of this fact had been lost.

Military campaigns such as Yu's expedition and a series of activities recorded as having occurred in Gan(?) in the 19th year were also not recorded in historical materials. King Kang, who had once been lodged in the collective memory as a king who won over "those who did not come to court," was transformed into a king who "gave the people rest," and his military campaigns were severed from memory of him. For example, the *Zhushujinian* quoted in the commentary of the *Houhanshu* recorded that Wangji (Jili), King Wen's father, attacked "Xiluo Guirong" and seized their twenty kings in the 35th year of the reign of King Wuyi of Shang. As Wang Guowei said in his "Guifang Kunyi Xianyun kao" (in *Guantang-jilin*), this Guirong might be Guifang, however, it is difficult to assume such a large scale expedition in Wangji's reign before the foundation of the Zhou.⁶⁹ The expedition to Guifang, that had been forgotten as an achievement in King Kang's reign, was probably reused as Wangji's achievement. Legends of King Mu's expedition to Quanrong might also be a variant on this original event.⁷⁰

Actual accounts about King Kang in the "Zhoubenji" of the *Shiji*, that generalized the reigns of King Cheng and King Kang in one sentence that "all under Heaven is peaceful, punishments were stopped and not used for forty years," are only summaries from two chapters of the *Shangshu*, the "Guming" and "Kang-wangzhigao," which chiefly describe a series of ceremonies, and the "Shuxu" of the "Biming" chapter that records, "King Kang commanded Zuoce Bigong 作策畢公 to divide communities, organize the suburbs of Zhou, and make the Biming."⁷¹

⁶⁹ The "Xiqiangzhu" of the *Houhanshu*, relying on the *Zhushujinian*, records Wangji's many expeditions. The *Zhushujinian* quoted in the commentary recounts in addition to the fact, "in the 35th year of Wuyi, Zhou Wangji attacked Xiluo Guirong, seized 20 *di* kings," that "in the 2nd year of Taiping, the Zhou people attacked Yanjingzhirong, Zhou troops were completely defeated," that "in the 4th year of Taiping, the Zhou people attacked Yuwuzhirong, overcome them. Zhou Wangji was appointed as Yin's *mushi*," and that "in the 7th year of Taiping, the Zhou people attacked Shihuzhirong and overcame them. In the 11th year, the Zhou people attacked Yituzhirong, and defeated their three *dafu*." This demonstrates that there were many expeditions besides that against "Xiluo Guirong" in Wangji's period.

⁷⁰ Yoshimoto(2004) concluded that the *Zhushujinian* passage that reads, "in the 19th year of the reign of King Zhao of Zhou, ...[He] lost six troops at the Han river," is a mistaken record of the activities in Gan in the 19th year of King Kang's reign. Although there are different opinions about the location of Gan, and the loss of troops does not accord with activities such as inspection of Yibo, or bestowal of a fief. "The 19th year" itself might derive from the memory of those activities.

⁷¹ The text of the "Biming" chapter was not transmitted in the Han era, and the current text belongs to false-*guwen* chapters. The current *Shuxu*, "King Kang commanded Zuoce Bi 作冊畢 to divided communities, organize suburbs of Zhou, and make the Biming" differs slightly from accounts of the "Zhoubenji" of the *Shiji*.

In addition, the Chushijia simply records the single phrase, “[King] Kang held his audience in the Fenggong,” which quoted the *Zuozhuan*, the 4th year of Duke Zhao, however, the *Shiji* almost completely erased King Kang’s achievements from the collective memory. Afterward, King Kang might on occasion be disparaged,⁷² but his “respected-alone” status was not remembered.

Bibliography

Japanese

- Hayashi Minao 林巳奈夫 1984. *Inshû Jidai Seidôki no Kenkyû; Insyû Jidai Seidôki Sôran 1* 殷周時代青銅器の研究—殷周時代青銅器綜覽一—. Tôkyô: Yoshikawa Kôbunkan.
- Ikezawa Masaru 池澤優 2002. ‘*Kô*’ no *Shisô* no *Shûkyôgakuteki Kenkyû; Kodai Chûgoku ni okeru Sosen Sûhai no Shisôteki Hatten* 『孝』の思想の宗教學的研究—古代中國における祖先崇拜の思想的發展. Tôkyô: Tôkyô Daigaku Shuppankai.
- Inami Ryôichi 井波陵一 2003. “Ô Kokui to Nijûshôkohô” 王國維と二重證據法. In Tomiya Itaru 富谷至 (ed.), *Henkyô Shutsudo Mokkan no Kenkyû* 邊境出土木簡の研究, pp. 9-47. Kyôto: Hôyû Shoten.
- Itô Michiharu 伊藤道治 1978, “Shû Buô to Rakuyû; Kasonmei to ‘Itsushûsho’ Takuyû” 周武王と雒邑—𤙴尊銘と『逸周書』度邑. In Uchida Ginpû Hakushi Shôju Kinenkai 内田吟風博士頌壽記念會 (ed.), *Uchida Ginpû Hakushi Shôju Kinen Tôyôshi Ronshû* 内田吟風博士頌壽記念東洋史論集, pp. 41-52. Kyôto: Dôhōsha. Revised edition in Itô, *Chûgoku Kodai Kokka no Shihai Kôzô* 中國古代國家の支配構造. Tôkyô: Chûôkōronsha, 1987.
- Kaizuka Shigeki 貝塚茂樹 1946. *Chûgoku Kodai Shigaku no Hatten* 中國古代史學の發展. Tôkyô: Kôbundô. Also in Kaizuka, *Kaizuka Shigeki Chosakushû* 貝塚茂樹著作集, vol. 4. Tôkyô: Chûôkōronsha, 1977.
- Kominami Ichirô 小南一郎 2005. “Seishû Ôchô no Seishû Keiei” 西周王朝の成周經營. In Kominami (ed.), *Chûgoku Bunmei no Keisei* 中國文明の形成, pp. 97-138. Kyôto: Hôyûshoten.
- Liu Zheng 劉正 2004. (trsl. by Taira Akiko 平顯子) “Kinbunchû no Byôsei ni kan-

⁷² For example, remarks such as that in the *Lushishuo* about the Guanju, the Zhounan, which reads, “Zhou declined, the *Shi* were born. This would have been in King Kang’s reign. King Kang lost his virtue in Fang, his ministers satirized that he was carefree, and thus the *Shi* were created,” were carried on in later periods.

- suru Kenkyû no Ippantekina Kenkai to Mondaiten” 金文中の廟制に關する研究の一般的な見解と問題點. In Sakade Shôshin Sensei Taikyû Kinenronshû Kankôkai 坂出祥伸先生退休記念論集刊行會 (ed.), *Sakade Shôshin Sensei Taikyû Kinenronshû; Chûgokushisô ni okeru Shintai, Shizen, Shinkô* 坂出祥伸先生退休記念論集—中國思想における身體・自然・信仰, pp. 315-346. Tôkyô: Tôhō Shoten.
- Matsui Yoshinori 松井嘉徳 2002. *Shûdai Kokusei no Kenkyû* 周代國制の研究. Tôkyô: Kyûko Shoin.
- 2004. “Go ko Tei Mei Kôshaku; Seishû Kôki, Sen’ôchô no Jitsuzô wo Motomete” 吳虎鼎銘考釋—西周後期, 宣王朝の實像を求めて. *Shisô* 史窗 62: 75-98.
- Matsumoto Masa’aki 松本雅明 1958. *Shikyô Shohen no Seiritsu ni kansuru Kenkyû* 詩經諸篇の成立に關する研究. Tôkyô: Tôyô Bunko. Also in Matsumoto, *Matsumoto Masa’aki Chosakushû* 松本雅明著作集, vol. 5-6. Tôkyô: Kôsei Shorin, 1986.
- 1966. *Shunjû Sengoku ni okeru Shôsho no Tenkai* 春秋戰國における尙書の展開. Tôkyô: Kazama Shobô. Also in Matsumoto, *Matsumoto Masa’aki Chosakushû*, vol. 12. Tôkyô: Kôsei Shorin, 1988.
- Shirakawa Shizuka 白川靜 1977. “Seishû Shiryaku” 西周史略. *Kinbun Tsûshaku* 金文通釋 46. Also in Shirakawa 2005.
- 1979. “Kinbun Hoshaku” 金文補釋. *Kinbun Tsûshaku* 50. Also in Shirakawa 2005.
- 1981. *Shikyô Kenkyû Tsûronhen* 詩經研究通論篇. Kyôto: Hôyû Shoten. Also in Shirakawa 2000.
- 2000. *Shirakawa Shizuka Chosakushû* 白川靜著作集, vol.10, *Shikyô* 詩經, part II. Tôkyô: Heibonsha.
- 2005. *Shirakawa Shizuka Chosakushû*, supplementary volume, *Kinbun Tsûshaku*, vol. 6. Tôkyô: Heibonsha.
- Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅 2000. “Senshin Ôkô Keihu Kô” 先秦王侯系譜考. *Ritsumeikan Bungaku* 565: 1-53.
- 2003. “Kodai Chûgoku no Keifu wo Yomitoku” 古代中國の系譜を読み解く. In Shoki Ôken Kenkyû linkai 初期王權研究委員會 (ed.), *Kodai Ôken no Tanjô* 古代王權の誕生, vol. 1, pp. 258-272. Tôkyô: Kadokawa Shoten.
- 2004. “Seishû Kinen Kô” 西周紀年考. *Ritsumeikan Bungaku* 586: 57-18.
- Zhu Fenghan 朱鳳瀚 2004. (trsl. by Tani Toyonobu 谷豊信) “Senseishô Biken Yôkason Shutsudo no Honki to Seishû Kizoku no Kazoku Keitai” 陝西省眉縣楊家村出土の遼器と西周貴族の家族形態. Tôkyô Kokuritsu Hakubutsu-

kan 東京國立博物館 and Asahi Shinbunsha 朝日新聞社 (ed.), *Chûgoku Kokuhô Ten* 中國國寶展, pp. 204-210. Tôkyô: Asahi Shinbunsha.

Chinese

- Cao Wei 曹瑋 2003a. “Shanshi Jiazhu Tongqiquan” 單氏家族銅器群. In Ma Chengyuan 馬承源 et. al. 2003.
- 2003b. “Gaozu’ Kao” “高祖”考. *Wenwu* 2003. 9: 32-34, 59.
- Chen Mengjia 陳夢家 1955. “Xizhou Tongqi Duandai” 西周銅器斷代, part 2. *Kaogu Xuebao* 10: 89-142. Also in *Chen Mengjia Zhuzuoji* 陳夢家著作集, *Xizhou Tongqi Duandai*, vol. 1. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju, 2004.
- Chen Pan 陳槃 1970, *Bujianyu Chunqiudashibiao zhi Chunqiu Fangguo Gao* 不見于春秋大事表之春秋方國稿. Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusuo.
- Chen Peifen 陳佩芬 2000. “Xinhuo Liangzhou Qingtongqi” 新獲兩周青銅器. *Shanghai Bowuguan Guankan* vol. 8: 124-143.
- Dong Shan 董珊 2003. “Lüelun Xizhou Shanshi Jiazhu Jiaocang Qingtongqi Mingwen” 略論西周單氏家族窖藏青銅器銘文. *Zhongguo Lishi Wenwu* 2003. 4: 40-50.
- Du Yong 杜勇 and Shen Changyun 沈長雲 2002. *Jinwen Duandai Fangfa Tanwei* 金文斷代方法探微. Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe.
- Gao Xisheng 高西省 1994. “Fufeng Juliang Haijia Chutu Palong deng Daxing Qingtongqi” 扶風巨良海家出土爬龍等大型青銅器. *Wenwu* 1994. 2: 92-96, 91.
- Guo Moruo 郭沫若 1957, *Liangzhou Jinwenci Daxi Tulü Kaoshi* 兩周金文辭大系圖錄攷釋, enlarged new edition. Beijing: Kexue Chubanshe.
- Li Xueqin 李學勤 1979. “Lun Mei Ao Shoucang de Jijian Shang Zhou Wenwu” 論美澳收藏的幾件商周文物. *Wenwu* 1979. 12: 72-76.
- 1999. “Rongsheng Bianzhong Lunshi” 戎生編鐘論釋. *Wenwu* 1999. 9: 75-81.
- 2003. “Meixian Yangjiacun Xinchu Qingtongqi Yanjiu” 眉縣楊家村新出青銅器研究. *Wenwu* 2003. 6: 66-73.
- Liu Shi’e 劉士莪 2004. “Qiang pan, Lai pan zhi Duibi Yanjiu; Jiantan Xizhou Weishi, Shangong Jiazhu Jiaocang Tongqiquan de Lishi Yiyi” 牆盤, 逯盤之對比研究—兼談西周微氏, 單公家族窖藏銅器群的歷史意義. *Wenbo* 2004. 5: 21-27.
- Liu Yu 劉雨 and Lu Yan 盧岩 2002. *Jinchu Yin Zhou Jinwen Jilü [JC]* 近出殷周金文集錄. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- Liu Zheng 劉正 2004. *Jinwen Miaoqi Yanjiu* 金文廟制研究. Beijing: Zhongguo

Shehuikexue Chubanshe.

- Ma Chengyuan 馬承源 et. al. 2003. "Shaanxi Meixian Chutu Jiaocang Qingtongqi Bitan" 陝西眉縣出土窖藏青銅器筆談. *Wenwu* 2003. 6: 43-65.
- Shaanxisheng Kaogu Yanjiusuo 陝西省考古研究所, Baojishi Kaogu Gongzuodui 寶雞市考古工作隊, and Meixian Wenhuguan 眉縣文化館 2003a. "Shaanxi Meixian Yangjiacun Xizhou Qingtongqi Jiaocang" 陝西眉縣楊家村西周青銅器窖藏. *Kaogu yu Wenwu* 2003. 3: 3-12.
- 2003b. "Shaanxi Meixian Yangjiacun Xizhou Qingtongqi Jiaocang Fajue Jianbao" 陝西眉縣楊家村西周青銅器窖藏發掘簡報. *Wenwu* 2003. 6: 4-42.
- Shaanxisheng Wenwuju 陝西省文物局 and Zhonghua Shijitan Yishuguan 中華世紀壇藝術館 2003, *Shengshi Jijin; Shaanxi Baoji Meixian Qingtongqi Jiaocang* 盛世吉金—陝西寶雞 眉縣青銅器窖藏. Beijing: Beijing Chubanshe.
- Shaanxi Zhouyuan Kaogudui 陝西周原考古隊 1978. "Shaanxi Fufeng Zhuangbai Yihao Jiaocang Fajue Jianbao" 陝西扶風莊白一號西周青銅器窖藏發掘簡報. *Wenwu* 1978. 3: 1-18.
- Sheng Changyun 沈長雲 1993. "Lun Zhou Kangwang" 論周康王. *Xizhoushi Lunwenji* 西周史論文集, vol. 2: 954-965. Xi'an: Shaanxisheng Bowuguan.
- 1997. "Lun Cheng Kang Shidai he Cheng Kang Shidai de Tongqi Mingke" 論成康時代和成康時代的銅器銘刻. *Zhongyuan Wenwu* 1997. 2: 68-75.
- Tang Lan 唐蘭 1934. "Zuoce Ling Zun ji Zuoce Ling Yi Mingwen Kaoshi" 作冊令尊及作冊令彝銘文考釋. *Guoli Beijing Daxue Guoxue Jikan* 國立北京大學國學季刊4. 1: 21-30. Also in Tang Lan 1995.
- 1962. "Xizhou Tongqi Duandai zhong de 'Kang Gong' Wenti" 西周銅器斷代中的"康宮"問題. *Kaogu Xuebao* 1962. 1: 21-30. Also in Tang Lan 1995.
- 1980. "Lun Zhou Zhaowang Shidai de Qingtongqi Mingke" 論周昭王時代的青銅器銘刻. *Guwenzi Yanjiu*, vol. 2: 12-162. Also in Tang Lan 1995.
- 1986. *Xizhou Qingtongqi Mingwen Fendai Shizheng* 西周青銅器銘文分代史徵. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- 1995. *Tang Lan Xiansheng Jinwen Lunji* 唐蘭先生金文論集. Beijing: Zijincheng Chubanshe.
- Wang Guowei 王國維 1921. "Guantang Jilin" 觀堂集林. In *Wang Guowei Yishu* 王國維遺書. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Shudian, 1983.
- 1925. "Gushi Xinzheng" 古史新證. In Wang Guowei, *Gushi Xinzheng; Wang Guowei Zuihou de Jiangyi* 古史新證—王國維最後的講義. Beijing: Qinghua Daxue Chubanshe, 1994.
- Yin Shengping 尹盛平 1992. *Xizhou Weishi Jiazhu Qingtongqiquan Yanjiu* 西周微氏家族青銅器群研究. Beijing: Wenwu Chubanshe.

- Zhang Guangyu 張光裕 2002. "Xinjian Xizhou 'Jia' Gui Mingwen Shuoshi" 新見西周'夾'簋銘文說釋. In Zhong Bosheng 鍾柏生 (ed.), *Disanjie Guoji Hanxue Huiyi Lunwenji; Guwenzi yu Shang Zhou Wenming* 第三屆國際漢學會議論文集:古文字與商周文明, pp. 107-144. Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiuyuan Lishi Yuyan Yanjiusuo.
- 2004. "Du Xizhou Laiqi Mingwen Zhaji" 讀西周逯器銘文札記. In Zhang Guangyu, *Xuezhai Xueshu Lunwenji* 雪齋學術論文集, vol. 2, pp. 277-284. Taipei: Yiwen Yinshuguan.
- Zhongguo Shehui Kexueyuan Kaogu Yanjiusuo 中國社會科學院考古研究所 1984-94. *Yin Zhou Jinwen Jicheng [YZ]* 殷周金文集成. Beijing: Zhonghua Shuju.
- 2001. *Yin Zhou Jinwen Jicheng Shiwen* 殷周金文集成釋文. Hong Kong; Xianggang Zhongwen Daxue Zhongguo Wenhua Yanjiusuo.

Afterword to the English version

On the publication of the English version of this paper, I would like to express my opinion about another problem, i.e. the periodization of Western Zhou history, which was not argued explicitly in the original version (although it is a necessary outgrowth of my argument).

I will first briefly review the course of the arguments about the periodization of the Western Zhou history in studies in Japan after WWII.

In Japan after WWII, studies on the Western Zhou history began with Kaizuka Shigeki's work in 1946. Kaizuka first introduced Bernhard Karlgren's theory dividing Western Zhou bronze inscriptions into two periods, the former half (the period of the reigns of King Wu, King Cheng, King Kang, King Zhao and King Mu) and the latter half (the period of the reigns of King Gong, King Yi, King Xiao, King Yi, King Li, Gonghe, King Xuan and King You) and then pointed out the existence of Middle Western Zhou bronze inscriptions that had a transitional character bridging the Early and Late Western Zhou bronze inscriptions. Therefore, the Western Zhou bronze inscriptions could be divided into three periods, the Early (covering the reigns of King Wu, King Cheng and King Kang), the Late (covering the reigns of King Gong, King Yi, King Xiao, King Yi, King Li, Gonghe, King Xuan and King You) and the Middle (covering the last years of King Kang's reign and those of King Zhao and King Mu). As the early bronze inscriptions were called "precious-shell-bestowal-style bronze inscriptions" and the later ones were named "official-chariot-clothes-appointment-style bronze inscriptions," the most important *merkmale* of this periodization is the appearance of the appointment-style bronze inscrip-

tions.

The work of Shirakawa Shizuka (1977), perhaps the sole academic history of the entire Western Zhou era in Japan, described Western Zhou history by dividing it into six stages: one, “The transition from Yin to Western Zhou” (covering the reigns of King Wen and King Wu); two, “Developments in the Early Zhou” (covering the reigns of King Cheng and King Kang); three, “Biyong in Fengjing” (covering the reigns of King Kang, King Zhao and King Mu); four, “The establishment of the political order” (covering the King Gong and King Yi); five, “King Xiao and King Yi’s reigns and trends of Huaiyi” (covering the reigns of King Xiao and King Yi); and six, “Vicissitudes of aristocratic society and the collapse of the Western Zhou dynasty” (covering the reigns of King Li, King Xuan and King You). The following is a comparison of the periodizations of Kaizuka, on the left, and Shirakawa, on the right.

Early Western Zhou: “Transition from Yin to Western Zhou ”

“Developments in the Early Zhou”

Middle Western Zhou: “Biyong in Fengjing”

Late Western Zhou: “Establishment of the political order”

“King Xiao and King Yi’s reigns and trends of Huaiyi”

“Vicissitudes of aristocratic society and the collapse of the Western Zhou dynasty”

Shirakawa likewise adopted the fundamental framework dividing the Western Zhou era into three periods, but he subdivided each period. Especially, the relation between “Biyong in Fengjing” and “the establishment of the political order” correspond nicely with the relation between transitional characteristics of the Middle Western Zhou bronze inscriptions and the appearance of appointment-style bronze inscription that had been pointed out by Kaizuka.

As Yoshimoto Michimasa (2003) has pointed out, scholars studying Yin and Zhou history in Japan after WWII can be divided roughly into three generations. Itô Michiharu, Matsumaru Michio, Higuchi Takayasu and Hayashi Minao formed the second generation of scholars that followed the first generation of Kaizuka and Shirakawa. Although both Itô and Matsumaru did not always explicitly argue periodization, Itô (1987: 13) for example, employed a periodization, distinguishing the Early (the reigns of King Wu, King Cheng and King Kang), the Middle (the reigns of King Zhao, King Mu, King Gong and King Yi) and the Late (the reigns of King Xiao, King Yi, King Li, King Xuan and King You) Western Zhou periods. As can be seen by the fact that he noted many bronze inscriptions of the Early and the former half of the Middle period record military achievements, other

events, and bestowals, while many of the inscriptions of the latter half of the Middle and the Late periods record official appointments and bestowals of chariots and clothes by the kings, Itô simply adopted Kaizuka's opinion and emphasized the changes in contents of inscriptions and the epochs reflecting such changes. These epochs, however, do not correspond to the periodization Itô employed and as a result he used terms such as "the former half of the Middle period" and "the latter half of the Middle period." On the other hand, Matsumaru and Takeuchi Yasuhiro (1993) used expressions such as "the Early Western Zhou bronze inscriptions (to about King Zhao's reign)" and "the Middle and Late Western Zhou (from about King Mu's reign)." Although they did not explicitly refer to an epoch between the Middle and Late Zhou, Matsumaru (ed. 1990: 316) described the reigns of King Yǐ and King Lǐ as the Late Western Zhou, it is clear that they regarded those times as a distinct epoch. Their periodization, however, contains the same problem as that of Itô.

The periodization of Higuchi and Hayashi, who also belonged to the second generation, was based on the chronological study of Chen Mengjia (1945). Chen divided the Western Zhou into three periods based on his estimate of the length of the reigns of Western Zhou kings, resulting in an Early Zhou lasting 80 years (the reigns of King Wu, King Cheng, King Kang and King Zhao), a Middle Zhou lasting 90 years (the reigns of King Mu, King Gong, King Yi, King Xiao and King Yi) and a Late Zhou lasting 87 years (the reigns of King Li, Gonghe, King Xuan and King You). As Higuchi (1963: 19) said, "[Chen] divided them equally creating periods 80-90 years in length, which is convenient in considering the length of each period," and Hayashi (1984: 192) said, "[Chen] divided the 257 years of the Western Zhou into three periods each about 80-90 years in length and roughly as long as [each period of] the Spring Autumn and Warring States periods," Chen's periodization offered periods of equal length suitable for the methodology of archaeological chronology.

As for Hayashi's chronology, Kominami Ichirô (2006) revealed the following episode. In a letter of thanks, Kominami wrote to Hayashi, "You dated bronzes assuming a great gap between stages A and B of the Middle Western Zhou (dating all the bronzes with appointment inscriptions after the stage B of the Middle Zhou). Would it not be more reasonable then to do away with the chronology that assumes a Middle period, and instead divide the Western Zhou into stages A, B and C of the Early period and stages A, B and C of the Late period?" Hayashi telephoned Kominami and asserted, "I could never accept such an opinion." Although Hayashi did not expound the grounds for his rejection, we can discern

from their “dialogue” a difference between periodization of Kaizuka (or Shirakawa) that emphasized epochs reflecting changes in content of inscriptions and that of Hayashi (or Higuchi and Chen) that proposed periods of equal length.

Indeed, Hayashi’s periodization is the most comprehensive standard in determining the dates of bronzes, and scholars of the third generation, including myself, cannot ignore the fruit of this labor. In fact, Hirase Takao (1994) and Yoshimoto (2004) who have attempted to reconstruct the chronology of the period from the dates of bronze inscriptions, regard Hayashi’s dating as an external (and absolute) standard against which to examine their reconstructions of the chronology, and Yoshimoto (1991) and Matsui Yoshinori (2002) have frequently used expressions such as “roughly since the stage B of the Middle period of Hayashi’s dating.” The completeness of Hayashi’s periodization, however, does not refute the *raison d’être* for the periodization of epochs based on the contents of inscriptions. Komimami’s bold suggestion of a periodization similar to that of Kaizuka, which provoked Hayashi, contains some truth, even if it may have wounded Hayashi’s feelings.

On the basis of this general review, I would like to express my opinion about the Western Zhou periodization growing out of an interpretation of the inscription of the “Lai Pan.” I will first list the stages of historical consciousness of Western Zhou people as seen in the inscription of the “Lai Pan,” and then develop a new periodization based on them.

1) The origin of the dynasty was attributed to the two kings, i.e. King Wen and King Wu, and eventually a discourse that combined King Wen and King Wu as a pair grew out of this conception.

2) As for King Cheng and King Kang, there was a conscious attempt to avoid combining them as a pair. King Cheng’s achievements, such as the suppression of the Three Supervisor’s Rebellion and the building of Chengzhou, were strongly seen as extensions of King Wu’s achievements.

3) As the “Kanggong problem” shows, King Kang occupied the position of “founder” in the Western Zhou mausoleum system, and there was a historical consciousness of King Kang’s reign as a distinct epoch.

4) As for the three pairs of six kings, i.e. King Zhao and King Mu, King Gong and King Yi, and King Xiao and King Yi, two of the kings, i.e. King Zhao and King Mu, were remembered as “Military Kings,” and these memories were carried on in historical sources.

5) In contrast, concrete achievements were not recounted for the two pairs of four kings, i.e. King Gong and King Yi, and King Xiao and King Yi. Later his-

torical sources that have little to say about kings Gong, Yi, and Xiao perhaps inherited the historical consciousness of Western Zhou people.

6) However, historical sources contain rich narratives of the achievements of the kings after King Yi's reign, and as for the "Kanggong problem," the palaces of King Yi and King Li were specified, therefore, King Yi's reign may have been a transitional period bridging the reigns of King Gong, King Yi, and King Xiao and the period after King Li's reign.

These facts surely demonstrate the historical consciousness of three periods, i.e. the reign of King Kang, the reign of King Gong, and the reigns of King Yi and King Li's as distinct epochs. Therefore, on the basis of this historical consciousness of the Western Zhou people, the Western Zhou may be divided into following four periods,

Period I: King Wen, King Wu, and King Cheng

Period II: King Kang, King Zhao, and King Mu

Period III: King Gong, King Yi, King Xiao and King Yi

Period IV: King Li, King Xuan, and King You

If we followed the periodization adopted in the Tang literary studies, i.e. the Early, High, Middle, and Late Tang, we can apply the terminology to the Western Zhou, creating periods running from the Early Western Zhou to the Late Western Zhou. I would like to give a brief description of the character of each period before concluding this afterword.

The first period, i.e. the period of the reigns of King Wen, King Wu, and King Cheng, was the period of the establishment of the dynasty. Two events marked the origin of the Western Zhou dynasty, King Wen's receipt of the Mandate and King Wu's conquest of the Yin. After King Wu's death, the task of the "conquest of the Yin" was inherited by King Cheng. Achievements such as the suppression of the Three Supervisor's Rebellion and the building of Chengzhou were later preserved in the *Shangshu* with an emphasis on memories of Tan, the Duke of Zhou. This likely corresponds to stage A of the Early period in Hayashi's periodization.

The second, i.e. the period of the reigns of King Kang, King Zhao, and King Mu, was remembered as the period of the "Military Kings" by the Western Zhou people of the fourth period. The full-fledged expeditions and conquest activities of King Kang's reign were further developed in the reign of King Zhao and King Mu. The combination of King Cheng and King Kang into a pair was merely the result of the achievements of King Kang having been forgotten. This corresponds to the stage B of the Early period and stage A of the Middle period.

The third, i.e. the period of the reigns of King Gong, King Yi, King Xiao and

King Yǐ, was the period when the appointment-style bronze inscription was established and the dynastic political order was completed. Although this period had few memorable achievements that would be recorded in the fourth period, segmentation of each family proceeded spurred on by appointments etc., and we can observe confusion regarding the royal succession, and formation of the ministers apparently to compensate for this. This corresponds stage B of the Middle period and stage A of the Late period.

The fourth period, i.e. the reigns of King Li, King Xuan, and King You, was the period when military strains arose, such as the unrest and rebellions of surrounding powers and expeditions against them. Within the government, powerful inner lords, such as Wugong, Bohefu, and Maogong, whose powers exceeded that of kings, appeared, and the dynasty also sought to reconfirm its own orthodoxy. This is the period that Shirakawa (1981) called the period of the “development of the Ya and Song poems,” and palaces of the Kanggong were also ordered in this period. This corresponds to the stages A and B of the Late period in Hayashi’s periodization.

The *Toyôshi Kenkyû* Vol. 64.3, in which the original version of this paper was published, was dated December 31, 2005, and Vol. 66. 4, in which this English version will be printed, will carry the date March 31, 2008. Two years and eight months will have passed between the two publications, and in the interim, the academic world concerned with Western Zhou history and the study of bronzes in Japan has lost two great pioneers. On January 1, 2006, Hayashi Minao died at 80, and on October 30 of the same year, Shirakawa Shizuka died at 96. We of the third generation began our studies under the direction of the second generation, which included Hayashi. During that period, the collected works of Kaizuka Shigeki (*Kaizuka Shigeki Chosakushû*) began to be published (1976), and the sixth and concluding volume of Shirakawa’s *Kinbun Tsûshaku* (1980) also came out. These words served as our “textbooks,” as we poured over them avidly taking notes. Now that we have lost both Shirakawa and Hayashi, the responsibility imposed us, the third generation, has grown heavier. If as a result of publishing this paper and afterword in English, the contents are examined and criticized, I will feel great pleasure in having borne some small portion of that responsibility.

References

- Chen Mengjia 陳夢家 1945. *Xizhou Niandai Kao* 西周年代考. Second printing, Shanghai: Shangwu Yinshuguan, 1955. Also in *Chen Mengjia Zhuzuoji*;

- Xizhou Niandai Kao, *Liuguo Jinian* 陳夢家著作集—西周年代考・六國紀年. Beijing: Zhounghua Shuju, 2005.
- Hayashi Minao 林巳奈夫 1984. *Inshû Jidai Seidôki no Kenkyû; Inshû Seidôki Sôran 1* 殷周時代青銅器の研究—殷周青銅器綜覽——. Tôkyô: Yoshikawa Kôbunkan.
- Higuchi Takayasu 樋口隆康 1963. “Seishû Dôki no Kenkyû” 西周銅器の研究, *Kyôto Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyû Kiyô* 7: 1-151. Also in Higuchi et.al., *Tenbô Ajia no Kôkogaku; Higuchi Takayasu Kyôju Taikan Kinen Ronshû* 展望アジアの考古學 樋口隆康教授退官記念論集. Tôkyô: Shinchôsha, 1983.
- Hirase Takao 平勢隆郎 1994. “Seishû Kinen ni kansuru Shiron” 西周紀年に關する試論. *Chûgoku Shigaku* 4: 121-138. Also in Hirase, *Chûgoku Kodai Kinen no Kenkyû; Tenmon to Reki no Kentô kara* 中國古代紀年の研究—天文と曆の検討から, Tôkyô: Kyûko Shoin, 1996.
- Itô Michiharu 伊藤道治 1987. *Chûgoku Kodai Kokka no Shihai Kôzô; Seishû Hôken Seido to Kinbun* 中國古代國家の支配構造—西周封建制度と金文. Tôkyô: Chûôkôronsha, .
- Kaizuka Shigeki 貝塚茂樹 1946. *Chûgoku Kodai Shigaku no Hatten* 中國古代史學の發展. Tôkyô: Kôbundô. Also in Kaizuka, *Kaizuka Shigeki Chosakushû*. vol.4. Tôkyô: Chûôkôronsha, 1977.
- Kominami Ichirô 小南一郎 2006. *Kodai Chûgoku; Tenmei to Seidôki* 古代中國—天命と青銅器, Kyôto: Kyôtodai gaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai.
- Matsui Yoshinori 松井嘉徳 2002. *Shûdai Kokusei no Kenkyû* 周代國制の研究. Tôkyô: Kyûko Shoin.
- Matsumaru Michio 松丸道雄 (ed.)1980. *Seishû Seidôki to sono Kokka* 西周青銅器とその國家, Tôkyô: Tôkyôdaigaku Shuppankai.
- Matsumaru Michio and Takeuchi Yasuhiro 竹内康浩 1993. “Seishû Kinbun chû no Hôsei Shiryô” 西周金文中の法制史料. In Shiga Shûzô 滋賀秀三 (ed.), *Chûgoku Hôseishi; Kihon Shiryô no Kenkyû* 中國法制史—基本資料の研究, pp. 3-55. Tôkyô: Tôkyôdaigaku Shuppankai.
- Shirakawa Shizuka 白川靜 1977. “Seishû Shiryaku” 西周史略. *Kinbun Tsûshaku* 金文通釋 46-47. Also in Shirakawa, *Shirakawa Shizuka Chosakushû*, supplementary volume, *Kinbun Tsûshaku*, vol.6. Tôkyô: Heibonsha, 2005.
- 1981. *Shikyô Kenkyû Tsûronhen* 詩經研究通論篇. Kyôto: Hôyû Shoten. Also in *Shirakawa Shizuka Chosakushû*, vol.10, *Shikyô* 詩經, part II. Tôkyô: Heibonsha, 2000.
- Yoshimoto Michimasa 吉本道雅 1991. “Seishû Sakumei Kinbun Kô” 西周冊命金

- 文考, *Shirin* 74.5: 38-66. Revised edition in Yoshimoto, *Chûgoku Senshinshi no Kenkyû* 中國先秦史の研究. Kyôto: Kyôtodaigaku Gakujutsu Shuppankai, 2005.
- 2003. Review of the *Shûdai Kokusei no Kenkyû*, by Matsui Yoshinori. *Shisô* 60: 69-74.
- 2004. “Seishû Kinen Kô” 西周紀年考. *Ritsumeikan Bungaku* 586: 57-18.

References for English Translation

- Falkenhausen, Lothar von 2006. *Chinese Society in the Age of Confucius (1000-250BC); The Archaeological Evidence*. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology, University of California.
- Legge, James 1865. *The Chinese Classics. Vol. 3: The Shoo King, or Book of Historical Documents*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press, 1960.
- 1871. *The Chinese Classics. Vol. 4: The She King*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press, 1960.
- 1872. *The Chinese Classics. Vol. 5: The Ch'un Ts'ew with The Tso Chuen*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong Press, 1960.
- Schuessler, Axel 1987. *A Dictionary of Early Zhou Chinese*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Shaughnessy, Edward L. 1991. *Sources of Western Zhou History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- 1997. *Before Confucius; Studies in the Creation of the Chinese Classics*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- 1999. “Western Zhou History”. In Michael Loewe and Edward L. Shaughnessy (eds.), *the Cambridge History of Ancient China; From the Origin of Civilization to 221 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

(translated by YOSHIMOTO Michimasa & Michael JAMENTZ)